

was fascinated by the way in which the power authority intends to tap additional kilowatts at Niagara Falls.

Under cover of darkness, when the thundering tourist attraction is not at stake, water will be drawn from the Niagara River and held in reservoirs and pools. Then, during daylight, it will be poured through canals and dropped some 300 feet via penstocks to a huge powerplant at the bottom of the yawning Niagara gorge. Thus the maximum amount of energy will be produced in the daytime, while factories are working full shift. Nor will it be necessary to spoil the beauty and grandeur of the falls when pilgrims and newlyweds are looking at one of the world's famous spectacles.

One basic difference between industries locating on the St. Lawrence and those in

our own Columbia Basin must be emphasized. The plants taking advantage of the low-cost kilowatts of the St. Lawrence frontier are only a midiron shot from millions of customers in the Eastern States. In the Northwest, by comparison, the long freight haul still intervenes across the continent and over the intermountain barrier—and freight rates, alas, are rising with every passing year of biennium.

Readers of this book review will be interested to learn that the Messrs. Sufrin and Palmer are opposed to special tax concessions for new industries. They support general New York State policy in this respect. They believe that tax rebates or "forgiveness" for new plants are almost always at the expense of existing industries in that particular community. They also warn that fly-by-night

factories tend to take advantage of temporary tax concessions, and then perhaps migrate somewhere else, leaving behind a legacy of unemployed families and unsupported public facilities.

The cost of the St. Lawrence Seaway is about \$1 billion with some \$300 million invested by the two national governments in the navigation facilities and the rest in the intricate powerplants. According to present schedules, the seaway will be completed sometime during 1959 "and, when it is finished, it will provide a 27-foot channel between Montreal and the Great Lakes." Advocates of Columbia River and Snake River navigation then will have a real show-case to point to, when they seek appropriations and further authorizations from a somewhat reluctant administration or Congress.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 17, 1958

Rev. Calvin Thielman, minister, the Presbyterian Church, Waynesville, N. C., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, O God, our Father, for all Thy goodness to the children of men; for the word of prophet and apostle, given for the enlightenment of the world; for the supreme revelation of Thyself in Thy Son, who became bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, to redeem us; for the gift of Thy Holy Spirit, whose power is sufficient to restore our hearts and our world to the order that will please Thee.

We entreat Thy forgiveness for the shameful peace which we have often made with our temptations.

Create within us a holy dissatisfaction with all that is base and low. Dispel from our minds the stale languor of past failures that haunt us.

Lift us to a new vision of our work in its eternal perspective. Grant us the courage to be expendable in the fight for that which is right.

Make us deaf to harmful praise. Help us to sense the littleness that clings to deeds of vanity.

We intercede for Thy mercy on behalf of the people we represent.

We remember before Thee, our Father, the members of our families, our friends, and our staff, whose costly sacrifices have made it possible for us to serve here. Tender to them a solemn sense of pride in their unsung labors for the Republic.

Help us to make the clean and unsoiled hours of this session fruitful for good. In Jesus' name. Amen.

REV. CALVIN THIELMAN

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am very proud to be present today to receive the inspiration which comes from the wonderful prayer delivered by a loyal and devoted friend of mine and a former Texan, who has moved on to other fields in North Carolina.

I am pleased to state that his contributions to our State, even when he was a boy in high school, and during his

early years in college, were great and enduring.

I know of no more dedicated person.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., March 17, 1958.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MANSFIELD thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 14, 1958, was dispensed with.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the Senate of March 14, 1958,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore, on March 15, 1958, signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 10021) to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1957, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2120) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, rehabilitate, operate, and maintain the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas, Mercedes division, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 1519. An act for the relief of Isaac Lidji, Henry Isaac Lidji, and Sylvio Isaac Gattegno; and

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.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements made in that connection be limited to 3 minutes.

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—THE ROAD BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I had anticipated that sometime this week the Senate would proceed to the consideration of the road bill, which on last Friday was ordered reported by the Public Works Committee. I had hoped the bill would be taken up by the Senate on Tuesday or Wednesday.

However, a very unusual situation developed in the Public Works Committee: Some of the members asked that the bill not be reported until minority views could be prepared, and found that it would be necessary to hold up that important, emergency measure for more than 1 week.

I hope it will be possible to work out some arrangement whereby the bill can at least be reported by the middle of the week, and whereby the Senate can proceed to its consideration in the latter part of the week.

In any event, I believe prompt action on the bill is not only desirable, but essential, particularly in view of the fact that 5,200,000 of the American people are unemployed, and the fact that the purpose of the bill is not only to provide good roads, but also to provide jobs for

Americans. I am told that it is estimated that 90 cents out of every dollar spent for roads goes for labor.

So, Mr. President, I believe it is rather difficult to justify taking more than 1 week to write a report and submit it to the Senate.

In any event, if the schedule which has been agreed upon is followed, the bill should be available for consideration by the Senate on Monday.

Mr. President, I anticipate that this week will be a relatively light one for the Senate. I do not believe the Senate will hold any night sessions this week; and I do not expect that the daily sessions will begin before noon. There may be exceptions, but at this time I do not anticipate any.

However, in view of the fact that I had hoped and believed, and had assured certain Senators, that the Senate would commence an Easter recess on Thursday, April 3, following the conclusion of its business on that day, and in view of the fact that the House of Representatives has made a similar arrangement, I wish all Members to be on notice that we hope to have the Senate complete its action on the road bill before the Senate commences its Easter recess. Therefore, if it is necessary for the Senate to meet early in the mornings and to continue its sessions until late in the evenings on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of next week, the leadership will ask that it be done, because I believe it is very important to the country that the bill be passed.

Mr. President, I turn now to another subject.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

THE TEXAS QUARTERLY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the University of Texas has just published the first number of a splendid magazine, the Texas Quarterly.

This is an auspicious event for Texans, and for enlightened men everywhere. It is another indication that the University of Texas is responding to the immense challenges that face us today—challenges that face us not only in the world of missiles and satellites, but also in the world of scholarship and humane education.

The Texas Quarterly reflects the spirit of a great institution of learning. In the Texas Quarterly, no artificial barriers are set up between men of science, men of Government and business, and men of art. As the Quarterly's editor, Dean Harry Ransom says in this issue:

A university must not prize, even when it must acknowledge, artificially neat little packages which are the stock in trade of many departmental systems. It must recognize the unity of knowledge.

Mr. President, the Texas Quarterly is founded on this belief. Its pages are open to physicists and poets. It will provide a communications center for men of ideas and experience in many fields of endeavor.

I know the Senate will join me in congratulating the University of Texas on this splendid beginning, and in wishing

the Texas Quarterly a long and informative life.

So that the Quarterly may be more easily available to my colleagues, the Members of the Senate of the United States, I have purchased a subscription to the Texas Quarterly for the Senate Library. I hope my colleagues will drop by the Senate Library and will examine our university's great, new publication.

Mr. President—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

THE PRESENT SITUATION—ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE SENATE LAST WEEK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to express to the Members of the Senate, on both sides of the aisle, my appreciation for their indulgence and their understanding during the sessions last week. It was one of the most productive and constructive weeks I have ever observed since I became a Member of the Senate.

During that week the Senate passed a housing bill which provides for 200,000 new homes. I am told that there will be employed approximately 3½ man-years per home, or a total of 750,000 new jobs, as a result of the enactment of that bill. The bill was reported to the Senate by a bipartisan vote. It was passed by the Senate by a vote of—as I recall—86 to 0. It is a comprehensive bill; it is a far-reaching bill. It is a bill designed to operate in the spirit and the atmosphere of our free-enterprise system.

Mr. President, I am confident of the future of this country. I believe in its possibilities. I do not think we have even skimmed the surface in exploring the avenues we should explore. I believe the statement that the great President Franklin D. Roosevelt made when he was inaugurated in 1933 was never truer than it is today, namely—

The only thing we have to fear is fear itself.

But there are many unemployed in this country. We must face up to that problem.

Last week there were reported from the appropriate committees two resolutions urging acceleration of approximately \$7 billion worth of public works. Those resolutions were adopted by this body with only one dissenting vote.

The farmers of this country have been in an economic decline. Their income has dropped from \$18 billion a year to \$11 billion a year, to the point where those who lend the money—and there are only 14,000 of them—last year took more in interest income than the 20 million people who produce the Nation's food and fiber. Interest income rose to some \$18 billion, and the farmers' income was \$11.5 billion. It was necessary to give the farmers confidence. We did that by guaranteeing a floor under his prices, so he knows he will not have prices on wheat or cotton or dairy products or corn reduced, and therefore he can have confidence in the future of his farm production.

I am confident those resolutions urging the acceleration of public works will be adopted by the House. I am quite sure 400,000 or 500,000 additional jobs will be created thereby. Added to the 750,000 in housing, added to the four or five or six hundred thousand from the road bill, and the bill which will give the farmers confidence, I believe we have made a great step forward to face up to the decline in employment the Nation has suffered.

Today the Senate will be presented with a measure based upon the meritorious concept of helping local governments speed up public works. Soon, I hope we will be able to consider on the floor a capital credit bill for small business.

I hope the Congress will give consideration to the problem of increasing old-age assistance benefits, improving social security, extending the time for which unemployment compensation may be paid, and reducing taxes, and will send us a bill, perhaps in one package, upon which the Senate can act.

I have made this statement this morning because it is very vivid in my memory what we went through in the early 1930's. I know it is much cheaper to prevent a depression than to get out of one.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am sure both the administration and the Congress are mindful of the economic problems confronting the Nation. I believe that the 170 million people of our country expect the Congress to move ahead, with due deliberation, in the consideration of important legislation pending before it.

The distinguished majority leader has mentioned that last week the Senate passed the housing bill by an overwhelming vote, and a bipartisan vote, and that other proposed legislation will be coming before the Senate in the weeks ahead.

I believe that such measures should receive reasonable and adequate consideration in committee. I am sure American citizens feel they should have an opportunity to be heard if they desire such an opportunity. There should certainly be a reasonable time for minority views to be prepared, whether such views come from the other side of the aisle or this side of the aisle. It is only in the dictatorships of the world that legislation "whizzes" through without the opportunity for minority views to be heard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Now I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I desire to associate myself with the statement the Senator has made as to the desirability of adequate hearings and thorough consideration of all legislative measures, and to point out that it is my information that the road bill was reported from the committee unanimously. In that committee there was a difference on only one point, and that was the billboard matter. It seems to me, and I hope the Senator will agree, that a difference on the billboard section of the bill could be expressed in less than 10 days, in a period when we are trying to provide

five or six hundred thousand men with jobs as soon as action can be taken.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am sure the Senator knows I have cooperated in facilitating the passage of proposed legislation through this body.

I expect to continue to do so. Both the distinguished Senator from Texas and I have been mindful that even though we find we do not always agree with the minority views on either side of the aisle, in our representative form of government the minority has the right to present its views, whether we agree with them or not. We certainly hope the bill will be facilitated. I am sorry there has been necessity for delay. With the implementation presently going on, if the bill be reported by next Monday, the Senate can then consider it. I am sure we shall be able to act on it in the 2 weeks remaining before the Easter recess; and I think we shall have made a very fine record. Of course, if its consideration can be facilitated and it can be passed earlier than that, that would be fine.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I want the Senator to know the minority I am speaking of is not the Republican minority. It is a bipartisan minority. It happens to be a divided minority on the billboard section of the bill. I hope my reference to the minority did not prompt the Senator to feel I was being more critical of Members on his side of the aisle than mine. Weeks of hearings have been held on the bill. We are told certain Senators have necessarily to be out of town, and they are going to get around to writing minority views on the billboard question in the latter part of the week. I do not criticize them for it. I merely point out the fact that the schedule this week will have to be adjusted. I hope I will have the Senator's cooperation in having the Senate meet earlier.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator always has my cooperation in having the Senate meet earlier and sit to a later hour. In view of the fact that we have used the terms "majority" and "minority" rather loosely, the Senator from Texas and I understand that majority and minority fluctuate from time to time. Sometimes the majority leader finds himself, as I have in the past, the leader of a minority, and the minority leader finds himself the leader of a majority. I wanted the RECORD to be clear that the minority the Senator was speaking of did not refer to Members on this side of the aisle in toto, but to a minority of the committee itself, and that the bill itself had been reported by a unanimous vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day I made some remarks on the recession, on the necessity for our acceleration of public works; and on certain action the Senate took last week, which I considered to be very productive.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following those remarks, a letter to the editor of the New York Times, written by Edward K. Smith, of the department of economics, Boston University. The letter was dated at Chestnut Hill, Mass., on March 13,

1958, and was published in today's issue of the New York Times. I have read Mr. Smith's letter with great interest and stimulation. I believe he expresses in it many sound suggestions. I do not embrace all of the letter; but I hope each Member of the Senate will have an opportunity to read it, to digest it, and to consider it.

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

TO AID ECONOMY: CUT IN TAXES DEEMED THE BEST AND QUICKEST METHOD

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The still deepening recession is rapidly confirming the opinion that several economists advanced months ago; viz, the predicted downturn of midyear 1957 would not be corrected, in the absence of substantial intervention, at the earliest until late 1958.

This view did not anticipate sputniks but it did assume more prompt action upon the part of Federal Reserve authorities than did in fact materialize. Both have come too late, in a sense, to do much good in the short run.

The overall optimism about the long-run performance of the American economy has served to alleviate fears of short-run recessions seriously impairing our long-run ability to provide for a growing economy. But there is a distinct possibility that the present recession may engender a cumulative wave of pessimism contributing not only to the deepening and widening of the present downturn but also to doubts about the long-run prospects of the economy itself, even in the face of facts to the contrary.

TIME TO ACT

If this be the case, then the time to act is now and in a positive and forthright manner. A large and complex economy cannot be talked out of recession. It is far easier to keep a boom going than to banish recessions with an outpouring of optimistic views not grounded on fact.

The increased spending on defense and public works, especially the latter, has too long a lag built into it to be an efficient anti-recessionary device. Public works are better suited to conditions of fairly severe depressions. They cannot be easily turned off if recovery is rapid and in many cases cannot be turned off at all. They tend to become built into the structure of things and invoke much more governmental control. Their inflexibility thus seriously impairs their ability to be timed to the kind of cycle we have experienced in the postwar period.

The best measure to take, in the present case, is to cut taxes—and not to cut them on present income, where the benefits do not accrue to the unemployed and come only in dribbles to the great majority of those still working—but to cut them on past income. This can be easily accomplished, for example, by allowing every taxpayer an additional \$100 to \$200 per exemption on his 1957 income tax due April 15. Some \$3 billion to \$6 billion could be pumped into the economy within 4 months under such a plan.

On the corporate-tax side a percentage reduction in total tax liability might be granted, again on the previous income year, perhaps with business in the first income bracket allowed a larger percentage reduction than those in the 52-percent bracket.

MANY ADVANTAGES

The advantages of this method are many. The tax cuts would be based on income already earned, and in most cases on taxes already paid out. Quick processing of tax returns would result in lump-sum payments of refunds available for immediate spending. It would reduce or eliminate payments to be made this April in the case of many thousands of other taxpayers. It would pro-

vide income for those who were working part or all of 1957 but not now. The lump-sum payments can have a far more stimulating effect than the very small increases in disposable income under other plans.

This is a one-shot affair and it does not tinker with tax rates and other provisions of the law, a process better left to careful evaluation in the longer run. And the action is a positive and forthright move to stem recession, worthy of a Government convinced of the long-run viability of the American economy.

The recession once cured, we may turn toward working out these adjustments necessary to our longer run stability, and not have to take the chance of the present kind of "readjustments" or "shakeout" leading to confusion and cumulative breakdown too serious to be turned about by the mechanism advocated above.

The public awaits the April 15 deadline and the Congress should act now.

EDWARD K. SMITH,
Department of Economics, Boston College,
Chestnut Hill, Mass., March 12, 1958.

LAUNCHING AND PLACING OF VANGUARD IN ORBIT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am pleased to state at this session of the Senate that the Vanguard has been successfully launched and is in its orbit. All of us are familiar with what must have been some frustrating experiences of those charged with the responsibility, and, undoubtedly, many of us understand what some of the problems were. I think we shall want certainly without regard to partisanship to compliment the Navy, the fine group of organizations, and the other services that cooperated in the common effort. We think those who took part in the effort perhaps had the luck of the Irish, on this St. Patrick's Day, getting the satellite into orbit.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I desire to join with the minority leader in expressing my gratification—indeed, my elation—at the success of the Navy in launching the Vanguard with its satellite, which is now in orbit. This is a reward of patience and of great ingenuity and courage on the part of the Navy. I certainly want to join the Senator from California, in congratulating the Navy upon this splendid achievement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to ask the privilege of associating myself with the statements of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] with regard to the successful launching of the Vanguard. I commend both Senators for their very great interest and more than usual activity with relation to the defense of the Nation, as well as for their patriotism. No member of the Committee on Armed Services has contributed more to our successful hearings, which lasted more than 3 months, than the Senator from Connecticut. I should like to recognize that fact and point it up

at this time, and, at the same time, express my great pride in our Government for its most recent success, even though it is simply one of a series of successes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am honored to have the majority leader express his approval in associating himself with my remarks on this subject. I am deeply grateful to the Senator from Texas for his generous comments concerning my services with him on the Committee on Armed Services.

NAVY SATELLITE SUCCESS SERVES AS REMINDER OF NEED FOR ADMIRAL BYRD ANTARCTIC COMMISSION—NAVAL LEADERSHIP IN EXPLORATION CITED

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to join in endorsing the fine statements made in relation to the launching of the Vanguard by the Navy. It is a welcome sign of the United States Navy's continuing leadership in the exploration of the unknown.

Throughout the history of our Nation the Navy has been among the pioneers in breaking through barriers to man's knowledge of his environment. Ships of our fleet have plowed through waters of the Seven Seas, discovering and charting unknown areas of our globe. Scientists from the naval observatories have helped to push back the limitation of man's knowledge of the universe—charting the heavens, laying the groundwork for today's outstanding achievement and for tomorrow's adventure of manned exploration of outer space.

Another area where the Navy has contributed significantly to man's knowledge of his early environment is in Antarctica. For many years the Navy has had the task of finding out about this vast unknown area.

Under the leadership of such outstanding Americans as Adm. Richard E. Byrd and Adm. George Dufek, the Navy has given our Nation a position of world leadership in knowledge of this, the last unknown area of the earth's surface.

Within the past few months, however, other nations, including Russia, have begun to take an active interest in the Antarctic Continent. As a part of the International Geophysical Year, many countries are conducting scientific studies of this area. During this period many other agencies of our Government have joined the Navy in conducting research programs in Antarctica. These programs, although they will lead to further knowledge of this area, are lacking in two essential factors, namely, coordinated leadership and programing for the future. Our present Antarctic program is contributing greatly to man's knowledge. Our program for the future must continue this pattern.

Last year, along with 22 of my fellow Senators, I sponsored a bill, S. 2189, calling for the creation of the Richard E. Byrd Antarctic Commission. The purpose of this Commission would be to coordinate all activities of our Government in this area under one Government agency. A companion bill was introduced in the House of Representatives.

Today the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House is holding a hearing on the measure. This comes as welcome news to all of us who recog-

nize the need for immediate action on this measure. I urge members of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, to which the Senate bill was referred, to follow the excellent example of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in holding hearings on this important proposed legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement I submitted to the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee during today's hearing be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

SENATOR WILEY SAYS ATOM BOMB BLASTS MAY PROVIDE KEY TO SECRETS OF MINERAL WEALTH IN ANTARCTICA—URGES CREATION OF RICHARD E. BYRD ANTARCTIC COMMISSION

(Statement by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY to be included in the record of hearings before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on H. R. 7869, Monday, March 17, 1958)

I regret that I am unable to attend this hearing personally so as to give my views on this bill, H. R. 7869, providing for the creation of the Richard E. Byrd Antarctic Commission to protect and preserve American rights in Antarctica. Unfortunately a conflicting commitment precludes my attendance. However, I appreciate the opportunity afforded me to present my views.

As you know, I am sponsor along with 22 other Senators of the Senate version of this legislation, S. 2189. I consider this legislation to be one of the most important bills to be considered by Congress in many years.

With every passing day, the need for this type of an Antarctic Commission becomes more and more evident. We continually read in the newspapers and magazines about Russian scientific advances in Antarctica. We know that Russia has definite plans for future development of this vast continent.

Very recently, the Government of Great Britain recommended that a 10-nation commission be formed to govern all future activities on the Antarctic Continent. The Governments of Argentina, Chile, Australia, and New Zealand have all asserted territorial claims in Antarctica.

Last November, Lawrence Gould, United States Chairman of the Antarctic Committee of the International Geophysical Year announced that the United States was going to maintain some permanent bases in Antarctica. This was a step in the right direction. But, it was only a step. There is great need for a continued program of coordinated activities on the part of the United States in this area. I think the time is long overdue for the United States to formulate—and announce to the rest of the world—a concrete policy with regard to its plans for the future of Antarctica.

In the first place, it is the United States which has contributed the overwhelming share of sacrifices in manpower, time, energy, and money for exploration of this so-called unknown continent.

The United States has done more work in Antarctica than the rest of the entire world combined. For us to be silent about our rights or by default arbitrarily give up our prerogatives in this area without first, at least, crystallizing our national policy on the highest level would be an absurd waste of our assets and indifference to our obligations.

There are many who feel that we should not bother with Antarctica because we don't know whether or not it is of any value. I think that these views show a lack of realistic thinking on the part of their proponents.

In the first place, the very fact that we don't know what is in Antarctica makes it

even more imperative for us to maintain our rights and privileges on the continent. There is strong evidence of vast deposits of mineral wealth in this territory. These minerals might well prove the salvation of our Nation in the not too far distant future. Thus far, for example, more than 178 different metal ores have been detected in the mountains of the continent.

NUCLEAR EXPLORATION OF UNKNOWN ASSETS

We may well now be in a position to begin to determine just exactly what the Antarctic Continent holds.

Only last week the Atomic Energy Commission revealed the results of studies of underground nuclear explosions. According to the reports from the AEC, future underground atomic blasts may well be able to tell us exactly what mineral material lies beneath the surface of the earth.

By using atom bomb blasts, which, by the way, seem completely safe from radioactive fallout when exploded underground, we may be able to determine positively where the greatest mineral wealth in the Antarctic Continent lies. Nuclear power may also provide the key to harvesting the mineral wealth from beneath the ice. Are we going to give up our rights to this possible treasure chest of mineral wealth virtually the day before we will know what it contains?

Another argument frequently used against the creation of the Commission is that we already have too many Government bureaus and agencies. Some persons feel that the establishment of this Commission would be too costly.

I say that we have too many uncoordinated agencies and bureaus now involved in the Antarctic program. This fact is one of the prime reasons for creating the Commission. There is a desperate need for integrated activity in the future plans and programs of the United States in Antarctica. Many experts from the diverse agencies now involved in Antarctic projects could be released from their present official connections and employed by the Byrd Antarctic Commission. This would achieve the desired result of a unified, coordinated effort without the necessity of adding any new individuals to the Government payrolls.

Virtually the only cost in establishing this Commission would be a modest sum for administrative overhead.

I feel that the question is not whether we can afford to establish this Commission—the prime question is can we afford not to establish the Commission?

There are many other reasonable and sound arguments for the United States formulation of long-range policy in Antarctica:

1. The distance between Antarctica and any point on the continent of North America can be measured in a matter of minutes, in terms of missile flights.

2. In the event of warfare, and the possible destruction of the Panama Canal, anyone controlling the strategic area of the Antarctic Continent could well control all shipping between the eastern and western coasts of the American continents.

3. We are spending hundreds of millions of dollars in building defenses for the Western Hemisphere by constructing radar bases and antiaircraft and antimissile installations all along the northern borders of our continent. If we do not maintain a firm attitude and preserve our rights in the Antarctic, we will be leaving the door wide open to the possibility in the event of war, of Russian attack from the southernmost points in our hemisphere. This needless vulnerability, of course, would be sheer folly.

NEED PERMANENT AGENCY NOW

The end of the International Geophysical Year is fast approaching. America must have some positive and concrete long-range pro-

gram of action prior to the end of this great scientific experiment. It is imperative that our policies be clearly defined in order that other nations, as well as our own Government agencies and commissions know just exactly how we stand with regard to this vital area.

I want to make it clear that I am not against international cooperation in Antarctica.

I do not want America to claim more than her due and just share of this unclaimed continent.

On the contrary, I am delighted to have other nations cooperate in a forward thinking program of claim adjudication and scientific development in this area.

However, my major interest—like yours—is the national well-being of the United States.

If the United States does not assert itself in this particular instance, we will be betraying the memory of brave men such as Adm. Richard E. Byrd and others who have worn the uniform of our country and who have devoted much of their lives to exploring the Antarctic Continent.

We must immediately plan a permanent program for the United States in Antarctica. That means more than a few permanent bases. It means a broad scale program.

We must let the rest of the nations interested in Antarctica know our position. We must respectfully but firmly assert our prerogative with regard to this area.

We do not want Russia, or any other nation, for that matter, to have the privilege of casting a veto in an international commission on Antarctica. If it can possibly be avoided, we do not want any nation building submarine or missile bases in strategic areas of this continent which could interfere with the security of our Nation. We do not want other nations to acquire the rights to possible great mineral wealth that Americans have explored and developed.

Furthermore, we want to have the privilege of exploration of the mineral wealth of the continent, by means of the new underground nuclear blast methods, or any other method which can successfully detect what lies beneath the ice-encrusted surface.

This is a matter for every thinking American to take into immediate consideration. It is a subject vital to the actual security of our Nation.

The present spasmodic and uncoordinated activities of many of our Government agencies in Antarctica must be brought under the direction of one central organizational body.

There must be sound, continuous planning, organization, and forethought which goes into our future program with regard to future development of this continent. The decision made by this committee and by the Congress will without doubt, vitally affect the future of our Nation, possibly as much as the decision taken by preceding Congresses with regard to Alaska, the Louisiana Territory and other territorial acquisitions by our Nation.

I urge that this committee give favorable consideration to the bill on the Antarctic Commission, and that this consideration be given immediately, in order that Congress may have an opportunity to act upon this measure. The Byrd Antarctica Commission should become an integral part of the Government organization in the very near future in order that we may be ready when the IGY terminates in December.

Thank you again for giving me the opportunity to present my views.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is now in order.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H. R. 1140. An act to amend Public Law 85-56 to permit persons receiving retired pay for nonregular service to waive receipt of a portion of that pay to receive pensions or compensation under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration (Rept. No. 1392).

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

H. R. 5332. An act to amend sections 102, 301, and 302 of the Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act (Rept. No. 1393).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance:

John G. Kissane, of Vermont, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 2, with headquarters at St. Albans, Vt.;

Anne A. Mitchell, of Connecticut, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 6, with headquarters at Bridgeport Conn.;

Harold R. Becker, of New York, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 9, with headquarters at Buffalo, N. Y.;

Josiah A. Maulsby, Sr., of North Carolina, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 15, with headquarters at Wilmington, N. C.; and

Jessie Dixon Saylor, of Georgia, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 17, with headquarters at Savannah, Ga.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HOBLITZELL:

S. 3495. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of John Brown's raid at Harpers Ferry; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 3496. A bill to provide for the beneficiation of certain low-grade manganese ores purchased by the General Services Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. HILL, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CLARK, Mr. LONG, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 3497. A bill to expand the public facility loan program of the Community Facilities Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3498. A bill to include the holders of star route and certain other contracts for the carrying of mail under the provisions of

the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LONG (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 3499. A bill to amend the vessel measurement laws relating to water ballast spaces; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 3500. A bill to require the full and fair disclosure of certain information in connection with the distribution of new automobiles in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. PROXMIER:

S. 3501. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to expend funds appropriated for the diversion of surplus farm commodities to provide balanced diets in schools and institutions and for needy families; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 3502. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3503. A bill for the relief of Marie Inette Konomos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 3504. A bill to increase the amounts authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year for the programs of maternal and child health services and services for crippled children provided for by title V of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

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

BENEFICIATION OF CERTAIN LOW-GRADE MANGANESE ORES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the beneficiation of certain low-grade manganese ores purchased by the General Services Administration. My colleague, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], is co-sponsor of the bill and Representatives METCALF and ANDERSON are introducing companion bills in the House today.

Mr. President, bills for this purpose have been introduced in the Senate and the House by me and others as far back as 1953. Most of these bills, however, asked for extension and enlargement of both the low-grade and car-lot manganese programs and establishment of additional low-grade manganese ore purchase depots, as well as authorization to up-grade to specification material the low-grade ores. These bills met with uniform disapproval by the agencies involved in the minerals programs, as well as by the Bureau of the Budget, so none of them moved out of committee.

The manganese purchase depot serving the Butte-Phillipsburg area in Montana is due to shut down about the second or third week in May 1958, as by that time the 6 million units assigned by the Office of Defense Mobilization will have been delivered. Mr. Gordon Gray, Director of ODM, will not extend the program. Neither will he authorize the beneficiation or up-grading of the ore to usable specifications, as we have been urging him to do for some years, although the ore is useless in its present form. The Government, by the time the purchase program is completed, will have an investment of approximately \$8,817,000 in the ore at this Montana depot, and some types of the ores, I am told, are subject to a certain amount of constant deterioration and should be processed with reasonable promptness.

This particular manganese depot is unique in that there is a Government-owned mill, or processing plant, already built on the premises which, handling similar ores, was operated during World War II, and which can be speedily put into operation. Additionally, a pilot plant recently has been in operation, the results from which indicate that satisfactory recoveries can be made of commercial grades of manganese.

Mr. President, as in many other areas of the United States, unemployment is rampant in my State of Montana, and Montanans now working are living under a nightmare of apprehension that they may be next in the queues of the unemployed, awaiting Government handouts. Already more than 14 percent of Montana's covered workers are getting unemployment benefits, though some have exhausted these, and there are 22,000 applicants for work pressing at the doors of the State unemployment offices. A great many of these are lead, zinc, and copper miners. The end of the low-grade manganese program will add to the misery by throwing several hundred more miners out of work.

The passage of the bill which I have just introduced will keep a substantial number of workers in jobs for perhaps a year, by which time it is to be hoped the administration will have devised methods of overcoming the recession.

I and my colleague [Mr. MANSFIELD] trust that this measure will have fast and sympathetic consideration as one way to keep men at work, and at the same time contribute to the production of a useful element for the national defense and the national economy out of ores which otherwise bid fair to be of little value to the country.

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

The bill (S. 3496) to provide for the beneficiation of certain low-grade manganese ores purchased by the General Services Administration, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to express myself as being in wholehearted accord with what the senior Senator from Montana, the chairman of the

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, has just said.

In the State of Montana we are not faced with what has been called a recession. As the senior Senator from Montana has pointed out, we are faced with a depression. Montana has the shameful distinction of ranking No. 1, on a percentage basis, among the States of the Union in the number of persons drawing unemployment compensation insurance.

The latest figures at my disposal, figures issued by the administration, indicate that for the week ending February 22, 1958, Montana led the list with a percentage of 14.9 percent. This morning I called Mr. Walter Dougherty, financial secretary of Butte Miners Local No. 1, and I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the information I received from him. I asked Mr. Dougherty the number of miners employed in Butte on January 1, 1957. He replied that according to the books, they numbered 5,109. I then asked him how many miners were employed today. The answer was that, on the basis of his latest checkoff, which was on March 8, the number was 1,827. The figure in March of this year was 1,827, as compared with 5,109 in January a year ago.

This means that the miners in the Butte camp now unemployed amount to approximately 63 percent of the total number of miners employed a little over a year ago. This does not take into account the craft unions, which have been hit just as hard.

When commentators and columnists talk about rough spots and craters of distress throughout the country, I would suggest they take a look at Butte, Mont., a one-commodity mining camp, which depends on one product, and note the condition it is in.

Mr. President, it is up to the Government to step in and take a look at this particular situation. It is nothing new. It has been as it is for a long time, as I tried to indicate on occasions on the floor of the Senate, and as I have tried to indicate in correspondence with the President and other individuals downtown, who ought to take a more active interest in the situation that exists, not only in the mining industry, but in the lumber industry of Montana, as well.

Mr. President, I should like at this point also to raise a question with respect to the efficacy of defense spending if it is going to apply solely to research and development in the missile field.

I point out that although we can accelerate the defense spending all we want in the field of missiles, it will not mean much in the way of employment for our people. I also point out that we are not in a position as yet to forego the use of conventional weapons. I most respectfully suggest to the administration that it look into this particular aspect of our security, and that it do something about making certain that our conventional defense setup is as strong and impregnable as it can be; that we have the number of trucks, tanks, rifles, and other means of defending ourselves that we must have, and will not have to rely exclusively on the weapons of what many call the war

of the future, a war to be based on missile and rocket developments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a letter I wrote to the President of the United States, dated September 5, 1957; a letter written to the President by the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and me dated February 11, 1958; a letter written to the State Board of Examiners of Montana by my colleague, Representative METCALF, and me on February 12, 1958; a letter from Mr. Gordon Gray dated April 19, 1957; a letter written by me to more than 6,000 petitioners of Butte, Silver Bow County, Mont., dated February 21, 1958, relative to the manganese plant and its activation; a letter I wrote to the President of the United States on February 21, 1958; a reply I received, not from the President, but from Mr. I. Jack Martin, Administrative Assistant to the President, dated March 12, 1958, in which Mr. Martin enclosed a copy of a letter to Mr. Frank Murray, secretary of state of Montana, which the Montana delegation had sent him weeks ago, and a copy of a press release issued by the White House and addressed to the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and Representative JOSEPH MARTIN, dated March 8, 1958, relative to what the administration proposed to do in the field of employment.

So far as concerns the specific question raised about the manganese plant in Montana and its use, and what will be done by the administration concerning the production of lead, copper, and zinc, and other matters mentioned in the letter to the President, no answer from him, was received. The letter sent to President Eisenhower was worthy enough, in my opinion, to have been brought to his personal attention because, I repeat, so far as Montana is concerned, and especially so far as Silver Bow County and Butte are concerned, they are not in a recession; they are in a depression. We think the administration should step in and give us some help in a legitimate manner.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
September 5, 1957.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The President,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I respectfully direct your immediate attention to the depressed economic conditions existing in the Nation's domestic lead and zinc industry.

The lead and zinc industry contributes significantly to the economy and defense of this country, and specifically to some 27 States. The value of this industry, including mines, smelters, and refineries in the United States is approximately \$1 billion.

Domestic production of lead and zinc has not kept pace with increased world production because our miners cannot compete with foreign labor, and the United States is being flooded with foreign imports of both lead and zinc. The impact of these imports in recent months has been tremendous. In my State of Montana, one of the largest zinc-producing States, the number of miners

engaged in bringing zinc out of the ground has dropped over 1,500 men in the last several months. This is not an isolated instance.

I had hoped that relief legislation would be enacted during the very recent session of the 85th Congress, but final action was not taken by either the Senate or the House of Representatives. Testimony presented in public Congressional hearings by both your representatives and those of the Department of the Interior have supported the need for relief for the domestic lead and zinc industry.

I have given considerable time and thought to this situation, and I feel that perhaps the dominant reason for the inability to obtain Congressional action was that many of my colleagues felt that relief legislation was not necessary since you, as the President of the United States, already have the authority to afford relief to the domestic lead and zinc industry from import competition. This authority was previously delegated to you by the Congress in trade-agreements legislation.

The authority you have is broad and general and applies to all industries which are injured or threatened with injury as a result of trade-agreement concessions. If not, the Congress has not been advised that your existing authority, under the escape clause and the national-security amendment, is inadequate in these matters.

It is clear that you have not made use of existing administrative procedures which are available to you to provide the necessary relief for this industry. I strongly urge that you do so, without delay.

The economy of our Nation is a metals economy. Our industrial life is based upon and is dependent upon a plentiful supply of raw materials demanded by our economy in times of peace and war. The best insurance for such a plentiful supply is keeping intact our domestic minerals production, thus insuring an adequate economic and mobilization base.

Again, I want to impress upon you the urgency of this matter, and ask that you personally review this situation, utilizing existing authority to bring relief to the domestic lead and zinc industry.

With best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

FEBRUARY 11, 1958.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Undoubtedly you are conversant with the very serious plight of our copper industry. The price of copper has plummeted from 55 cents a pound in April 1956 to a current market price of 25 cents a pound—a price which will not permit the economic operation of a large portion of the United States industry. For several months the copper market has been in a condition of glut and production exceeded consumption last year nearly 300,000 tons.

We would call to your attention the following facts concerning this vital industry:

1. Copper is an irreplaceable strategic raw material.
2. For national security reasons during the Korean crisis the Federal Government underwrote the development of new ore bodies, and most reliable current estimates are that projects developed under the Defense Production Act have added more than 250,000 tons to the annual American production. (In other words, the expanded capacity sponsored by the Government is almost equivalent to the surplus production which has depressed prices to their present level.)
3. American copper producers are mining the lowest grade ore, and paying the highest wages in the world today. (Their competitive disadvantage is indicated by the fact that the average hourly wage of the United

States copper miner is more than 50 percent of the total daily wage paid by foreign producers.)

We also wish to point out that the American copper industry has, by its own volition, asked to have the copper tariff suspended in past years and has operated under a free market since the end of World War II except for a brief period of 4 months. The industry has turned to the Federal Government for assistance now only as a last resort measure to prevent economic disaster.

We consider it highly significant that the copper people are not demanding protection of a permanent high tariff. The legislation we, and other colleagues, have introduced (S. 2998 and companion House bills) contemplates a new floor and import tax which will tend to balance out competition between the foreign and domestic producer until such time as the influence of expanding markets will permit a return to normal operations.

We are not requesting at this time that you take steps to restrict imports of foreign copper, as by law Congress has suspended the import tax on copper until June 30 of this year. However, it is plain that major shutdowns will probably occur unless special legislation is enacted soon to provide temporary relief. (Nor does the industry feel that it has an adequate remedy before the Tariff Commission. All available evidence indicates that it would take more than a year to present a case and get a ruling on this problem.)

Although Members of Congress from copper producing areas have formed a united front, we are convinced that we cannot succeed unless strong executive leadership is forthcoming in support of our legislation. We urge you to throw the full weight of your office behind this legislation in order that the Nation may maintain a healthy and vigorous copper industry as an integral part of its national defense effort.

Sincerely,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senator.
MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senator.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 14, 1958.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: On behalf of the President, I am pleased to acknowledge your and Senator MURRAY's February 11 letter respecting legislation for the relief of the copper industry, and to assure you that a further reply will be forthcoming at an early date.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

I. JACK MARTIN,
Administrative Assistant
to the President.

FEBRUARY 12, 1958.

STATE BOARD OF EXAMINERS,
Helena, Mont.

GENTLEMEN: Your letter of January 30, 1958, addressed to the Montana Congressional Delegation is at hand.

You probably are aware that we have been working with the Office of Defense Mobilization and the General Services Administration for several years: (1) To get an extension of the low-grade manganese program; and (2) to arrange for the beneficiation of the present GSA stockpile at Butte and Phillipsburg.

There seems to be some misunderstanding about the milling deduction from payments to the shippers. The deduction was for the purpose of computing payments on deliveries, as with deductions for grade and for impurities and there never was a fund established into which these deductions were paid. At the time the program was set up

the Government felt a shortage of manganese might develop and these low-grade ores would have to be beneficiated. This condition did not develop. The Office of Defense Mobilization would have to authorize the General Services Administration to borrow Defense Production Act funds for milling these ores. ODM does not feel this action is warranted as the national defense manganese stockpile requirements are now fulfilled. This fact, aside from the expense involved, also is responsible for the failure of your delegation to get an extension of the low-grade manganese program, either by Executive order or by act of the Congress.

The report of the Special Stockpile Advisory Committee made to ODM Director Gordon Gray, entitled "Stockpiling for Defense in the Nuclear Age" recommends upgrading stockpiled materials to the ultimate usable form but only when the equivalent material cannot be purchased cheaper on the open market. The precise language states that subspecification material "should be up-graded when this can be accomplished at less cost than buying new material." An extensive correspondence with the General Services Administration indicates that the Butte-Phillipsburg stockpile does not fulfill this recommendation.

While your Congressional Delegation is acutely aware of the present unemployment situation and is anxious to alleviate it, ODM Director Gray has long taken the attitude, as did Director Flemming before him, that he is helpless to exercise his Defense Production Act authority for purely economic purposes where the project is one not directly required for national defense or essential for stockpiling.

This puts the matter squarely in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior, who has no money for the purpose and who has consistently opposed legislation aimed at extending the low-grade program and providing for beneficiation plants at the various low-grade manganese depots.

It is not a question of the feasibility of treating the stockpile. In spite of all our urging the Administration simply will not approve the project, administratively or legislatively. We shall, however, not relax our efforts to try and get something done.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senator.
MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senator.
LEE METCALF,
Member of Congress.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., April 19, 1957.

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and
Insular Affairs, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: I have your letter of April 2 transmitting a petition signed by the manganese producers in the Butte and Phillipsburg, Mont., mining districts urging that the Government-owned manganese concentrating facilities and the nodulizing plant of the Domestic Manganese and Development Company at Butte be placed in operation at once to beneficiate and nodulize the low-grade manganese ores acquired under the low-grade purchase program at Butte to meet specifications for manganese sold to the Government under the carlot manganese purchase program. Your letter requests our comments on the petition.

At the time this domestic support program was established, the United States was faced with the possibility of all-out war and very limited reserves of metallurgical manganese. Emergency efforts, therefore, were directed toward developing domestic and other accessible sources of usable grades of manganese.

At present, however, Government-held inventories of specification-grade metallurgical manganese are far in excess of the minimum stockpile objective, and quantities on hand and on order are almost equal to the long-term objective. Thus we have on hand and on order sufficient specification-grade metallurgical manganese to meet any foreseeable national emergency.

There is thus no immediate urgency to utilize the low-grade material now in Government stocks and accruing under the domestic low-grade manganese support program. The material, of course, could serve as a reserve beyond the ample amounts of specification-grade material on hand and on order should unforeseen developments indicate a need for upgrading it to usable form.

In view of the foregoing, it is concluded that the defense justification cannot presently be established for the beneficiation program as requested in the petition.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON GRAY,
Director.

UNITED STATES SENATE, COMMITTEE
ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION,
February 21, 1958.

To the 6,000 petitioners of Butte, Silver Bow County, Mont.:

This will acknowledge receipt of your petition relative to the use of the domestic manganese plant in Butte.

I want to assure you of my great interest in this matter and my desire to be of all possible assistance. To date the reports which Senator MURRAY and I have received from Gordon Gray, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, and others, have not been too encouraging. I am very much concerned, though, about the economic situation in Butte and having worked in the mines myself for 10 years, Butte is close to my heart, and I want to do everything I possibly can to be of assistance. I am, therefore, once again taking up the matter with Mr. Gray and other officials downtown and while I cannot promise anything definite, you may rest assured I will do all in my power to be of assistance to help alleviate the situation in Butte and Montana.

I am enclosing for your consideration the latest report from Mr. Gray and also a letter which Senator MURRAY and I sent to the President on the copper situation, together with the reply from the White House. As you know, Senator MURRAY and I have introduced a bill, S. 2998, seeking to set a floor of 30 cents a pound on copper imported from abroad. We have also introduced a bill to impose a tariff on lead and zinc, S. 2271. This matter is now also before the Tariff Commission for consideration.

I have also written a letter to the Secretary of Labor to declare Butte a distressed area so that it will be possible for defense contracts and other Federal works which may be proposed to be diverted to Butte.

The whole delegation has been very active, and I am also enclosing a copy of our last communication to Governor Aronson urging that he join with us in making arrangements for the distribution of surplus foods to areas like Butte where unemployment is bad and the need for this type of assistance necessary.

Must close now, but again assuring you of my interest in the situation in Butte and my desire to be of all possible assistance, I am

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

P. S.: I am enclosing a copy of a letter I am directing to the President of the United States asking for his personal assistance in the manganese matter.

Regards,

M. M.

FEBRUARY 21, 1958.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am in receipt of a petition signed by over 6,000 residents of Butte and the State of Montana seeking immediate aid for the activation of the mill of the Domestic Manganese and Development Co. in Butte, Mont. At that mill there are approximately 350,000 tons of manganese ore purchased by the Federal Government. The Federal Government has deducted from the shippers of manganese the sum of \$16.60 per ton to process the ore. As stated in the manganese regulations, this mill charge is to be applied to process low-grade ores. It is my belief that such money should be applied to process low-grade ores which are worthless in their present form, because this money was intended for this purpose.

The Government-owned domestic manganese mill represents an investment of approximately \$2 million and can be activated in 1 or 2 months. It is my understanding that the low-grade manganese program will terminate on July 1, 1958. If this should happen, it would mean that all small manganese producers in Butte, Phillipsburg, and the State of Montana would be forced to cease operations and, furthermore, that the domestic manganese company would be compelled to discharge its present working force. The total effect, if this were to happen, would be between 300 to 400 men now working in the Montana manganese industry. It is my belief and the belief of the people of Montana that the \$16.60 per ton deducted to process this ore, with the mill available and ready for immediate production at Butte, that the immediate preparation for the activation of this facility would be of prime importance in avoiding additional unemployment which has already created a serious problem in Butte. Activation of the mill will enable small miners to continue operating their properties, will create new employment, and will, therefore, enhance Silver Bow's depressed economy.

May I point out, Mr. President, that on the basis of the latest figures I have, that 21,500 Montanans are, as of February 14, seeking employment—according to the figures of the Unemployment Compensation Commission of the State of Montana. This means that upwards of 90,000 Montana citizens are today feeling the effects of reduced earnings because of mounting unemployment in my State. As of January 18, on the basis of insured unemployment figures compiled by the Bureau of Employment Security of the United States Department of Labor, Montana ranked second to Oregon with a percentage of 12.3, compared to Oregon's 12.8. As of now it would be my belief that due to the continued depressed conditions, that we would very likely have the dubious honor of leading all the States in the Nation on an insured unemployment basis.

I cannot impress upon you too strongly the extremely difficult situation which exists in my State. As one who worked in the mines of Butte for 10 years as a mucker and miner, I am deeply aware and conscious of the situation as it exists in my old home town. I believe that the time for action in helping the people of Butte and Montana is now and not in the future and I, therefore, most urgently and most respectfully request that you give your personal attention to the request and the petition of my people for aid and assistance in activating the Domestic Manganese and Development Co. mill in Butte; that you urge the Tariff Commission to reach a decision and make known its findings on the question of lead and zinc which has been before them since last November; and that you as the President of the United States give your personal attention in support of the bill, S. 2998, intro-

duced by Senator MURRAY and me to put a new floor of 30 cents a pound under copper and to impose an excise tax which will tend to balance our competition between the foreign and domestic producers.

The State of Montana is convinced that strong executive leadership is necessary if the depressed and downtrodden mining industry, which means so much to the people of our State and our country, is to be given the consideration, the protection, and assurance which it deserves. May I personally express to you the gravity of this situation and urge that you do all you can to help us at your very earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 12, 1958.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: This is in further reply to your letter of February 21 concerning the problems of the Montana producers of copper, lead, zinc, and manganese.

You know, I am sure, of the President's deep concern for those families experiencing the hardship of shortened working time or temporary unemployment. It is because of this concern for the welfare of all Americans that he has emphasized the importance of taking the proper steps to promote the renewed expansion of job opportunities. In this connection, many steps have already been taken or proposed to the Congress and others are being considered. Moreover, the President's statements of February 12 and March 8, copies of which are enclosed, clearly express his determination to pursue every measure that might become appropriate as the economic situation develops.

With respect to S. 2998 relating to copper imports, the executive branch study of this measure is under way and the reports will be forwarded to the appropriate committees at an early date.

The President also shares your interest in the problems facing the producers of lead and zinc. You will recall that last August, in a letter to the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, the President reaffirmed his interest in the long-range minerals program. The administration program included proposals for sliding scale import taxes designed to moderate lead and zinc imports. When the Congress did not enact these proposals, the lead and zinc industry filed the escape clause application to which your letter refers. On the following day, the President requested the Tariff Commission, by a letter to its chairman, to expedite these proceedings and was assured that the matter would move ahead as speedily as possible.

I need hardly say, therefore, that the President is greatly concerned over the welfare of our lead and zinc producers. He has made this clear through the administration's legislative proposals, in his August letter, and by his efforts to expedite the consideration of the industry's escape clause application.

With respect to the Domestic Manganese and Development Co., you know, of course, that the reactivation of this plant as urged in your letter is a question with which the Office of Defense Mobilization is primarily concerned. I have been in touch with the Director of that Office and understand that the defense needs for metallurgical manganese have been fully met. Since, moreover, the Government is fulfilling its obligation under the purchase program, there are no grounds for using defense funds to reactivate the processing plant as proposed. That reactivation would require appropriations and authority that are not now available. You may be interested in seeing the reply of the Director of the Office of Defense Mobiliza-

tion to the Montana secretary of state on this matter. I am glad to enclose a copy. With best wishes.
Sincerely,

I. JACK MARTIN,
Administrative Assistant to the President.

DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN INFORMATION IN CONNECTION WITH DISTRIBUTION OF NEW AUTOMOBILES

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to require labels on automobiles, spelling out such things as freight charges, method of shipment and the retail price suggested by factories to dealers.

The bill would thus require automobile manufacturers to make public their suggested retail prices on new cars rather than keeping these prices secret.

It would not remove the opportunity for retailer and purchaser to engage in that great American sport of bargaining over prices of both the new car and the trade-in. But it would arm the presently bewildered car buyer with some necessary facts, and would do away with the advantage held now by a few unscrupulous dealers. Presently the dealer who is honest about the so-called list price cannot compete with the one who "picks" several hundred dollars extra into it so he can pretend to give more on the trade-in.

This proposal would remove the secrecy about a new car's price by a public label. Other facts of importance to the consumer would provide immediate improvement to the car market by helping to restore public confidence in car selling practices.

At present, how does one find out what a car costs? It is simply fantastic that the most wanted product in the world should have become a hydromatic pea in a Madison Avenue shell game. We can find out about hydromatics, mercomatics, dynaflo, torsion bar suspension, seat lifts with a memory, and even dual and triple jet fuel injection, but the one simple fact we really want to know—how much does the darn thing cost—we cannot find out at all.

The proposed label would include the name, make, model, serial number, freight charge, final assembly point, method by which the car had been transported, and the dealer to whom shipped, as well as price.

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

The bill (S. 3500) to require the full and fair disclosure of certain information in connection with the distribution of new automobiles in commerce, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. THURMOND), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague, who is a member of the Subcommittee on Automobile Mar-

keting Practices of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. PAYNE. My colleague was very kind and courteous to me, as he always is, when he offered me an opportunity to cosponsor this particular piece of proposed legislation. While I am not joining as a cosponsor, as I explained to my colleague from Oklahoma, I feel that the proposal has considerable merit. There are many features of it which I believe should be gone into very carefully by the committee. There certainly is a field which needs to be explored in this regard. I gain that impression not only from my work on the committee, but also from some experience which I have had in the automotive field. While I have not joined as a sponsor, I am very sympathetic to the aims and objectives of the proposed legislation, and certainly will work very closely with my colleague in connection with hearings on the particular bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. I deeply appreciate the comment of my distinguished colleague from Maine. This is merely a starting point. Hearings will be held, and the bill will be subject to such amendments as the trade and the public may have to suggest.

I think it is peculiar, indeed, that such great institutions as the Ford Motor Co., which spends hundreds of thousands of dollars in advertising through double-page spreads in the Saturday Evening Post to the effect that the new 4-seated Thunderbird can be bought for \$56 a month, will not tell us what the car costs. A few people might want to know what the car costs, perhaps with the idea of paying cash for it rather than buying it on payments extended over 3 years, with the interest almost equaling the price of the car.

The automobiles being manufactured today are the most wanted product which the American people desire; and yet I defy any Member of the Senate or of the public to tell me what the suggested retail price of any of the big three or big four cars is. We can find out only through the \$1,000 trade-ins which are offered, and by deducting the phony "pack" which is so often added.

RETAIL PRICING OF NEW AUTOMOBILES

Mr. MONRONEY subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today I introduced a bill which will return the automobile industry to a system of advertised delivered pricing and put suggested retail price tags on new cars.

For almost a score of years as the great automobile industry developed into a major heavy industry it was the custom of the factories to advertise the prices of cars, so that any buyer could clearly know what the suggested or advertised retail price of the car was.

For the past several years, we have seen such advertising, which was so valuable to the public as a gauge to the price of the car, disappear from the colored one-page or double-truck advertisements of the automobile companies. Today practically no major automobile manufacturer and practically

no retailer ever advertises the suggested retail price of the automobile.

For the past several weeks a committee of the Senate has been involved in an inquiry which has raised the question: Are car prices too high?

Numerous witnesses recently appeared before the Senate Antimonopoly Subcommittee hearing ably chaired by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. Walter Reuther, president of United Auto Workers, says the price of cars ought to be cut \$100. One hundred dollars from what? Harlow Curtice says car prices are not too high. Ford Motor Co. agrees. So do the other manufacturers. Mr. President, these gentlemen did a good job in presenting their own viewpoints about who should get what share of the money that you and I pay for a car. They disagreed mainly on how the money should be divided. Mr. President, I think the public can be excused if their primary concern is in the amount of money they put up in the first place.

How does one find out what a car costs? It is simply fantastic that the most wanted product in the world should have become a hydromatic pea in a Madison Avenue shell game.

The bill I now present would require automobile manufacturers to make public certain things which the purchaser has a right to know in order to make an informed purchase. This would not do away with the great American sport of bargaining over the prices of both the new car and the trade-in, but it would let the customer know where to start.

A label affixed to the windshield would show the name, make, model, and serial number of the car; the assembly plant, the dealership to which delivered; and the method of transportation.

On the label would be stamped the advertised retail price which was suggested by the factory, including the freight charges and the retail price of the attached accessories.

If one walks within 10 feet of the door of an automobile show room, he will get an hour's lecture on the details of hydromatics, mercomatics, dynaflo, powerglides, twin-beam headlamps, torsion bar suspension, torsion air suspension, two- and four-way seat lifts with a memory, dual and triple carburetors, and even jet fuel injection.

One can find out about convertible hardtops, hardtop convertibles that do convert, hardtop convertibles that do not convert, power steering, power brakes, power windows, and a lot about horsepower.

But the one simple fact that he really wants to know—how much does the darn thing cost?—he cannot find out at all. It may help a little if one is an ex-FBI agent charged with vitamin pills, a jet-propelled slide rule, and a library full of blue books, green books, orange books, and red books—assisted by a Ph. D. in mathematics.

Not only is the car buyer unable to determine the factory-advertised price of the car; no one is able to tell him, in advance, how much the finance charges or insurance will be. Indeed, he may

not even see his insurance policy until weeks after he has bought the car.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and I have spent 3 years making the most comprehensive study of automobile marketing that Congress has ever undertaken. We held extensive hearings, and we hoped, as a result of the facts developed, that the industry would find its way out of the oriental bazaar without the necessity of Federal legislation. In that hope we have been gravely disappointed.

Recent editorials in Advertising Age magazine of December 30, 1957, and January 27, 1958, suggest that the traditional American system of honest sales for an honest price has deteriorated into the economic jungle of a Middle East bazaar, in which everything, including price, is a mystery. They reprint a newspaper advertisement offering for a charge of \$5 to supply the prospective car purchaser the services of a car shopper who will get, in writing, 4 competitive quotations from authorized new-car dealers.

Other ads, from the Wall Street Journal of December 13, 1957, offer—for a fee—to supply information as to the automobile dealer's wholesale delivered costs. Thus we have come to the point that one must have a guide through the automobile marketing jungle.

I believe I speak for the public when I say it would be a pleasure to have a price label on cars. I think the people would heave a sigh of relief if they could go to a showroom and see what the advertised selling price is. In fact, much of the current slump in car sales is caused by plain old fear, or perhaps revulsion, on the part of the prospective car buyer. The car market today—with disposable personal income at almost record levels—would be immediately improved if public confidence in car-selling practices could be restored.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorials and advertisements be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

EXHIBIT A

[From Advertising Age of December 30, 1957]

THE BIGGEST MARKETING PROBLEM OF 1958

It could be that we are losing our perspective. But the more we think about it, the more we are convinced that the biggest marketing problem in America revolves around the marketing of automobiles.

We don't mean precisely how many will be sold in 1958, either. That is important to the economy—extremely important. But, what is infinitely more important, it seems to us, is how they are sold.

The American economy has evolved, through a couple of centuries, on the basis of trust and confidence; of clearly defined costs and prices; of standardized products available from trustworthy producers and dealers at identifiable prices and under clearly ascertainable terms.

Through the past half century, the automobile industry has been a leader in helping to develop this orderly concept of marketing on the American scene, a concept under which the buyer had less reason to beware than under any other previous set of conditions. And now this self-same automobile

industry has led the way to a breakdown of all these concepts and a return to the economic jungle of a Middle East bazaar, in which everything, including price, is a mystery. Customers are no longer customers in the traditional American sense; they are traders and bargainners, pitting their puny knowledge and their buying skills against the experts, in a game which is rapidly discarding all semblance of rules.

No one knows any longer how much an automobile costs—any automobile. No one knows what equipment and gadgets belong on an automobile; what items are included in the cost and what items are available on option, at extra cost. No one knows what a trade-in is supposed to be worth. And no one, understandably, believes a word of the retail price advertising of automobiles that appears every day in our newspapers and over our air waves.

With perfectly straight faces, dealers advertise "savings up to \$2,000" on cars that sell, altogether, for \$3,500 or \$3,600; with the utmost contempt for facts and for even the most elementary factors of human decency, they use weasel words and double-talk to snare the unwary buyers, who have no way of knowing what they are supposed to pay.

Whose fault is all this? It all depends, of course, on whom you ask. But one great big step to cut out all the double-dealing could be taken by manufacturers and should be taken by manufacturers. The public has a right to know what new cars are supposed to cost; what is standard equipment and what is not—and the manufacturers have an obligation to tell them. And don't tell us, please, that this can't be done. Approximate prices can be quoted; they have been in the past, and they can be now.

If we don't clear up this enormous area of economic jungle on the marketing scene, we can expect this jungle to encroach further and further on the marketing civilization we have so laboriously hacked out over a couple of centuries. Already the jungle has overrun enormous areas of our marketplace. We can't wait any longer to start beating it back again.

EXHIBIT B

[From Advertising Age of January 27, 1958]

TOOLS FOR AUTOMOTIVE JUNGLE

In the December 30 issue, Advertising Age said editorially that the biggest marketing problem of 1958 is how, rather than how many, automobiles are sold. We said that the marketing of automobiles has now reached a condition approximately like "the economic jungle of a Middle East bazaar, in which everything, including price, is a mystery."

The editorial apparently hit a responsive chord. It has been reprinted by a couple of newspaper financial columnists, and commented upon by several editorial writers. Its appearance has also resulted in a couple of very interesting pieces of mail reaching us, which bear out our original assertion that buying a car now forces Americans to become "traders and bargainners, pitting their puny knowledge and their skills against the experts." One of these pieces of mail is reproduced here. For \$5 Jadara will get the puzzled buyer four quotations on a car, thus saving the buyer a bit of the slogging from dealer to dealer which otherwise is involved.

The other is a classified ad from a New York paper, in which Auto Costs Publications offers the puzzled auto shopper a book which "gives you the wholesale prices of 1958 cars and equipment," so that the buyer can "get in the driver's seat and save hundreds of dollars" when he buys a new car.

This is utterly and completely ridiculous. What kind of economy do we live in where such tools as these are hopefully offered to shoppers as protection against lack of elemental price knowledge? We suggested originally, and we suggest again, that the public

has a right to know what new cars are supposed to cost, and what is standard equipment and what is not—and that manufacturers have a clear-cut obligation to tell them.

They are not living up to that obligation now, but they ought to be. The public ought to begin a sensibly close approximation of prices on all models and all gadgets, and the ridiculous price advertising and silly wheeling and dealing—much of it based on phony prices to start with—of dealers ought to be stopped, or curtailed.

Letting the public in on the secret of what the cars ought to cost is the logical and most important first step on the road to marketing sanity.

NOW BUY YOUR NEW CAR IN COMPLETE CONFIDENCE

Let us do your shopping for you and secure for you, in writing, four competitive quotations from authorized new car dealers.

Write or call today for more information and the order form.

State your preference on the form and return it back to us. We will then solicit, by mail, four quotes for you on the model of your choice.

Introductory offer fee, \$5.

JADAR QUOT-A-CAR SERVICE.

CHICAGO, ILL.

EXHIBIT C

[From the Wall Street Journal of December 13, 1957]

NINE HUNDRED PERCENT RETURN TO NEW CAR BUYERS ON YOUR \$10 INVESTMENT¹

That's right—investment of \$10 in a copy of Auto Costs will net you at least a 900 percent return. Auto Costs gives you the exact wholesale cost of all new 1958 cars and their equipment. It puts you in the driver's seat when you buy a new car—you can't be fooled—you may save hundreds of dollars. All model and price changes are included free. Send \$10 for a 1 year subscription or only \$18 for an economy 3 year subscription.

AUTO COSTS.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

NEW CAR BUYERS

Thousands saved money last year. You, too, can protect your pocketbook. Tell us make of car you plan to buy and we'll send you dealer's wholesale prices, including options and accessories, with instructions for figuring a fair deal in your locality. Send \$1 for each make of car.

COOPERATIVE RESEARCH.

DETROIT, MICH.

NINE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-FOUR PERCENT PROFIT ON YOUR \$1 INVESTMENT

If you plan to buy a new car, tell us the make and we will send you wholesale prices on all body types, options, and accessories, with instructions for figuring a reasonable retail price including freight, taxes, and a fair markup for the dealer. You may save \$200 or \$300. Many of our customers have. In any case you will have the satisfaction of knowing what sort of a deal you made. With our report in hand you won't have to worry about packed prices and other sharp dealer practices. You can't bargain effectively without accurate price information. If you save only \$10.84 in a car deal, you will have made \$9.84 on your \$1 investment.

Send \$1 for each make of car.

AUTO PRICE REPORTS.

DETROIT, MICH.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to yield.

¹ If you save only \$100 in a car deal, you will have made \$90 on your \$10 investment.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank my friend the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] for his kind reference to me.

It has been an unusual pleasure to work with the Senator from Oklahoma on this important subcommittee. He has worked tirelessly and assiduously. I think the people of the United States should be greatly indebted to him for the magnificent service he has rendered in bringing to light the unsavory marketing practices in the automobile business. I think the achievements of the subcommittee are a great contribution to the public welfare.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished colleague, and fellow committee member, who also is a cosponsor of the bill about which I am speaking. The junior Senator from South Carolina helps to protect the most vital segment of our small-business community. He has fought determinedly for small business.

If we do not make certain ground rules against hitting below the belt in the merchandising of the most desirable product which America produces, a new automobile, then Congress will be guilty of turning its back on one of the last great hopes for the survival of small business.

The unscrupulous operators, in their greater degree of unprincipled activities, could exploit the public into believing that a car which has an advertised factory list price of \$3,000 is really a \$4,500 car, and that by giving the prospective buyer a \$1,000 allowance on the old jalopy, he is getting a bargain, because the legitimate dealer will allow him only \$350.

In other words, by marking up the list price of an automobile to an unrealistic amount—which is done repeatedly by unscrupulous automobile dealers—they are able to offer far more for trade-ins than can be offered by scrupulous dealers who wish to sell new automobiles at honest prices and to allow honest amounts for the old automobiles that are traded in.

But under the system which has developed in the "oriental bazaar," misleading pricing-practice that is engaged in at the present time, the legitimate dealer is penalized, and at the same time the purchaser of the automobile is subjected to deceit and fraud in connection with his purchase.

Mr. President, I have talked to automobile dealers in half the States in the Union, and I have rarely found one who wishes to see such practices continued by the great American automobile industry. This industry has put into the hands of the American people more automobiles than the automobile industry of any other country has ever dreamed of putting in the hands of their people.

The dealers wish to hold their heads high, as self-respecting businessmen who are honest in their advertised words and in their statements.

But the current practice, which a few automobile dealers have forced upon the industry, makes it impossible for the average citizen to know exactly what is the

list price of any of the various models and makes of automobiles.

Mr. President, last December, in order to ascertain just how one finds the retail price of an automobile, a member of the subcommittee staff sent \$1 in answer to one of the advertisements which I have just inserted in the RECORD. In return, he received certain documents, which I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

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

EXHIBIT D
INSTRUCTIONS ESTIMATING APPROXIMATE RETAIL PRICE

To the cost at the factory of the appropriate body type and series, add the cost of the accessories and options as shown on the opposite side of this sheet and mark up the total by 30 percent to reflect the full suggested retail margin.

Then list the prices of any special services which you may desire such as undercoating, antifreeze, dealer preparation, or waxing. To this must be added the freight from the main factory location of the make to your city which is approximately \$10 plus 20 cents a mile for the first 150 miles plus 5 cents a mile thereafter, but not more than \$1.25 for Ford, Chevrolet, and Plymouth. The freight goes up in proportion to weight for heavier cars.

To the grand total of the items listed above must be added the local sales tax, if any, and the charge for the license or registration fee and title papers, to arrive at total delivered price. All Federal taxes are included in the cost figures.

A Michigan Business Review study indicated that one customer in six paid more than the suggested delivered retail price as computed above, while about one-third of all customers secured a discount from this price of \$200 or more on low-priced cars.

Dealer cost of 1958 model Lincoln and major accessories

MODEL AND BODY TYPE AND DEALER COST	
Capri series:	
53-A Sedan, 4 door	\$3,755
57-A Hardtop, 4 door	3,755
63-A Hardtop, 2 door	3,645
Premier series:	
53-B Sedan, 4 door	4,225
57-B Hardtop, 4 door	4,225
63-B Hardtop, 2 door	4,035
Continental:	
54-A Sedan, 4 door	4,615
75-A Hardtop, 4 door	4,615
65-A Hardtop, 2 door	4,425
68-A Convertible	4,775

ACCESSORIES AND OPTIONS, DEALER COST

Tires:	
Nylon white side walls 9.50 over 9	\$64.95
Nylon white side walls 9.50 over 9.50	59.05
Rayon white side walls 9.50 over 9	42.10
Rayon white side walls 9.50 over 9.50	42.10
Air conditioner	491.20
Heater and defroster	104.00
Electric door locks, 2 door	22.35
Electric door locks, 4 door	33.85
Electric dimmer	38.00
Power lubricator	33.00
Power seat, 6 way, Premier and Continental	34.70
Power seat, 6 way, Capri	81.75
Power vent windows	51.00
Power windows, Capri	92.40
Radio	134.55
F. M. attachment	99.00
Front seat speaker	8.30
Automatic starter	8.30
Chrome curb guard	20.65
Directed power differential	44.00

Dealer cost of 1958 model Lincoln and major accessories—Continued

ACCESSORIES AND OPTIONS, DEALER COST—CON.	
Front license plate frame	\$5.85
Leather trim (std. conv.)	76.75
Remote control deck lidlock	23.10
Seat belts (front seat only)	18.20
Tinted glass	37.15
Transparent sun visors	20.65
Wheel covers	28.10
Special paint: std. conv.	30.00
Freight from Novi, Mich.	

Work sheet

Dealer cost at factory:	
Basic charge for body type and series	\$ _____
Options and accessories (list)	_____
Subtotal	_____
Add 30 percent for suggested dealer markup	_____
Freight: (See instructions) (from main factory)	_____
Special services ¹	_____
Total	_____
State and local sales taxes on above total	_____
License, registration, and title fees	_____
Suggested retail delivered price	_____

¹ Special services includes waxing, gas, lubrication, undercoating, etc. These prices are set locally. You can ask dealer for other makes what they charge. In addition, many dealers ask \$25 to \$60 for preparing the car for delivery.

You should beware of phony options and accessories. A few dealers will allow their salesmen to charge customers for options, such as special colors, which the factory actually supplies at no extra cost.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, from an examination of this material—for which \$1 was paid—it is possible to prepare a worksheet with mathematical calculations based on the data supplied; and thus one can finally determine the suggested retail delivered price of a Ford, a Buick, a Chrysler, or a product of the American Motors Corp. or Studebaker-Packard.

Mr. President, in the heyday of the automobile business, the price f. o. b. Detroit was advertised on every automobile-advertisement billboard. From it one could determine the delivered price. But, as I have said, today it is necessary to use a slide rule, and almost use an ouija board, in order to determine what the delivered price should be.

Mr. President, the automobile dealers themselves are beginning to recognize how their industry is being hurt by this flimflam.

Out of all the confusion there came—as usual, not from on high, not from the booming voices of big business or big labor, but from a hardheaded, and I may add, a hard-hit small-business man who recognizes the economic facts of life when he sees them—some worthwhile information.

Mr. George G. Downes, president of the New Jersey Automobile Dealers Association, sent to me the results of a poll of the automobile dealers of New Jersey. This question was presented to the dealers:

If all manufacturers consistently advertised an "advertised delivered price" listing what is included in the price, as well as Federal tax, freight, and an item to cover handling and delivery * * *

Would you then favor such procedure?

Mr. President, of the 257 replies received within 1 week, 245—or 94 percent—of the dealers voted for the proposition.

The growing concern of the dealers is reflected by the fact that the National Automobile Dealers' Association at its recent convention adopted the unanimous recommendation of its board of directors, as follows: "That NADA continue to urge all manufacturers to use and advertise realistic uniform delivered prices on a national basis."

NADA's executive vice president, Adm. Frederick J. Bell, had this to say at a recent Senate committee hearing:

In the matter of pricing, we have recommended to the manufacturers that they return to a practice—that existed for many years in the industry—of having a nationally advertised uniform delivered price for their products.

Mr. President, I wish to read to the Senate the impromptu testimony of Birkett L. Williams. Mr. Williams, a Ford dealer from Cleveland, Ohio, frankly exposed the racket of packing new-car prices in order that the buyer will be fooled into thinking he is getting a higher trade-in allowance for his used car. This is what Mr. Williams testified on February 19 of this year, at a hearing of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee:

I would like to say that nothing we want in any way intended to lessen or do away with competition. I think we are all smart enough to know that the life of good business is keen competition and the ability to survive under those conditions.

But we would like to be able to get, as Fred Bell pointed out this morning, some decent ground rules under which we could play which we don't feel we can get at the present time.

Now nobody knows what the price of an automobile is today, and too many customers, too many consumers, are flimflammed, cheated, skinned because they go in and they trade on the mistaken theory that the only thing that makes any difference to them is how much they get for their old car.

Well, now, if one man prices his new car at \$2,000, and the other man is pricing the same car at \$2,200, obviously the second man can give him \$200 more for the old car and still be even. Maybe he only gives him \$100 more, and by raising the price of his new car unduly, he has profited himself—the dealer, I mean—\$100. That is the sort of thing we would like to eliminate. We would like to get the deception, the flimflam stuff, the slight of hand, out of this business, and be able to get it on a basis where people know what the price of the car is, and know what they are paying for the car, and to eliminate all this razzle-dazzle stuff that is making all the trouble.

Mr. H. H. Shuart, publisher of Motor News Analysis, a widely read and informative automobile newsletter, further has amplified on the effect of this price confusion. I ask unanimous consent that his comments be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PUBLIC FORCED TO SHOP FOR AUTO PRICES

Just what is cross-selling: Might it not as well be called cross-buying? Who causes it? Dealer? Prospect?

Dealers blame fellow dealers. But could latter draw prospects from other areas unless those people were willing to desert their hometown dealer in hope of finding better value of treatment elsewhere.

What possible gimmick in contracts or in law can stop this perfectly human urge? With no public pricing structure anywhere in this industry car prospects are compelled to shop to find out how much autos cost.

Factory advertising gives no clue whatever to car prices; myriad options only serve to confuse, mystify, obscure. Public is told it can't trust dealer pricing when NADA's Sutter publicly deprecates shady practices at retail level. What can innocent, befuddled prospect do except plod from dealer to dealer hoping somewhere along his route to meet some guy he feels he can trust, some quoted prices he thinks reasonable?

Why this price mystery? Is it not primarily due to factory abandonment of advertised delivered price? Did not that open door to packs, gimmicks, bait ads, other screw devices in local dealer promotion?

And would not many of these devious practices fade in light of factory advertised prices formulated, not to take advantage of competition but to give public honest information?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, if the automobile dealers are in favor of such a price label, and if, as I sincerely believe, the public is in favor of such a price label, who could be against it? Is each factory afraid to take this step, for fear of losing competitive advantage? Or have the manufacturers of automobiles sought to prevent price competition by abandoning the once standard advertising of the delivered price? Former Assistant Attorney General Stanley Barnes, an able Republican trustbuster, has charged that the automobile manufacturers compete in every way except as to price.

At the present time, the suggested retail prices of automobiles and accessories are furnished to every automobile dealer by the factory. But the dealer cannot afford to make them public, or else he will lose in the competitive swim, for then he could not pretend to overallow for the customer's used automobile.

Perhaps the greatest effect of automobile price tags would be to halt the wild, deceitful, gimmick advertising. No dealer can offer \$1,000 for anything that runs unless he adds that \$1,000 to the new car price. He could not pack prices in that way if there were a label showing the factory suggested retail price. This would transfer the competitive advantage from the most deceitful dealer in town to the dealer of the highest character and efficiency.

I read a headline from an ad appearing in the Washington Daily News of Thursday, March 13, 1958:

Three hundred dollars cash and free weekend in New York will be given to the lucky buyer.

That is an example of some of the foolish and extravagant advertising claims made in order to sell cars at a price that never reveals what the honest list price is.

I have followed the advertising of automobile dealers from coast to coast for months, and I have been unable to find, except in rare instances, advertising by even the most responsible and respect-

able dealers that carries a standard advertised list or delivered price.

There are other things beside price that are important to the car buyer. He wants to know the condition of the car and how it got from the assembly plant to the dealer. Was it towed with the speedometer disconnected? Has it been shuttled from dealer to dealer? Is it really a bootlegged or a used or mis-used car?

If the purchaser wants to buy a bootlegged car, it is his privilege, but at least he should be able to find out if it has been bootlegged and where it started from.

The car buyer has a right to know the quality, condition, and price of the biggest investment he ever makes in his lifetime except for his home.

If pillows must be labeled, if bacon must be labeled, if even beans must be labeled for the protection of the consumer, surely cars should be.

Mr. President, if we have faith in the American marketing system, we believe that a citizen who has the facts can take care of himself. We should allow the car buyer to have the facts, and not allow the manufacturers to force him to go through the time consuming and sometimes frightening ordeal of today's automobile guessing game.

If the car buyer has the facts, we shall have less cause to worry about whether prices are too high or too low. The processes of competition would help to determine that. But there can be no competition in prices unless the purchaser can find out what the prices are.

Mr. President, I submit a bill which would require a label to be placed on the windshield of every new car. On this label would be detailed the advertised price of the car, accessories, freight, and also the method of transportation, and the dealer to whom it was first sold.

I feel that unless the automobile industry—a slump in which is now threatening the prosperity of the Nation—does not return to the fundamentals of clean, honest, true merchandising, all the public-works programs that can be enacted in this Congress—and I am a coauthor of many of them—will be of little avail in reviving the No. 1 industry of America. Incidentally, more than 17 percent of the people of Michigan are unemployed.

I believe competition must come about in the pricing of automobiles. I believe by forcing a factory to commit itself on an advertised delivered list price, we will do something toward accomplishing that objective.

It will be found that Ford and Chevrolet will try to beat each other's advertised price on the same kind of model. The price is the first thing the buyer needs to know about an automobile. As I stated earlier, it is at that point that there comes into play the great American sport of bargaining. If the delivered retail price is hidden away in the vaults of the Detroit manufacturers, or concealed only in the files of the dealer, the customer does not have the information he needs.

But do not think, Mr. President, that the customer is a "dope." Do not under-

estimate the intelligence of the American automobile buyer. No matter how the dealer or manufacturer may try to confuse the price, the automobile buyer has a device for meeting the situation. Today he is meeting it by staying out of the automobile showrooms, by not looking at cars, because he is tired of chasing all over town in an attempt to find what the price is.

There should be a suggested or nationally advertised delivered price of the car.

In conclusion, it seems to me this bill would establish truth in advertising.

It would establish truth in merchandising.

I believe it is the best way to protect the automobile-buying public.

USE OF SURPLUS FOODS TO ASSIST NEEDY FAMILIES IN COMMUNITIES SUFFERING FROM SERIOUS UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have received appeals from the mayors of La Crosse and Ashland, Wis., and from a great many individual citizens and community leaders in my State, to help obtain a larger quantity and a better selection of foods for needy families in communities suffering from serious unemployment.

I have learned that the Secretary of Agriculture has funds available, totaling \$514 million, for the purchase, processing, and distribution to the States of surplus foods for schools, welfare institutions, and needy families.

In addition, Congress has authorized another \$500 million to be appropriated if it is needed for this purpose.

Of this total of \$1,014,000,000 authorized by Congress, the administration's present plans call for spending only \$143 million—or less than one-seventh of the total.

The Secretary of Agriculture has ruled that items other than cornmeal, wheat, flour, cheese, dried milk, and rice are not in sufficient surplus to justify distribution to needy families.

Mr. President, the present unemployment emergency creates an urgent need for supplementary food supplies for needy families.

The Secretary of Agriculture has rejected recent requests for distribution of high-protein foods which are required to provide balanced emergency diets for needy families.

It is a shocking contradiction to have the same Department of the Government, on the one hand, justify low prices to farmers on the ground that there are burdensome surpluses, while on the other hand it is denying food for needy families, and also for the school-lunch program and welfare institutions, on the ground that there is not a sufficient surplus to warrant the use of the funds provided by Congress for that purpose.

Prices of many agricultural commodities which would be very valuable from the standpoint of providing balanced diets to those in need are extremely low. The following are the present parity

percentages of some of the most depressed commodities:

Turkeys, 67 percent of parity; chickens, 69 percent; milk, 84 percent; butterfat, 79 percent; peanuts suitable for processing into peanut butter, 74 percent; eggs, 84 percent; and sheep, 81 percent.

I am introducing a bill to broaden the present statutory authority in respect to the distribution of food to the needy. My bill will direct that the funds available be put to use to provide increased quantities and a better selection from the standpoint of requirements for balanced diets, of the food products which our economy produces in such abundance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be permitted to lie on the table until the close of business tomorrow to allow other Senators who wish to do so to add their names as cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received, appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The bill (S. 3501) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to expend funds appropriated for the diversion of surplus farm commodities to provide balanced diets in schools and institutions and for needy families, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I should like to point out that the bill would make it possible to do what I am sure vitally every Senator desires to do, and that is put our great abundance of food into the stomachs of hungry people. There is no reason on earth why it should not be done. The money is available. It has been appropriated. The food is available in surplus. The people are hungry. They need it. Mayors of cities in Wisconsin have asked for it. Outstanding citizens have asked for it. It should be done as promptly as possible.

INCREASED FUNDS FOR MATERNAL HEALTH AND CHILD HEALTH

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in November of 1957 the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers recommended, in one of their formal resolutions, that Congress raise the statutory ceiling on maternal and child health and crippled children funds to \$25 million for each fiscal year, from \$16.5 million and \$15 million, respectively.

The recommendations, Mr. President, were based on a detailed analysis of the job ahead and of the financial problems faced by the States which participate in this vital Federal-State grant-in-aid program. Basic among the problems of all States and affecting both the MCH and CC programs, are increases in costs, the increase in child population, and the need for trained personnel.

While the Bureau of Census reports that, between 1955 and 1965, the number of children under 18 years of age will increase by 21 percent and reach a total of 67 million, the cost of public health

personnel continues to rise. Between 1947 and 1953, the salaries of public health nurses increased on an average of 74 percent. In addition to the cost of those who are already trained, States report that they require more personnel and more opportunities to provide graduate training in various aspects of the MCH and CC programs. The recommended increase in the Federal grants would allow the States to develop these long-range goals.

It is most urgent, Mr. President, that more Federal funds be made available to these child-health programs. I have learned from a highly respected and qualified authority in this field, my good friend, Dr. Martha M. Eliot, chairman of the Department of Maternal and Child Health, Harvard University, that at the present time there are many children whose operative care must be delayed because of a lack of funds in State agencies. Likewise, many States are not able to do needed work for children with rheumatic heart disease, for children who are deaf and require hearing aids, and for children with cleft palate. According to Dr. Eliot one of the newest and most appealing programs which is limited by a lack of funds is the provision of artificial arms and legs for children who either have been born without an arm or leg or have been injured in accidents. Amazing advances have been made in the manufacture of small-sized arms and legs for infants as small as 18 months of age. Yet, because of a shortage of funds, many children are still awaiting the opportunity to lead the normal life which these advances permit.

Mr. President, a Nation which spends over \$40 billion a year for defense cannot afford, on either a humanitarian or a practical basis, to allow a resource as priceless as the health of its children to go without the best possible medical treatment. Therefore, I am proud to introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would raise the statutory ceiling on maternal health and crippled children funds to \$25 million. I request that the bill appear in the RECORD along with my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 3504) to increase the amounts authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year for the programs of maternal and child health services and services for crippled children provided for by title V of the Social Security Act, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 501 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, the sum of \$15 million, and for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1951, the sum of \$16,500,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1958, the sum of \$25 million."

(b) Paragraph (2) of section 502 (a) of such act is amended (1) by striking out "1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "1958",

and (2) by striking out "\$8,250,000" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,500,000."

(c) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 502 of such act is amended to read as follows: "Out of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 501 the Secretary shall allot to the States (in addition to the allotments made under subsection (a)) for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1958, the sum of "\$12,500,000."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 511 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, the sum of \$12 million, and for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1951, the sum of \$15 million", and inserting in lieu thereof "for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1958, the sum of \$25 million."

(b) Paragraph (2) of section 512 (a) of such act is amended (1) by striking out "1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "1958", and (2) by striking out "\$7,500,000" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,500,000."

(c) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 512 of such act is amended to read as follows: "Out of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 511 the Secretary shall allot to the States (in addition to the allotments made under subsection (a)) for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1958, the sum of "\$12,500,000."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this act shall be effective with respect to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1958.

and my study has revealed the critical nature of this matter. Unless some action is taken we will have arrived at a situation which will be impossible to correct. Within 3 years we will see practically all of the experienced lawyers leaving active duty, and we will not have qualified legal personnel in the military services to protect the interests of the United States, either at home or abroad, nor will they be available to protect the interests of the boys we are drafting. I therefore urge that immediate consideration be given to this problem.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and be printed.

EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1950—AMENDMENTS

Mr. AIKEN submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3420) to extend and amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1950, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3420, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

TECHNICAL CHANGES IN FEDERAL EXCISE-TAX LAWS—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUSH submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 7125) to make technical changes in the Federal excise-tax laws, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

DAIRY PRODUCTS MARKETING ACT OF 1958—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] may be added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 3456) to provide a substantially self-financing program to protect the returns of producers of milk and butterfat used in manufactured dairy products to the producers thereof, to provide a formula for computing parity farm income and parity income equivalent prices, to establish a Federal Dairy Advisory Committee, to promote and protect and encourage family-scale farming in the dairy industry, to enable milk producers to keep supplies in reasonable balance with the need and demand therefor, to prevent discrimination between the various manufactured dairy products in Government food-purchasing programs, and for other purposes, introduced by me, for myself, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. HUMPHREY, on March 12, 1958.

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

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

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

By Mr. JENNER:

Address delivered by him to the Indiana State Republican dinner on October 14, 1957.

Address delivered by him to the Knights of Columbus in East Chicago, Ind., on November 6, 1957.

Statement by him on S. 2646, relating to the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Snowball," which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of Saturday, March 15, 1958, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

SNOWBALL

It is seldom helpful to keep telling a patient who is ill that he may die. Too many quick generalizations about particular economic statistics could have a similar effect on the country in the recession.

Let there be no mistake: the recession is serious, and it justifies the concern about it. But there seems to be little smugness on this subject either on Capitol Hill or in the White House. The caution in the administration, and among some legislators, is primarily the care that properly is exercised in prescribing drastic drugs before the diagnosis is exact. There is certainly a danger in doing too little; but there also is a danger, if all the nostrums are applied at once, of losing a mammoth reinflation that would be equally damaging to the country.

The resources of Government are dedicated, both by law and by determination, to the prevention of economic catastrophe. Apart from the interest rate reductions by the Federal Reserve Board, the administration already has taken a number of steps. The Defense Department, for example, has announced plans to let \$10 billion in contracts by June 30—\$4 billion more than during the last half of 1957. There are similar plans to speed up public works and reclamation spending.

Congress has been no less busy. The Senate has passed an emergency housing bill as well as a resolution to accelerate public works and military programs. Measures to extend unemployment benefits are sure to pass. A number of tax cut proposals, encompassing personal income, corporation, and excise taxes, either individually or in combination, are in readiness and could be applied quickly if such sweeping action were found desirable.

It is against this background that the new estimates on personal spending and plant and equipment expenditures for 1958 ought to be considered. The 13-percent drop in plant expansion is troubling, but the fact that business outlays are down is scarcely new. The \$32.1 billion which industry is expected to spend is still a great deal of money.

No individual statistic is a reliable guide in this complex matter of assessing the state of the economy. Unemployment, particularly in certain distressed areas, justifies much of the worry expressed by the AFL-CIO. Yet department store sales last week were up 7 percent over a year ago. Railroad carloadings were down, but applications for FHA mortgages in February showed an astounding rise.

The point is that this frenetic pulsetaking every few moments can do as much harm as

AMENDMENT OF MIGRATORY BIRD HUNTING STAMP ACT OF 1934—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON (by request) submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2617) to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF METHOD OF BASIC PAY FOR MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in accordance with the statement of the Honorable Charles S. Rhyne, president of the American Bar Association, before the Stennis subcommittee handling military pay legislation (S. 3081), that such general military pay legislation be amended to incorporate the provisions of two bills which I have previously introduced, S. 1165 and S. 1093, I have prepared and do now offer the substance of these bills as amendments to that effect and ask that the amendments be referred to the Committee on Armed Services and be printed. These amendments will carry out the objectives of the American Bar Association as set forth in Mr. Rhyne's statement, which statement was placed in the body of the RECORD on Friday last. That statement is fully descriptive of the urgently critical problems existing in connection with the procurement and retention of lawyers in the Armed Forces whose professional services afford protection not only to the individual rights of our citizens, but also to the economic interests of the American people. In addition, I made a statement before the Stennis subcommittee

good. It is unlikely that the country will or can talk itself out of the recession; some price adjustments and corollary wage restraint, in addition to governmental action already instituted, probably will be necessary. But it is altogether possible for the country to talk itself into something worse, in the manner of a hypochondriac.

Most of us tend to make judgments based on the prevailing confidence or state of mind. And if we keep telling each other, almost masochistically, how dreadful we feel, it will be easy to develop a psychology of recession that will further affect purchasing in snowball fashion. Neither the public nor Government alone can restore confidence, but both together can. Let there be no attempt to hide the facts, grim or otherwise. But let all of us, particularly those who interpret the figures, try to keep them in perspective.

IMPORTANCE OF HIGHWAY DEVELOPMENT TO COORDINATE WITH THE GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today we start consideration of legislation to strengthen the Federal-State highway program.

Our purpose is twofold: (a) To expedite this vital program for its own sake so as to provide for improved automotive and truck transportation for the American people and thereby increase safety, lower costs, and so forth; and

(b) To help enable highway construction to pick up the slack in our economy.

As the Midwest views the highway program, one of its most interesting features is the relationship between that program and the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway.

It is our hope and belief that as the 27-foot, 2,300-mile deep-water seaway comes into being, it will be served by an improved road network which will get the goods to and from the docks rapidly.

One of the big problems of American highway transportation, however, is that the huge tractor-trailers which currently move night and day across this Nation's highways, at 50 miles an hour or more, are slowed to a snail's pace when they get into American cities.

And as they approach dockside areas, which are especially crowded, the tractor-trailers become almost immobilized. The result is unnecessary delay and higher costs of transportation.

It is the hope of the Midwest, therefore, that the Federal highway program will, indeed, be accelerated and that it will help provide for improved access to the Nation's port areas.

Other actions are, likewise, essential if the full promise of the St. Lawrence Seaway is to be realized.

First. As indicated on the Senate floor on March 12, there must be a speedup in appropriations for the Great Lakes connecting channels. The current budget for 1959 contains only around \$18 million for deepening the channels. At this rate it will be long after 1962 before the channels to the upper Lake States are both 27-foot downbound and upbound.

The deadline must be advanced, instead of pushed back. The channels must be completed as soon as possible.

Second. There must be improvement of harbors along the lakes so that they can make fullest use of the seaway.

Right now there are no less than 13 harbors in my own State that can accommodate moderate-sized seagoing vessels. But only three of these harbors, Ashland, Milwaukee, and Superior, now have channel depths about the same as the seaway. Both these and other harbors must be improved if they are to get full advantage of deep-draft shipping.

These and related facts were pointed out in an excellent statement which was delivered by Mr. Robert Mathes on the occasion of the 45th Wisconsin Highway Conference in January of this year. Mr. Mathes is the port-development specialist serving in the Wisconsin Division of Industrial Development. This division, in turn, is attached to the office of Gov. Vernon Thomson.

I believe that this statement will be of deep interest to all friends of the St. Lawrence Seaway as an illustration of what the alert State of Wisconsin is thinking and planning in terms of maximum State and National prosperity from the seaway.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

WISCONSIN PORT DEVELOPMENT AS IT RELATES TO HIGHWAY PLANNING

(By Robert F. Mathes, port development specialist, State of Wisconsin Division of Industrial Development)

Governor Thomson, Mayor Zeldler, Vice Chairman Doyne, President Howard, gentlemen. I am very happy to be here today and to have the opportunity to explain to you our study for the development of Wisconsin port cities.

It is significant that my talk is being given in Milwaukee because port development is not a new subject here. Under the guidance of Mr. H. C. Brockel, your very able municipal port director, and the City of Milwaukee Board of Harbor Commissioners, the planning and growth of one of the finest ports on the Great Lakes has taken place. Your city leaders are to be commended on their foresight in preparing the port of Milwaukee for a leading role in the development of world commerce via the St. Lawrence Seaway.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The St. Lawrence Seaway navigation and power projects are among the major construction projects undertaken by man. The work being done to harness this great waterway is especially commendable because it is the joint effort of two nations—the United States and Canada. When the seaway is completed in the spring of 1959, for the first time in history, large oceangoing ships will be able to sail more than 2,000 miles from the Atlantic Ocean to our Wisconsin port cities on Lakes Michigan and Superior.

The St. Lawrence Seaway project, long a dream of many of us both in the United States and Canada, became a reality in May 1954, when President Eisenhower signed into law the enabling legislation introduced by our Senator ALEXANDER WILEY and Congressman George Dondero, of Michigan. Previously, in December 1951, the Government of Canada had approved similar legislation.

The term "seaway" applies to the manmade improvements along 180 miles of the St. Lawrence River between Lake Ontario and Montreal. The river here is studded with islands, sharp bends, and rapids which until now, have made navigation by large ships impossible. The work now underway will eliminate these obstacles by providing a navigable

channel 27 feet deep and from 200 to 450 feet wide through this area. A series of 7 locks are being constructed to permit vessels to bypass the rapids, which cause the level of the river to fall from 246 feet above sea level on Lake Ontario to only 20 feet above sea level at Montreal.

Concurrent with the navigation improvements, the State of New York and the Province of Ontario are erecting a system of power dams that will utilize the flow of this mighty river to produce 2 million kilowatts of electricity. The St. Lawrence River, fed by the largest natural reservoir in the world—the five Great Lakes—has a remarkably even flow of water, making it an ideal source for the generation of electricity. The 3,200-foot-long St. Lawrence power dam, being erected near Massena, N. Y., will be the second longest hydroelectric power dam in the world, exceeded in length only by Grand Coulee Dam in the State of Washington. A second dam, the Long Sault Dam is being constructed nearby to control the slight fluctuations in the river level in order to provide a constant flow of water at the power dam. This part of the project will be completed and placed into operation July 1 of this year.

The entire St. Lawrence Seaway project will cost about \$1 billion. The navigation phase of the work will cost about \$450 million, paid about one-third by the United States and two-thirds by Canada. This work will be paid for from tolls charged to the vessels passing through the waterway. The power phase of the project will cost about \$600 million, paid equally by New York State and Ontario. This work will be paid for from the sale of electric power generated at the dam.

IMPORTANCE TO WISCONSIN

What does the St. Lawrence Seaway mean to Wisconsin? A look at the map will show you that Wisconsin's shores are at the head of the Great Lakes. In other words, we are situated as far inland as ships can come.

This location makes Wisconsin the natural site for the establishment of industrial plants that can import their principal raw materials by water and that plan to market their products in the areas of this country and Canada that lie between the western Great Lakes and the Rocky Mountains. Water transportation is inexpensive, and is employed to its best advantage for the carriage of low value bulk cargoes such as iron ore, coal, gypsum rock, sulfur, phosphate rock, and a multitude of other commodities found here and abroad that are consumed in our manufacturing processes. The opening of the seaway will permit large oceangoing ships to carry full shiploads, of as much as 25,000 tons, in the case of high density iron ore, directly to waterfront plant sites in Great Lakes port cities.

Fortunately, Wisconsin is ready to capitalize on this new transportation medium because we can boast 13 harbors that can already accommodate moderate size seagoing vessels. Only 3 of these harbors—Ashland, Milwaukee, and Superior—now have channel depths about the same as the seaway. Proposals to improve the others, however, are presently under study as part of the most comprehensive single transportation study project ever undertaken by the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the Federal agency responsible for providing navigable ship channels in United States harbors. What is important to us now is the fact that many necessary harbor improvements, such as breakwaters, bulkheads, movable bridges, Coast Guard stations, and navigation light-houses and buoys, already have been built. Of even more significance from the standpoint of industrial development, our port cities have sound industrial zoning ordinances and waterfront sites available for the erection of industrial plants. Having these physical essentials, our cities also can boast

that extra ingredient that is so very important in any program of this sort, namely, an enthusiasm for port development on the part of local citizens.

Two other advantages will be open to us when the seaway is completed next year. One will be the growth of foreign general cargo or merchandise trade, and the other will be the delivery of many products by water that now arrive via overland routes.

The term "foreign general cargo trade" describes the exporting and importing of the myriad of commodities that are traded amongst the countries of the world. This commerce, which includes almost every item from sewing needles to railway locomotives, and medicinal pills to live elephants, moves between the world's major ports on ships we generally term "freighters." Several of our Great Lakes ports, already very active in this trade, are improving their terminal facilities in order to handle what we anticipate will be a sizable increase in general cargo shipping next year.

In order to handle general cargo, a port operation must include a multitude of ancillary services, such as stevedoring, banking, customs, insurance, and export packing. And in order to make port calls profitable to ship operators, large minimum quantities of cargoes must be offered for each scheduled departure. Because of these requirements, it will be unwise for all but a few of our port cities to envision themselves as becoming leading general cargo ports.

The development of terminals for the receipt of specialized shipments will warrant the attention of several of Wisconsin's port cities, especially those located near the large Milwaukee-Chicago population center. Since the end of the war, several enterprising ship operators have successfully carried in bulk certain commodities traditionally delivered already packaged. Three of these commodities, transported in a rather spectacular fashion, are industrial chemicals, wine, and orange juice. These cargoes, all liquid, are carried between ports on the Atlantic, gulf and Pacific coasts of the United States in ships resembling the familiar petroleum tanker. At the destination, the liquids are pumped ashore into storage tanks at terminal facilities where they are bottled or packaged for local distribution and sale. This new method of shipment reduces both transportation costs and damage claims.

PORT DEVELOPMENT IN WISCONSIN

Last year the State legislature established the position of port development specialist, to which I have been appointed, within the Wisconsin Division of Industrial Development. This division, as you know, is attached to the Governor's office. The purpose of my work is to assist Wisconsin port cities in the formulation of their port development programs and to make recommendations to the Governor and the legislature on port development matters that affect the State as a whole.

My principal task, since I began my work here in Wisconsin about 3 months ago, has been to visit each of the harbors in our State. I have made trips to the port cities on Lake Michigan and Superior, along the Mississippi River and on the shores of Green Bay. Much to my pleasant surprise, I learned that there are about 25 cities and towns in Wisconsin with developed port facilities. These vary from improvements to river mouths for the shelter of recreation and fishing craft, to the development of the finest ports on the Great Lakes. I completed this indoctrination phase of my work only last week.

The next phases of my activity shall be to analyze the foreign trade patterns of Wisconsin exporters and importers, and to determine what types of industries would benefit by locating in one of our lakefront cities. I shall also investigate the ways that the growth of pleasure boating may affect our harbor improvement program.

In order to obtain the necessary data on Wisconsin's foreign trade, the University of Wisconsin School of Commerce is undertaking a detailed survey of this subject. Last autumn, by means of a postcard survey, the research group assigned to this study learned that one-half of our firms do some exporting and importing. The School of Commerce is now distributing questionnaires to these companies, asking for additional information regarding the quantity of goods that are exported and imported now and what volume is anticipated a few years hence, their foreign market areas or sources of materials, and the plans of these companies to use our Great Lakes ports upon the completion of the seaway.

I shall be working closely with the other members of the division of industrial development staff in order to learn which industries we should approach for discussions of relocation plans. You may have read that our office has retained an advertising agency to carry on our nationwide advertising program. One element of this program will be to explain to these industries the advantages our lakefront harbors have to offer.

As a more individual service to Wisconsin port cities, we shall assist in evaluating the suitability of waterfront sites for the construction of marine or industrial terminal facilities. The first aim of our studies shall be to determine the economic need for the proposed terminals. Beyond that, if the proposed projects appear to be feasible, we shall analyze the physical suitability of the sites by studying such items as the adequacy of the navigable channel, the accessibility to railroad and truck transportation, the suitability of subsurface conditions, and the size, layout, and design of the proposed terminal construction. Where the magnitude of the projects indicate that our staff cannot handle the work, we can assist in finding competent consultants.

HIGHWAY INTEREST IN PORT DEVELOPMENT

The interest that the members of the Wisconsin highway conference have in the development of our ports stems directly from the importance of motor truck transportation to today's port operations. Wisconsin's early and sincere concern with the improvement of highway transportation is evident from our fine highway system and our early regulation of motor carriers.

I understand that Wisconsin can boast one of the best secondary road systems in the United States. After driving over many of these roads in my recent travels to all parts of the State, and comparing them to similar roads in many other States I have visited, I can attest to the truth of this statement.

Good local roads are vitally necessary to permit our farmers to deliver their produce to market; they are going to be a great asset in enabling our manufacturers—especially those located in the more remote parts of the State—to carry their export products to our port cities and to bring back their import goods in return.

You are all well aware of the phenomenal growth of the motor carrier business within the past two decades. I have been informed that here in Wisconsin, trucks haul almost all our milk and paper products, and carry from one-half to more than 90 percent of our poultry, eggs, butter and—beer. Wisconsin has been a leader in regulating the operation of motor trucks in the carriage of commerce, and led the Federal Government by 2 years in the passage of the present Motor Carrier Act.

I have already mentioned that trucks play an important role in carrying world commerce to and from our harbors. In the great Port of New York, for instance, about one-half the general cargo that is unloaded from ships is delivered to consumer by truck, while about 20 percent of the exports are

carried from manufacturer to steamship pier by truck.

How can you help improve this flow of goods between our factories and our harbors? By sound planning of new arterial highways and local access streets in and around our port cities, and by the establishment of traffic ordinances designed to speed the flow of truck traffic to and from the waterfront. Close cooperation with municipal and county boards of harbor commissioners is essential to effectively achieve this program.

One of the major problems which confronts our large coastal seaports is vehicular-traffic congestion. Their streets were built decades ago to accommodate horse-drawn drey carts, not the large over-the-road tractor trailers in use today. These big trucks speed across modern turnpikes to get to these cities, only to lose this precious time advantage when they arrive because they have to creep along busy narrow streets to get to the waterfront, and then they frequently must wait in line for hours before they can drive into a narrow pier shed, where, after they are unloaded, they must back out because there is not enough room at the end of the pier to permit them to turn around. This is not to say that our seacoast ports are not striving very hard to correct this situation. They are doing a marvelous job in this respect. What we want to do is to benefit from their mistakes in our own street and highway planning.

There are a number of important points regarding streets that we must consider in our port-planning activities. As I mention them you will undoubtedly note that they are adapted from criteria you have frequently utilized. They are as follows:

(a) An arterial highway system designed to bypass congested business districts and to route trucks directly to the waterfront.

(b) A street system within the harbor-terminal area adequate to accommodate large over-the-road trucks.

(c) An efficient traffic-flow pattern in the terminal area and on the piers.

(d) Sufficient parking facilities behind and inside the pier sheds to accommodate trucks that arrive to load or unload cargo.

(e) Ample parking space in the terminal area for longshoremen and pier personnel.

(f) One point not concerned with port planning alone—adequate separation of highways and railroad tracks to permit the erection of industrial buildings in between.

In conclusion, let me say that you can be of the greatest assistance to our port-planning program by carefully considering these criteria and by working closely with local harbor boards whenever you plan streets and highways in Wisconsin port cities. By doing this you will be contributing in the most helpful way possible to our overall effort to develop the finest harbors on the Great Lakes.

SEARCH FOR PEACE BY THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, sometimes it is the little thing that shapes the course of world events.

Today America's position is portrayed by propaganda as that of a warmonger. Sometimes I fear we help give credence to this canard by emphasizing in our publicity our progress in science for death, instead of science for life.

Saturday night the famous Washington Gridiron Club departed from its usual practice of lampooning the great and the near great with only satirical songs, written to parody the well-known song hits of today and of yesterday. I am told that this is one of the few times in its 73 years that this has been done.

This departure came in a serious closing song that brought the banquet to a cheering climax. This song was entitled "Around the World We Search for Peace."

It was written to the music of *Around the World in 80 Days*, which movie by Producer Mike Todd, has just been awarded the title of the "Best Moving Picture of the Year" by Film Daily's poll of critics, reviewers, and commentators.

I hope other Senators will join me in requesting the Voice of America to ask Producer Todd to release the copyright privileges on the music—with the words of the gridiron song—to be used as the theme song of the Voice of America.

Sometimes a good song is worth a thousand speeches. This is such a song, and the music going around the world for 80 days may help to show the world the peace-loving face of Uncle Sam instead of the grim face of military power.

It might be possible to translate this beautiful song and the wonderful theme of the words into other languages so that we could touch the heart of the world with the true desire of every American to find the road to a just and a lasting peace.

The words of the closing Gridiron song were written by Frederic W. Collins, Washington correspondent of the *Providence Journal*, and were sung by Gene Archer, with Fletcher Knebel as music chairman. The words are:

Around the world we search for peace.
Our goal is clear, we'll persevere. Our hope shall never cease.

We know somewhere, sometime, somehow
Mankind will know the blessed glow, he
deeply prays for now.

Where hate and strife and fear now reign,
Let men and nations join their hearts and
hands as one again

And pledge their vow that all around the
world,

We'll always find our world at peace.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY—1958

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the Irish are a proud people—proud of their heritage and of their traditions.

But I don't think anyone ever called the Irish selfish about these things. An example of this unselfishness is the willingness of the Irish to share their beloved saint—St. Patrick—with one and all on every March 17.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from today's *New York Times*, entitled "Everybody's Saint," be printed in the *RECORD* at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

EVERYBODY'S SAINT

One doesn't have to be Irish in order to have an affection for St. Patrick—St. Patrick wasn't Irish, either, not by birth. This doesn't prevent St. Patrick's Day from being the festival of a particular faith and an especial nation, but it does make it possible for those among us who never walked down O'Connell Street or kissed the Blarney Stone or rode in a jaunting car around the Lakes of Killarney to be glad when this saint's day rolls around.

St. Patrick's Day doesn't come in what the calendar says is spring, and that is fair

warning. However, there is a kind of spring thought in it. Its green is for Ireland, which is indeed a fair green land, but it is also because it won't be long now before the turn of the year will be at hand, and we can all relax and live happy ever after.

But St. Patrick's Day is mainly a day when everybody is, or ought to be, good-natured and in a kindly mood toward everybody else. It is true that the Irish have done enough fighting in their day—too much, to be sure, like the rest of the world. They are not a docile people, putting up gently with injustice. When there was no fighting to do at home they often went out and looked for it: they defended liberty in our own Revolution; they fought for the Union (and for the Confederacy, too, for that matter) in our own Civil War, and they were almost as numerous on freedom's side of the second World War as they would have been if their government had joined in it with the other democracies.

St. Patrick was willing enough to fight when necessary: against sin, against snakes, against anything that he judged was hostile to God's will. But it isn't fighting we think about today—and this day, in this year, in this generation, in this often sad, and tragic time, is a good day to think of a saint who was full to the brim of his heart with goodwill and a cheerful love for all mankind.

And he loved life, too—the parade would surprise him, for he was not a proud man, but he'd keep time to the drums, the pipes, and the brasses like the rest of us, and he wouldn't find any irreverence, where none is meant, in those who love his humanity as well as his saintliness.

CONTROL OF SIGNBOARDS ON THE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, 1 week from now the Senate is scheduled to begin debate of a major new highway bill. Along with many other very constructive features, this bill will include a significant new section to protect the investment which America's traveling public is making in the highways through their taxes on gasoline and other automotive necessities. The bill will include a section to encourage and assist State regulation of billboards along the new Interstate Highway System.

I want to address a brief plea today particularly to my Democratic colleagues on this side of the Senate aisle, regarding this provision of the new highway bill.

Mr. President, the battle to recognize roadside beauty and scenery as a legitimate aspect of the Federal interest in the national highway network has been waged from the beginning in total disregard of party lines. I initiated this effort when authorization of the new Interstate System first came before the subcommittee on roads, on which I serve. I have from the beginning had the support of the able chairman of the subcommittee, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. Other members from both sides of the subcommittee table joined in support. When the billboard-control provision first came to a vote in the full committee last year, and lost by one vote, party lines were not involved.

This year, the able junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], who had reconsidered his previous opposition to the measure, and I joined together in submitting a single, unified billboard-control amendment to the highway bill. It

was further amended in committee to reflect the views of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]. When the billboard-control amendment was adopted by the Public Works Committee this year, the vote again ignored party lines.

Mr. President, I recount this background to show that this issue has not been a partisan one. I am sure it will not be a party issue when it reaches the floor of the Senate. Instead—as I am sure every Senator knows from his mail and from editorial comment in the press of his State—it is a question of extremely widespread public interest, cutting across all political and economic lines, except of course for the narrow self-interest of the billboard industry itself.

It is, Mr. President, essentially a conservation issue in the broad sense of that term. And that is why I want to address my Democratic colleagues today—to suggest, not a spirit of partisan controversy, but perhaps of friendly competition with our colleagues on the other side in supporting the public interest in these spectacular new highways we are building across our land.

I want to remind my colleagues, Mr. President, that during modern times our party has been the party of conservation. I trust that Democratic Senators will recall, when they consider this issue, that ours is the party of Franklin D. Roosevelt, who set aside the Olympic National Park in Washington State and the Kings Canyon National Park of California; who established the Civilian Conservation Corps and the Great Plains Shelterbelt project, as well as the great river projects such as TVA, Bonneville, and Grand Coulee, the Central Valley and the Columbia Basin irrigation projects and many other good works to safeguard the natural resources and environment within which our Nation lives. More improvement of trails, shelters, and campgrounds took place in our national forests while Franklin D. Roosevelt was President than in any other era.

In addition, FDR was the man who founded our modern United States Fish and Wildlife Service and put it under the direction of a great career biologist like Dr. Ira Noel Gabrielson. He brought to the head of the United States Forest Service distinguished career forester Lyle F. Watts. Under the only President ever to be elected more than twice, the conservation agencies and conservation policies enjoyed their greatest support and highest prestige.

Can anyone doubt, Mr. President, where Franklin D. Roosevelt would have stood in the battle between the public and the billboard industry, with respect to preserving uncluttered and unobstructed the roadways of a vast, new, limited-access superhighway system across America? Can there be any question of where this great Democratic President would have stood, any more than that other conservationist, his illustrious Republican namesake who preceded him in the White House?

I trust members of our party will not turn their backs on this heritage, when

the issue is squarely joined in the Senate to decide whether or not outdoor advertising companies are to be handed, as a gift from Congress, the bonanza of plastering their signs along the \$40 billion worth of splendid new cross-country highways to be built from the taxes of traveling Americans. Billboard control has been included in this highway bill with the endorsement of the present administration. I believe President Eisenhower himself has expressed the wish that control could be accomplished. Can we do less than the extremely moderate steps now proposed to encourage and assist the States to act?

I hope that eminent leaders of the Democratic Party, such as ex-President Harry Truman, Gov. Adlai Stevenson, and others may find occasion to add their voices to the chorus demanding that the public interest in roadside billboard control be recognized by Congress in our highway legislation. One such leader has already done so, Mr. President, both by action in his own State and by public statements. The distinguished Governor of our most populous State, Gov. W. Averell Harriman, endorsed billboard control in testimony before our Senate Roads Subcommittee. In an article in the Reporter magazine, Governor Harriman explained what has been done in New York State, particularly on the beautiful New York State Thruway, and what ought to be done everywhere. In concluding my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD this article by Governor Harriman, from the Reporter of March 6, 1958.

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

A GREAT GREEN PATH ACROSS AMERICA
(By Averell Harriman)

ALBANY.—It seems to me that the case for banning billboards on our new National System of Defense and Interstate Highways is both simple and irrefutable. We have mapped out and begun building what will be the largest superhighway system in the world. If we keep it free of billboards it can also be one of the most beautiful.

In the field of transportation, the American genius for the practical has created many objects of unique utility, ranging from the Yankee clippers to the Brooklyn Bridge, which have also been uniquely beautiful. The divided limited-access expressway, following the contours of the land rather than slicing through it, is in many ways our most impressive achievement yet. The gliding, effortless grace of these vast stretches of concrete sweeping along the American countryside has given a new dimension to travel, and thereby to life in the United States.

Three-quarters of the mileage of the Interstate System will be built over new rights-of-way, where no road has ever before existed. Since they can be entered only at 15- to 20-mile intervals, there will be none of the ribbon development that has grown up along our older roads. If the billboards are also kept away from our new superhighways the countryside will remain untouched; in constructing a military transportation system, we shall have built at the same time 41,000 miles of national park.

Legislation aimed at banning billboards from the Interstate System was defeated in Congressional committee last year. The same bill is up for action again this session, but if it fails again it may be too late. The

States, which are paying 10 percent of the cost and carrying out the actual construction, have already completed some sections. The billboards are already going up. Once they are up, there is little likelihood of their ever coming down.

Toward the end of last year's battle in Congress, Arthur Krock observed that the public didn't seem to care what happened. I think it might be more accurate to say that the public didn't know what was at stake. Perhaps it still does not. It may be we have shouted "colossal" at one another so often we have trouble recognizing something really big when it does come along. In much the way that space satellites were once looked upon by some as just another scientific gimmick, the Interstate System seems to be generally regarded as just another highway program.

It is a great deal more than that. The Highway Act of 1956 authorized the largest public-works program in history. We are not simply improving our road-transportation facilities, the way Indian trails were made into wagon routes which in turn became highways. We are creating an entirely new system to bind centers of population together in a vast network of four-lane, limited-access, and for the most part toll-free superhighways. In the age of the metropolis and the automobile, it will become the primary transportation system of the Nation. It will take at least 13 years to complete and will cost \$60 billion—three times the total capitalization of American railroads.

BLOCKING OUT THE CATSKILLS

Because what we are building is an entirely new system, it has become both more necessary and at the same time more possible for us to maintain our contacts with the strength and beauty of the American countryside. It is wrong to let the billboards spoil it all.

To understand the alternatives, one need only compare the New York State Thruway with Route 17, which connects with the thruway near my farm at Harriman 40 miles north of New York City. The thruway, running up the Hudson to Albany and from there west along the Mohawk to Buffalo and beyond, is one of the first major segments of the Interstate System to have been completed. In my opinion it is one of the most beautiful highways in the world, giving the traveler magnificent views of the Hudson and Mohawk Valleys. Route 17 runs through equally lovely country in the Catskill Mountains and along the southern tier of New York counties. It is not yet part of the Interstate System, but it is being rebuilt to interstate specifications by many of the same engineers who built the thruway. The only difference is that a State law forbids billboards within 500 feet of the thruway whereas Route 17, which is not so protected, is being lined with billboards that either block out the Catskills or distract the eyes from them.

As if that weren't bad enough in itself, we recently discovered that crews of workmen had been sent by unknown persons onto State property along a newly completed stretch of Route 17 to cut down stands of trees that were obstructing the view of some new billboards.

Banning billboards along the new Interstate Highways could scarcely be called a heavy blow to the advertising industry. There are 3,400,000 miles of streets and roads in the Nation, most of which remain open to as many billboards as advertisers are willing to pay for. The Interstate System will add a mere 1.2 percent to the total mileage. Moreover, the small businesses such as motels and restaurants that use billboards to advertise their whereabouts can do so at the exits, which are the only points where travelers can turn off the highways anyway.

The curious—and recently discovered—argument that billboards contribute to traffic safety by keeping people awake is an admirable bit of best-defense-is-a-strong-offense strategy, but that is about all that can be said for it. To be sure, it has not been established that billboards actually cause accidents on the open highways, although a study made by the Minnesota Department of Highways in cooperation with the United States Bureau of Public Roads indicated that the greater the number of nonofficial signs at intersections, the higher were the accident rates. As for the open highways, there is not one jot of scientifically documented evidence to prove billboards actually prevent accidents at any hour of the day, much less at night when most of them can't be seen anyway.

INDUCEMENT TO THE STATES

The responsibility for protecting the beauty of our new highways is inescapably that of the individual States that are designing and building them and will subsequently maintain them. Such is the power of the billboard interests, however, that it seems clear there will have to be some Federal inducement to persuade the States to act. Last year I requested the New York State Legislature to extend the thruway prohibition against billboards to all of our interstate and limited-access highways. The bill passed the assembly by a thumping 124 to 19, only to meet a silent death in a senate committee. I have requested legislative action again this year.

Senator ALBERT GORE of Tennessee, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Public Roads, is vigorously supporting a proposal to increase by three-quarters of 1 percent the amount the Federal Government will pay toward construction in any State that prohibits billboards within 660 feet of the interstate highway. This would add nothing to the total cost of the highways but it would provide a substantial inducement to State legislators. And it is they, after all, who must make the final decision.

**THE SENATE'S MAJORITY LEADER,
LYNDON B. JOHNSON**

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished majority leader on his leadership during the past week. Last week was indeed a positive and constructive week in the history of the Senate. Action was taken which will put to work hundreds of thousands of persons who are now unemployed.

Considering the few weeks the Senate has been in session, this accomplishment was very remarkable, indeed. In verve and drive it has been compared by competent journalists with the first hundred days under President Franklin D. Roosevelt. It certainly constitutes a great landmark in Senate leadership. The majority leader deserves a world of credit for this.

As a Senator from Wisconsin, I feel certain I express the sentiment of the people of Wisconsin, especially those who are now out of work, who will be put to work by the accomplishments of last week. I express deep thanks for a remarkably able leadership.

**CALE P. HAUN AND JULIA FAY
HAUN—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC.
NO. 83)**

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the Pres-

ident of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 674, entitled "An act for the relief of Cale P. Haun and Julia Fay Haun."

The bill would provide 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, sole stockholders of River Grange Co., Inc., which was liquidated pursuant to a plan of complete liquidation adopted on December 24, 1953, the elections of Cale P. Haun and Julia Fay Haun 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 adoption of such plan. The bill states that 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.

Section 112 (b) (7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 provides a special rule in the case of certain complete liquidations of domestic corporations occurring within 1 calendar month for the treatment of gain on the shares of stock owned by qualified electing shareholders. The effect of this section is to permit deferral of tax upon unrealized appreciation in the value of the property distributed in liquidation. An election to be governed by section 112 (b) (7) must be filed by the shareholder or by the liquidating corporation with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue on or before midnight of the 30th day after adoption of the plan of liquidation. The bill would waive this requirement for the named taxpayers.

The records of the Treasury Department show that River Grange Co., Inc., adopted a plan of complete liquidation on December 24, 1953. The Internal Revenue Service began an examination of the return of this corporation on September 9, 1954, and a question arose as to whether the stockholders had filed an election under section 112 (b) (7). It was found that no such election had been filed. A representative of the taxpayers had advised that an election was mailed on or about September 10, 1954, which date was more than 7 months after the expiration of the statutory period for filing the election.

Except in the case of special circumstances, the enactment of special legislative relief for a taxpayer who has not made an election within the time prescribed by law constitutes an inequitable discrimination against other taxpayers similarly situated. The primary extenuating circumstance on which the taxpayers appear to rely in this instance is that a professional adviser, upon whom the taxpayers were accustomed to depend in legal matters, was incapacitated by illness 6 months prior to the adoption of the plan of liquidation so that the taxpayers were compelled to rely on other professional advisers. The circumstances of this case do not seem to justify special legislative relief.

The granting of special relief in this case would constitute an inequitable discrimination against other taxpayers similarly situated and would create an undesirable precedent which might encourage other taxpayers to seek relief in the same manner.

Under the circumstances, therefore, I am constrained to withhold my approval of the bill.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 17, 1958.

WPA AND PWA

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal points out in a recent article that no American wants to return to the days of the WPA and PWA, and that while this was an unhappy period in American history, President Eisenhower, in a recent statement by him was unnecessarily harsh in criticizing the spirit behind these agencies.

The Milwaukee Journal has never been a New Deal paper. It has been extremely critical of many of the big Government, big brother implications of the New Deal. With a sense of fairness which has always characterized the Journal, however, it points out that many Americans have deep gratitude toward these New Deal agencies, which saved them from idleness and starvation, and provided in many cases a rich and invaluable investment in highways, bridges, libraries, schools, and erosion control and irrigation programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point following my remarks.

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

DON'T BELITTLE WPA AND PWA

No American wants to return to the days of WPA or PWA. The very initials bring memories of an unhappy period in American history. Nevertheless, President Eisenhower was unnecessarily harsh in mention of WPA and PWA in his Saturday statement about the present recession.

Many Americans have a deep gratitude toward those New Deal agencies, which saved them from idleness and starvation. Furthermore, accomplishments of those depression-time, made-work programs are still with us today, 20 years after the agencies were liquidated.

What did the WPA (Works Progress Administration) and the PWA (Public Works Administration) do?

Between 1934 and 1943, the WPA and predecessor agencies pumped almost \$15 billion into the economy. Jobs were provided for more than 8 million Americans on 1½ million projects. There was some waste, some leaf raking. However, WPA contributed 643,000 miles of highways, roads, and streets; 77,000 bridges and viaducts; 54,000 new public buildings; 5,832 schools, libraries, auditoriums, and gymnasiums; 1,650 parks, 3,000 playgrounds; 285 new airports; 944 sewage treatment plants; and hundreds of flood and erosion control, irrigation, and conservation projects.

Here in Milwaukee, the WPA improved 900 miles of roads and streets, erected 43 bridges and viaducts, reconstructed 91 schools, installed 222 miles of street lighting, and built many miles of storm and sanitary sewers. WPA and CCC (Civilian Conservation Corps) labor developed and improved much of the county park system. It made Whitnall Estabrook, and Lincoln Parks the beauty spots they are.

The PWA constructed 34,524 projects, ranging in size from a 1-room school in Arizona to a \$60 million sewage disposal facility in Chicago. At its peak, it employed 650,000 men on construction sites and an estimated 1,200,000 off the sites. Total cost of PWA construction was \$6 billion, of which roughly a third was contributed by benefiting communities.

In the Milwaukee area, PWA helped build the filtration plant and the Cherry Street bridge, nearly \$4 million worth of school improvements, and \$3 million worth of sewer repairs and extensions. The Parklawn housing project was a PWA development. Most of the suburbs built schools, sewers, and streets with PWA aid.

To apply such words as "schemes" and "dubious activities" and "unsound" in blanket indictment of WPA and PWA seems uncalled for and unjustified.

It may be, of course, that Mr. Eisenhower didn't have an awareness of the need or accomplishment of WPA and PWA. All of that time he was sheltered in the Army, much of it serving as General MacArthur's aide in the far-off Philippines.

ECONOMIC DECLINE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, of course public officials do a great disservice to our country when they create a dangerous psychology of pessimism by exaggerating the seriousness of the economic decline.

On the other hand, they do a similar disservice by remaining silent or by exaggerating the optimistic trends in our economy.

I feel very strongly, Mr. President, that it is desirable for public officials to speak out and, on the basis of the most responsible and authoritative facts they can find, to indicate exactly what is the status of our economy. With this in mind, I call the attention of the Senate to two excellent articles which appeared recently. Mr. John G. Forrest, of the New York Times, reported yesterday that there are serious danger signals with regard to our Nation's economic health. The Department of Commerce and the Securities and Exchange Commission have said, according to Forrest, that business spending this year would fall 13 percent, or \$5 billion below that of last year.

Forrest also reports that at the same time, the Federal Reserve Board describes in its latest survey of consumer spending a spreading pessimism about the economic outlook, and more seriously, a cutback by consumers in plans to buy major products. Forrest reports that home building last month dropped to the lowest annual rate since 1954. He calls attention to slumping exports and the prospect that these will be substantially below those of last year.

In a similar article by Mr. Harold B. Dorsey in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, Mr. Dorsey predicts that the annual rate of business capital expenditures for the first 6 months of this year is likely to show a year-to-year decline of at least \$6 billion, and expresses his personal opinion that the decline will be much larger. He also points to the drop in the annual rate of exports of from \$2 billion to \$3 billion a year below last year, and expresses concern that Government moves

will not be able to accomplish a sizable recovery in the level of business activity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two articles be printed in the RECORD at this point following my remarks.

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

[From the New York Times of March 16, 1958]

RECESSION NEWS ARRIVES PELLMELL, BUT MARKET PUSHES DOGEDLY UPHILL

(By John G. Forrest)

The state of the Nation's economic health continued to dominate both domestic and foreign news last week. That state was definitely queasy, though nothing like a crisis had set in.

Surprisingly, the stock market shrugged off the continuing rash of gloomy news. It ended the week with a modest gain. The New York Times combined average of 50 stocks closed at 280.99, up 2 points. The gains in specialty issues were largely attributed to short covering.

Wall Street had its reasons. The bad news had been discounted well in advance and the statistics that now were being issued came as no surprise. Unemployment was expected to rise, and it did; corporate earnings for the fourth quarter of 1957 were expected to show declines, and they did; capital expenditures for plant and heavy equipment were expected to dip, and they are falling.

SIX AND SEVEN-TENTHS PERCENT IDLE

In mid-February, unemployment rose to 5,173,000, the highest level since August 1941, and a jump of 679,000 from the mid-January figure. George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, pointed out that listing those on short workweeks would add another 1,300,000 to the total. As it was, the officially reported unemployment rate stood at 6.7 percent of the labor force.

President Eisenhower announced he would recommend that the Federal Government extend benefits to workers who had exhausted their State jobless payments. The program would cost \$600 million to \$800 million and temporarily extend jobless pay for 39 weeks from the 26 weeks now prevailing.

The Department of Commerce and the Securities and Exchange Commission reported that business spending this year would fall 13 percent, or \$5 billion, from the record \$37 billion of 1957. The estimated decline is nearly double that predicted in surveys last fall.

At the same time, the Federal Reserve Board issued its latest survey of consumer spending plans. It showed a spreading pessimism about the economic outlook and, more significant, a cutback in plans to buy major products. Indications were that new-car sales would be hit—as they have been these last few months—and that there would be fewer buyers for new homes.

BUILDING DIP

Home building last month dropped to an annual rate of 890,000 starts, the lowest since 1954. As a rule, February heralds a seasonal upturn in home construction. This year, of course, the weather was unusually severe.

There are some who believe that slumping exports are a major contributing cause of the recession. Latest figures tend to bear them out. In January, overseas shipments were 10 percent below those of a year earlier. They fell 8 percent in December. The statistics in both months exclude military-aid shipments.

There was one thin ray of cheer, however, from the Washington statistical factory. The Federal Reserve Board said department-store sales in the first week this month ran 7 percent ahead of the like week last year. It was emphasized, though, that sales a year

ago were badly depressed by the weather. Also, Easter is 2 weeks earlier this year and traditional buying may be well under way.

ARMS STEP-UP

Slowly but surely, defense spending is beginning to pick up. In the first half of this year, procurement contracts are now scheduled to run at a rate of \$1.7 billion to \$1.8 billion a month, compared with about \$1 billion a month in the last half of 1957. The outlay for military construction in the first half will amount to about \$1.7 billion, against \$327 million in the final half of last year.

The Government soon will be back in the money market. The Treasury next month will seek \$3 billion in new cash. The terms have not yet been disclosed. The reason for the borrowing: Later this month the Government will have to pay off about \$3 billion in tax-anticipation notes issued last July.

IS THE RECESSION SLIDING INTO SOMETHING WORSE?

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

The apparent immunity of the stock market to very bad business news symbolizes Wall Street's interesting interpretation of the present business situation.

It is argued: "Everybody knows that business figures are bad. The worse they get, then the more pressure there is on the Federal Government to do something, and the palliatives administered by hysterical politicians will probably be of an inflationary character." Whenever speculators sense a revival of an inflationary atmosphere they tend to look with greater favor on common stocks.

In the presence of this rationale, a discussion of business statistics seems to have only the academic interest of a post mortem. In fact, however, a consideration of the business figures should have a real practical value, especially if one is willing in his diagnosis to clear his mind of the cloudy generalities and misconceptions about inflation.

So far as the business analyst is concerned, probably the most significant set of statistics recently released are those which indicate an acceleration in the downward trend of business capital expenditures. According to the joint report released last week by the Department of Commerce and the Securities and Exchange Commission, capital expenditures by business in the third quarter of last year reached a peak of \$37.75 billion when the year-to-year gain was 5.2 percent. The revised figures for the fourth quarter of last year indicate that the scope of the year-to-year improvement had dropped to 0.6 percent. Now it is anticipated that capital expenditures for the first quarter of this year will show a year-to-year decline of 7.7 percent, for the second quarter the decline is expected to be 12 percent, and for the second half of this year it is anticipated that the annual rate of these expenditures will be \$6.1 billion below the same period of 1957, a decline of 16 percent.

These figures tend to confirm a study on the same subject prepared by the National Industrial Conference Board sponsored by Newsweek magazine. That study indicated that appropriations for capital expenditures by the large manufacturing companies in the fourth quarter of last year were down 33 percent from a year earlier and the backlog of unexpended appropriations on December 31 was 20 percent lower than a year before. These figures give a good idea of the actual capital expenditures by these companies 6 to 9 months later.

In this column on February 3 it was pointed out that business analysts would be watching carefully to see "whether the decline will continue into the stage where weakness breeds weakness." * * * Whatever the original reason for the first decline in the

volume of demand, the resulting deterioration in earnings has a further debilitating effect upon the demand for goods and services, which, in turn, is likely to cause a further drop in earnings."

Unquestionably, there is an association between the declining trend of business earnings and the declining—and accelerating—trend in business capital expenditures. Unfortunately, the latter trend has an adverse effect on job creation, which tends to reduce purchasing power and the ability to move goods at the consumption line.

It was officially reported last week that January exports recorded a 10 percent year-to-year decline. This tends to support an observation made in this column a few weeks ago that our export volume for this calendar year is likely to be \$2 billion below last year.

The University of Michigan Federal Reserve Board analysis of consumer attitudes revealed last week a marked rise in pessimism about the general outlook, with some curtailment of plans to buy major items as compared with a year ago at this time. This more conservative attitude on the part of the consumer is another evidence of weakness breeding weakness.

The figures on the total dollar volume for all types of retail sales for the month of February recorded a 3 percent decline from January (seasonally adjusted), and were 1 percent below February a year ago. The decline in physical volume in the past 12 months was, of course, greater than the 1 percent decline in dollar volume, because prices have increased by over 3 percent in the past year. Perhaps the February figure was a fluke because of the bad weather. In fact, February seasonally is one of the slowest months of the year for business as a whole. The seasonal impulses should now turn favorable, and this might help the figures and the psychology. However, the March figures had better record good gains over a year earlier or the implications will be bad.

This brief summary of some of the more significant business indicators has negative implications about the outlook, certainly appearing to justify an increasing concern about the possibility that the current recession is sliding into something worse. In line with the pattern of current Wall Street thinking, this condition enhances the prospect for lower taxes and higher Government expenditures.

But in appraising the effects of the various estimates of probable tax reductions and of increases in Government spending, we should have in mind the above-mentioned prospect that the annual rate of business capital expenditures 6 months from now is likely to be showing year-to-year declines of at least \$6 billion (it is my personal opinion that the decline will be larger). The annual rate of exports is likely to be running two to three billion dollars below last year and neither business nor the consumer seems to be in the mood to provide a satisfactory volume of demand at this price level.

The Government moves and the general ignorance about the subject of inflation may create some kind of inflationary psychology, but I can see some very good reasons for doubting that the Government moves will, in fact, be inflationary in terms of higher prices or even in terms of a sizable recovery in the level of business activity and employment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am an optimist. I believe that this Government can stop this economic downturn, and can do so promptly. I call the attention of the Senate to an article in yesterday's New York Times by Mr. Herbert Koshetz. He points out that on the one hand there is a school that thumps for more Government spending.

An equally vociferous group argues that a cut in the Federal income tax is the quickest way to create purchasing power. Mr. Koshetz asks why not try some of each? In the same issue of the New York Times Mr. Edwin L. Dale, Jr., has a careful, well-organized article entitled "Cut Taxes or Spend? Answer To Be Both."

This morning Mr. Dale has a follow-up article in the New York Times entitled "Need for a Tax Cut Seen by Economists," in which Mr. Dale makes this extremely significant statement:

What do all the Presidential and Congressional antirecession actions add up to? A consensus of private economists here would go something like this:

All the items are useful, some more than others. But the whole package may not amount to much this year unless a tax cut is added.

Mr. Dale then makes an extremely careful analysis of the probable economic impact of each antirecession step which has been taken, or is likely to be taken by the Congress, including jobless pay, housing, highways, public works, defense and credit. It is on the basis of this analysis that Mr. Dale concludes that it is the consensus of economists that the whole package may not amount to much without a tax cut.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the three articles 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 March 16, 1958]

AN EXAMINATION OF COUNTERMEASURES AS RECESSION CONTINUES TO DEEPEN

(By Herbert Koshetz)

The debate in Washington on how to halt the recession has stirred echoes all over the land. It all goes to prove that fighting a recession is not a science but an art, and those who practice it aren't too sure of their skill.

Economists could easily draw upon their experience if they could pin down the exact cause. But no two recessions have produced the same set of statistics. Changed conditions create a lot of doubt on what are the best measures to be taken.

On one hand there is the school that thumps for more Government spending. An equally vociferous group argue that a cut in the Federal income tax is the quickest way to create purchasing power to pull out of the slump.

The casual observer is inclined to ask: Why not try some of each?

Fortunately, the Government is committed to a policy of full employment, and therefore it will act.

THE BAD NEWS

In the meantime, however, conditions tend to grow worse. Unemployment in February rose to more than 5,100,000, the highest in 16 years. Industrial production is expected to fall another 2 points to 131 percent of the 1947-49 average, the lowest point since December 1954.

Manufacturers' backlog of orders have been cut back, and even those companies that felt they could weather a long storm aren't quite so sure now. The National Industrial Conference Board last week reported that 3 out of 4 producers polled had reported their January 1958 orders well below those of 1 year previously. The average decline in new orders and billings, the conference board said, was 10 to 20 percent.

The board added, however, that most of the manufacturers surveyed were of the opinion that new orders had hit their low in the latter half of 1957 or would do so in the present quarter. One out of five showed gains in new orders and billings during January, as compared with January 1957.

ROUGH ON DURABLES

The hard-goods industries appear to have been hit the hardest. The conference board revealed that 84 percent of the metalworking companies had declines in new orders and 81 percent had lower billings. In the non-metal group, 58 percent reported lower orders and 61 percent lower billings.

This is no time to lose heart, particularly since seasonal factors should work in favor of both producers and distributors. There are areas in which improvement in weather will bring about an upturn, such as in housing starts.

January housing starts, incidentally, showed a marked improvement over the final months of 1957. But the ground gained in January was lost in February. It is hoped that spring will induce a revival.

Retail trade likewise lost ground in February, and the weather was largely to blame. An early Easter, however, will tend to stimulate apparel sales. In the fashion field there are basic style changes, such as the chemise dress, which are making themselves felt.

Actually, the chemise does not have universal acceptance among women shoppers. It has created a lot of discussion, however, and aroused curiosity among all classes of shoppers. If they haven't come to the stores to buy, at least they come to look, and the aggressive retailer has been able to capitalize on the increased traffic in the apparel department.

STYLE INFLUENCE

Women are slow to take up new styles that might be considered extreme. But if the styles catch on at higher price levels, they generally do well after adaptations have been made in the medium- and popular-price ranges. The style handle is still one of the strongest tools that apparel retailers have for maintaining volume.

From the retail standpoint, a tax cut would do much to boost morale. In Washington, one of the most popular plans is to raise the personal exemption from \$600 to \$700, saving wage earners and other taxpayers about \$2,800,000,000 a year.

And a moderate cut in taxes at the corporation level would prove beneficial also. It could well stem the decline in plant investment. It was estimated last fall that companies would be spending at an annual rate of \$37.5 billion for new plant and equipment during the fourth quarter of 1957. Actually, their rate of spending was at least \$2 billion below that. And the recession has brought a deep cut in estimates for the first quarter of 1958. These estimates had been reduced in the light of cutbacks on expansion plans. Now they are in for further reductions.

IMPACT OF EXPORTS

A decline in exports as revealed by the latest figures is also a matter of concern. In January, the United States exported \$1,403,000,000 worth of goods, exclusive of military shipments. This was 10 percent below shipments in January last year.

It is recalled that in the recession of 1953-54, one of the factors that aided recovery was the rising trend of shipments abroad. But the Nation's economy now will not have that assistance, mainly because European countries are undergoing a gradual softening of the boom they enjoyed in the last 2 years.

If the United States suffers a loss of 10 percent in exports for 1958 as a whole, sales abroad will be \$2.6 billion less than they were last year. If the loss could be kept

down, it would mean less dislocation to the economy. But to keep exports at a high figure, the United States has no alternative but to accept a goodly amount of imports.

And this spells out why there should be no hesitation in renewing the reciprocal trade program in a manner that makes it possible for foreign countries to maintain their markets here.

[From the New York Times of March 16, 1958]

CUT TAXES OR SPEND? ANSWER TO BE BOTH—CONGRESS AND THE ADMINISTRATION WORK ON A PACKAGE PROGRAM

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, March 15.—The politics of fighting the recession—much like the politics of reacting to the Soviet missile-satellite threat—appears to have produced an extraordinary result: More agreement than disagreement about what to do.

This has major consequences for the economy. If Government actions can help, as almost all economists think they can, they can help best if they are taken quickly. And they could never be taken quickly in a divided government with one party running Congress battling the other party running the executive.

At the end of this week, the degree of harmony and sweet reasonableness seemed dazzling:

Item. Both the President and the Congressional Democratic leadership were clearly in agreement that the next major weapon to be fired is a tax cut.

Item. There were strong indications that the proposed administration tax bill would be along much the same lines as a bill being worked up by leading Democratic Congressional tax writers.

Item. Republicans voted unanimously for the big Democratic housing bill in the Senate, after the Democrats in the banking committee had compromised their bill somewhat to meet Republican demands.

PRACTICALLY UNANIMOUS

Item. All but one Republican in the Senate and all of the Republicans on the House Public Works Committee voted for the Democratic resolutions urging a speeding of public-works projects already under way. The President had already ordered a partial speedup.

Item. Both the President and the Democratic Congressional leaders are agreed on the need for an emergency bill to extend unemployment-compensation benefits, though they differ on details.

Item. The President and the leaders also quickly settled on the device of a stepped-up highway program, though again they disagreed on some important details. All of the Republicans on the Senate Public Works Subcommittee voted for the compromise bill.

All this does not mean that politics has suddenly vanished from the scene. An explanation of the situation might go something like this:

The Democrats count, to begin with, on the recession itself to help them in the next election. Under the disaffection theory of politics, what matters is the performance and results produced by the "ins" rather than the proposals of the "outs." The Republicans will be blamed for the recession, even if it is cured rather quickly.

The Democrats will be able to orate about the recession in the election—just as much as if they had tried to engineer a completely Democratic package of solutions.

Furthermore, most of the top Democratic leaders in Congress have become convinced of the responsibility theory of how to win elections. Under this theory, the worst thing the Democratic opposition could do in a condition of emergency—sputnik or economic—would be to balk the response of the administration to the situation.

Men like LYNDON JOHNSON and SAM RAYBURN are understood to be genuinely convinced that the vast middle group of Americans would give the Democrats far more credit for helping the administration than for appearing to ride off on a program of their own—always provided the Democrats add a little extra to each administration proposal to give it something of an opposition flavor.

And, finally, Messrs. JOHNSON and RAYBURN are working hard to make a Democratic record of their own—a record whose key descriptive word is speed. They have galvanized Congress into a pace of action almost unheard of for this stage of the session. And in some instances they have beaten the administration to the punch with actual proposals, the chief item to date being housing.

ECONOMICS AFTER POLITICS

If this explains the political paradox, it leaves two other major related questions:

How does the package stack up economically? And will the package work?

Economists can disagree about the right medicine for recessions just as much as ordinary citizens. For the first few months of the recession, there emerged a natural debate over the relative merits of more Federal spending and tax cuts.

Time and events have rendered the argument at this stage almost academic. There are two main reasons:

(1) The final package is clearly going to involve some of both. Spending on roads, unemployment compensation, public works, defense and housing will inevitably rise slowly, but over the next 15 months it will be some undetermined but significant amount, upward of \$1 billion, higher than was projected when the President submitted his budget in January.

As for the tax cut, it will take an unlikely surge of pep in the economy this month to avert it. It is by all odds the most powerful weapon in the package, and the chances now are strong that it will be used.

(2) The recession—certainly in the sense of unemployment—gathered force rather more rapidly than was foreseen when the spending versus tax-cut debate was being conducted in January and early February. The same economist who argued at the turn of the year that it was far better to spend more on such things as education or hospitals than to cut taxes might well be ready to go along with a tax cut now because of the need for speed.

The administration and the Congressional Democrats appear to have picked out most of the spending items that can be stepped up reasonably quickly. A big school-building program aided by Federal funds, as an example, could not possibly get rolling for a full year. So any economist who agrees that massive Federal antirecession action is necessary is almost forced to agree at this stage that a tax cut is the next item.

MODERN THEORY APPLIED

The package as a whole reflects rather precisely the modern "compensatory" theory of combatting the business cycle. By more spending or by tax cuts or both, the Government, according to this theory, is supposed to incur a large budget deficit and thereby to supply the extra demand that is missing from the private sector.

The compensatory theory is not universally accepted, but its acceptance is far greater today—particularly after the writings of the late John Maynard Keynes in the late 1930's—than it was during the great depression.

In general, then it can be said that the majority of economists would accept the propriety and desirability of the package that is emerging. But the opposition is not negligible.

The opposition is of two types. Among many conservatives—the editorial page of

the Wall Street Journal is a good example—the compensatory idea has never been accepted. This school doubts that big anti-recession deficits will work to restore full employment and is convinced that they will only have the ultimate effect of further diluting the value of the dollar.

This school is much more strongly represented in Congress than the recent performance would indicate. But the conservative school has simply been swept along with the antirecession tide.

THREAT OF INFLATION

The other type of opposition, also among conservatives, accepts compensatory action as the right medicine, and medicine that will work. But it doubts that the recession has reached the stage where a major attack is necessary. This school—which includes some important people in the administration and Federal Reserve System as well as private businessmen and economists—fears that a too early and too strong onslaught on the recession will turn the economy around so drastically that inflation of a serious nature will be upon us again.

Under this line of thought, excessive anti-recession action just postpones the day of reckoning. A new, artificial boom will be created, only to give way to really major collapse later.

It is important to distinguish between these two forms of opposition. The latter group has no doubts that the antirecession deficit will work; it merely fears that the deficit will work too well. Will it?

DEFICIT FORESEEN

The prevailing view among economists, it seems safe to say, is that it will—that is, a deficit of the order of \$10 billion, which will be almost inevitable if the tax-cut weapon is added to the spending package already in the works. There is considerable skepticism, however, that the spending measure alone will have much economic impact.

Most economists, in fact, would probably go so far as to say a deficit of this magnitude—with its multiplier effect of perhaps another \$10 billion in addition to the original sum—would work even if general psychology remains pessimistic while the Government actions are taking hold.

With the package now nearly inevitable, we shall soon know. The year 1958, in many respects, is providing the great test by fire of modern economic theory.

[From the New York Times of March 17, 1958]

NEED FOR A TAX CUT SEEN BY ECONOMISTS

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, March 16.—What do all the Presidential and Congressional antirecession actions add up to? A consensus of private economists here would go something like this:

All the items are useful, some more than others. But the whole package may not amount to much this year unless a tax cut is added.

Following is a rundown of the probable impact, as seen by experts here, of the various measures, other than a tax cut, that have been proposed:

JOBLESS PAY

The measure to extend the duration of unemployment compensation benefits is probably the most important item in the package proposed to date. No good spending estimate can be made until it is known what the final bill will provide, but spending could easily come to \$1,200,000,000.

What is more, this will be the earliest spending of all the items in the package. It could start almost within a week after passage of the legislation.

However, there is one important qualification. This measure would not add to incomes and spending, but would merely pre-

vent a threatened decline. In short, it cannot be an upward force by itself.

HOUSING

The array of administrative and legislative actions is extremely complicated. But housing experts appear agreed on one generalization about the whole group, including the \$1,850,000,000 Democratic bill moving through Congress:

The actions are helpful, but they will not mean a big upsurge in housing starts while people are uncertain about the future.

Only restored confidence will spur home sales and home starts in a significant degree, according to this opinion. The point is stressed that the measures are aimed at bolstering private, not Government-built, housing. To quote one expert:

"A builder doesn't start a house unless he thinks he can sell it."

Nonetheless, there is some hope that the measure will, at least, lead to some revival of the veterans housing program.

HIGHWAYS

The trouble here is that it is difficult to spend money fast. The bill moving through Congress, despite its multi-billion-dollar price tag, would mean a maximum of only \$800 million—and probably considerably less—of new contracts placed by the States in this calendar year. Most of that would be let in the last half of the year.

The \$800 million is not, of course, a negligible item. But even that much would provide a maximum of only 100,000 jobs in direct roadbuilding and supplying industries, according to one rule-of-thumb formula.

PUBLIC WORKS

So far the amounts involved are small. Under proposals backed by the administration and Congressional leaders, probably no more than \$300 million additional will be spent this calendar year. This includes water projects, hospitals, flood control, etc.

DEFENSE

This is the most difficult item to evaluate. There will be a large increase in placement of defense orders in the February-June period compared to the previous 7 months—about \$2,300 million a month compared to \$1,050 million.

However, this is somewhat deceptive. Much of the increase is merely to make up for the slow rate of ordering last summer, when the Government was making an effort at an economy drive.

Defense spending will rise somewhat during calendar year 1958, but not nearly so much as the figures on orders would indicate. The annual rate of spending is now estimated at only about \$2 billion higher in the last half of this year than in the first half.

Finally, there is some doubt that the Pentagon will be able to pump out the contracts at the planned rates. This doubt has been implicitly acknowledged by the Secretary of Defense, Neil H. McElroy.

The defense step-up is a help. The question is whether it will be enough to offset downward forces in the private economy.

CREDIT

There has long been debate in economic circles over the effectiveness of making money easier during slumps. Monetary policy is often compared to a man and a string—he can pull it but he cannot push it.

The point is that easier money does not help if the private economy does not generate willing and worthy borrowers. To date, bank loans have been declining despite easier money. However, it is generally accepted that the easy money policy of the Federal Reserve System did play an important role in helping the economy out of the 1953-54 recession.

There is little disposition among economists here to sneer at the antirecession

efforts made by the administration and Congress. There is considerable praise for the speed at which the cumbersome machinery of Government has gone into action.

There are of course some economists in and out of Government who believe that the economy will recover within 6 months of its own accord.

But whether a person thinks that Government action is imperative or not, there is some doubt that the measures in the works will have a major impact on the economy. That is another reason why the betting here places heavy odds on the likelihood of a tax cut, and a big one.

THIS IS NOT THE TIME TO INCREASE INTEREST RATES ON HOUSING MORTGAGES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in the recent debate in the Senate concerning the interest rate for veterans' housing, Republican Senators who favored increasing the interest rate contended that was necessary in order to persuade capital to invest in GI housing mortgages. At that time some of us disputed that contention.

Mr. President, an article written by Mr. Albert L. Kraus and published yesterday in the New York Times bears importantly on this issue. Mr. Kraus indicates how increased savings deposits present a banking problem. With a decline in business loans, new investment sources are needed. Investment money is aggressively and eagerly seeking new sources of investment.

In the course of the article, Mr. Alfred J. Casazza, executive vice president of the Savings Bank Trust Co., of New York, is quoted as telling the American Bankers' Association that:

The dynamic factor in the supply of investment funds is the transformation of commercial banks into aggressive buyers of securities and aggressive mortgage lenders.

Mr. President, this article provides strong documentary support for the Democratic position that this is not the time to increase interest rates. I call the article to the attention of the Senate in the hope that it will help forestall the taking of any similar action during the rest of this session.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

SAVINGS NOW POSE BANKING PROBLEM—WITH A DECLINE IN BUSINESS LOANS, NEW INVESTMENT SOURCES NEEDED—RATE DIP ALSO POSSIBLE—COMMERCIAL INSTITUTIONS ARE FACING BIGGEST DIFFICULTY WITH GAIN IN DEPOSITS

(By Albert L. Kraus)

Commercial banks, which took the lead in the race for savings deposits for the first time last year, face an uncomfortable prospect.

Because of the decline in business borrowing and a possible drop in rates, they must find other sources of investment at returns high enough to sustain the present level of interest payments, or cut the rate to savings depositors.

A cut in the savings rate would mean abandoning the measure of competitive equality the commercial banks have strug-

gled to obtain with the mutual thrift institutions—the savings banks and savings and loan associations.

The commercial bankers have given no indication of surrendering easily. A recent survey by the American Bankers Association showed that commercial bankers will spend 28 percent more on advertising this year than in 1957. Once again first emphasis will be given to savings.

"More and more bankers are convinced that the extensive savings campaign of last year, which helped to boost savings so high, should be waged with just as much vigor in 1958," the association said. A principal reason is that savings depositors become prospects for a commercial bank's other services.

DEPOSITS RAISED LAST YEAR

In last year's drive, commercial banks increased their time deposits \$5.4 billion to \$56 billion, a gain more than twice that of 1956. In comparison, savings banks increased their deposits \$1.6 billion to \$31.6 billion, and savings and loan associations their share accounts \$4.8 billion to \$41.9 billion. Life insurance policy reserves rose \$4.3 billion to \$83.4 billion. The increase was less last year than in 1956 in all classes of institutions except the commercial banks.

A primary factor was the increase in savings rates. Commercial banks across the Nation increased their rates during the year.

In New York State, for instance, 3 out of 4 commercial banks paid less than 2½ percent at the start of the year. By the end, the proportion was reversed. Of 421 New York State commercial banks surveyed recently, 331 were paying 2½ to 3 percent on savings.

So far this year there has been no indication of any slowdown in the growth of commercial bank savings deposits. To the contrary, along with the mutual thrift institutions, the commercial banks report an upturn.

New savings have continued to increase, but the major gain has resulted from a significant decline in withdrawals. Fear of the possible extent of the recession and buyer hesitancy to purchase durable goods are cited as explanations.

Howard D. Crosse, assistant vice president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, says the downturn in short-term interest rates should pose no special problem for the commercial bank that shifted last year—when it raised its saving rate—to higher yielding investments.

Some, in areas that would support such activity, increased their mortgage and consumer lending. Others took losses in their bond accounts to obtain higher yielding Governments, corporates and municipals.

Because of the reverse in the pattern of interest rates, some of these banks already have been able to take profits this year.

Not all commercial banks, however, were able or willing to subject themselves to the necessary self-discipline.

Alfred J. Casazza, executive vice president of the Savings Bank Trust Co., said that despite the big gain in savings last year, overall commercial bank mortgage and security holdings increased only slightly. He told American Bankers Association's 55th annual savings and mortgage conference:

"The dynamic factor in the supply of investment funds is the transformation of commercial banks into aggressive buyers of securities and aggressive mortgage lenders."

From mid-November, when the Federal Reserve announced its first reduction in the discount rate, until the end of February, business loans of weekly reporting member banks declined \$1.4 billion, while investments by these banks increased \$2.7 billion, he said.

"So long as the demand for business and consumer loans lags, commercial banks will be under constant pressure to sustain earnings by expanding investments," he added.

The Chase Manhattan Bank's decision to resume warehousing of Government guaranteed and insured mortgages after a 2-year hiatus probably result in part at least from this pressure.

Chase Manhattan scored the largest savings gain among New York City banks last year. Its savings deposits rose 82 percent to \$418 million.

In addition to shifting to higher yielding investments, commercial banks can effect economies by cutting expenses. A large New York City bank recently asked its branch managers to attempt to weed out low-balance savings accounts and accounts with much activity, two of the chief causes of higher operating expenses.

A recent cost study by a large thrift institution showed that a balance of \$211 was needed merely to break even on the paper work and overhead, and a balance of \$2,300 to pay the current dividend.

BASIS FOR OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED REDUCTION OF PRICE SUPPORTS FOR DAIRY COMMODITIES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, only 15 days remain until the order by Secretary Benson to slash the price supports for dairy commodities is scheduled to take effect.

Mr. President, no other issue is of more urgent interest to the people of Wisconsin—not only to her dairy farmers, but also to her small-business men, professional people, working people, civic leaders, and Government officials. The prosperity of Wisconsin's dairy industry is as essential to the economy of Wisconsin as is the prosperity of agriculture generally to the prosperity of the Nation. The people of Wisconsin hail the action taken last week by this body, when it passed the joint resolution to maintain farm price supports at the 1957 level until improved legislation can be enacted by Congress. They hope the other House will see fit to join in the passage of the resolution.

Unfortunately, a great deal of misinformation has been given to many of our citizens who are not personally familiar with the facts about our farm situation. One of the most prevalent errors is the notion that the farmers who are in economic difficulty are engaged in small, inefficient operations.

According to the Department of Agriculture, dairy farmers in eastern Wisconsin in 1956 received on their labor returns of only 43 cents an hour. Mr. President, I should like to emphasize that the average dairy farmer in that region is not a marginal operator. He is one of the most efficient, most highly productive farmers in the entire world.

Mr. President, the following additional figures provided by the Department of Agriculture describe the scale of the average dairy operation in that section of Wisconsin:

The average dairy farmer there has a total investment of \$33,770 in his dairy operation. He milks 20 cows and raises 25 hogs; and the farmer and his family provide almost 90 percent of the total labor on the farm. Only about 9 percent is hired.

He is a substantial buyer of industrial products. His biggest single expense is for machinery. The average farm has

two tractors, and the average farmer spends nearly \$2,000 each year for farm machinery. He spends \$802 for purchased feed; \$216 for fertilizer and lime; \$495 for fencing materials and farm buildings. His total expenses—most of which constitute a market for products of nonagricultural, manufacturing industries—total \$4,658 a year.

These statistics apply to the average farm operator, Mr. President, who receives for his labor a return of only 43 cents an hour.

He is a heavy payer of taxes. His tax bills each year amount to \$369. Who can point out any other group, Mr. President, whose tax payments amount to such a crushing burden on an income of only 43 cents an hour?

This average Wisconsin dairy farmer, Mr. President, has greatly improved both his efficiency and his productivity in the past 10 years. But his returns have dropped. He has been punished—instead of rewarded—for his efficiency and his increasing contribution to our standard of living.

If the change proposed by Mr. Benson is allowed to go into effect, further punishment will be imposed upon these farm families for their contribution to the prosperity and the strength of America. Mr. Benson's order is unfair; it is cruel; it is unwise. It endangers the economic security of hundreds of thousands of loyal, hardworking Americans; and it threatens to undermine the entire national economy. If Mr. Benson's order is permitted to go into effect, it will give the economy a dangerous shove toward the disaster of a major, nationwide depression.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HEAD- QUARTERS FOR NATIONAL SO- CIETY OF SONS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the purpose of H. R. 9271, which now is on the calendar, is to permit the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution to occupy the residence at 2412 Massachusetts Avenue as the national headquarters of the society. The society was given a charter by act of Congress 51 years ago to have its headquarters in Washington, D. C.

The Society of the Sons of the American Revolution is a leading, patriotic organization, nonprofit, nonsectarian, and nonpolitical. It is devoted to the support of the Constitution of the United States. It teaches the history of the founding of the Nation. It inculcates and stimulates love of our country and the flag and loyalty to our Government. This the society does by giving cash prizes and medals to students for good citizenship, as judged by teachers and student bodies. Cash prizes are given to student winners of historical orations in State and National contests. The local societies give medals to the outstanding members of the local ROTC. The local societies urge the teaching of American history in schools and colleges, and some of them give scholarships.

The adult population is influenced patriotically by the holding of commemorative

exercises on the birthdays of patriots and on the anniversaries of the 4th of July, Constitution Day, and Flag Day. Annually, the governor of each State is requested to issue a proclamation for the observance of Constitution Day within his State.

None of this work with the schools and the public is done by or from the national headquarters. Instead, it is done by the local societies. The national headquarters is used to house a voluminous library which the national society's genealogist uses to verify and confirm the applications made for membership. It is used to house the records of membership. The membership is made up of distinguished leaders in the Senate and House of Representatives, governors of States, and leaders in the professions, education, and business.

When the present owner of 2412 Massachusetts Avenue applied for a variation in the zoning, to permit occupancy by the Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, a few citizens in that part of the city objected, on the grounds of noise and increase of traffic. The building is to be used as the residence of the national executive secretary. In the building during the day, there will be, also, the genealogist, two secretaries, and the telephone operator. Of these five persons, the executive secretary, only, uses an automobile. Twice a year there will be a trustees' meeting. Conventions are held in hotels in cities throughout the United States. So in the headquarters building there will be very little noise, and the traffic will be very light, when compared with traffic in the same block going to the Mexican delegation offices and to and from the huge Canadian office building. In the block immediately to the west there are two large apartment houses; the Japanese and Indian Embassies are between them; and there are also the Spanish Embassy commercial attaché offices. In the block to the east there are the embassies of Denmark, Ecuador, China, and Korea; also a private school, and the Fellowship House, Inc., offices. This side of Massachusetts Avenue is not in the restricted residential A zone but is in the third category of residential zone known as BR, which permits row houses and community or apartment houses.

The building at 2412 Massachusetts Avenue contains 10 rooms and servants' quarters. Its size is suitable and ample for the home of the national society. It has a plain and dignified appearance. There is no need or desire to change the external appearance of the building, and there is little need for change inside. The use of the headquarters is of a quiet, conservative, and residential character. Many residents of the neighborhood have written, to the Board of Zoning Adjustment, letters favoring the society's occupancy. The adjacent owners on each side of the building welcome the society there, so they have stated in letters.

The President of the Board of District Commissioners for the District of Columbia has written to the chairmen of the District of Columbia Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, letters in which he states that the occupancy of the building by the Sons of the

American Revolution will have no adverse effect on the neighboring property and that "they (the Commissioners) do not offer objection to passage of the bill."

Mr. President, the bill was supposed to be reached during call of the calendar today. However, the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] promised a resident of the District of Columbia that he would object. That resident stated that the headquarters could secure a building for possibly \$60,000 or thereabouts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia informs me that he was under the impression that the headquarters to be obtained would be used by the local chapter in the District of Columbia; he did not know it would be used by the national headquarters. However, since he promised to object to consideration of the bill during the call of the calendar today, he has requested that the bill not be considered today.

Out of courtesy to the Senator from Virginia, I shall not attempt to have the bill considered today. But I desire to give notice that on tomorrow I expect to ask that the bill be acted on by the Senate. There is a time limit in connection with this matter, inasmuch as the national headquarters has sold the building it formerly occupied, and it is necessary that arrangements be made promptly to obtain another building for the national headquarters.

I may say that, as a result of the proposed exchange, the national organization will be able to accumulate a reserve of approximately \$100,000, which is badly needed for its work.

I am very anxious to have the bill passed, and to have the national headquarters accommodated in this manner. I am quite confident the Congress will act wisely in this connection.

GOVERNORS' INTERSTATE INDIAN COUNCIL—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the agenda and list of 12 resolutions passed by the Governors' Interstate Indian Council at their 10th annual meeting held at Oklahoma City, Okla., on October 24, 25, 26, 1957. The great State of North Dakota is one of the States represented in the Governors' Interstate Indian Council and the Honorable John B. Hart, executive director of the North Dakota Indian Affairs Commission, was one of the speakers at this conference. I further ask that his remarks be placed in the RECORD.

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

GOVERNORS' INTERSTATE INDIAN COUNCIL
K. W. Bergan, chairman, State Capitol,
Helena, Mont.

Francis McKinley, vice chairman, Fort Duchesne, Utah.

John Shaw, secretary; Burbank, Okla.
Directors: Harold Farley, Boise, Idaho; Paul Jones, Windowrock, Ariz.; N. B. Johnson, Oklahoma City, Okla.; A. H. Wright, Salem, Oreg.; S. C. DeMers, Butte, Mont.

States represented: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

AGENDA, 10TH ANNUAL MEETING, OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., OCTOBER 24, 25, 26, 1957

October 24

8 a. m.: Registration of official delegates, Blue Room, State Capitol.

9 a. m.: Conference called to order, K. W. Bergan, chairman, presiding.

9 a. m.: Invocation, Dr. Charles E. Webber.

9:10 a. m.: Address of welcome, Hon. N. B. Johnson, Supreme Court Judge, State of Oklahoma.

9:20 a. m.: Greetings and presentation of flowers, by Mrs. A. B. Cockrell, vice president, State Federation of Women's Clubs.

9:30 a. m.: Response to the Welcome, Maurice Powers, of Washington.

10 a. m.: Objectives and functions of the council, John Hart, North Dakota.

10:20 a. m.: History and accomplishments of the council, A. H. Wright, Oregon.

10:40 a. m.: Panel discussion—State problems from impacts of Indian people.

Hon. N. B. Johnson, Oklahoma, leader.

Discussants: A. H. Wright, Oregon; W. W. Hill, New Mexico; Fern Wanek, South Dakota; James Mosier, Colorado; Charles F. Miller, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, D. C.; Forrest Gerard, Public Health Service, Washington, D. C.; Miss Selene Gifford, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, D. C.

Recess for lunch.

1:30 p. m.: Panel discussion—Relocation and industrialization programs from the State point of view.

Hon. N. B. Johnson, Oklahoma, leader.

Discussants: Harley Fletcher, South Dakota; Pete Shepherd, Kansas; Maurice Powers, Washington; Clarence Wesley, Arizona; George Keith, Wisconsin; Clifford Rucker, Minnesota; Gordon Ibbotson, Colorado; Charles F. Miller, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, D. C.; John Hart, North Dakota, summarizer.

3:30 p. m.: Panel discussion—Law and order in Indian country, State and Federal cooperation.

George Smith, Minnesota, leader.

Discussants: Gordon Dickie, Wisconsin; Lewis B. Holt, Idaho; William H. Kelly, Arizona; Patrick Gourneau, North Dakota; Miss Selene Gifford, Bureau of Indian Affairs, summarizer.

7:30 p. m.: Report of nominating committee—Chairman Fern Wanek, Hon. N. B. Johnson, Harold Farley, James Mosier, and Warren Emm.

8 p. m.: Panel discussion—Problems on welfare assistance for people of Indian blood.

Walter W. Broemer, Texas, leader.

Discussants: Raymond Thacker, Nevada; Clyde Edmonds, Utah; Vidal Ballard, Idaho; George Keith, Wisconsin; Selene Gifford, Washington, D. C.; Maurice Powers, Washington, summarizer.

October 25, 1957

8:30 a. m.: Panel discussion—State and Federal cooperation in vocational education, higher education, public education, and secondary education.

Harold Farley, Idaho, leader.

Discussants: Harvey Wright, Oregon; John Artichoker, South Dakota; Warren Emm, Nevada; Walter W. Broemer, Texas; George Smith, Minnesota; James Mosier, Colorado; Selene Gifford, Washington, D. C.; Fern Wanek, South Dakota, summarizer.

10:30 a. m.: Report by States—Termination of supervision.

George Keith, Wisconsin leader.

Alex Miller, Oregon. Roundtable discussion.

Recess for lunch.

1:30 p. m.: Miscellaneous problems.

3:30 p. m.: Resolutions—Report of resolutions committee: George Keith, Wisconsin; A. H. Wright, Oregon; Hon. N. B. Johnson, Oklahoma; John Hart, North Dakota; Clarence Wesley, Arizona; James Mosier, Colorado.

5:30 p. m. Election of officers.

7 p. m.: Dinner meeting—Guest speakers: Dr. Angie Debo, University of Oklahoma; Hon. Ed Edmondson, Congressman from Oklahoma.

RESOLUTIONS—GOVERNORS' INTERSTATE INDIAN COUNCIL, OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., OCTOBER 24, 25, 26

Resolution No. I

Whereas a high proportion of admissions to Indian hospitals and related medical facilities is due to illness which is predominantly resultant from unsanitary conditions due primarily to inadequate and unprotected water supplies and inadequate facilities for disposal of human waste and related environmental factors; and

Whereas the use of open surface and unprotected well-water sources of supply is to be found in some areas, and hauling of water for domestic use distances of 1 to 10 miles is a common practice on many reservations; and

Whereas promiscuous disposal of human wastes or use of totally inadequate privy facilities are found in some areas, with resultant fly problems and high incidence of diarrhea and dysentery; and

Whereas H. R. 246, H. R. 2894, and S. 1498 of the 85th Congress, known as the sanitation facilities bills, sponsored by the Public Health Service, embody principles and provisions which, if enacted into law, will greatly aid the Public Health Service in remedying these conditions and improve the health of Indians: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Governors' Interstate Indian Council in session at Oklahoma City, Okla., on this the 25th day of October 1957, reaffirms its recommendation and endorsement of the principles incorporated in these sanitation bills and urge that every effort be made to bring about the enactment of this legislation in the next session of Congress; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Surgeon General of the United States and appropriate Congressional committees dealing with this type of legislation.

Resolution No. II

Whereas, based on the reports of the staff of the Division of Indian Health, the Governor's Interstate Indian Council is of the opinion that satisfactory progress has been made in improving both medical and public-health services provided for Indians during the 2 years of its administration of the Indian health program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Governors' Interstate Indian Council endorse in full the recommendations of the Surgeon General to the Congress for funds for the operation of Indian health programs for the fiscal year 1958. While many improvements have been made during the past 2 years in the expansion of health services for Indians under the administration of the Public Health Service, the Governors' Interstate Indian Council is of the opinion that increasing appropriations should be made by the Congress from year to year until the standard of Indian health has been brought to the same standards of other racial groups.

Resolution No. III

Be it resolved, That the President of the United States and the Bureau of the Budget be prevailed upon and urged to release the

frozen funds provided for the construction of hospitals in those areas where the need is most urgent.

Resolution No. IV

Whereas the Governor of Oklahoma has extended to the Governors' Interstate Indian Council the privilege of using the Blue Room adjacent to the Governor's office; and Whereas the council deeply appreciates this courtesy: Be it

Resolved, That the council extends its thanks to Governor Gary for the courtesy so extended.

Resolution No. V

Be it resolved by the Governors' Interstate Indian Council, That it extend its thanks and appreciation to the press and TV for the publicity it has given this conference, and for the many other courtesies shown the council.

Resolution No. VI

Whereas the Oklahoma State Federation of Women's Clubs has presented to this council a beautiful bouquet of flowers; and

Whereas the council is desirous to extend its sincere appreciation for the courtesy so extended; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the council go on record as thanking the Oklahoma State Federation of Women's Clubs for the beautiful bouquet; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to Mrs. Charles Strother, president, Oklahoma State Federation of Women's Clubs, 811 West Taliaferro Street, Madill, Okla.; Mrs. G. E. Haslam, chairman, Oklahoma State Federation of Women's Clubs, Indian Affairs division, Anadarko, Okla.; and Mrs. Beulah Richardson, president, M'Ahote Club, 1016 NE. 15th, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Resolution No. VII

Be it resolved, That the Governors' Interstate Indian Council express its thanks and appreciation to Mrs. Hallie Johnson, 311 NW. 22d, Oklahoma City; Mrs. Lena Holloway, Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce; and the Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce for the fine assistance they rendered the council during its session.

Resolution No. VIII

Whereas the Governors' Interstate Indian Council is cognizant of the many and varied problems that face our Indian citizens; and

Whereas various State agencies have been striving to develop industries and programs so as to raise the economic and social levels of our Indian citizens; and

Whereas said States through their agencies have worked diligently in behalf of the indigent Indian citizen to raise their standards of living; and

Whereas said States have found that the path between reservation and integration is strewn with many obstacles difficult to surmount, and with the financial needs rising above all others; and

Whereas said States are trying to solve these financial problems and have tried to cooperate with the Federal Government and work out an equitable program of financial responsibility but have not been able to find solid ground upon which to stand in the matter of financial responsibility between the Federal Government and the States because no fixed legislation sets forth where Federal financial responsibility ends and State responsibility begins; and

Whereas said States have found only a very flexible Bureau of Indian Affairs policy in this matter of where Federal financial responsibility ends and where State financial responsibility begins: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress be urged to enact legislation defining just when Federal financial responsibility ends and when State financial responsibility begins in their efforts to raise the economic and social levels of our Indian citizens.

Resolution No. IX

Be it resolved by the Governors' Interstate Indian Council, That the complete costs of any termination programs be borne by the Federal Government.

Resolution No. X

Be it resolved, That the Governors' Interstate Indian Council go on record wholeheartedly supporting the industrial development program now being sponsored by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and that adequate appropriations be made to carry out an aggressive program of encouraging such industrial development on or adjacent to Indian reservations and where economically feasible; and be it further

Resolved, That this council support the relocation program where there is a lack of economic opportunity among the Indian tribes.

Resolution No. XI

Be it resolved by the Governors' Interstate Indian Council, That the Congress be memorialized to provide adequate appropriations for Indian scholarships.

Resolution No. XII

Be it resolved by the Governors' Interstate Indian Council, That Dr. William Kelly, the delegate from the State of Arizona, be designated by the council to investigate the feasibility of a permanent secretary and report to the executive committee before the next regular meeting of the council.

Delegates: William H. Kelly, Arizona; James R. Mosler, Colorado; Gordon M. Ibbotson, Colorado; John Artchoker, Jr., South Dakota; F. R. Wanek, South Dakota; Harold Farley, Idaho; Vidal Ballard, Idaho; Lewis B. Holt, Idaho; George A. Smith, Minnesota; Clifford E. Rucker, Minnesota; K. W. Bergan, Montana; Raymond Thacker, Nevada; W. H. Clasby, Oklahoma; N. B. Johnson, Oklahoma; Warren Emm, Nevada; W. W. Hill, New Mexico; Patrick Gourneau, North Dakota; John B. Hart, North Dakota; A. H. Wright, Oregon; Avex D. Miller, Oregon; Walt Broemer, Texas; Mrs. Doris Sylestine, Texas; Clyde C. Edmonds, Utah; Maurice E. Powers, Washington; George M. Keith, Wisconsin; Gordon Dickle, Wisconsin; Clarence Wesley, Arizona; Pete W. Shepherd, Kansas.

Consultants: Miss Selene Gifford, Bureau of Indian Affairs; Charles F. Miller, Bureau of Indian Affairs; Forrest Gerard, Public Health Service; Harley Fletcher, State Planning Board of South Dakota.

HISTORY OF PREVIOUS CONFERENCES

First national meeting, St. Paul, Minn., 1949.

Second national meeting, Salt Lake City, Utah, 1949, Jarle Lierfallom, Minnesota, chairman.

Third national meeting, Oklahoma City, Okla., 1950, Jarle Lierfallom, Minnesota, chairman.

Fourth national meeting, Helena, Mont., 1951, Jarle Lierfallom, Minnesota, chairman.

Fifth national meeting, Phoenix, Ariz., 1952, Alva A. Simpson, New Mexico, chairman.

Sixth national meeting, Carson City, Nev., 1953, Allan P. Jeffries, Idaho, chairman.

Seventh national meeting, Sun Valley, Idaho, 1954, Allan P. Jeffries, Idaho, chairman.

Eighth national meeting, Santa Fe, N. Mex., 1955, A. H. Wright, Oregon, chairman.

Ninth national meeting, Sheridan, Wyo., 1956, Steve DeMers, Montana, chairman.

Tenth national meeting, Oklahoma City, Okla., 1957, K. W. Bergan, Montana, chairman.

OBJECTIVES AND FUNCTIONS OF THE COUNCIL
(By John Hart, North Dakota)

Gentlemen, I now feel like a real enrolled member of an Indian tribe. I was not consulted when assigned this topic.

Tradition is that old men counsel and young men do. With the retirement this year of Ed Rogers, it appears to me I am the only presently participating member of the March 1950 meeting creating this council. I take it the council wants me to limit my activities to counseling.

My counseling will be generally along the lines of what one of our leading daily papers in North Dakota heads its editorial page, "It Seems to Me."

Following the founder's meeting in March 1950 the governors' conference, composed of the governors of the 48 States, at the request of Governor Youngdahl of Minnesota, passed a resolution creating and assuming direct responsibility for this council. Thus this council has a theoretical standing of some considerable dignity.

At the meeting creating this council, there was thorough discussion on the question of Indian participation. The moving force behind the council, Governor Youngdahl, stated and restated: "The Indians will be brought into future discussions until the problem is licked." This thought was implemented in the creating resolution by stating, "This council shall consist of two persons appointed by the governor of each State, one of whom shall be an Indian whom the governor shall appoint from a panel of three names submitted by the Indians of the State * * *."

The mandatory provision for the panel system of selecting the Indian delegate results in a moral probability the Indian delegate represents the composite thinking of the Indians of his State—not merely the views of an isolated tribe or an isolated individual. Thus it seems to me an essential element for a livable, workable solution is uniquely present in this council. The other delegate appointed by the governor is authorized as the representative of State government. Each of the two delegates represents the views of sovereign governmental entities. Each has a clearly defined responsibility.

A laudable example of an Indian delegate representing the Indians of his State is the Indian delegate from the State of Oklahoma at the Helena, Mont., meeting of this council vigorously opposing the resolution of the council supporting a transfer of health services from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Public Health Service. This same delegate continued opposing this transfer of responsibility before the various committees of Congress. At all points he clarified his position by saying "the Indians of Oklahoma."

When we consider the other representative, it seems to me that since he represents the State government, he must, of necessity, be familiar with the views of the State and county officials and particularly with the views of the appointing governor. He is, in effect, voting for the governor. He is speaking for his State. Thus it seems to me a second essential element for a livable, workable solution is uniquely present in this council.

If this governor's representative is afraid to commit the governor, then we must acknowledge that this governor's representative is actually a governor's observer. There is an important distinction of authority between a governor's representative and a governor's observer. A governor's observer may or may not dignify this council, but he adds little or nothing to affirmative efforts.

The creating resolution states: That the council shall (1) consider the various aspects of the Indian problems; (2) act jointly on items of common interest; (3) exchange information among the States; (4) cooperate with the National Congress, Federal and local governmental agencies, and other organizations that are interested in the American Indians; (5) within a reasonable time and after meeting with Indians and Federal repre-

sentatives, recommend to the governors proposed legislation for submission to Congress; and (6) consider such other matters as the council deems advisable.

The problem confronting us was defined by the creating resolution. This resolution states "Whereas it is obvious that it is necessary that the States coordinate and work together to solve their Indian problems." The proceedings show that Governor Youngdahl stated after the passage of the resolution, as follows: "The majority of the Indians want an opportunity for self-improvement and want to work with the white people in the job of becoming good citizens."

We have been selected as, so to speak, the architects to provide the blueprints of recommendations to our governors for proposed legislation for submission to Congress. True, we have discretion, but we cannot ignore our responsibility to actually draw the sadly needed blueprints. The foundation we blueprint for this house if it is to be livable and endure and solve the present problems must recognize and include the legitimate rights and interests of both the Indian tribes and the States. Ignoring the legitimate interests of either will make our time spent here strictly social. Four hundred thousand Indian people, several thousand BIA employees, and 17 State governments will be affected by our work or nonwork, our agreement or disagreement, as the case may be.

Do we, the representatives, want to perform the labor necessary to create these blueprints, or do we, the representatives, merely have a case of that lovely infectious disease called Oklahoma travelitis? Perhaps we can all agree we want the prestige of the Governor's appointment, but like a Congressman coming up for election, we will, at all costs, avoid endorsing anything except the multiplication tables and the Ten Commandments.

It seems to me the Governors' Interstate Indian Council is not convened for the purpose of creating a selective captive audience for government, State, tribal, or special interest politicians reiterating past policies, defending inconsequential criticism or singing the song of We'll Have Pie in the Sky By and By.

Our order for blueprint specifies "cooperate with the National Congress, Federal and local governmental agencies and other organizations that are interested in the American Indian." We will cooperate, but we must not be dominated. We should, at all costs, avoid being known as another resolution-endorsing agency. The influence of a resolution is limited by the resoluteness of the resolving body. We must exercise our delegated authority and fulfill our designated responsibility. Our governors want blueprints, not resolutions.

It seems to me we should not be afraid to examine old ideas or explore new theories. We must be ever mindful that no organization, Government bureau, or political party is the sole custodian of knowledge, scientific fact, and administrative insight in the field of Indian affairs. And we, the representatives of the governors, cannot declare a monopoly on being the friend of the Indian. It seems to me that in respect to the Indian people and the States we represent, we must view with alarm any attempts to stampe us in any direction or on any resolution without a full, free, and complete flow of information and discussion, unhampered by the necessity of attending social events or that age-old convention cry of "I've got to go home because I'm out of money." We cannot, however, view with alarm to the point where we do nothing except recall the trail of tears and the other 1,017 injustices of yesterday. We live with the problems of today. We plan the solutions of tomorrow. Our powwow dance will be to the tune of Accentuate the Positive, Eliminate the Negative.

It seems to me the representatives of the sovereign States and the sovereign Indian tribes rate the cooperation and counseling of the Government's dead horse. Our discussions must be with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, not with his assistant or his public-relations counsel. I am reminded of pleasant Sun Valley where we listened attentively to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs reiterate the Bureau's policy. I am again reminded of Sheridan, Wyo., where we, the governor's representatives, paid the Commissioner the respect of attentively listening to him again reiterate the Bureau's policy. However, when it came time for consultation and questions, the Commissioner had a more important prior appointment. Our questions were discussed and largely unanswered by the Commissioner's personable assistants. As an audience, we listened to the lead horse; as governor's representatives attempting to cooperate we heard the second string defending team receive the Bureau's page-worn Book of Answers. Essentially the same book of answers that brought this council into being. Perhaps as realists, we should refill the teacup and do something worthwhile, like speculating on the future of Indian affairs by observing the tea leaves.

It seems to me that under the creating resolution, part 3, "exchange information among the States," we have preliminary blueprints for important panel discussions such as is on our present agenda. Our time is limited, but the necessity of full, free discussion and debate knows no time limitation if the decisions or compromises we reach are to be fully understood and retain influential value for the morrow. A panel discussion, Indian time if you please, can make decisions.

It seems to me that this council must deal with principles, items of community, State or national importance. Separating the significant from the insignificant is admittedly a difficult task. History records only the significant. Do we the governor's representatives have the capacity to pick out from the strawpile of talk the principles? My answer is yes, because so many people and so many States demand that we do something. When we permit our antagonists to lead us into inconsequential arguments, we are asking for defeat. If we stick and insist that the discussion be on ideas and principles, the inconsequential chitter-chat will solve itself.

I am reminded of a conversation I had with one of the prominent delegates after the Carson City meeting. This delegate stated approximately as follows: "Well, the Governor lets me do just about what I want to at this council meeting. When I get back, I usually visit with him for a few moments and tell him of the resolutions that we got through which were of interest to our State, but he really doesn't pay too much attention to this council." I reiterate this indictment because historically it is pretty much true. We, the delegates, have ourselves to thank for this criticism. The time of decision may be closer than we think. I submit that in conformity with our order for blueprints given us by the governors' conference, we should at this ninth annual council have had sufficient exposure to the BIA's historic position to take definite stands on the following important principals.

1. Is the ultimate objective in the field of Indian affairs the social and economic integration of the Indian people with the general citizenry?

2. If integration is the ultimate answer, what, if any, special Federal relationships should be retained by the individual Indians or by the tribes?

3. Again, if integration is the ultimate answer, what blueprint of desegregating community services for Indian people can and will be acceptable to both the Indian people and the States?

4. Should the Federal Government's financial responsibility for community services such as schools, medical care and welfare during the period of transition be related to the needs of land or should it be related to people?

In our discussions, we must be constantly striving for a uniform, mutually agreeable clarification acceptable to both the States and the Indian people of the basic principle of financial responsibility. In making this decision, we must decide which is the more important—land or people?

Until this council comes to grip with the realities of this problem, we will continue to splash water without materially raising the social or economic level of our Indian people. We have the authority. We have the command of the governors of the 48 States to unearth the mutually acceptable solution which has so long evaded the search of our forefathers. Let us work today without shifting this one problem to our children. Our children will need to use all possible energy to solve the big problem now unfolding in this, the infancy of the satellite age.

HISTORY AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE COUNCIL

(By A. H. Wright, Oregon)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, from the great State of Oregon I bring you greetings from our Governor, Robert D. Holmes. Due to the urgency of State affairs, the Governor was not able to attend this meeting, but he sends his regards and best wishes for a successful meeting.

Governor Holmes is vitally interested in the welfare of our Indian people; for the State of Oregon probably faces the biggest, immediate Indian problem in the Nation today, due to the fact that our Klamath people are in the process of being released from Federal supervision. The Governor has set up definite policies concerning the State's relationship with the Indians and the Federal Government, and has instructed me to follow these in our deliberations here at this conference.

The policies of the State of Oregon may be defined as follows:

1. No Federal legislation which vitally affects our Oregon Indians should be enacted without giving the State, the Indian, and the local governmental agencies an opportunity to make a careful, analytical survey of the problems involved and the planning that must be made at the State level to implement the changes that would be brought about by this legislation.

2. All agencies of both the State and Federal Government at every level should unite in an effort to raise the social, educational, and economic standards of our Indian people.

3. All agencies of both the State and Federal Government should make a distinct effort to provide job opportunities for qualified Indian people.

4. All State and local agencies should use every means at their command to provide services for Indian people on the same basis they are provided for non-Indians.

5. Every effort should be made to do away with discriminatory practices.

6. Full citizenship rights should be given our Indian people as soon as feasible and possible, and they should be expected to accept the responsibilities and duties of full citizenship.

7. Within the framework of these policies, the State of Oregon should cooperate with the Federal Government and other States.

I have been requested to outline for this conference the history and accomplishments of the Governors' Interstate Indian Council. The Governors' Interstate Indian Council was organized in 1947. Governor Luther Youngdahl of the State of Minnesota was a bit disturbed with what he considered some of

the arbitrary and unilateral practices of the Indian Bureau in dealing with the Indians in his State, and in an effort to get the State government into the picture, he requested the governors of the various States having a substantial Indian population, to meet in St. Paul and discuss the so-called Indian problem. Governor Youngdahl was of the opinion that the Indians were citizens of the various States as well as being wards of the Federal Government. Therefore, he concluded that the States had an interest in what happened to their Indian citizens. He stated that the Federal Government should at least confer with the States before it took some arbitrary action that would affect not only the Indian people, but the State and certain local governmental agencies as well. There were several governors at this meeting, and, where the governors could not attend, they appointed someone to represent them. It was the consensus at this first meeting that the States did have a vital interest in their Indian people, and that a permanent organization should be established to be called the Governors' Interstate Indian Council. While no charter, constitution, or by-laws was drawn up to govern the activities of the organization, nevertheless, certain guiding principles were set forth at this meeting.

EASTERN WILLIAMS SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter from Mr. Howard Lund, chairman, Eastern Williams Soil Conservation District, and Mr. Morris Stromme, chairman of the Little Muddy Soil Conservation District, telling me of action taken by the district supervisors concerning Senate bill 2496.

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

WILLIAMS COUNTY
SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS,
Williston, N. Dak., December 17, 1957.

Hon. Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: At our December meeting of the supervisors of the Little Muddy and Eastern Williams Soil Conservation Districts we reviewed and discussed Senate bill 2496. We understand that this bill will be considered at the next session of Congress.

In reviewing this bill we were particularly concerned with part of section 2. Quote, "Whenever the waters of any stream or other body of water are proposed or authorized to be impounded, diverted, the channel deepened, or the stream or other body of water otherwise controlled or modified for any purpose whatever, including navigation and drainage, by any department or agency of the United States, or by any public or private agency under Federal permit or with Federal financial or technical assistance, such department or agency first shall consult with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, etc."

As you know the cooperators in our soil conservation districts receive technical assistance from the United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service. Also many of the cooperators receive financial assistance from the United States Department of Agriculture Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Program when applying soil and water conservation practices. Thus, if our interpretation of proposed Senate bill 2496 is correct, much of the conservation work done by cooperators on their farms would first have to be approved by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

Our soil conservation district is pleased to cooperate with the Wildlife Service. However, if Senate bill 2496 as now written should become law, we think it would become more difficult for farmers to apply soil and water conservation practices on their farms. Thus we would actually make less progress in conservation of soil, water, and wildlife than we are making at the present time.

At our December meeting the supervisors of the Little Muddy and Eastern Williams Soil Conservation Districts went on record as opposing Senate bill 2496 as now written.

Kindly give our action your usual thorough consideration when considering Senate 2496.

Sincerely,

HOWARD LUND,
Chairman, Eastern Williams Soil
Conservation District.

MORRIS STROMME,
Chairman, Little Muddy Soil Con-
servation District.

NORTH DAKOTA ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS— RESOLUTIONS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter from Mr. Fred G. Ehlers, president of the State Association of Soil Conservation Districts, enclosing two resolutions adopted at the annual meeting concerning agricultural conservation program practices and soil and water research.

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

NORTH DAKOTA ASSOCIATION
SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS,
Hettinger, N. Dak., December 26, 1957.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
The United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Enclosed please find two resolutions passed by the North Dakota Association of Soil Conservation Districts while in session at their 19th annual meeting at Grand Forks, N. Dak., on November 15, 1957.

These two resolutions are:

1. Resolution on agricultural conservation program practices.

2. Proposed research resolution for soil and water research for North Dakota.

Our membership desired that you be informed of our attitude on these two subjects concerning agriculture.

In addition, may I take this opportunity to thank you for your previous support to us in conserving the soil and water resources of North Dakota and the Nation.

Very truly yours,

FRED G. EHLERS,
President.

RESOLUTION ON AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION
PROGRAM PRACTICES—RESOLUTION BY NORTH
DAKOTA ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION
DISTRICTS AT THEIR 19TH ANNUAL MEETING
AT GRAND FORKS, N. DAK., NOVEMBER 15,
1957

We wish to commend the Agricultural Conservation Program Service for the assistance and impetus this Service has given to the establishment of conservation practices on farm and ranch lands in this State and in the Nation. This program has done much to further the goals of soil conservation districts.

While the entire program has been of much benefit to farmers and ranchers of this country there is a definite need to strengthen that part of the program dealing with permanent type practices. Benefits and financial returns are not immediate for these

practices; nor always recognizable by the farmers or ranchers. Because of this there is a definite need for financial assistance to get permanent practices applied to our farm and ranch lands. We recommend that the Agricultural Conservation Program Service of the Department of Agriculture do everything possible to strength that portion of the program dealing with permanent enduring type conservation practices. Such strengthening might take the form of increased payments for the permanent practices or in some cases a reduction in emphasis and payment on the so-called annual practices if the annual practices appear to be too competitive.

The conservation reserve program offers many opportunities to landowners to achieve long time conservation benefits. We wish to recommend that the conservation reserve program of the Soil Bank Act be continued.

PROPOSED RESEARCH RESOLUTION FOR SOIL AND
WATER RESEARCH FOR NORTH DAKOTA—RES-
OLUTION BY NORTH DAKOTA ASSOCIATION OF
SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS AT THEIR
19TH ANNUAL MEETING AT GRAND FORKS,
N. DAK., NOVEMBER 15, 1957

Whereas grasslands and the livestock economy associated therewith represents a large portion of North Dakota agricultural land, and the conservation and efficient use of water, control of periodic runoff, and associated soil erosion poses a serious threat to these valuable resources on such lands, research in the vital area of conserving and efficiently utilizing limited rainfall on grasslands and protecting the soil resources on such lands needs continued attention. A permanent and stable livestock economy in this area requires establishment and maintenance of a strong research effort on these problems; and

Whereas a large percentage of precipitation received is lost by evaporation and surface runoff under the present practice of using summer fallow in the rotation. (Areas of the State having the least rainfall are using the most summer fallow resulting in a large water loss where water is most needed. Of course the 25 percent of annual rainfall stored in the soil for the use of next year's crop is also of the most value in the areas of lowest annual rainfall.) Soil losses due to wind and water erosion are proportionally very much higher during the summer fallow season than when the field is being cropped. Development of procedures to reduce these losses and improve the efficiency of water use by crops are essential for more effective use of limited rainfall supply. Possibilities of land surface treatment, management systems to reduce runoff, and chemical or other soil treatments to reduce evaporation and runoff losses on summer fallow need to be explored; and

Whereas soil and water problems in the State of North Dakota present a threat to sustained production of livestock and crop products, productivity in the lands of North Dakota have been good for the time they have been farmed. This has made it easy to overlook their decline to date. It is of the utmost importance that the research program be strengthened in line with the agricultural and productive capacity of this region. In this State, farm and ranch families have a continuous struggle to protect their cultivated and grazing land against erosion during high winds, frequent occurrences of excess runoff during winter and spring periods, adjustments of cropping systems to soil and water conserving practices which will insure adequate erosion protection; and

Whereas over a million acres of land are being considered for irrigation in North Dakota, the farmers in these potentially irrigable areas will need to know the expected economic benefits as well as the problems

they will encounter in changing from dry-land to irrigative farming: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the North Dakota Association of Soil Conservation Districts hereby directs its officers to request adequate funds from the United States Department of Agriculture and the State of North Dakota to conduct a long-time basic research program commensurate with our needs and increase our present facilities to adequately assist farmers and ranchers in meeting the soil and water problems peculiar to the State of North Dakota. We also direct our officers to carry this resolution to the National Research Committee of the National Association on Soil Conservation Districts, and that they request the research committee to include such moneys as are needed to expand our research program in the national request for funds from the Congress; be it further

Resolved, That we hereby direct our officers to send copies of this resolution to our Congressional delegation, Secretary of Agriculture, and the Bureau of the Budget so that they may know of our needs.

STANDING ROCK SIOUX TRIBAL COUNCIL—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a resolution by the Standing Rock Sioux Tribal Council urging Congress to enact S. 809, introduced by me and cosponsored by 20 Senators. S. 809 is a bill to provide loans to Indian tribes to encourage industry near Indian reservations for the purpose of aiding the economy of that area and the providing of gainful employment to the American Indian so that he may properly support his family.

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

RESOLUTION OF THE STANDING ROCK SIOUX
TRIBE OF NORTH DAKOTA AND SOUTH DAKOTA
URGING PASSAGE OF S. 809, A BILL TO PRO-
VIDE A FOUR-POINT PROGRAM FOR AMERICAN
INDIANS

Whereas the American Indian community in the midst of the greatest and wealthiest Nation in the world by and large has a standard of living far below the average for this country particularly in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Montana; and

Whereas the Government of the United States in its moral concern over the welfare of peoples in Europe, Asia, and Africa has spent and is spending billions of dollars in an effort to better the living conditions and economy of those foreign peoples; and

Whereas money and technical aid are gravely needed at home for the American Indian: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Congress enact S. 809 in order that the point 4 program may be brought to the American Indian as well as to foreign nations.

INDIANS HAVE GOOD IDEAS, TOO

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Indians Have Good Ideas, Too," published in the Devils Lake (N. Dak.) Herald of February 25, 1958. I believe this fine editorial will be most enlightening to the Members of the Congress in trying to solve the very complex problem of Indian affairs.

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

INDIANS HAVE GOOD IDEAS, TOO

In all the discussion of the Indian problem, which comes particularly close to towns like Devils Lake, no one has ever bothered to ask the Indians themselves what they would do to advance their own welfare.

Spokesmen for the Indian people have ideas but they have been too often ignored by the Government in its relations with them. Sometimes we forget that Indian leaders are well qualified to speak for their own people. If the rest of America listened to them, they could learn a lot.

Those leaders are well qualified by education and experience to voice the plight of their brothers. Some work in the professions. All have dedicated themselves to the welfare of their people.

Many Indians would write off the Bureau of Indian Affairs as a failure. Like most Government agencies, it has to unravel itself from a lot of red tape before it can take action on Indian problems, with the result that often not much gets done.

Among those of that belief is William J. Bordeaux of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., who left the reservation 26 years ago. He remembers the turn of the century when Indians had cattle, little supervision and freedom to use their own money. The Sioux began their decline, he says, when the Indian Bureau began selling off the cattle and making the Indian use purchase orders in place of money.

Local judges, he believes, should rule on the competence of individual Indians. Those who are competent should manage their own property free of control. They would pay taxes, in lieu of which States should provide housing in fringe areas of metropolitan centers near reservations.

Other Indians disagree with the idea of writing off the Indian Bureau, for that would make it easier for the Government to wipe its hands of the problem.

Indians and leaders from four States gathered at Rapid City, S. Dak., in early December for a discussion of their needs. They, too, came up with some advice.

They want the Bureau to extend social services to Indians in off-reservation communities.

City governments were asked to create local housing authorities to receive Federal aid from the Federal Public Housing and Redevelopment Administration.

Indigent Indian people also need the services of a legal aid society, which in some cities has been of great help to those in need.

Indians also need psychiatric and social services on the reservations to help them adjust to the complexities of modern life. Tribal councils were urged to consider employing experts on legal aid and psychiatric social services for their members.

Congress already has tried to help the Indians by training them in vocations under a law which went into effect last year. They also have been assisted under relocation programs, if they want it.

These are other attempts at solving a very complex problem, one which challenges our very best minds, both Indian and non-Indian, for a solution.

DEBTORS OF PEERLESS FINANCE CO., FARGO, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article from the Fargo Forum, Fargo, N. Dak., entitled "Debtors of Fargo Finance Firm Freed From Repayment by Cass Court Order," which was issued after a final

report from the court appointive receiver, when a temporary injunction was imposed against the firm's operations in legal action instituted by the North Dakota attorney general's office.

Mr. President, I have publicly commended the attorney general, the Honorable Leslie Burgum, and his staff for instituting this action against the small-loans sharks which I hope will be completely smashed by these legal actions by the attorney general.

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

DEBTORS OF FARGO FINANCE FIRM FREED FROM REPAYMENT BY CASS COURT ORDER

A Cass district court order Monday absolved 394 debtors of the Peerless Finance Co. of Fargo from any liability whatsoever for loans received from the company totaling \$17,230 in face value.

The order was issued by Judge John C. Pollock after he heard a final report from M. A. Wilk, of Fargo, appointed receiver for the firm in December 1956. Wilk was appointed when a temporary injunction was imposed against the firm's operations in legal action instituted by the North Dakota attorney general's office.

Wilk, represented by Attorney Mart Vogel, of Fargo, recommended the court order in view of the civil liability imposed under North Dakota laws against those proven to have charged usurious rates of interest.

He told the court these same laws had prevented him from making any attempt to collect on any of the loans placed in his custody as a receiver of the firm.

Wilk contended that if he had tried to collect, the borrowers could have filed lawsuits against the firm and possibly collected amounts far in excess of what he could have realized for the firm on the notes.

He said the situation existed because so many of the outstanding loans the firms had made were to borrowers who had borrowed several times from the firm and had made some repayments of loans that included usurious interest charges.

All but 17 of the 394 debtors involved were "repeat" borrowers, Wilk said.

Wilk cited one example of a party that had borrowed 30 times from the firm since June 1948.

On a current \$100 note, he said the borrower owed the company \$48.80 in interest, or \$46.75 in excess of the 7 percent annual maximum rate legally allowed now in North Dakota.

Deducting for the excess interest and 25 percent of the principal, which the debtor could do under the law because he had been charged usurious interest, would leave \$77.05 that the company could collect.

This same borrower, however, had previously borrowed and paid back another \$100 loan and interest of \$48.80.

State law would allow him to sue the firm for twice the amount of the excess interest charged plus 25 percent of the principal, or \$118.50 for the note and interest he had paid.

Thus, Wilk explained, any attempt to enforce the collection of the \$77.05 that could be collected legally on the outstanding note would subject the company to possible legal action for \$118.50.

This same situation exists for the bulk of the loans the firm has out, Wilk said.

A temporary injunction imposed against the firm in December 1956 was made permanent last January after attorneys for Dale L. Hooker, Omaha, Nebr., operator of the firm, signed a stipulation agreeing to end their opposition to the injunction action.

The firm has been closed and in custody of a court-appointed receiver since December 5, 1956, when the injunction action was

brought by the North Dakota attorney general's office on the grounds the firm was charging usurious rates of interest.

Seven percent annually is the maximum legal rate of interest on borrowed money under North Dakota law.

In its complaint against the Peerless firm, the State alleged the company had charged as high as 277 percent interest on small loans.

Francis Murphy, Fargo attorney representing Hooker, was present at Monday's hearing before Judge Pollock and raised no objection to the court's ruling.

Asked about the possibility of an appeal from the order, Murphy told a reporter the hearing was the final step in the case so far as he was concerned.

Donald Crothers, of southwest Fargo, defense attorney with Murphy in the case, could not be reached.

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter and a resolution I have received from the United Mine Workers of America.

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

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,

Washington, D. C., March 13, 1958.

To the Members of the United States Senate, 85th Congress.

MY DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the international executive board of the United Mine Workers of America, I submit to you the enclosed resolution unanimously adopted by the board in executive session, Washington, D. C., March 12, 1958.

The resolution is self-explanatory and is designed to give the most direct and immediate succor to the unemployed peoples of this Nation.

It is our hope that you will give your personal attention and efforts in the enactment of legislation to activate the purpose of this resolution.

Yours very truly,

JOHN OWENS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Whereas the United Mine Workers of America for a number of years have been advocating an increase in the schedules for unemployment compensation payments, and for the payments to continue for the duration of the unemployment period; and

Whereas we believe that this is the most direct approach in caring for the unemployed in the Nation; and

Whereas we further believe that these payments should be made by the Federal Government to the various States in behalf of the unemployed because to do otherwise would require concurrent legislation in the various States in many of which the general assemblies will not meet for some time; Therefore, be it

Resolved by the international executive board of the United Mine Workers of America, now in session in Washington, D. C., That we recommend to the Congress of the United States the immediate adoption of legislation upon the following basis: First, that the unemployment compensation payments be based on 75 percent of the average weekly wage of the beneficiary. Second, that the payments be made direct to the States on behalf of the unemployed beneficiaries, and that this amount be the difference between that paid by the State and the amount provided in new Federal legislation, as the basis for computing costs of the Federal Government. Third, that the new unemployment benefits be paid for the duration of the unemployment period.

FOREST ACCESS ROADS—RESOLUTION OF GRANGEVILLE, IDAHO, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, a resolution of the Grangeville, Idaho, Chamber of Commerce, asking for increased appropriations for forest access roads.

Mr. President, the amount appropriated in fiscal 1958, and approved by the House of Representatives for fiscal 1959, for forest access roads is \$5,914,000 less than the amount authorized. If this money were appropriated, it could be put to work now to achieve not only needed road construction, but also to help solve the unemployment problem.

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

Whereas over 80 percent of Idaho County, Idaho (4,414,191 acres), is national forest land; and

Whereas only about one-half of the allowable annual cut of timber is being harvested each year from this Federal land; and

Whereas increasing sales of national forest timber to the allowable cut that can be continued in perpetuity would provide needed jobs and local revenue for schools and roads; and

Whereas the greatest obstacle to increasing the annual timber harvest is the absence of an adequate road system; and

Whereas the construction of forest access roads by the Federal Government makes it possible for the Forest Service to offer smaller blocks of timber for sale and thereby make it possible for small operators to bid competitively for timber; and

Whereas the preponderance of timber operators in this area are small operators who are dependent upon the national forests as a source of timber; and

Whereas construction of needed access roads will also enable hunters, fishermen, picnickers, campers and other recreationists to visit additional forest areas; and

Whereas every dollar used on construction of needed forest access roads returns more than the principal to the United States Treasury within 1 to 4 years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Grangeville Chamber of Commerce, Grangeville, Idaho, does hereby recommend and urge the Congress of the United States to:

1. Immediately and substantially increase appropriations to the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture for access roads; and
2. Continue such appropriations until the road systems on the National Forests are adequate to provide management of all resources upon the sound principles of multiple use and sustained yield; and
3. That copies of the resolution be sent to all Senators and Representatives from Idaho in the United States Congress.

NATIONAL CAPITAL CULTURAL CENTER OF THE PERFORMING ARTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have introduced in the Senate, and Representative FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey, has introduced in the House companion bills, S. 3335 and H. R. 9848, authorizing construction of a privately financed National Capital Cultural Center of the Performing Arts, to be located on a federally owned site on the Mall, opposite the National Gallery of Art.

It is my understanding that the Senate Public Works Committee will hold hearings on this proposal in the near future.

In the Washington Post of Sunday, March 16, there appeared an excellent article entitled "Mall Is Fit Spot for Hall," written by the distinguished columnist and drama critic, Richard L. Coe.

I ask unanimous consent that this fine article, commenting on the merits of this proposal, be printed in the RECORD.

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

MALL IS FIT SPOT FOR HALL

(By Richard L. Coe)

How about that auditorium?

New Jersey's dogged Democrat Congressman FRANK THOMPSON has been joined in his efforts by the lucid Senator from Arkansas, WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, in trying to latch onto Mall property opposite the National Gallery of Art for a National Cultural Center of the Performing Arts.

What could be a more fitting spot?

In the way and very much in the way is a concurrent attempt to latch onto the same land for an air museum. It doesn't take much imagination to see that a worthwhile air museum would soon be busting at the seams in such comparatively restricted space. Representative THOMPSON points out that Bolling Air Force Base is soon to be evacuated and that it would make an ideal setting for the air exhibits. An auditorium would need space—and parking underneath it—but nothing like the space of a worthy collection of air age mementos would require.

To resolve this impasse hearings will be held shortly before Senator PAT McNAMARA'S Subcommittee on Public Buildings. The Michigan Democrat heading this subdivision of the Senate Committee on Public Works plans to give good warning of the hearings since he is aware there is a definite conflict between the auditorium and air interests for the site.

What can Washingtonians who want an auditorium do to let their interests be known about this?

Looks like it's the old answer for this voteless community—letters, wires, public discussion, and whatever pressures can be mustered.

One outfit that's been supremely quiet about supporting an auditorium adjacent to the Mellon Gallery has been the board of trade. Now is the time for its cultural development subcommittee to start cracking.

One reason the Board of Trade may have lost interest was the failure of last year's auditorium commission to gain the Foggy Bottom site it envisioned for a far more ambitious project which would have included a huge convention hall.

Somebody should alert Board members to the fact that a worthy auditorium could well attract visitors to the city just as the Mellon Gallery has done. And someone should also remind the members that the projected annual performing arts festival could have no future at all unless a suitable building is created.

Representative THOMPSON'S new bill (H. R. 9848) benefits from his experience last year with the more ambitious project in Foggy Bottom. When that was defeated its opponents said "We can still have the cultural center and quicker, on one of the several available Government-owned sites."

Now he has pinpointed, with eminent logic it seems to me, the land Congress picked out in 1938 for a national art center. That project has been moved to the old Patent Office building (Seventh and F Streets, NW.) but aviation interests have been trying to move in on the Mall property.

THOMPSON says that his bill would provide a cultural center similar in purpose to the \$205 million Lincoln Square Center of the Performing Arts now under way in New York. Once the Government grants the land, Robert Dowling, president of the American National Theater and Academy, foresees financing on nongovernmental level.

The Ford and Rockefeller Foundations contributed \$2½ million each to Gotham's Lincoln Square project and there are indications they also would contribute to a similar venture here. Private individuals and public groups also have promised contributions.

The ultimate set-up would be similar to the Smithsonian Institution, regents of which are directed to solicit gifts, bequests, subscriptions, and moneys to construct, furnish, equip, and maintain. The procedure is the same which set up the Mellon and Freer Art Galleries and is now working on the Bell Tower Memorial to the late Senator Taft.

The need for such an auditorium can hardly be exaggerated. It was glaringly reflected last week when a full-stage production of Back to Methuselah was pushed onto the hopelessly ill-equipped platform of Constitution Hall. It should never have been there, nor should operatic or ballet events, but so long as the platform is the only choice, the managers will be using it, a system under which the public and the artists are the losers.

What chance of success does this Fulbright-Thompson effort have?

With no District of Columbia vote and only a few spokesmen, fruition of the auditorium dream depends on letting the Members of Congress know how both Washingtonians and home State voters feel about the glaring cultural lack in what is supposed to be the capital of the Western World.

THOMPSON pointed out the other day that the real Trojan horse is the declining level of education with its vulgarization of cultural standards. If this is not reversed, and immediately, we shall soon become a big but second-rate people, fat, Philistine, and self-indulgent.

Granting by Congress of the Mall land for a fitting twin to the world-respected Mellon Gallery could clearly be a fruitful achievement. Surely with the space and equipment already at Bolling, the Air Museum already has a potential home. For our own and visiting foreign performing arts the capital of the Western World has none.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Under the unanimous-consent order entered on Friday last, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, commencing with Order No. 1368.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senate is proceeding, under a unanimous-consent agreement, with a call of the calendar commencing with Order No. 1368. The clerk will state the first measure which is in order on the calendar.

ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL LAND FOR COWPENS NATIONAL BATTLEGROUND SITE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 602) to provide for the acquisition of additional land to be used in connection with the Cowpens National Battlefield site, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 1, at the beginning of line 8, to strike out "ground, the Secretary is authorized and directed to accept, for use as a parking lot for the convenience of persons visiting the monument heretofore erected on the land heretofore acquired pursuant to such act, any plot of land (not in excess of 5 acres) adjacent to such heretofore acquired land which may be tendered as a gift to the United States for such purpose" and insert "ground, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to accept, on behalf of the United States, donations of land not to exceed 1 acre, situated adjacent to and between the present battlefield site and relocated Highway 11", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in addition to the land heretofore acquired by the United States by gift pursuant to the act entitled "An act to erect a national monument at Cowpens battleground," approved March 4, 1929 (45 Stat. 1558), for the purpose of erecting a monument on the site of the Cowpens battleground, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to accept, on behalf of the United States, donations of land not to exceed 1 acre, situated adjacent to and between the present battlefield site and relocated Highway 11.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the passage today of my bill, S. 602, will afford a great sense of satisfaction to the patriotic groups in South Carolina who have sponsored and urged the enactment of this bill. I may be pardoned a personal reference when I say it will likewise be a source of great personal pleasure to me. Having been born at Honea Path, S. C., and having had my home and office so close by the battleground at Cowpens, I have felt an abiding and continuing interest in a due recognition of the importance of this important engagement in the cause of American freedom.

The enlargement of the grounds surrounding the battle site is in part a fitting tribute to its importance. The historical accounts of the engagements in South Carolina culminating in Green's and Morgan's victory at Cowpens saved the Southern Colonies to the American cause. Many at that time felt that the victories at Kings Mountain and Cowpens would have an adverse effect in the efforts of the patriotic forces in the Southland. It was felt that they might become complacent with victory. To the contrary, these successes had just the opposite effect. They inspired the southern soldiers to a more determined effort. The battles at Camden, S. C., Kings Mountain, Cowpens, and Guilford Courthouse forced Cornwallis and his battered troops to retire to Wilmington, N. C. The net result of these successes of the Continental forces led Cornwallis to take refuge at Yorktown where on October 19, 1781, he finally surrendered.

This surrender was followed by the signing of peace on November 30, 1782.

The Daughters of the American Revolution have urged the enlargement of the grounds surrounding the battlefield as a useful means of protecting and preserving its integrity. The recognition by the Congress in the enactment of S. 602 will be a fitting tribute to the patriotic efforts of these good women. Their relentless efforts to maintain and preserve our historic shrines are appreciated by Americans everywhere.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IMPORTATION OF ARTICLES FOR EXHIBITION PURPOSES WITHOUT PAYMENT OF TARIFF

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 439) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Seventh International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes, was considered, order to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LENDING OF CERTAIN ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE EQUIPMENT TO THE GIRL SCOUTS OF AMERICA

The bill (S. 2630) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment, and to provide certain services to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, and to permit use of certain lands of the Air Force Academy for use at the Girl Scout Senior Roundup Encampment, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to lend to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, a corporation created under the act of March 16, 1950, for the use and accommodation of the approximately 10,000 Girl Scouts and officials who are to attend the Girl Scout Senior Roundup Encampment to be held during the period beginning in June 1959 and ending in July 1959, at Colorado Springs, Colo., such tents, cots, blankets, commissary equipment, flags, refrigerators, and other equipment and services as may be necessary or useful, to the extent that items are in stock and available and their issue will not jeopardize the national defense program.

(b) Such equipment is authorized to be delivered at such time prior to the holding of such encampment, and to be returned at such time after the close of such encampment, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of Defense and the Girl Scouts of the United States of America. No expense shall be incurred by the United States Government for the delivery, return, rehabilitation, or replacement of such equipment.

(c) The Secretary of Defense, before delivering such property, shall take from the Girl Scouts of the United States of America a good and sufficient bond for the safe return of such property in good order and condition,

and the whole without expense to the United States.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized, under such regulations as he may provide, to permit, without expense to the United States Government, the Girl Scouts of the United States of America to use such portions of the undeveloped lands of the United States Air Force Academy adjacent to such encampment as may be necessary or useful, to the extent that their use will not interfere with the activities of such Academy, and will not jeopardize the national-defense program.

WEARING OF UNIFORM OF RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS BY CERTAIN PERSONS

The bill (H. R. 7696) to authorize certain persons to wear the uniform of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REPLACEMENT OF CENTRAL PORTION OF THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2883) 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, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Over, Mr. President. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

WALTER F. GEORGE LOCK AND DAM

The bill (H. R. 9653) to provide that the Fort Gaines lock and dam on the Chattahoochee River shall hereafter be known and designated as the Walter F. George lock and dam was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the bill will designate the lock and dam on the Chattahoochee River between the States of Georgia and Alabama as the Walter F. George lock and dam.

Every Member of the Senate, of course, knew my distinguished predecessor in the Senate, the late President pro tempore of the Senate, Walter F. George. He had one of the most remarkable political careers in the history of my State. He was dearly beloved by all the people of Georgia.

I believe it is a very fitting tribute to the late distinguished statesman from my State that the Congress of the United States designate the Fort Gaines lock and dam in his honor. Senator George was one of the most beloved men who ever served in the United States Senate.

The best illustration I believe I could use to demonstrate the esteem and affection which his colleagues in this body had for Senator George is that when he passed away a little less than a year ago the Senate, out of respect to his memory, sent at least one-third of its members on a round trip of almost 1,500 miles to pay him honor and tribute.

I did not want to let this opportunity pass, Mr. President, without inviting the attention of Members of the Senate to

the bill, and in this way further showing a mark of respect to the late distinguished and great Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia for the very fine statement he has made relative to the naming of the lock and dam for the late distinguished Senator from that State, our former President pro tempore, a man who served both as chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance and as chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

I did not want this opportunity to pass without assuring my friend and colleague from Georgia that the sentiments he has expressed today represent not only the feeling of those on his side of the aisle, but the unanimous feeling of all of us on this side of the aisle.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSFER OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION BUILDING TO THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 984) to provide for the transfer of the Civil Service Commission Building in the District of Columbia to the Smithsonian Institution to house certain art collections of the Smithsonian Institution, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments, on page 2, line 7, after the word "essential", to strike out the semicolon and "but in any event such transfer shall be made within 5 years after the date of the enactment of this act"; in line 12, after the word "it", to strike out "entirely"; and in line 13, after the word "Institution", to insert "upon transfer of funds available to the Smithsonian Institution for such purposes"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Administrator of General Services shall transfer the Civil Service Commission Building (formerly known as the Patent Office Building), and the site thereof located between Seventh and Ninth Streets and F and G Streets NW, in the District of Columbia, to the Smithsonian Institution without reimbursement, for the use of certain art galleries of the Smithsonian Institution.

(b) The transfer provided for by subsection (a) shall be made at such time as the Administrator of General Services determines that the use of the building by the Federal Government for office purposes is no longer essential.

(c) The Administrator of General Services, in consultation with the Smithsonian Institution, is authorized to enter into such contracts and take such other action as may be necessary to make it suitable to house certain art galleries of the Smithsonian Institution upon transfer of funds available to the Smithsonian Institution for such purposes.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3420) to extend and amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Over, Mr. President. We do not think this bill is properly calendar business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

ACCEPTANCE OF DECORATIONS BY CERTAIN PERSONNEL CONFERRED BY THE PHILIPPINE GOVERNMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8437) to amend the act of August 3, 1956, to authorize certain personnel of the Armed Forces to accept and wear decorations conferred by the Philippine Government, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "amended", to insert "(a) by striking out the words 'Armed Forces' and inserting in lieu thereof 'uniformed services' and (b)"; in line 7, after the word "the", where it appears the third time, to strike out "Armed Forces" and insert "uniformed services"; and on page 3, after line 14, to insert:

(9) Following that part of section 1 captioned "Air Force" add a new paragraph as follows:

"COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

"Capt. Charles Pierce, 1030, Legion of Honor, degree of commander."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to amend the act of August 3, 1956, to authorize certain personnel of the uniformed services to accept and wear decorations conferred by the Philippine Government."

WHEAT ACREAGE HISTORY

The bill (S. 3406) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to wheat acreage history, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Over, Mr. President. The bill is not properly calendar business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia if it is intended that Calendar No. 1378, S. 3420, a bill to extend and amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, popularly known as Public Law 480, and Calendar No. 1380, S. 3406, a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938,

as amended, with respect to wheat acreage history, will be taken up for consideration by motion during this week?

Mr. TALMADGE. The majority leader has so announced. This side of the aisle—or at least the calendar committee—is wholeheartedly in favor of those bills, but we believed they were of sufficient importance and of such a major nature as to warrant debate and discussion by the entire membership of the Senate.

The majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], indicated last week that the major agricultural bills would be taken up by and would be voted on by the Senate this week.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, both the bills are of major importance. It would be desirable, I think, to have the membership of the Senate on notice as to a definite time when the bill will be called up for consideration.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. I refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 14, page 4483, where the Senator from Texas set forth the legislative program for the week. The Senator stated:

Mr. President, following the call of the calendar, at the earliest practical opportunity, the following measures will be brought before the Senate:

Calendar No. 1378, S. 3420, extending and amending the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act.

Calendar No. 1392, S. 3441, providing for a minimum-acreage allotment for corn and other purposes.

Calendar No. 1393, S. 3408, amending the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide that cotton-acreage allotments for the States for 1958 and subsequent years shall be no less than in 1956.

Calendar No. 1394, S. 3385, amending section 114 of the Soil Bank Act with respect to compliance with corn-acreage allotments.

And so forth. The list includes, in addition to the bills I have mentioned, at least six other bills, most of which deal with major agricultural products.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise that Calendar No. 1416, House bill 11086, is a companion bill to one of the bills just mentioned. Undoubtedly it will be passed over.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wonder if the Senator from Georgia can be a little more precise as to what the most practical moment will be for calling up these bills, and whether or not they will be called up in the order enumerated by the statement of the majority leader, which the Senator from Georgia has just read.

Mr. TALMADGE. I have no way of knowing what the majority leader had in mind, except what he said. I would not attempt to interpret the meaning of what he said. I think the statement is clear. I think it indicates that the majority leader expects to bring the bills up at the earliest possible opportunity this week.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I note that the distinguished majority leader is now present in the Chamber. I wonder if it would be possible for him to

give us any sharper definition as to the time when these agricultural measures may be brought up for consideration. With respect to one or two of them, the Senator from South Dakota was contemplating possibly making a statement, and perhaps offering an amendment. If it were at all possible to be a little more precise as to the time when they will be called up, I think it would be helpful, not only to me, but to other Members of the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, before the distinguished majority leader answers the question, I should like to have him know that in his absence we conferred with the calendar committees on both sides of the aisle relative to Calendar No. 1394, Senate bill 3385, which relates to the counties which have become commercial corn counties this year for the first time. We find there is no opposition to the bill. In view of the fact that corn planting is in progress in my State at this time, I had hoped that the bill could be passed today, either on the call of the calendar or upon motion later.

I do not believe any of the other agricultural bills are in the same situation. The bill to which I refer was unanimously reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I did not hear the inquiry of my friend from South Dakota. If he will repeat it, I shall try to be responsive.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wonder if it would be possible to fix a little more precisely the time at which the various agricultural bills which have been mentioned may be considered. As the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] has indicated, they are of wide interest. There is hardly a State that is not affected by them in some way. If we knew more precisely when they were coming up, we could adjust our schedules and be ready with statements or amendments more promptly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The majority leader wishes to retain a reasonable degree of flexibility as to the order in which the various bills are to be called up.

All the bills listed on pages 4483 and 4484 of the RECORD are ready for action, but because of the indication by the Senator from Vermont that there might be some controversy with respect to the measure relating to Public Law 480, I do not plan to call it up on motion today, because certain Senators desire to be absent on St. Patrick's Day. Unless I change my plans—and I do not think I shall—the bill relating to Public Law 480 will not come up today.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is definitely helpful. Is it the prospect that the bill relating to wheat acreage will be taken up today?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No. I do not plan to move to take up any bills today, other than those which may be passed on the call of the calendar.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is certainly helpful, and I appreciate the statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am always glad to accommodate my friend, to reciprocate for his kindness to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, what can the majority leader tell us with respect to the bill I mentioned a few minutes ago?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The calendar committees have cleared it. I am always glad to see such bills acted upon promptly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next order of business on the calendar.

PETRIFIED FOREST NATIONAL PARK, ARIZ.—BILL PASSED TO FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (S. 2359) to authorize the establishment of the Petrified Forest National Park, in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar. House action is pending at this moment, and it is hoped that the Congressional action on the bill can be completed if we place it at the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 8002) to provide for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over. It is not proper business to be disposed of on the call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

RICHARD K. LIM AND MARGARET K. LIM

The bill (S. 1987) for the relief of Richard K. Lim and Margaret K. Lim was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Richard K. Lim and Margaret K. Lim 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.

SAYO ONO TAYLOR

The bill (S. 2735) for the relief of Sayo Ono Taylor was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sayo Ono Taylor shall be held and consid-

ered 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 fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ABBAS MOHAMMAD AWAD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2713) for the relief of Abbas Mohammad Awad, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bonds which may have issued in the case of Abbas Mohammad Awad. From and after the date of the enactment of this act, the said Abbas Mohammad Awad shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHANNA DIPPOLD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2807) for the relief of Johanna Dippold, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act Johanna Dippold, the fiancée of Carl R. Pitchford, 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 Johanna Dippold is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Carl R. Pitchford and that she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act other than the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of that act: *Provided further*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Johanna Dippold, 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 above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Johanna Dippold, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Johanna Dippold as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COMPACT BETWEEN THE STATE OF OREGON AND THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7153) giving consent of Congress to a compact between the State of Oregon and the State of Washington establishing a boundary between those States, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 2, after line 4, to strike out:

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL AUTOMATION CONGRESS AND EXPOSITION

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 347) authorizing and requesting the President to invite the several States and foreign countries to take part in the Fourth International Automation Congress and Exposition to be held in the New York Coliseum at New York, N. Y., from June 9 to June 13, 1958, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments, on page 2, line 3, after the word "authorized", to strike out "and requested"; and in line 7, after the year "1958", to strike out the semicolon and "and be it further

Resolved, That no funds appropriated by Congress for any purpose whatsoever shall be used to defray the expenses of any foreign country or foreign individual participating in the Fourth International Automation Congress and Exposition to be held in New York City".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The title was amended, so as to read: "Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the several States and foreign countries to take part in the Fourth International Automation Congress and Exposition to be held in the New York Coliseum at New York, N. Y., from June 9 to June 13, 1958."

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3441) to provide for a minimum acreage allotment for corn and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Over.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over. It is not proper business to be disposed of on the call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3408) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to provide that cotton-

acreage allotments for the States for 1958 and subsequent years shall be no less than in 1956, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, Senate bill 3408 is a bill authored by the junior Senator from Georgia and several other Senators. I ask unanimous consent at this time that the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] be listed as one of the sponsors of the bill.

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

Mr. TALMADGE. The bill is extremely important to a vast section of our country, but it is the opinion of the calendar committee that it is not calendar business, and it is requested that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CORN-ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3385) to amend section 114 of the Soil Bank Act with respect to compliance with corn-acreage allotments, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the word "under", to insert "an acreage-reserve contract or", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 114 of the Soil Bank Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, no person shall be ineligible to receive payments or compensation under an acreage-reserve contract or a conservation-reserve contract by reason of the fact that the corn acreage on the farm exceeds the farm-acreage allotment for corn if such contract was entered into prior to January 1 of the first year for which the county is included in the commercial corn-producing area: *Provided*, That the foregoing provisions of this sentence shall apply only to a farm for which an 'old farm' corn allotment is established for such first year. For purposes of this provision, a contract which has been terminated by the producer under the program regulations by reason of the fact that the county in which the farm is located was included in the commercial corn-producing area for the first time in 1958, and which is reinstated, shall be deemed to have been entered into as of the original date of execution of such contract."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the calendar committees on both sides of the aisle, and of the majority and minority leaders in permitting passage of the bill at this time.

The bill provides that farmers in counties which become commercial corn counties for the first time—and there are 38 such counties in the Nation this year—who are regular corn planters, and who enter into conservation reserve or acreage reserve contracts prior to January 1 of the first year in which the county is included in the commercial corn area, shall be exempted from the requirement of cross-compliance with corn acreage allotments.

The House has passed a similar bill. There are minor differences between the two bills, and the Department of Agriculture is willing to recommend approval of the language of the Senate bill.

At this time I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from further consideration of the House bill, H. R. 10843, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of that bill, that all after the enacting clause be stricken, and that the text of the Senate bill be inserted in lieu thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the bill referred to is not at the desk at the present time. The bill will be sent for.

Mr. HOLLAND. I was advised by the staff of the committee that it was ready to be acted upon.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the situation, the Senator from Florida is asking that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from further consideration of the House bill. Would that not bring it automatically before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first inquiry the Senator has directed to the Chair is correct. However, the Chair is endeavoring to get the bill to the desk. Once that has been accomplished, further action can be taken on the matter.

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the committee be discharged from further consideration of the bill and that when the bill reaches the desk the Senator from Florida be allowed to take up the item again for the action already indicated.

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

Mr. HOLLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of Calendar No. 1394, S. 3385. H. R. 10843, a companion bill, was before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but by earlier action the Senate discharged the committee from further consideration of the House bill, and I desire it substituted for the Senate bill and considered at this time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may I ask the nature of the bill to which the Senator from Florida is referring?

Mr. HOLLAND. The bill, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, relates to the counties which have become commercial corn counties this year for the first time, and in which corn growers have found themselves in the very difficult position of being adversely affected by penalties not within the mind of either the Government or themselves at the time the corn growers entered into earlier contracts with the Government for acreage reserve or conservation reserve under the Soil Bank. It also applies to future situations of this kind.

Mr. AIKEN. I realize that those growers are deserving of having something done for them, but I was wondering about Calendar No. 1392, S. 3441, to pro-

vide for a minimum acreage allotment for corn and other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That bill was passed over on the call of the calendar.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to inquire about it. That is the bill in which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is very much interested. It seems to me that it should be tied in with the bill which the Senator from Florida is seeking to have considered now, because it fixes allotments for corn. It also was reported unanimously by the committee. Was there objection to Calendar No. 1392, S. 3441?

Mr. CLARK. There was objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. I may say, for the information of the Senator from Vermont, that both calendar committees agreed to the consideration of the bill which I have just called up. The majority leader has announced that the other agricultural bills, five in number, will be brought up at the earliest practical opportunity.

Mr. ELLENDER. I objected to the consideration of Calendar No. 1392, S. 3441, on the assumption that it would be taken up tomorrow or at the earliest practical opportunity. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] desired to be present when it was taken up. That is why I objected.

Mr. AIKEN. That is perfectly satisfactory to me. I am agreeable to having it go over until tomorrow. I simply thought that if we gave consideration to one of the bills, we ought to give consideration to the other, too. But on the assurance that it will be taken up shortly, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 10843?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10843) to amend section 114 of the Soil Bank Act with respect to compliance with corn acreage allotments.

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the House bill be amended by striking out everything after the enacting clause and substituting, in lieu thereof, the text of the Senate bill, S. 3385, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 10843) was read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which Senate bill 3385 was passed is reconsidered, and the bill is indefinitely postponed.

FISHERIES LOAN FUND

The bill (S. 3295) to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 in order to increase the authorization for the fisheries loan fund established under such act was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. CLARK. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ATTENDANCE BY CERTAIN FOREIGN STUDENTS AT THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS COLLEGE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3243) to permit certain foreign students to attend the District of Columbia Teachers College on the same basis as a resident of the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments, in line 5, after the word "visas", to strike out "shall" and insert "may", and in line 9, after the word "Columbia", to insert "Admission to and attendance at such college by such students shall be subject to rules and regulations prescribed by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed 25 foreign students who are in the United States on valid unexpired student visas may be permitted to attend the District of Columbia Teachers College each year on the same basis, so far as payment of tuition and fees are concerned, as a resident of the District of Columbia. Admission to and attendance at such college by such students shall be subject to rules and regulations prescribed by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the bill arises by reason of the fact that approximately 25 students from perhaps a dozen foreign countries were admitted to the District of Columbia Teachers College this fall without the payment of tuition and with the understanding that they would not be required to pay tuition. Their personal finances and the public assistance available to them from their countries were based on that understanding. After the conclusion of the first semester the local authorities advising the District of Columbia Teachers College discovered some legal objection in the law to permitting these foreign students to attend the Teachers College without payment of fees.

There was quite an uproar in the newspapers about the situation, to the effect that these young men and women had been unfairly dealt with in being brought to this country under an understanding and then being told that a fee would have to be paid, which fee they were unable to pay. Under the circumstances, as a member of the Subcommittee on the Judiciary of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I undertook to introduce proposed remedial legislation which would permit the students to stay in the country in accordance with the initial understanding. The bill was approved by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia and by the three Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and it was also unanimously approved by the Committee on the District of Columbia. It was also approved by the Department of State, which indicated it was quite relieved that the bill had been introduced, as the situation was causing the Department some embarrassment.

Mr. ELLENDER. The necessity for the bill is that under the present laws the Board of Education of the District of Columbia is precluded from giving free tuition to foreign students. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. They did not know it at the time they accepted the students.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments reported by the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

UNIFORM SIMULTANEOUS DEATH ACT

The bill (H. R. 3486) to provide that the Uniform Simultaneous Death Act shall apply in the District of Columbia was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECREATION BOARD FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 1843) to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Recreation Board for the District of Columbia, to define its duties, and for other purposes," approved April 29, 1942, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following paragraph be added at the end of section 2, article II, of the act entitled "An act to create a Recreation Board for the District of Columbia, to define its duties, and for other purposes," approved April 29, 1942:

"Notwithstanding the provision of section 301 of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945, as amended (68 Stat. 1110; 5 U. S. C. 921), requiring regularity in the scheduled work between the hours of 6 o'clock postmeridian and 6 o'clock antemeridian, the Board shall have the power to prescribe rules and regulations governing the payment of night differential for nonregularly scheduled work between such hours by such of its employees as are subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, when such nonregularly scheduled work is within the employee's basic workweek: *Provided, however*, That all other provisions of such section 301 shall be in full force and effect: *Provided further*, That no night differential may be paid for night overtime work that is not regularly scheduled."

REMOVAL OF DANGEROUS AND UNSAFE BUILDINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3059) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1899, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "by", to strike out "(a)"; in line 9, after the word "thereof", to strike out "Commissioners", and (b) conform to the term 'Commissioners' the pronouns

modifying 'inspector of buildings' wherever such pronouns occur in such act" and insert "Commissioners". The first sentence of the first section of such act, as amended, is amended by striking 'his opinion' and inserting in lieu thereof 'their opinion' and by striking 'he shall' and inserting in lieu thereof 'they shall'; and on page 3, line 15, after the word "first", to strike out "four" and insert "three"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes", approved March 1, 1899 (30 Stat. 923, as amended; title 5, ch. 5, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by striking the term "inspector of buildings" wherever such term appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "Commissioners." The first sentence of the first section of such act, as amended, is amended by striking "his opinion" and inserting in lieu thereof "their opinion" and by striking "he shall" and inserting in lieu thereof "they shall."

SEC. 2. The first section of such act, as amended (sec. 5-501, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The term 'Commissioners' means the Commissioners of the District of Columbia sitting as a board or the agent or agents designated by them to perform any function vested in said Commissioners by this act."

SEC. 3. Section 3 of such act, as amended (sec. 5-503, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by striking the third sentence therefrom.

SEC. 4. The second sentence of section 4 of such act, as amended (sec. 5-504, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by striking "bear interest at the rate of 10 percent per annum until paid, and be carried on the regular tax rolls of the District of Columbia and shall be collected in the manner provided for the collection of general taxes" and inserting in lieu thereof "be collected as general taxes are collected in said District in the manner provided in section 6 of this act."

SEC. 5. Such act, as amended, is amended by inserting the following sections immediately after section 4, reading as follows:

"Sec. 5. The Commissioners shall determine the cost and expense of any work performed by them under the authority of the first four sections of this act and shall assess such cost and expense upon the lot or ground whereon such structure, excavation, or nuisance stands, stood, was dug, was located, or existed, and this amount shall be collected as general taxes are collected in said District in the manner provided in section 6 of this act. Any person, corporation, partnership, syndicate, or company subject to the provisions of the first 3 sections of this act who shall neglect or refuse to perform any act required by such sections shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$50 for each and every day said person, corporation, partnership, syndicate, or company fails to perform any act required by such sections.

"Sec. 6. Any tax authorized to be levied and collected under this act may be paid without interest within 60 days from the date such tax was levied. Interest of one-half of 1 percent for each month or part thereof shall be charged on all unpaid amounts from the expiration of 60 days from the date such tax was levied. Any such tax may be paid in three equal installments with interest thereon. If any such tax or part thereof shall remain unpaid after the expiration of 2 years from the date such tax was levied, the property against which said tax was levied may be sold for such

tax or unpaid portion thereof with interest and penalties thereon at the next ensuing annual tax sale in the same manner and under the same conditions as property sold for delinquent general real-estate taxes, if said tax with interest and penalties thereon shall not have been paid in full prior to said sale."

SEC. 6. Section 5 of such act, as amended (sec. 5-505, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), is renumbered "Section 7" and is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 7. (a) Any notice required by this act to be served shall be deemed to have been served when served by any of the following methods: (1) when forwarded to the last known address of the owner as recorded in the real estate assessment records of the District of Columbia, by registered mail, with return receipt, and such receipt shall constitute prima facie evidence of service upon such owner if such receipt is signed either by the owner or by a person of suitable age and discretion located at such address: *Provided*, That valid service upon the owner shall be deemed effected if such notice shall be refused by the owner and not delivered for that reason; or (2) when delivered to the person to be notified; or (3) when left at the usual residence or place of business of the person to be notified with a person of suitable age and discretion then resident or employed therein; or (4) if no such residence or place of business can be found in the District of Columbia by reasonable search, then if left with any person of suitable age and discretion employed at the office of any agent of the person to be notified, which agent has any authority or duty with reference to the land or tenement to which said notice relates; or (5) if any such notice forwarded by registered mail be returned for reasons other than refusal, or if personal service of any such notice, as hereinbefore provided, cannot be effected, then if published on 3 consecutive days in a daily newspaper published in the District of Columbia; or (6) if by reason of an outstanding unrecorded transfer of title the name of the owner in fact cannot be ascertained beyond a reasonable doubt, then if served on the owner of record in a manner hereinbefore provided. Any notice to a corporation shall, for the purposes of this act, be deemed to have been served on such corporation if served on the president, secretary, treasurer, general manager, or any principal officer of such corporation in the manner hereinbefore provided for the service of notices on natural persons holding property in their own right; and notices to a foreign corporation shall, for the purposes of this act, be deemed to have been served if served personally on any agent of such corporation, or if left with any person of suitable age and discretion residing at the usual residence or employed at the usual place of business of such agent in the District of Columbia.

"(b) In case such notice is served by any method other than personal service, a copy of such notice shall also be sent to the owner by ordinary mail."

SEC. 7. Such act, as amended, is amended by inserting a new section immediately after section 7, as renumbered by this amendatory act, reading as follows:

"Sec. 8. Whenever the Commissioners find that any building or part of a building, staging or other structure, or anything attached to or connected with any building or other structure or excavation shall cause a building to be unsafe for human occupancy, they shall give notice of such fact to the owner or other person having an interest in such building, and to the occupant or occupants thereof. If within 5 days after such notice has been served upon such owner or other interested person, such building or part thereof has not been made safe for human

occupancy, the Commissioners may order the use of such building or part thereof discontinued until it has been made safe: *Provided*, That if in the opinion of the Commissioners the unsafe condition of the building or part thereof is such as to be imminently dangerous to the life or limb of any occupant, the Commissioners may order the immediate discontinuance of the use of such building or part thereof. Any person occupying, or permitting the occupancy of, such building or part thereof in violation of such order of the Commissioners shall be fined not more than \$300 or imprisoned for not more than 30 days."

SEC. 8. Section 6 of such act, as amended, is renumbered "section 9."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADMISSION FREE OF DUTY OF ARTICLES IMPORTED FOR EXHIBITION PURPOSES

The bill (H. R. 10242) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Chicago International Fair and Exposition to be held in July 1959, at Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLARIFICATION OF NAVIGATION RULES FOR THE GREAT LAKES

The bill (S. 1976) to clarify the application of navigation rules for the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of February 8, 1895, entitled "An act to regulate navigation on the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters" (ch. 64, 28 Stat. 645; 33 U. S. C. 241), is amended by deleting the first sentence and substituting the following: "The following rules for preventing collisions shall be followed in the navigation of all public and private vessels of the United States upon the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters as far east as Montreal and in the navigation of all other vessels upon such lakes and waters while within the territorial waters of the United States."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the act of February 8, 1895 (ch. 64, 28 Stat. 649; 33 U. S. C. 244), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Every licensed or unlicensed pilot, engineer, mate, or master of any vessel subject to section 1 of this act who neglects or refuses to observe the provisions of this act or the regulations established pursuant hereto shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding \$500.

"(b) Every private vessel subject to section 1 of this act that shall be navigated without complying with the provisions of this act or the regulations established pursuant hereto shall be liable to a penalty of \$500, for which sum such vessel may be seized and proceeded against by way of libel in any district court of the United States of any district within which such vessel may be found."

SEC. 3. Sections 4412 and 4413 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (46 U. S. C. 381) are hereby repealed.

LIGHTS FOR VESSELS TOWING OR BEING OVERTAKEN

The bill (S. 2115) to amend the act of June 7, 1897, as amended, and section 4233 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to lights for vessels towing or being overtaken, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That article 3 of section 1 of the act of June 7, 1897, as amended (30 Stat. 97, as amended; U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 33, sec. 173), is amended to read as follows:

"**ART. 3.** (a) A steam vessel when towing another vessel or vessels alongside or by pushing ahead shall, in addition to her side lights, carry 2 bright white lights in a vertical line, one over the other, not less than 3 feet apart, and when towing one or more vessels astern, regardless of the length of the tow, shall carry an additional bright white light 3 feet above or below such lights. Each of these lights shall be of the same construction and character, and shall be carried in the same position as the white light mentioned in article 2 (a) or the after range light mentioned in article 2 (f).

"(b) A steam vessel carrying towing lights the same as the white light mentioned in article 2 (a), when pushing another vessel or vessels ahead, shall also carry at or near the stern 2 bright amber lights in a vertical line, one over the other, not less than 3 feet apart; each of these lights shall be so constructed as to show an unbroken light over an arc of the horizon of 12 points of the compass, so fixed as to show the light 6 points from right aft on each side of the vessel, and of such a character as to be visible at a distance of at least 2 miles. A steam vessel carrying towing lights the same as the white light mentioned in article 2 (a) may also carry, irrespective of the position of the tow, the after range light mentioned in article 2 (f); however, if the after range light is carried by such a vessel when pushing another vessel or vessels ahead, the amber lights shall be carried in a vertical line with and at least 3 feet lower than the after range light. A steam vessel carrying towing lights the same as the white light mentioned in article 2 (a), when towing one or more vessels astern, may also carry, in lieu of the stern light specified in article 10, a small white light abaft the funnel or aftermast for the tow to steer by, but such light shall not be visible forward of the beam."

Sec. 2. Article 10 of section 1 of the act of June 7, 1897, as amended (30 Stat. 98; U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 33, sec. 179), is amended to read as follows:

"**ART. 10.** (a) A vessel when under way, if not otherwise required by these rules to carry one or more lights visible from aft, shall carry at her stern a white light, so constructed that it shall show an unbroken light over an arc of the horizon of 12 points of the compass, so fixed as to show the light 6 points from right aft on each side of the vessel, and of such a character as to be visible at a distance of at least 2 miles. Such light shall be carried as nearly as practicable on the same level as the side lights.

"(b) In a small vessel, if it is not possible on account of bad weather or other sufficient cause for the light to be fixed, an electric torch or a lighted lantern shall be kept at hand ready for use and shall, on the approach of an overtaking vessel, be shown in sufficient time to prevent collision."

Sec. 3. Section (d) of rule No. 3 of section 4233 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (U. S. C., 1952

edition, title 33, sec. 312), is amended to read as follows:

"(d) At or near the stern, where they can best be seen, 2 amber lights in a vertical line, one over the other, not less than 3 feet apart, of such a character as to be visible from aft for a distance of at least 2 miles, and so screened as not to be visible forward of the beam."

Sec. 4. Rule No. 10 of section 4233 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 33, sec. 319), is amended to read as follows:

"Rule No. 10: (a) A vessel when under way, if not otherwise required by these rules to carry one or more lights visible from aft, shall carry at her stern a white light, so constructed that it shall show an unbroken light over an arc of the horizon of 12 points of the compass, so fixed as to show the light 6 points from right aft on each side of the vessel, and of such a character as to be visible at a distance of at least 2 miles. Such light shall be carried as nearly as practicable on the same level as the side lights.

"(b) In a small vessel, if it is not possible on account of bad weather or other sufficient cause for this light to be fixed, an electric torch or a lighted lantern shall be kept at hand ready for use and shall, on the approach of an overtaking vessel, be shown in sufficient time to prevent collision."

EQUITABLE TREATMENT FOR PRODUCERS PARTICIPATING IN THE SOIL BANK PROGRAM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2937) to provide equitable treatment for producers participating in the Soil Bank program on the basis of incorrect information furnished by the Government, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Soil Bank Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"COMPENSATION FOR INCORRECT INFORMATION FURNISHED UNDER 1956 PROGRAM

"SEC. 127. In any case under the 1956 program in which a producer, in reliance, in good faith, on incorrect or incomplete information furnished to him by an authorized representative of the Secretary, entered into an acreage reserve or conservation reserve contract, or took action with the intention of entering into such a contract, and the producer is not entitled to receive under the provisions of the program the payment which was stipulated in the contract, or which would have been stipulated if a contract had been entered into the Secretary is hereby authorized, whenever he deems it desirable in order to provide fair and equitable treatment to such a producer, to compensate such producer for any loss suffered by him as a result of action taken for the purpose of participating in the program."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the bill has received the unanimous approval of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It also has received the approval of the Department of Agriculture, which suggested some technical improvements which would be adopted by the committee amendment. The bill simply authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to compensate producers for hardships suffered under the 1956 Soil

Bank program as a result of incorrect information furnished by county committees. The 1956 program was put into effect hurriedly, after the Agricultural Act of 1956 was approved; and a number of mistakes occurred. In some cases the producer was given incorrect information as to the size of his allotment. In others, the Department's measurement of his acreage turned out to be incorrect. Examples of the types of mistakes covered are set out on pages 1, 2, and 3 of the committee report. These mistakes were not the farmers' mistakes, and the farmers should not be required to suffer for them.

The committee amendment, which was suggested by the Department of Agriculture, makes no change in substance in the bill, but was suggested by the Department and adopted by the committee as a clearer statement of the provisions of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HUNGRY HORSE DAM, MONT.

The bill (S. 847) to amend the act of June 5, 1944, relating to the construction, operation, and maintenance of Hungry Horse Dam, Mont., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to clarify the status of the Hungry Horse project, Montana, section 1 of the act of June 5, 1944 (58 Stat. 270, 43 U. S. C. 593a), is hereby amended by adding to it a new sentence reading as follows:

"The Hungry Horse project shall be subject to the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto)."

COMPACTS BETWEEN STATES OF NEBRASKA, WYOMING, AND SOUTH DAKOTA

The bill (S. 2557) to amend the act granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation of certain compacts by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and South Dakota, in order to extend the time for such negotiations, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and South Dakota of certain compacts with respect to the use of waters common to two or more of said States," approved August 5, 1953 (67 Stat. 365), is amended by striking out "5 years" and inserting in lieu thereof "8 years."

TRANSFER TO THE GOVERNMENT OF PROPERTY IN PHOENIX, ARIZ.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2813) to provide for certain credits to the Salt River Valley Water

Users Association and the Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District in consideration of the transfer to the Government of property in Phoenix, Ariz., which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "Arizona", to insert "as evidenced by an acceptable abstract of title, certificate of title, or title guaranty policy"; on page 2, line 2, after the word "building", to insert "that the Attorney General of the United States has rendered a written opinion in favor of the validity of the title"; in line 5, after the word "accepted", to strike out "the tender" and insert "a warranty deed, in form approved by the Attorney General and with documentary stamps thereto attached in amounts required by law, conveying the unencumbered fee simple title to the properties therein described to the United States of America,"; and in line 19, after the word "District", to strike out the comma and "or so much of said amount as is not paid in cash or other valuable considerations" and insert a colon and "Provided, That if said amount is in excess of said obligations, the difference may be paid in cash or other valuable considerations."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon certification by the Administrator of the General Services Administration to the Secretary of the Interior that the Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District has tendered to the United States marketable title to certain properties in the city of Phoenix, Ariz., as evidenced by an acceptable abstract of title, certificate of title, or title guaranty policy now owned by it which are necessary for, or reasonably useful in connection with, a new Federal courthouse and office building, that the Attorney General of the United States has rendered a written opinion in favor of the validity of the title and that the Administrator, acting on behalf of the United States, has accepted a warranty deed, in form approved by the Attorney General and with documentary stamps thereto attached in amounts required by law, conveying the unencumbered fee simple title to the properties therein described to the United States of America, the Secretary shall credit toward repayment of such of the obligations assumed by the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association and the Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District under the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) as he finds proper an amount equal to the value of the properties transferred, as determined by an appraisal satisfactory to the Administrator, the Secretary, and the Salt River project agricultural improvement and power district: *Provided,* That if said amount is in excess of said obligations, the difference may be paid in cash or other valuable considerations.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF CIVIL AVIATION

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 72) favoring Congressional recognition of the 20th anniversary of civil aviation under the Civil Aeronautics Act of

1938, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States, on this 20th anniversary of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, reaffirms its support of the policies set forth therein; and urges strict adherence to policies which will enable civil aviation to solve its present economic and technical problems and assure the public of the benefits of a strong air transport system and civil aviation industry.

The preamble was agreed to.

INCREASE IN EXPENDITURES FOR THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The resolution (S. Res. 272) authorizing an increase in expenditures for the Committee on Foreign Relations was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the 85th Congress, \$10,000, in addition to the amounts, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, approved August 2, 1946, and Senate Resolution 152, agreed to July 3, 1957.

PAYMENT OF GRATUITY TO ELEANOR N. GAGG

The resolution (S. Res. 275) to pay a gratuity to Eleanor N. Gagg was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Eleanor N. Gagg, widow of William H. Gagg, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 7½ months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF THE SENATE, IF NEEDED

The resolution (S. Res. 276) providing additional funds for the Official Reporters of the Senate was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate, to the Official Reporters of the Senate debates and proceedings, during the period March 1, 1958, to December 31, 1958, so much as may be necessary, not to exceed \$10,000, for the employment of additional office personnel.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS RELATING TO ACCEPTANCE OF STATUE OF MARIA L. SANFORD

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 71) to print the proceedings in connection with the acceptance of the statue of Maria L. Sanford, late of Minnesota, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the proceedings at the presentation, dedication, and acceptance of the statue of Maria L. Sanford, to be presented on November 12, 1958, by the State of Minnesota in the rotunda of the Capitol, together with appropriate illustra-

tions and other pertinent matter, shall be printed as a Senate document. The copy for such Senate document shall be prepared under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Sec. 2. There shall be printed 5,000 additional copies of such Senate document, which shall be bound in such style as the Joint Committee on Printing shall direct, and of which 100 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 1,900 copies shall be for the use of the Members of the Senate from the State of Minnesota, and 500 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 2,500 copies shall be for the use of the Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Minnesota.

REVISION OF FISH AND GAME LAWS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 532) to revise and modernize the fish and game laws of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Commissioners are authorized to restrict, prohibit, regulate, and control hunting and fishing and the taking, possession and sale of wild animals in the District: *Provided,* That nothing herein contained shall authorize the Commissioners to impose any requirement for a fishing license or fee of any nature whatsoever: *Provided further,* That nothing herein contained shall authorize the Commissioners to prohibit, restrict, regulate, or control the killing, capture, purchase, sale, or possession of migratory birds as defined in regulations issued pursuant to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of July 3, 1918, as amended (16 U. S. C. 703-711), and taken for scientific, propagating, or other purposes under permits issued by the Secretary of the Interior: *And provided further,* That nothing herein contained shall authorize the Commissioners to prohibit, restrict, regulate or control the sale or possession of wild animals taken legally in any State, Territory or possession of the United States or in any foreign country, or produced on a game farm, except as may be necessary to protect the public health or safety. As used in this section the term "wild animals" includes, without limitation, mammals, birds, fish, and reptiles not ordinarily domesticated.

Sec. 2. Authorized officers and employees of the Government of the United States or of the government of the District of Columbia are, for the purpose of enforcing the provisions of this act and the regulations promulgated by the Commissioners under the authority of this act, empowered, during business hours, to inspect any building or premises in or on which any business, trade, vocation or occupation requiring a license or permit is carried on, or any vehicle, boat, market box, market stall or cold-storage plant. No person shall refuse to permit any such inspection.

Sec. 3. (a) All rifles, shotguns, ammunition, bows, arrows, traps, seines, nets, boats, and other devices of every nature or description used by any person within the District of Columbia when engaged in killing, ensnaring, trapping, or capturing any wild bird, wild mammal, or fish contrary to this act or any regulation made pursuant to this act shall be seized by any police officer upon the arrest of such person on a charge of violating any provision of this act or any regulations made pursuant thereto, and be delivered to the Commissioners. If the person so arrested is acquitted, the property so seized shall be returned to the person in whose possession it was found. If the person so

arrested is convicted, the property so seized shall, in the discretion of the court, be forfeited to the District of Columbia, and be sold at public auction, the proceeds from such sale to be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia. If any item of such property is not purchased at such auction, it shall be disposed of in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioners.

(b) If any property seized under the authority of this section is subject to a lien which is established by intervention or otherwise to the satisfaction of the court as having been created without the lienor's having any notice that such property was to be used in connection with a violation of any provision of this act or any regulation made pursuant thereto, the court, upon the conviction of the accused, may order a sale of such property at public auction. The officer conducting such sale, after deducting proper fees and costs incident to the seizure, keeping, and sale of such property, shall pay all such liens according to their priorities, and such lien or liens shall be transferred from the property to the proceeds of the sale thereof.

SEC. 4. (a) Any person convicted of violating any provision of this act, or any regulation made pursuant to this act, shall be fined not more than \$300 or imprisoned not more than 90 days, or both.

(b) Prosecutions for violations of this act, or the regulations made pursuant thereto, shall be conducted in the name of the District of Columbia by the Corporation Counsel or any of his assistants.

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioners, respectively, are authorized to delegate any of the functions to be performed by them under the authority of this act.

(b) The Commissioners are authorized to make such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act: *Provided*, That any regulations issued pursuant to this act shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior insofar as they involve any areas or waters of the District of Columbia under his administrative jurisdiction.

(c) As used in this act the word "Commissioners" means the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent or agents, and the words "Secretary of the Interior" mean the Secretary of the Interior or his designated agent or agents.

SEC. 6. Nothing in this act or in any regulation promulgated by the Commissioners under the authority of this act shall in any way impair the existing authority of the Secretary of the Interior to control and manage fish and wildlife on the land and waters in the District of Columbia under his administrative jurisdiction.

SEC. 7. Section 902 of the act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1336), as amended (title 22, secs. 1607 and 1703, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 902. Penalties: Any person who shall violate any provision of the preceding section shall for each such offense be fined not more than \$300 or imprisoned not more than 90 days, or both."

SEC. 8. The following acts or parts of acts are repealed:

(a) Sections 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, and 903 of the act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1335, 1336), as amended (title 22, secs. 1601, 1602, 1604, 1605, 1606, and 1608, D. C. Code, 1951 edition);

(b) Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 of the act approved March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1012), as amended (title 22, secs. 1609-1620, D. C. Code, 1951 edition);

(c) Sections 1, 2, 3, and 5 of the act approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 808), as amended (title 22, secs. 1621-1624, D. C. Code, 1951 edition);

(d) Sections 1 through 3 of the act approved December 18, 1919 (41 Stat. 368; title 22, secs. 1625-1627, D. C. Code, 1951 edition); and

(e) Sections 1 through 4 of the act approved March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1379; title 22, sec. 1603, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

SEC. 9. This act shall take effect on the 180th day following the approval thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSPORTATION ON CANADIAN VESSELS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3100) to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska, or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment on page 2, line 7, to strike out "transportation" and insert "transportation, unless the Secretary of Commerce determines that United States flag service is available to provide such transportation", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, until June 30, 1959, notwithstanding the provisions of law of the United States restricting to vessels of the United States the transportation of passengers and merchandise directly or indirectly from any port in the United States to another port of the United States, passengers may be transported on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and passengers and merchandise may be transported on Canadian vessels between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation, unless the Secretary of Commerce determines that United States flag service is available to provide such transportation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 11086) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to wheat acreage history was announced as next in order.

MR. TALMADGE. Mr. President, this bill is not properly calendar business, and I ask that it go over.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PETRIFIED FOREST NATIONAL PARK, ARIZ.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Calendar No. 1381, Senate bill 2359, which earlier today was ordered placed at the foot of the calendar, will now be called.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2359) to authorize the establishment of the Petrified Forest National Park, in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes.

MR. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over. Perhaps it can be

brought up later in the day, by motion. The corresponding House bill has not yet arrived at the Senate.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will go over. That concludes the call of the calendar.

PROCUREMENT OF ARTICLES WITHIN THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE MUTUAL SECURITY ACT

During the consideration of S. 3243, relating to attendance by certain foreign students at the District of Columbia Teachers College,

MR. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, when the pending bill has been acted on, I shall address the Senate on another subject.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator from West Virginia that under the rule the Senate is now engaged in the call of the calendar. The call will be continued through to completion, with each Senator having the right to object or reserve the right to object, and to speak on a measure for 5 minutes, or to speak on any other subject for 5 minutes.

MR. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

MR. REVERCOMB. Do I understand correctly that Senators are permitted to seek recognition for 5 minutes in order to speak on any subject during the call of the calendar? I understand that to be the rule.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

MR. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

MR. REVERCOMB. I yield.

MR. CLARK. Mr. President, I hope our good friend, the Senator from West Virginia, will permit us to complete the call of the calendar before he speaks on an extraneous subject. The calendar is quite short today, and we have every expectation of completing its call within 10 or 15 minutes. There are several Senators on the floor who are interested in the call of the calendar. Recognizing the complete right of the Senator from West Virginia to speak on an extraneous matter, I hope he will let us conclude the call of the calendar before he speaks on such a matter.

MR. REVERCOMB. It is always my pleasure to comply with the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania. However, what I desire to say is very short and will not take more than a few minutes, and will not delay the Senate unduly. In that connection, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may be printed in the RECORD at the end of the call of the calendar.

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

MR. REVERCOMB. I desire to make a very brief statement on a subject which I consider to be very important at this time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, positive action is being taken on several fronts by both the administration and the Congress to speed economic recovery.

Another important step that would not require Congressional action would be for the President of the United States to invoke section 510 of the Mutual Security Act of 1957, as amended.

A large percentage of the commodities procured by the International Cooperation Administration under the mutual security program are being purchased abroad. In many instances, perhaps, they can be purchased cheaper in foreign countries. However, in view of the unemployment that exists in this country at the present time, it is my feeling that such purchases should be made in this country. Congress made specific provision for this course of action in adopting the Mutual Security Act of 1957. Section 510 of that act reads:

Funds made available under title 2 or chapter 3 of title 1 of this act may be used for the procurement of commodities outside the United States unless the President determines that such procurement will result in adverse effects upon the economy of the United States, with special reference to any areas of labor surplus, or upon the industrial mobilization base, which outweighs the economic advantages to the United States of less costly procurement abroad.

I point out that under this language the President is authorized to act, and if he determines "that such procurement will result in adverse effects upon the economy of the United States, with special reference to any areas of labor surplus," such purchases should be made in this country.

We are confronted with such a situation today. Because of present conditions, there is every justification, I feel, for invoking this provision. It is my understanding that purchases of commodities under the mutual security program are being made at the rate of more than \$1 billion a year. If the purchase of such materials were made in this country, many additional jobs would be provided.

The coal industry in my own State clearly illustrates the importance of such action. Coal production has declined substantially in recent months, and unemployment in many areas is becoming a serious problem. The situation facing the coal industry, the steel industry, and other American productions is such that, to my mind, it clearly justifies invoking section 510 of the Mutual Security Act.

It is my feeling that the commodities we need at this time should be purchased from our domestic producers. This is particularly important now when every sound step possible should be taken to speed an upturn in business activity. Surely such a step would be understood by other countries. We would continue to assist them with the aid provided under the Mutual Security Act for our joint strength and defense.

I have written a letter to the President of the United States, urging that this action be taken promptly. It is my hope that the President will invoke section 510 of the Mutual Security Act so that American industries may receive

the full benefit from this phase of the foreign aid program, and I have urged that this be done. Such action would be in keeping with the other steps which are being taken to check any recession in our economy.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of title 42, section 2251, United States Code, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Aspinall, of Colorado, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2042) to authorize the conveyance of a fee simple title to certain lands in the Territory of Alaska underlying war housing project Alaska-50083, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 8250) to authorize the establishment of the Petrified Forest National Park in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

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

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3420) to extend and amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOB-LITZELL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPANSION OF PUBLIC FACILITIES LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators SPARKMAN, HILL, MONRONEY, PROXMIER, COOPER, CLARK, LONG, YARBOROUGH, and SMATHERS, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to expand the public facility loan program of the Community Facilities Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk until the close of business tomorrow in order that any Senator desiring to add his name as a co-sponsor may be permitted to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

The bill (S. 3497) to expand the public facility loan program of the Community Facilities Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD a short statement explaining the bill.

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

PROPOSAL TO EXPAND EXISTING PUBLIC FACILITIES LOAN PROGRAM FOR LOCAL PUBLIC WORKS, BY BROADENING SCOPE AND LOWERING INTEREST RATE

BACKGROUND

To counteract the recession, Congress is acting to accelerate Federal public works. It is proposed also to accelerate local public works, not by PWA approach, but through expanding and liberalizing existing loan program, to take off the shelf existing backlog of projects. Federal projects are usually large-scale, relatively few. Even when planning is complete, there is a necessary delay for organization and assembly of money, men, material, and machines. Local projects exist in virtually every community. There is a huge backlog because of war, inflation, and tight money. Two hundred and sixty million dollars worth of such projects, for which Federal Government advanced planning funds, have plans completed and are ready for construction. Projects costing approximately \$366 million have received Federal planning advances, and plans are now under way. Another \$500 million is represented by applications pending for planning fund advances. These figures do not include projects launched without Federal planning advances, and which may be ready for financing.

EXISTING FEDERAL PROGRAM FOR ASSISTANCE TO PUBLIC WORKS PLANNING AND FINANCING

(Administered by Community Facilities Administration of HHFA, an existing operating unit, with offices and programs throughout United States.)

1. Planning: Interest-free advances to provide a shelf of local public works. Forty-eight million dollars authorized as of July 1, 1958. Seventeen million dollars appropriated to date. Advances repaid when projects begin.

2. Public facilities loans; loans to, and purchase of obligations of, States and local political subdivisions to finance projects.

DEFECTS OF PRESENT LOAN PROGRAM

1. Practically limited to communities of 5,000 and under for water and sewer systems.

2. Interest rates of 4½ percent on general obligation bonds, 4½ percent revenue bonds, 30-year maturity, make loans attractive only to communities with worst credit ratings.

3. Only \$100 million authorization.

HIGHLIGHTS OF PROPOSED LOAN PROGRAM

1. Expand project eligibility: Construction repair, and improvement of public streets, sidewalks, highways, parkways, bridges, parking lots, airports, and other transportation facilities; public parks and other public recreational facilities; public hospitals; rehabilitation and health centers; public refuse and garbage disposal facilities; water, sewage, and sanitary facilities, and other public utility facilities; public police and fire protection facilities; public schools, libraries, offices, and other public buildings; and public land, water, and timber conservation facilities.

2. Set interest rate at maximum of one-fourth of 1 percent above average rate on all Government debt. (Results in present rate of 3 percent, same as college housing loans.) Compare sample recent private rates of:

	Percent
Top grade (Concord, N. H.)-----	2.80
AA (Memphis, Tenn.)-----	3.00
A (New York, N. Y., and Fort Smith, Ark.)-----	3.20
BAA (Hot Springs, Ark.)-----	3.85

Three percent rate for this program would tend to bring down interest rates, specifically for this type financing and generally throughout economy.

3. Increase authorization from \$100 million to \$2 billion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, both the Congress and the administration are taking action to accelerate Federal public works programs.

On March 12, under the leadership of the Senator from Texas, the majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senate passed a resolution declaring it to be the sense of the Congress that construction programs for which funds have been appropriated should be accelerated to the greatest practicable extent, to promote economic recovery. However, little, if anything, has been done to accelerate local public works.

I do not think it is necessary, for purposes of this statement, to argue the nature and extent of the recession which our economy is now undergoing. It seems to be generally acknowledged that the Federal Government should act to counteract the recession. The only argument seems to be as to the nature and timing of the steps which the Government must take.

Over a month ago the New York Times summarized the views of Prof. Arthur F. Burns, former Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, as follows:

Professor Burns believes that the recession which began after the peak in July and August 1957 will continue at least for some weeks or months. The contraction will not be ended by a revival of business investment, of export demand, or any other economic development but only by "massive" Government intervention.

The Joint Economic Committee on February 27 called for expanded programs for Federal and local public works to stimulate economic activity and to contribute to long-run growth.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has proposed a bill, S. 3231, to create a Public Works Administration, which would make grants in the ratio of 90 percent Federal money to 10 percent State or local funds for local public works.

On March 9, in a letter to the minority leaders of the Congress, the President expressed his concern over the PWA approach. If I correctly understand the position of the majority leader on this issue, he proposes that the Senate decide whether or not to establish a Public Works Administration on a standby basis, or, as he puts it on March 12, "to engage in long-term planning and to be ready to go in the event a large scale public works program becomes essential." I think this is a wise precaution under the present circum-

stances. I do not think it is desirable that a Public Works Administration be put into actual operation at the present time. However, we are not limited to the alternatives of a PWA, on the one hand, or nothing on the other.

What I propose here is a more moderate and intermediate approach to accelerate local public-works projects.

While large scale Federal public works programs, such as the development of rivers and harbors, flood-control projects, highways, and Federal buildings, make great contributions to our economic well-being, so also can State and local projects such as public streets, sidewalks, roads, bridges, waterworks, parking lots, recreational facilities, hospital, sewer systems, fire-protection facilities, schools, libraries, and so on. Undoubtedly, as a result of war, inflation, and credit restraints, there is a great backlog of need for these facilities.

As desirable as large scale Federal public works are—and I, of course, think that they are—and even though planning may be complete, I question whether they can have as immediate an effect as many smaller local public projects such as those I have described. Large-scale works require time for the assembly of large numbers of professional, managerial, and working people, large amounts of material and money, transportation facilities, and equipment. Many smaller projects can be put into operation immediately, with smaller problems of organization, if financing is ready. Because of the greater number of them, however, they can have a great revivifying effect upon the total economy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am very much interested in the Senator's excellent proposal. I shall do all I can to see that it receives consideration by the Senate at the earliest possible date.

I have two questions I wish to ask the Senator from Arkansas. First, does he have any indication of how many—and in what dollar amount—applications are pending in cases in which plans have already been made and the projects could be put into operation immediately?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Five hundred and five plans have been approved, with a projected cost of more than \$666 million. There are under review 144 applications, which involve another \$513 million. Of course, every one of them will not be approved, but those 2 categories would total \$1,180,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. What the Senator is saying is that if the authority he seeks in his bill should be granted, we could expect, from applications already on file, more than \$1 billion worth of applications would have to be considered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, there would be more than \$1 billion worth. I may say many others made plans without having borrowed money from this particular program, which are also ready to establish their eligibility for loans.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, the Federal Government has authorized appropriations of \$48 million for advances to State and local governments for planning purposes. Is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The authorization, under Public Law 354, 84th Congress, was \$48 million.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And only \$17 million of that authorization has been appropriated. Is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. But under the \$17 million which have been appropriated there has been submitted to the Federal agency, the agency already in existence, in excess of \$1 billion worth of projects for which plans have already been made or are ready to be made. Is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Congress, in its wisdom, should appropriate the difference between what has been appropriated and what it has authorized, namely, the difference between \$17 million and \$48 million, or \$31 million, then we could expect substantial applications as a result, could we not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For planning, that is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I assume the Senator will urge upon the Congress that it advance money at the earliest practical date, in the first appropriation bill, to provide advance planning money, so that it can be loaned to the cities and the political divisions desiring it?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. I shall come to that point later in my remarks.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Has the Senator introduced a bill which would prescribe a certain limit on the funds which will be loaned?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have just introduced the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How much lending authority is provided?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Two billion dollars.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. When does the Senator expect to have hearings on the bill?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We have just cleared with the ranking minority member of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], arrangements to have the first hearing on Wednesday afternoon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand the Senator contemplates that all these funds will be handled under an existing agency. Is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The existing agency is a constituent unit of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. It is called the Community Facilities Administration. It has been engaged in these types of planning and lending functions for some years now. As a matter of fact, this was a continuation, in a sense, of an activity which used to exist under the RFC, which was of great help to small communities.

By law and administrative action I may say, it has been restricted to the very small communities, partly because it was felt such communities were the

ones needing it the most and there was no need for expanding the program.

The whole planning activity was intended to make ready plans for exactly such an emergency or contingency as that with which we are now faced because of which there is the need to step up public works.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, there is no grant involved in the Senator's proposal, but it is all on a loan basis?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This is a loan program. The bill proposes to make the funds available under the same interest-rate formula we used in the college-housing program.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. What about the interest rate?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is the formula to which I refer. The interest rate is arrived at under the formula of the college-housing program, which we debated at great length last year. That is a formula which we believe does not cost the Government anything.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I remember, we had a yea and nay vote on that matter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the proposal provide that the borrower shall pay the Federal Government the going interest rate, plus one-quarter of 1 percent?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is the average interest rate of all the outstanding Government obligations, plus one-quarter of 1 percent for administrative costs. That is, stated very briefly, the formula.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I congratulate the Senator for his vision and his foresight. I think he has presented a very constructive proposal. I hope the committee will hold hearings at the earliest possible date and that the hearings will be thorough and conclusive. I look forward to the time when the Senator will report the bill from his committee, by a bipartisan vote, for consideration by the entire membership of the Senate.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will yield in a moment.

I thank the majority leader for his remarks. I might say that I do not think I deserve all the credit. I believe this is a good example of the foresight of the Congress in passing the law in the 84th Congress which continued this planning activity. All the bill which I have introduced seeks to do is, so to speak, to carry the program on through to its logical conclusion and to put into effect what the previous bill anticipated, and for which I think it very wisely made provision.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am willing to have the Senator from Arkansas share the credit with the entire Congress. I wish to congratulate him for taking the initiative, for making a very able speech, and for submitting the proposal as well as fixing a date for hearings on it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the Senator's remarks.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am happy the Senator has taken that action.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to point out that this is an example of what I call foresight on the part of the Congress, in looking down the line ahead to anticipate the day when we could use the plans, encouraging communities to make them, and supplying a small amount of money to help them do so.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. The proposed legislation the Senator from Arkansas is discussing, for which he would now have the Congress authorize up to \$2 billion in loans, was introduced by the late Senator Maybank and the Senator from Indiana. The purpose at the time was to provide loans of money to communities affected by Government action. The Government was building Army camps or atomic energy plants, and of course the communities did not have sufficient funds to pay immediately the necessary costs, as a result of the heavy load thrown upon them.

If I remember correctly, the program really started because of an atomic energy plant being constructed in South Carolina, in connection with which the Government took over thousands and thousands of acres and made it necessary to move a number of cities and towns. When the towns moved, of course, they did not have sufficient money to build the community facilities, so we passed the law which provided that the Federal Government loan them money.

The law has been in effect for some time. As I say, that legislation was introduced by me and the late Senator Maybank, when the late Senator Maybank was chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

However, I want to invite the attention of Senators to the fact that we are now talking in terms of \$2 billion of Federal money to be used for the purpose of stopping a recession which in my best judgment has already spent its course. If we will exercise just a little patience and give the things which the Congress and the President have started, time to work, we will—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not believe I care to yield to the Senator so that he may expound upon that subject. I wish to finish my statement, and then the Senator can criticize it in any way he desires.

Mr. CAPEHART. I appreciate the feelings of the able Senator. I should like to say one thing before I sit down. I am afraid there is going to be an opportunity for large sales of liniment for backs, because Senators on the other side of the aisle are bowing to each other and congratulating each other on new theories.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator may expound further upon that subject. I do not care to yield at this time for that purpose.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator never cares to yield when he is being hurt.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not care to yield for that purpose.

I should like to say that the able Senator from Indiana has expressed his views before on the state of our economy.

Mr. CAPEHART. I notice that the Senators on the other side are making very, very deep bows.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The record as to the origin of this kind of legislation is also quite clear.

Mr. President, the Federal Government for many years has had programs to assist State and local governments and their political subdivisions in the planning and financing of such facilities. Various Government agencies in the past have participated in this responsibility. Some of the loan programs which were formerly administered by the RFC have been continued, along with other programs of other agencies, in the Community Facilities Administration, a constituent unit of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. This Administration is existing, active, and operating, with offices and programs throughout the United States. We do not need a new agency to facilitate local public works. Among the programs it administers are:

First. Advances for public works planning: A program of interest-free advances to provide a shelf of planned public works which might be placed under construction quickly should the economic situation make such action desirable.

Second. Public facility loans: A program to provide loans or to purchase the securities and obligations of States and their local political subdivisions and instrumentalities and public agencies, corporations, and commissions established under State laws to finance specific public projects.

The bill I am proposing has as its purpose to take off the shelf this backlog of planned public works, and through the public-facility-loan program put them under construction. Of course, it would also enable the construction of many projects planned without Federal advances, and others which have not yet been planned. Undoubtedly, there are many of these programs which also have been on the shelf because of credit restrictions or for other reasons, but which are vitally needed.

The public facility loan program, as I have said, has been in operation for a number of years. However, a system of priorities has been established which, in fact, has limited its usefulness. It has been useful recently only to the smallest communities with the worst credit ratings, and for only a few kinds of projects. The interest presently charged is $4\frac{1}{8}$ percent for 30-year general obligation bonds and 4 percent for 30-year revenue bonds. These rates may be compared with the following sample interest rates on municipal bonds of recent date. Top grade—Concord, N. H., 2.8 percent; AA—Memphis, Tenn., 3 percent; A—New York City and Fort Smith, Ark., 3.2 percent; and BAA—Hot Springs, Ark., 3.85 percent. Other recent bond issues of municipalities have sold at various rates. For example, a recent rate paid by Little Rock, Ark., was 3.03 percent,

and Quitman, Ark., a very small town, 4.5 percent. These rates are for general obligation bonds. Revenue bonds usually require interest rates of approximately one-fourth of 1 percent higher.

A comparison of these sample rates with those charged under the present public facility loan program will illustrate why the latter program is of limited use under its present interest rate requirements.

The bill I am introducing would apply the interest rate formula under the college housing loan program to the public facility loan program, resulting in a maximum applicable rate at present of 3 percent. I believe this would be of substantial help to many municipalities, and it would also tend to bring down interest rates, specifically for these types of securities, and generally throughout the economy.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator will recall that some years ago—in 1955, to be exact—the junior Senator from Louisiana, along with other Senators, was urging that we should revive this program, whereby loans would be made available to the small communities. Such a provision was subsequently incorporated as an amendment in the housing bill which was passed that year.

The limitations which caused this program to be available primarily to small cities were placed in the legislation because that was about the only thing we could hope to get at that time.

I believe the Senator will recall that the RFC had been abolished, and many people were contending that the Government should not lend money if the money could be found elsewhere.

Many of us pointed out at that time that many small cities simply could not obtain loans. Therefore we established a \$100 million revolving fund, and made that fund available to the small communities, which in many instances were unable to obtain credit.

As I understand, what the Senator is proposing is that this program should be made available today more broadly, and that those limitations should be removed. I agree that that is a good proposal, so long as we have available enough funds to enable more people to be cared for. As I understand, the Senator states that such would be the result. Funds would be available not only for the small cities, but for the larger ones as well.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Louisiana is quite correct.

I compliment him for the part he played in keeping this program alive in the instance to which he refers. He has always shown a great interest in helping communities in this fashion, and he has always had a very great and effective interest in keeping the interest rate as low as possible.

I believe the proposed interest rate is fair. At least, in my view, it does not involve any subsidy on the part of the Government. It takes into consideration the average cost of all Federal bor-

rowings, and adds one-quarter of 1 percent for administrative costs. So I think it reimburses the Government for its out-of-pocket costs.

The Senator from Louisiana is quite correct in that the program takes into consideration the plans which have been made, and any other plans local communities have, and makes available money at reasonable cost.

I congratulate the Senator on his foresight in 1955, in foreseeing that this program would become very useful in the future.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator from Arkansas. I wish to join him in sponsoring the bill. I am sure it would be a very substantial advantage to our economy if it were enacted at this time. In the event this program is undertaken as an emergency measure, I hope it will not inadvertently lead to a discontinuation of the earlier program, which I believe should be continued in good times and bad. We should see that smaller communities always have available to them some agency to which they can go if credit is not otherwise available for essential sanitary facilities and things of that kind.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator. I invite attention to the fact that under the terms of the bill even the small communities now taking advantage of the law would get a lower interest rate.

Mr. LONG. That is extremely desirable.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am most intrigued by the proposal being explained by the Senator from Arkansas. I should like to make several inquiries as to the particulars of the program.

Is there any limit as to the population or assessed valuation of a community which may be eligible under the proposed program?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is no limitation in the bill. If the Senator is referring to local limitations, under which many cities are placed by State law, I do not know about that situation. But there is no limitation in the bill.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In other words, my home community of Portland, Oreg., with a population of 420,000 to 430,000, would be eligible to seek loans under the terms of the bill?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to ask about one particular type of program which is of a special interest and urgency to my State. We are distressingly far behind in the cleaning up of stream pollution, and providing sanitary districts to take care of sewage. This is of particular significance in Oregon, where we have such valuable migratory fish runs, which have been imperiled and jeopardized because rivers are full of sewage and chemical wastes of one kind or another. I should like to ask the Senator—although I think I can anticipate what his reply will be—whether or not the loans he has in mind would be available for projects to clean up rivers, and to help dispose of sewage.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is my belief that they would. There is this language in the bill: "and public land, water, and timber conservation facilities."

In the existing program sewage and water facilities have been two of the most eligible types of projects.

Mr. NEUBERGER. And most useful.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And most useful. I certainly think the kind of program mentioned by the Senator would be eligible under the terms of the bill.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator.

I do not know whether the Senator from Arkansas welcomes cosponsors. If he does, I shall be glad to join as a cosponsor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I announced before the Senator entered the Chamber that I would welcome cosponsors. The bill will remain on the desk until tomorrow for the purpose of adding the names of additional cosponsors.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I would feel privileged to be listed as a cosponsor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The point which I think is particularly important is that these programs, large and small, many of which have already been planned, could be put into operation sooner than many comparable public-works activities. I favor the construction of dams in the Senator's State and in other States as soon as possible. However, it is quite obvious that many small projects could get under way much more quickly than the larger ones.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator has a valid point.

Only a few weeks ago I was visited by Paul C. Northrop, roadmaster in Multnomah County, Oreg., in which Portland is located. He pointed out that an effort is being made to mobilize a tri-county sanitary district to take care of suburbs which are spread out from Portland, where sewage conditions are very deplorable because the population has grown so much faster than have the necessary plants to dispose of the waste. He emphasized how useful it would be if there were some Federal agency which could provide loans for this purpose at a relatively low rate of interest, so that the carrying charge would not be unbearable from the standpoint of the taxpayers.

The Senator has a very cogent point, and I am pleased to be a cosponsor of his bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator for his contribution. The formula for the interest rate in the bill is arrived at by adding one-fourth of 1 percent to the average interest rate on all Government obligations at the end of the month preceding the borrowing. Thus, the borrower would be charged an interest rate on the basis of the cost of Government borrowings, plus one-fourth of 1 percent for administrative expenses.

The bill would also increase the amount available to the Community Facilities Administration from \$100 million to \$2 billion. It would direct the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Community Facilities Administration to assist in the immediate construction of essential public works and public facilities which would enhance the health

and welfare of the public of the United States and would reduce unemployment and stimulate business activity. The loans made under the amended statute could run for as long as 50 years, and, in some instances, up to 55 years.

Another provision of the bill would authorize the postponement of the principal repayments up to 5 years, or postponement of all payments of principal and interest up to 5 years; but, if interest were so postponed, it would be added to the interest due over the balance of the life of the loan.

The status on the advanced planning program of the Community Facilities Administration is indicated by the following table. The table also indicates the immediate impact this bill could have by providing financing for the backlog, or shelf, of projects which have received advance planning grants and are ready for construction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table, showing the figures I discussed a moment ago with the majority leader, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Program of advances for public works planning—Status as of Feb. 28, 1958

	<i>Million</i>		
Total authorization, Public Law 345, 84th Cong.			\$48
Authorization available as of July 1, 1957 (additional \$14 million available July 1, 1958)			34
Actual appropriation to date			17

	Number	Planning funds	Estimated project cost
Applications approved (net)	505	\$11,492,504	\$666,523,727
Applications under review	144	5,773,674	513,980,974
Total		17,266,178	1,180,504,701
Plans completed	263	4,336,275	290,618,857
Advances repaid	40	701,690	40,013,911

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This table shows that first, projects costing approximately \$260 million are already planned and ready for construction; second, projects costing approximately \$366 million have received Federal planning advances and planning has started; and, third, projects costing over \$500 million are being reviewed for advances of Federal planning funds. This table does not account for local projects which have been launched without Federal help but which may be in need of favorable financing.

This table also reveals that appropriations for planning advances are inadequate to permit approval of applications now on hand. There are only \$17 million available, and approval of pending applications would require \$17,266,178—thus appropriated funds are practically exhausted as of March 1, 1958. I am advised that the President has requested \$8.5 million in planning funds for fiscal year 1959, but that no money for this purpose is contained in the 1958 second supplemental appropriation bill. I urge the Senate conferees on this bill to take note of this situation and to do whatever may be possible toward including additional planning funds in the second supplemental bill. If this is not possible, then such funds should certainly be provided as soon as possible.

I call attention to the fact that the authorization for such funds is already in existence.

On February 19 of this year, Chairman Martin, of the Federal Reserve Board, was asked the following question:

Last year you will recall there were many—I do not recall whether you were one or not—who said that Federal, State, and local public works should be postponed to prevent adding to inflation. I wonder if you would agree that at this time there is no further need to keep the brakes on Federal, State, and local public works in view of the substantial decrease in spending in the private sector of the economy?

He replied as follows:

I would agree with that. I would say that there ought not to be at this juncture created works just for the sake of creating employment. They should be items that are needed and necessary and going to contribute something. They should not be just strawmen.

I agree with this view, and this bill is designed to accelerate necessary public works projects at the State and local levels. Many of these projects are already planned, and the Federal agency machinery is already established. By providing additional funds, at lower rates of interest, to launch these projects, the Federal Government can make a quick and fruitful investment in the general health and welfare of the Nation.

Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

SUMMARY OF A BILL ENTITLED "THE COMMUNITY FACILITIES ACT OF 1958"

The Community Facilities Act of 1958 provides that a \$2 billion revolving fund, from which the Community Facilities Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency can make loans to States, or to cities, counties, and other State agencies, for the immediate construction of essential public works and public facilities.

This would be an expansion of an existing \$100 million revolving fund now being administered by the Community Facilities Administration.

The bill's declaration of policy states that the immediate construction of essential public works and public facilities by States and State agencies would enhance the health and welfare of the people of the United States and would reduce unemployment and stimulate business activity.

Loans could be made directly or in cooperation or participation with other lending agencies. Loans could not be made for operating expenses of the agency or project, nor could they be made if credit were otherwise available on equally favorable terms and conditions. Loans must be of such sound value or so secured as reasonably to assure repayment. Loans may run for up to 50 years. However, up to 5 annual installments of principal and interest may be deferred, and in such a case the maturity may run up to 55 years. The loan agreement may also provide, if the borrower wishes, for postponement of payments of principal or interest or both for up to 5 years. This would not reduce the total of principal and interest to be repaid.

The \$2 billion revolving fund may be borrowed from the Treasury, and interest must be paid to the Treasury at not more than the average annual interest rate on interest bearing Government obligations, at the end of the preceding month, adjusted to the

nearest one-eighth of 1 percent. The borrowers may be charged interest at not more than one-fourth of 1 percent over the rate paid to the Treasury. The interest charged the borrower, within these limits, is to be based on the need to promote the public works and facilities and stimulate business activity and employment.

The terms public works and public facilities are broadly defined. The following are included within the terms: construction, repair, and improvement of public streets, sidewalks, highways, parkways, bridges, parking lots, airports, and other transportation facilities; public parks and other public recreational facilities; public hospitals; rehabilitation and health centers; public refuse and garbage disposal facilities, water, sewage, and sanitary facilities, and other public utility facilities; public police and fire protection facilities; public schools, libraries, offices, and other public buildings; and public land, water, and timber conservation facilities.

**NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 3497—
COMMITTEE MEETING DURING
SESSION OF SENATE ON WEDNESDAY**

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I announce, for the information of all Senators, and the public, that on Wednesday afternoon the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold a hearing on Senate bill 3497, to expand the public facility loan program, and that we shall invite representatives of the Community Facilities Administration to present information on the proposed legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, while the minority leader is on the floor, did I understand the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency to say that he expected his committee to meet on Wednesday afternoon?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I made that announcement a moment ago. I had conferred with the ranking minority member of the committee, and it was agreeable to him. He so stated while he was on the floor a moment ago. He is agreeable to having the committee meet on Wednesday afternoon. I did not have a chance to speak to the minority leader or to the majority leader with respect to obtaining permission to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, if there is a session on that day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object in this instance—as a general rule, I believe it is preferable to obtain permission for such a meeting each day. However, in view of the statement just made, I shall not object on this occasion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am not sure that we will have a session on Wednesday. The Senator from Texas would like to say that it is not appropriate to ask for such unanimous consent at any time, but believes it is proper to make such a request at any time after the matter has been cleared

by both sides, so that the committee may make its plans, except, of course, in the event a minority member of the committee has objected, or the chairman of the committee does not desire to call such a hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

EXPANSION OF PUBLIC FACILITIES LOAN PROGRAM

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I have joined the Senator from Arkansas in the introduction of the bill. I should like to state briefly my reasons. I agree wholeheartedly with the statement made by the senior Senator from Indiana. I have no doubt myself that in time—I do not know how long, but I believe within a reasonable time—the strong forces which are latent in our economy will assert themselves and that we will move on to new advances.

It cannot be denied that during the last 5 years new confidence in the economy of this country has been established. This is true because the administration has brought into balance expenditures and income, and for that reason enabled a tax cut which, while criticized at the time, has stimulated an investment, unparalleled in our history.

Within that ground, it should be realized that much that has been said during the last 3 weeks, while it expresses a proper regard for those who are out of work, and our desire they be put at work, an objective which all of us with human spirit should support, it does not take into account the real strength of the country. I have no doubt myself that the administration has taken steps—and other steps will be taken as needed—which have started the remarkable economic advance that we have had in the country in the last 5 years.

A few days ago some of us on this side of the aisle joined in a statement advocating antirecession steps. It might not have been interpreted correctly. We advocated that any programs which were in existence under existing governmental agencies and for which funds were available, and which could be immediately put into action, should be accelerated as started by us. We named the housing bill, highway construction, the allocation of contracts, and several other items. We did not exempt one need, even if it involved new expenditures. We urged that the Federal Government, as a matter of humanity, appropriate money to maintain unemployment insurance for those whose insurance had been exhausted. This was a matter to which the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] addressed himself last week.

I join the Senator from Arkansas on his bill for another reason. I believe the distinguished Senator would agree that his bill would not, if enacted, have any immediate effect on employment. Other expenditures such as housing, highway construction, and defense expenditures can have immediate effect, but the pro-

posal under consideration is a long-range matter. I like it for several reasons. First, it does use an existing program operated by an existing agency, the HHFA. Second, it does not call for grants to communities, it places assistance upon the basis of loans, which are repayable with interest. It could have, possibly, an effect upon the debt limit, but I assume that that matter would be adjusted to the needs and to the fund. I know of some communities in my State, such as Newport, Covington, Bellevue, and other cities, which wish to make sewage improvements. Some cannot do so, because the fund at the present time is limited to, I believe, cities of 5,000 or 10,000 population.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is 5,000, I think, under administrative ruling.

Mr. COOPER. That is an illogical limit, it seems to me.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That has been the administrative practice. The law provides for 10,000, but it has been kept to 5,000, under the conditions which have existed.

Mr. COOPER. There are improvements like sewage facilities which affect the health of the community. There are other improvements, as streets, that are necessary. I assume when the bill comes out of committee there will be a provision in it with respect to the size of the community. I believe that some of the larger cities, can take care of their needs.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to observe at this point that some of the larger cities have credit ratings which enable them to get money slightly cheaper than the bill would provide.

Mr. COOPER. I close by saying that I would not at this time support a public-works bill such as I have been reading about, based upon a WPA pattern, or one which makes full grants to cities.

As I understand the proposal, it is based upon the use of an existing agency, the HHFA, which would make loans to communities. If the committee placed some limits upon the size of the community in which the funds could be available, or some means of taking into account the taxing resources of the city, and its ability to finance improvements, it would be a good bill.

I can see that it might have inflationary tendencies, and that would be the possibility of exceeding the debt limit. But if managed properly the benefits could far exceed these possibilities.

There is another reason why the bill interests me. Ever since I have been in the Senate on various occasions I have been a sponsor, or a cosponsor, of education bills. A few weeks ago much was said in the Senate about the defense of the Nation. Not much has been heard about it lately. As an element of defense, we were concerned about education in the Nation. We know the problems which make it difficult to secure passage of school-construction bills. I favor Federal-aid programs for school construction and teachers, a program which over the next 10 years would improve the educational facilities of the Nation so that they might meet the needs of the country. But we know the difficulties which are involved in getting this legislation passed.

The bill would provide a method by which towns and communities themselves could borrow money and construct such facilities.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall listen with an open mind in the hearings. At the moment, I am not too certain that I favor the bill as it is written. I shall offer an amendment to the bill or a substitute if it is proposed to do what the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and other Senators suggest should be done concerning Government guaranties of private loans, as the Government now guarantees FHA loans. My amendment would require that the interest rate be the prevailing interest rate, rather than to subsidize the different agencies which are piling up, day by day, through various proposals, literally billions and billions of dollars of debt, which, if the money should be spent, would cause the debt to go through the ceiling.

I do not think anyone is giving any thought to the solvency of the Nation. If it is necessary to do what is being talked about, I think it ought to be done on the basis of the prevailing interest rate, with the Government doing nothing more or less than guaranteeing the payment, as it does for FHA loans. The communities and cities which use the service should pay a fee, just as do the home builders of America. Let the Federal Government guarantee or insure the loans.

Mr. President, I serve notice that I shall offer such an amendment as a substitute for this kind of bill. I do not think the Nation can afford to be thrown further into debt. I do not see any reason in the world why, if this is a good, sound project—and there are many such—the regular, prevailing interest rate should not be paid. Why permit one city to get the benefit of a very low interest rate, while its neighbor, perhaps 10 or 20 miles away, is financing projects by itself and paying the going rate of interest?

I serve warning that I shall offer a substitute to the bill on that basis, if it seems to me that it is needed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania will state it.

Mr. CLARK. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] yielded to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CLARK. My understanding was that the Senator from Arkansas had the floor. Did he yield it? I wanted him to yield to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas yielded to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yielded under a unanimous-consent agreement that the Senator from Kentucky might speak briefly without my losing the floor.

Mr. COOPER. I had asked unanimous consent that the Senator from Arkansas might yield to me for a few minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I rise to the point of order that the Senator from Arkansas has no right to yield the floor for any purpose whatsoever, except to sit down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Last week the subject of unemployment insurance was discussed at length. I said then that the fund contained about \$8 billion.

On last November 30, the unemployment reserve fund was \$9,190,000,000. From December 1, 1957, through February 28, 1958, which was 90 days, or 3 months, \$553 million was expended from the funds by all 48 States of the Union and Alaska, leaving in the fund \$8,600,000,000.

I hope the press will circulate those figures widely, because that information ought to give confidence to the people who are unemployed and all the other people of the Nation that the unemployment-insurance reserve fund at the moment, which is the fund from which the States can call upon the Federal Government for assistance, was \$8,600,000,000 as of March 1.

I call attention to the fact that, despite the recession, only \$553 million of the \$9,190,000,000 was used during the past 90 days, or the 90 days prior to March 1. That is a little more than 6 percent in 3 months.

This means that if unemployment-insurance benefits are continued on that basis for the next 12 months, the amount used would be a little more than \$2 billion from the reserve fund which on November 30, 1957, contained more than \$9 billion.

That, I think, should be good news to the people. It is good news to the people. I think the time has arrived when Senators, Representatives, and reliable public officials should start to tell the people of the United States about the soundness of this reserve fund.

I think the soundness of the economy can be demonstrated by, for example, the news that retail sales in Washington last month were up 7 percent over a year ago. We ourselves ought to show some confidence in the strength of the economy. I liked the statement which the majority leader made this morning, when he said that he was more optimistic than he has been in a long while.

I do not mean to say that the things which Congress and the President have been doing are not good. I think they are. I think that accelerated public spending for certain projects is very much worthwhile, especially for projects for which it was intended to spend the money anyway. I simply say that the time has arrived when, in my opinion, we ought to stand still for a little while on these things, in order to show some confidence and faith in the economy, because the economy is sound.

Just as a man can be talked into being sick, so a nation can be talked into a depression. Let me quote what Mr. Truman said during the 1949-50 depression:

A certain amount of unemployment, say, from three to five million, is supportable. It is a good thing that jobseeking should go on

at all times. This is healthy for the economic body.

That was on February 15, 1950.

In January 1950, 5,063,000 Americans were out of employment. At the end of February of this year, approximately 5,100,000 Americans were out of employment—for all practical purposes, exactly the same number as the number unemployed in January 1950, when President Truman said that although that was not a healthy situation, the Nation could stand anywhere from 3 million to 5 million unemployed.

Personally, I wish not one person was unemployed. However, my point is that, in my opinion, Senators may be talking the country into a recession.

I am not receiving from Indiana any letters on this subject. The people from Indiana are not writing to me to request that Congress do many unsound things.

I believe Congress should begin to be optimistic, and should call attention to the good things, and should help instill confidence.

At the same time, let us do the necessary things. But let us not overdo them—which is what I believe the Congress is doing now.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I never thought I would live to see the day when the Senator from Indiana would quote something President Truman said in 1950, in order to paint a rosy picture of the economy at this time.

I believe the country is in a recession. Certainly I do not rely on the figures circulated in Washington, D. C. I think too many Members of Congress have their noses buried in the District of Columbia.

In the State of Montana—from which I am receiving a great deal of mail on this subject—a depression exists, because, as I tried to point out earlier today, 63 percent of the miners who were employed a year ago in the Butte mining camp are out of work now, and 75 percent of the trades people and members of the crafts who work in and around the mines there are now out of work.

In Montana as of February 22, 14.9 percent were drawing unemployment compensation benefits; and that figure does not include those whose relief payments have run out or those who work for themselves or those who work on a part-time basis.

I wish to say to the Senator from Indiana that it is time for this administration and the Congress to wake up, because, although some might call the present condition a recession, unless something is done in the next several months, believe me, it is going to be a depression.

Let me call the attention of the Senator from Indiana to a particular aspect of the matter, which seems to have escaped the notice of the administration, the people, and the Congress, together: One of the things Mr. Stalin said at the end of the Second World War was that he was looking forward to the inevitable depression which was going to occur in the capitalistic United States; and that

when that day came, he felt that his ideology would "make hay."

That is the danger. As one who went through the depression of the 1930's, I never want to see those days return. If they do, this country will pay a terrible price.

So I say it is time for the Congress and the administration, together, not to issue "chins up, eyes front" statements, but to begin to take action, and to see to it that the American people are given, not charity, but jobs.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wish to state that the Senator from Montana is 100 percent correct; but we should do it by removing the roadblocks which hinder private industry. We ought not throw more roadblocks in the way of private industry. We should permit private industry to do the job. To do it the way too many people are suggesting today would be to do it in Mr. Stalin's way, which was for the Government to own everything—of course, in Russia the government owns everything—and for the government to handle all these matters, and for the government to provide employment. As we know, in Russia everyone works for the government. Many of the suggestions we have heard of late would have the United States duplicate the socialistic system. We must be very careful, as a result of all such suggestions, we do not permit that to happen.

Mr. President, I have not heard anyone suggest that the Congress take steps to help private industry put more Americans back to work. All the suggestions I have heard around here have been on the basis of taxing the American people and having the Federal Government spend the money.

I am willing to have Congress do things that will permit private industry to increase its employment. Either the United States will have a society and a Federal Government in which the Government owns everything and does everything and spends all the money; or the United States will have a free, private-enterprise system.

Let us do things that will take the shackles off business. Let us permit private industry to do the necessary things.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield for a correction?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Last week, did not the Senator from Indiana vote to have the excise taxes on automobiles and other manufactured products reduced—which, in turn, would have helped private industry?

Mr. CAPEHART. Certainly I did not vote for that amendment. However, I shall vote for that proposal when it is brought forward as a separate bill. But I refused to vote for it as an amendment to the bill which was before the Senate last week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Last week the Senator from Texas and others of us advocated giving that help to private industry. Why did not the Senator from Indiana vote for that amendment?

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senators who advocated the adoption of that amendment were not fooling anyone; we know

that the proper way to handle that matter is to introduce such a bill and have it considered by the appropriate committee and reported to the Senate. The Senators who advocated the adoption of that amendment last week were not fooling me or anyone else about that move.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope we were not fooling the automobile manufacturers.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I make no apologies for being fearful that Members of Congress and other high officials may talk the country into a recession. I make no apologies for being fearful that the Government may spend billions and billions of dollars in an effort to create jobs—made jobs—when it would be better to consider how to take the shackles off private industry and permit private industry to provide the needed jobs.

However, Mr. President, the Congress is fast moving down the road in the direction of having the Government do all these things. I have not added up the cost of all the proposals which have been made of late in the Congress, but certainly they will run into the billions and billions and billions of dollars.

That is why I said a moment ago that when the bill of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] comes from the Banking and Currency Committee I shall offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute. I do not particularly like the idea of having the Government guarantee private-enterprise loans, but I shall offer a substitute to the effect that the Federal Government shall guarantee or insure the loans in the way it is done under the FHA.

So, Mr. President, Senators had better stop, look, and listen before too many roadblocks are thrown in the way of private industry.

I believe it will be just as easy for all of us to devote our thoughts and our attention to figuring out ways and means to help private industry put the unemployed back to work; that will be just as easy for the Congress as it would be to figure out ways and means to spend the taxpayers' money in order to have the Government provide employment.

I say reservedly, and with apologies, that little intelligence is required to introduce a bill providing that the American people be taxed \$2 billion in order to do this, that, or the other thing. But intelligence and ingenuity are required to draw up a bill to help the private-enterprise system in the Nation do the necessary job. However, as I have said, little intelligence or ingenuity is required to propose the spending of \$2 billion, \$4 billion, \$6 billion, \$8 billion, \$10 billion, or \$12 billion. Anyone can work out such a bill.

Mr. President, the Members of Congress should get together and should figure out the ways and means to do the job, if it needs to be done; and I am the first to say that it will need to be done if the depression or recession gets any deeper.

But my best judgment is that we have checked the recession. In that connection, I give the Congress—including every Member of the Congress—much

credit, and I also give the President much credit, for taking certain actions.

But I say the time has come when we should stop talking about it, and should permit some of the things the President has suggested, or some of the things the Congress has suggested to the President, to take effect. Certainly there has not yet been time for them to take effect.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I believe I have concluded what I wish to say at this time. On tomorrow, I shall have more to say.

Mr. CLARK obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It has been interesting to listen to the Senator from Indiana. I do not see how we can talk ourselves into prosperity any more than we can talk ourselves out of a depression. I desire to point out that, in addition to my own State's having 14.9 percent of its employable workers on unemployment compensation, in the State of Idaho—this was true on February 22—the figure is 12.4 percent. In the State of Kentucky it is 12.3 percent. In the State of Oregon it is 12.3 percent. In the State of Michigan it is 12.2 percent. In the State of the present Presiding Officer [Mr. HOBLITZELL], West Virginia, it is 12.2 percent. In North Dakota, it is 11.7 percent. The national average is 7.9 percent. Those figures do not include persons partially employed or self-employed.

I do not know what the Senator from Indiana means when he says the Government should not do this, that, or the other thing, because, is it not true, insofar as the highway program is concerned, it is private industry that builds the roads and gets the contracts?

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I think I have the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. So far as housing is concerned, private industry builds the houses and gets the contracts. I think the facts should be laid on the table. We had better face the facts as of now, and not be going back to the days of McKinley, or even Truman.

Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. MONRONEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Indiana, or to any other Senator, with the understanding that by so doing I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. The figures the Senator from Montana gave us refer to those drawing unemployment insurance.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. There are literally millions of people who do not draw unemployment compensation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And some who are not working do not draw unemployment compensation.

Mr. CAPEHART. And some who are not working do not draw unemployment compensation. I know that as well as the Senator from Montana does. I am not unmindful of that fact. I again want to say I make no apologies for trying to solve this problem in the private enterprise way, and not trying to solve the problem in what I consider to be the socialistic way of taxing and taxing the American people and putting people to work through that method. We may have to do it; I do not know; but I am going to be against it as long as I can be. I want to try to do it through the private enterprise route, by finding ways and means of helping private enterprise put people back to work, and not by putting that burden on the Federal Government.

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I had obtained the floor for the purpose of engaging in a brief colloquy with my friend from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], whose bill I have cosponsored. I shall not take more than 2 or 3 minutes, and then I shall yield the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am also a cosponsor of the bill, and am very enthusiastic about making available for smaller cities, financing within 50 percent of what the larger cities enjoy in the big market, and seeing that the smaller cities enjoy the kind of cheaper financing which the bill provides.

Mr. CLARK. I could mention to the Senator 12 or 15 cities in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania which are in that category.

Mr. President, I was happy to cosponsor the bill introduced by the Senator from Arkansas. I particularly desire to commend him for the fact that he has undertaken to fix interest rates for loans to help finance the construction of facilities at a rate identical to that applying in the college-housing loan program, which he sponsored, and which has been in effect with such great help to our educational institutions.

I find myself regrettably in complete disagreement with my friend from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] in his thinking that we ought to have high interest rates and a private market for loans in this kind of public works program, which definitely has behind it an antirecession purpose.

I am also happy that the Senator from Arkansas has undertaken to include public schools among the public facilities which can be financed with the loans. So I am happy to cosponsor the bill.

However, I say, in all candor to my good friend from Arkansas that, in my judgment, highly desirable though the bill is, it is not really going to have any helpful effect in the many depressed areas throughout the country, where unemployment is critical and has existed since long before the present recession occurred. As he knows, there are now pending before the Banking and Currency Committee, of which he is the distinguished chairman, bills offered by the administration, and a bill offered by the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], who is now present on the floor,

and a bill offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], of which I and other Senators are cosponsors. I do not know whether the name of the Senator from Oklahoma is on the bill, but I believe he is in sympathy with the principle involved therein. I hope we shall be able to have prompt action on one or more of those bills at the earliest possible time, because my people in Pennsylvania—and this is true in many other States where critically depressed conditions have continued for many years—are crying for action and need action now.

The chairman of the committee and I are in disagreement with respect to the political philosophy involved in the depressed areas bill; but I wanted to make it clear, that in cosponsoring his bill, which I endorse completely, I am not yielding the feeling I entertain that we must have area redevelopment legislation in this session of Congress, and the quicker we can get it, the quicker we shall put people back to work. I hope my good friend is going to give some of the rest of us on the committee time to convince him that our views have some merit.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Was the Senator asking me a question, or was he giving me a lecture? It was not clear.

Mr. CLARK. I would certainly never willingly attempt to lecture the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator yield for—

Mr. CLARK. In a second. I want the RECORD to be very clear that nothing is farther from my mind than an attempt to lecture the Senator from Arkansas, who knows so much more than I do about the subject. I would never want to be in the position even of seemingly attempting to lecture him. I was referring to an opportunity to have a hearing on the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understood the Senator to say he wanted me to wait for a question. I do not know whether he has asked a question.

Mr. CLARK. The question is, Can we have a hearing on the depressed-areas bills?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator knows the bill to which he has made reference, and the other bills on the subject, are before the subcommittee and have not been reported to the full committee. I presume the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who is a sponsor of that type of bill, is eager to have hearings. I further should like to point out that the recession, or the so-called depression, that has occurred in some of the coal towns, particularly in Pennsylvania, has now spread to the whole United States. The bill which we are discussing, and others, propose to meet the problem, I think, on a national basis, and not upon a single-community basis.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield so I may ask a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think the bill is a cure-all for conditions in communities whose economy is based on natural resources or some other peculiar asset or resource. The bill does not offer to be a cure-all for all the ills of the

Nation, in all its diversities; and no other bill will be, in my opinion. So far as hearings are concerned, I think the subcommittee is ready, willing, and able to hold hearings. It has not reported to the full committee. When it does, I think the full committee will consider the bills.

Mr. CLARK. Let me say it is my understanding the subcommittee has completed hearings.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It has not reported the bill.

Mr. CLARK. It has not reported the bill, for reasons with which I think my friend is familiar. The fact of the matter is we have already created a precedent in our committee by bringing before the full committee the Sparkman housing bill. We are about to create a precedent by bringing before the full committee the bill introduced by its chairman [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. I hope we may have an opportunity to bring before the full committee a depressed areas bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course, the bills the Senator has referred to are extensions of policies already existing, the basic principles of which have been approved, and constitute existing law. It is not customary to take a new, highly controversial issue, and bypass the subcommittee.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for 1 minute?

Mr. CLARK. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Maine in a moment, but I wish to make another point first.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Especially when the chairman of the committee feels strongly about such a controversial issue. That is customary in the committee system.

Mr. CLARK. The chairman of the committee is entitled to his views, which I respect, even though I do not agree with them.

The chairman will recall that in 1956 the Senate passed a bill practically identical with that which is held up in the committee. Therefore, we are not discussing a new measure.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think the Senator is fair in holding the previous action against me, because the Senator knows that under great pressure, and very reluctantly, in order to be sort of friendly to certain colleagues, I finally agreed to the bill at that time. For that matter to be brought up against me now will only make it difficult to be agreeable in the future as to some of these highly controversial measures.

Mr. CLARK. I am sure the Senator from Arkansas will always remain friendly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was not in favor of the bill then; at least I was not very strongly in favor of it. Today the recession or depression is nationwide, and it ought to be met on a nationwide basis, not upon a particularized basis pertaining to a few special cases.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am sure the chairman's sunny disposition and friendly attitude toward all his colleagues will continue, and we shall

shortly have a day set aside for hearings on these bills.

May I point out what has happened? Over a layer of an existing depression in Maine, Pennsylvania, and elsewhere, which lasted a long while, there has been superimposed another layer, creating a bad current recession.

The bill of my good friend from Arkansas, which I was happy to cosponsor, will take care of only the second layer, not the first.

Mr. President, I shall now be glad to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Before the Senator from Pennsylvania yields, may I ask him to ask the Senator from Illinois to report the bill?

Mr. CLARK. I shall be happy to do so.

Mr. President, I yield now to the Senator from Maine, who wishes to address himself to the Senator from Arkansas, and I ask unanimous consent that I may so yield without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I, too, wish to inquire of my good friend, the Senator from Arkansas, who is the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, with relation to a couple of matters.

The indication was just given in a statement, unless I misunderstood the effect of it, that the proposed legislation had come before the subcommittee, but had not been reported, and, therefore, as I understood the implication, was a proposal of a type which probably should not be considered at this time. Is that inference correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All I wish to say is that the proposal before the subcommittee is not an expansion of an existing program, such as the housing bill was. That distinguishes the proposed legislation from the treatment given the housing bill. The subcommittee should pass upon the matter. When the subcommittee passes upon it and refers it to the full committee we shall certainly take it up, in due time.

I suggest that the Senator address his pleas to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. PAYNE. The Senator from Maine, I assume, understood the chairman of the committee correctly as to the matter.

I believe the Senator from Pennsylvania pointed out a moment ago that a bill very similar to the one which is before the subcommittee for consideration was reported by the subcommittee, was reported by the full committee, and was passed by the Senate 3 years ago.

Recently I addressed a letter to the very amiable chairman of the committee with reference to the legislation we are discussing at present, which would have an effect upon the areas which have had their economies dislocated because of certain economic conditions which simply will not be corrected by the type of work being proposed in the bill the Senator from Arkansas has introduced. There has been a complete change in the

complexity of the situation in certain given areas.

Let me simply state that in my letter to the Senator I requested that a hearing be scheduled before the full committee. I requested a hearing before the full committee on the administration bill, on the bill introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and on the bill I introduced.

What was the reply? The reply was to the effect that it could not be done, because the committee was busily occupied with numerous other measures, and examples were cited. I wish I had a copy of the letter with me. There was cited, however, date after date after date after date when it was going to be impossible for the full committee to give consideration to the proposed legislation, notwithstanding the fact that the many people who are idle in these communities are not going to be helped too much, as the Senator from Pennsylvania has stated—which is true—by the legislation now being proposed.

My question is, How does it happen that all of a sudden, after last week's correspondence, in which it was stated the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency could not hear the matter because the full committee was so rushed with hearings on other bills, today on the floor of the Senate we have introduced a piece of proposed legislation which was referred to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency and as to which notice was given, sir, that hearings will be held on Wednesday of this week before the full committee?

Finally I desire to say, before the Senator answers, that this will be very good news, I am sure, to the thousands of unemployed textile workers in the area of Saco and Biddeford, to those who are out of employment in Lewiston and Auburn, and other areas of the United States, to the coal miners and others in Pennsylvania, of whom the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has spoken, and to those for whom the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has been working. It will be wonderful news to them that proposed legislation which would help straighten out their situations, by revitalizing the economies of the areas and making a change in the whole approach, is lying dormant in the committee and has lain dormant there now for over a year—for nearly a year and 3 months—without a single bit of interest shown in it or action having been taken by the full committee. Despite that, the bill relating to housing was brought up—and I was in favor of it—and passed by the Senate within about 3 or 4 days, and now the Senator from Arkansas is proposing the identical system of maneuvering in connection with the bill he has today introduced. I am not sure that I am not in sympathy with the bill to a great degree, but not to the point where I shall be willing to lend my name to it now, since the other bill has been held up for more than 15 months.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall be happy to yield to my friend from Arkansas, and I ask unanimous consent that in so yielding I shall not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, several observations could properly be made. As a matter of fact, the committee is very busy. The hearing for Wednesday had to be scheduled in the afternoon. The Senate will be in session.

The importance of this type of legislation, that is, the bill I have just introduced, in connection with the immediate problem of the recession has been recognized by many Senators and by the majority leader, who specifically requested that we fix a date for the hearing at the earliest possible time. I could not set aside the hearings which had been scheduled for this week on the bill in which the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE] is very much interested, and as to which plans have been made long in advance.

As I have said, the measure I have introduced relates to an expansion of an existing program. I think it is noncontroversial. Therefore, the bypassing of the subcommittee is in accord with the practice which we have followed with regard to housing, and the practice which we follow in many other similar instances.

That procedure has nothing in common with the proposed legislation in which the Senator is interested. That legislation which passed the Senate in 1956 was then reported by the Labor Committee. I think the Senator has pointed out and has indicated the nature of the difficulty. The Senator assumes by his statement that the Congress by enacting legislation can correct inherent basic difficulties which arise in a community where the character of the business of the people has changed. For example, the Senator has mentioned coal.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me say a word, please.

I used to be interested in a company which made farm wagons. That company went out of business completely. There was not anything Congress could do about it. People simply do not use farm wagons anymore. I do not think any bill could have helped that situation.

If the coal industry is depressed, as it is, it is also certainly true that mostly it is depressed in the marginal areas. However, I notice from the reports that the Consolidated Coal Co. has reported the highest earnings in its history. The story is not all bad.

There are many of us who do not accept the principle the Senator from Maine thinks is self-evident, namely, that by waving a wand we can re-create the fundamental prosperity of every town in Maine which is suffering from a depression.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me say that is not something which is self-evident, as the Senator assumes, whereas the measure which is being set for hearing

Wednesday afternoon relates to an existing program. It relates to something Congress has approved. It relates to a program in being. It has been a bipartisan matter.

A moment ago the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] made some remarks that confused me. At first he took credit for sponsoring the program. The next moment he was denouncing it as socialism. I was not sure where he stood.

In any case, Congress enacted the program. It is in being. So far I know of no one who has seriously questioned the basic validity of the idea which is involved, and which is proposed to be expanded by the legislation I have proposed. If there were great controversy, and the subject required thorough hearings, it would be referred to a subcommittee, as is the usual practice.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President—
Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I still have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor.

Mr. CLARK. I make this point only because at an earlier time the floor was lost because a technical point was raised. Ordinarily I would not make the point.

I ask unanimous consent that I may yield further to the Senator from Arkansas without losing the floor.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I had in mind one further point, because of the vigorous attack on the procedure by the Senator from Maine.

The chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], was in favor of the procedure in the handling of the housing bill, as was the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. No one thought there was any need of hearings in the subcommittee. As I pointed out previously, bills similar to the Payne bill are before the subcommittee. Hearings have been held, and no report has been made to the full committee.

I do not think the Senator from Maine has any complaint.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Maine with the same understanding, that I shall not lose the floor.

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

Mr. PAYNE. I should like to make one further observation. This is a brand-new approach to the problem. It is something to which the Congress has never given any consideration over the years. What is proposed by this legislation with respect to distressed areas and dislocations of the economy is a brand-new approach.

My good colleague the Senator from Arkansas is a very high-ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Does he want the RECORD to indicate to the American people, to the unemployed textile workers, to the unemployed in the coal industry, and in industries in other areas of our country that we have not had programs—some of which, I am sure

have been proposed by my colleague—of foreign aid based upon certain philosophies of technical assistance to various areas of the world, in an effort to help the people of other nations to rebuild their economies? Does the Senator wish to say that such programs have not been considered by the Congress?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator is suggesting that the groups he has in mind are illiterate and know nothing about modern techniques—

Mr. PAYNE. The Senator knows better than that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The present situation is not at all comparable with the point 4 programs.

Mr. PAYNE. What did we do when we went into some foreign countries which previously had industries, which were in such a condition as to be almost nonexistent? We built up a new economy for them. The money of the taxpayers of the United States was used for that purpose. I did not object to it. I supported that program. I am simply asking that our own people, whose economy has been dislocated by reason of certain policies, receive the same consideration which we are giving to other countries. The committee is not giving such consideration.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, let me say in conclusion that I believe the colloquy has demonstrated that there is strong bipartisan support for an area redevelopment bill. The distress in Maine, Pennsylvania, Montana, and other States and communities is not Republican distress. It is not Democratic distress. It is American distress. It has existed for a shameful length of time. It is a disgrace to our country that we have done nothing about it up to this time.

I hope with all my heart that arrangements can be made by which Members of this body, will have an opportunity, on a bipartisan basis, to express their views as to whether that shameful condition shall be brought to an end by effective aid from the Federal Government.

I honor my good friend from Arkansas. Perhaps I have spoken with more heat than I should have spoken. The Senator from Arkansas is sincere in his views. He is a man of great compassion, with an interest in the welfare of the unfortunate.

I hope with all my heart that an opportunity will be given to the Committee on Banking and Currency to vote on area distress legislation at the earliest possible moment, and that an appropriate bill may be reported to the Senate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I desire to congratulate the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] for his introduction of the community facilities bill of 1958. I am glad to be associated with him as a cosponsor of the bill. I think the bill is wise and sound and is urgently needed.

I favor passage of the bill, for two reasons:

First, it will make it possible immediately to commence local projects and, in doing so, to put people to work.

Second, it will keep interest rates low; and it also will keep down local taxes, which by and large are regressive.

RAMON MAGSAYSAY, AUGUST 31, 1907—MARCH 17, 1957

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, 1 year ago on this day, the life of one of the great patriots and leaders of this age was tragically crushed out against a mountainside far off in the Philippines.

Americans who knew him respected President Magsaysay as fully as did his own countrymen. Though 10,000 miles from this Chamber, the ideals and spirit of that man are as close to our hearts as if he were one of us. Indeed, the nobility of purpose of Ramon Magsaysay's life stands as an image for all men who cherish liberty and justice to emulate.

He rose from humble beginnings in Zambales Province, just north of historic Bataan, to become first a garage mechanic and later the manager of a local bus line. When the American Army requisitioned his trucks, he himself voluntarily went with them to the war. The fall of Bataan found him organizing a guerrilla force in the mountains of his native province. His forces were so successful during the dark days of the Japanese occupation that they were able to clear the enemy from the entire Zambales coast. The long-awaited return of American troops found Magsaysay leader of all the guerrilla forces in western Luzon under orders from General MacArthur.

After the war he was elected to the Congress of the Republic of the Philippines, where he worked tirelessly for the welfare of his fellow veterans of the war. Twice he visited Washington on missions in which he showed the honesty, strength of purpose, and the tremendous vitality with which he later won for his country victory over the Communist armed aggression that threatened to annihilate it.

In September 1950, he was appointed Secretary of National Defense. Seeing the growth of the Communist Huk movement in the face of inadequate resistance from an army weakened by corruption and war-weariness, he revamped and revitalized his department. He personally set the standard of honesty, efficiency, and concern for the people. His insistence that the Philippine Army live up to this standard inspired his troops with enthusiasm and won the campaign that destroyed a powerful, organized Communist guerrilla force of 10,000 armed men.

As a result of his inspiration, the Philippine people overwhelmingly chose him as their new President. Not satisfied with mere military defeat of communism, Magsaysay launched the second great campaign of his public life. In the interest of political stability and social progress, he personally waged an effective fight against corruption in government, the great despoiler of the Nation's wealth. To destroy the treacherous allure of communism to the ignorant and poverty stricken, he led in the building of a better life for his people. Resettlement programs, land reforms, agricultural credit facilities, barrio—village—road development, education, social security, and public health improvement were some of the blessings he brought to a people that had known chiefly pov-

erty and oppression aggravated by political corruption. His example of honesty and concern for the people was soon reflected in improved performance in every phase of Philippine Government activity.

In foreign relations he was just as courageous and imaginative in leading his nation to the signing of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty in Manila, and in encouraging every measure to check the infection of today's greatest threat to the world, communism.

The chief gift of his life unstintingly offered to his people was hope. Hope for more meaning to their struggles. Hope for a good life of freedom, dignity, and spiritual and material improvement.

His passing in the prime of life, before seeing the fulfillment of his great vision for his country, was a loss felt far beyond the Republic of the Philippines. In the words of our Secretary of State:

That loss falls also everywhere upon those who, having liberty, would preserve it; upon those who never having had liberty, would gain it; and upon those who having lost liberty, would regain it.

We who viewed from afar his life of sacrifice and danger can console ourselves with the knowledge that 100 years from March 17, 1957, no less than 1 year from that fateful day, the truly great spirit of Ramon Magsaysay will live on to inspire and motivate the struggles of free men against enslavement.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING OF REPORTS BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the filing of reports by the Committee on the Judiciary, required by Senate resolutions, be extended to March 31, 1958. The resolutions referred to are Senate Resolutions 49, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, and 58.

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

PETRIFIED FOREST NATIONAL PARK, ARIZ.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, earlier today, on the call of the Calendar, consideration of Calendar No. 1381, S. 2359, was deferred because the House bill had not come to the Senate. Since that time the House bill has been received. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2359.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2359) to authorize the establishment of the Petrified Forest National Park in the State of Arizona and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the House bill, H. R. 8250.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 8250) to authorize the establishment of the Petrified Forest National Park, in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 8250) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate having just passed H. R. 8250, S. 2359 will be indefinitely postponed.

UNITED NATIONS CONTROL OF OUTER SPACE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, once again the United States has been placed on the defensive in the cold war. Once again we find ourselves in a position where we must explain, and justify, and stammer.

This situation would be deplorable enough if it resulted from a weakness in our position. But it is even more tragic than that. The fact is that we led our weakest cards from a position of strength.

This morning's New York Times carries an article by a distinguished diplomatic correspondent, E. W. Kenworthy. The headline over this article is very revealing. It says: "United States Aides Concede Soviet Space Plan Is Propaganda Gain."

This article quotes our own officials as saying that the Soviet proposal for United Nations control of outer space "was a brilliantly conceived, executed, and timed propaganda stroke." And it is difficult to disagree in honesty with that estimate.

The fact that the Soviet proposal is merely a mask for unacceptable conditions will be little noticed by the world anxious for peace. The impact will be simply that the Soviet Union wishes to use outer space for peace while the United States hesitates and stands firm only on negative proposals.

Mr. President, there is no excuse for this situation. The potentialities of outer space for bringing peace to this world were first stated by the Senate majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, on January 14 of this year in a public statement. He said:

Further, it would be appropriate and fitting for our Nation to demonstrate its initiative before the United Nations by inviting all member nations to join in this venture into outer space together.

This statement struck a responsive chord in the breasts of people everywhere. On January 31, United Nations General Assembly President, Sir Leslie Munro, suggested a United Nations conference of scientists and diplomats to study control of outer space. He said, at the time, that the world was looking

for someone to bring the issue to the United Nations.

On February 3, the Senate majority leader once again spoke on this question—this time to the Senate. His words are well worth recalling and I wish to quote a few paragraphs from his statement:

There is no point in deluding ourselves that we can just call off the arms race on our own initiative. There is no point in debating why they do not call off the arms race at their own initiative.

The only worthwhile discussion is what is said in the effort to find ways and means of breaking the logjam—of bringing the tragedy of the cold war to an end.

This is the time to act—now, while the satellites are searching for facts instead of for targets.

I would hope that our leaders would give urgent consideration to a proposal for joint exploration of outer space by the United Nations. I would hope that this proposal could be pressed earnestly, vigorously and with all the sincerity at our command.

No one would stand to lose by this proposal. The alternative is a disorderly arms race which can end only in death and destruction.

Mr. President, had those words been heeded at that time, we would not find ourselves in our present predicament. We would be standing before the world in our true garb—that of the nation which desires peace and which is willing to take the necessary steps.

Instead, we have blundered into the world of George Orwell in which the aggressor carries the banner of the peacemaker, and the peacemaker is forced to carry the banner of the aggressor. And it would be a great mistake to underestimate the impact of such propaganda on the uncommitted portions of the world.

Mr. President, no one of us carries a crystal ball which actively predicts the future. We can only hope that the historians who describe that future after it has happened will not describe this particular chapter of American history as the age of timidity and defeat.

A proposal was advanced by the Senate majority leader. The President's special adviser on disarmament endorsed it. The Senate minority leader said he thought outer space should be handled by the United Nations.

The distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] lent his full support to the proposal, as did the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If I recall correctly, the Secretary of State, while he took no action on the proposal, thought it could be used as a step in the right direction.

At least, the Secretary of State said the idea was under consideration. Then the Soviet Union picked up the ball and ran with it dangerously close to a touchdown.

Mr. President, the stakes are enormous. They include the future of our Nation. They also include the concept of freedom as a social system whereby the affairs of mankind can be conducted.

We cannot forever depend upon a merciful God to save a people whose leadership handles so lightly the responsibilities which have been entrusted to it.

The responsibility here is plain. Congress can propose and Congress can authorize. But only the executive branch can conduct the foreign policy of this Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the article written by Mr. Kenworthy, of the New York Times; the statement made by the Senate majority leader on February 3; the speech made by the Senate majority leader before the Columbia Broadcasting System affiliates in Washington on January 14, 1958; and certain other excerpts.

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

[From the New York Times of March 17, 1958]

UNITED STATES AIDES CONCEDE SOVIET SPACE PLAN IS PROPAGANDA GAIN (By E. W. Kenworthy)

WASHINGTON, March 16.—The Soviet Union's proposal for control of outer space was a brilliantly conceived, executed and timed propaganda stroke, in the view of some officials here.

In a statement issued yesterday, the Soviet Foreign Ministry proposed a United Nations agency to police a ban on outer space missiles and administer a program for the peaceful use of space.

The plan was conditioned on the removal of United States overseas military bases, first and foremost in Europe, the Middle East, and North Africa.

IMPACT IN NATO ENVISAGED

After reading the text of the statement, some officials here felt that Moscow might have scored a coup that could have considerable impact not only in neutral nations but also in some North Atlantic Treaty countries.

These officials said the condition that made the Soviet proposal so obviously unacceptable to the United States might appear reasonable to many persons in these countries if they accepted Moscow's plausible justification for it.

As the Soviet plan for a United Nations body to supervise peaceful space research, the consensus of many officials here was, we got scooped.

These are the points made by officials today in conceding that the Soviet plan was a shrewd propaganda move:

First, they note that the Soviet plan was prefaced by a long passage impugning the motives behind President Eisenhower's peaceful space proposal in his letter to Premier Nikolai A. Bulganin of January 12.

The Soviet statement said:

"In making this proposal, President Eisenhower singled out from the general disarmament problem the question of intercontinental ballistic missiles. * * * He proposes, in fact, to ban intercontinental ballistic missiles only. * * * It is noteworthy that, while proposing a ban on the intercontinental ballistic missile, the United States builds its military plans on the use of atom and hydrogen bombs as warheads in the short and medium-range rockets which they already possess."

In short, the Soviet statement says, the United States is trying to ban the weapon "which could be used against objectives on the territory of the United States," while insisting on retaining the bases from which it can reach the Soviet Union with nuclear-armed intermediate-range missiles and strategic bombers.

Officials note that there is a large distortion here. In his letter to Premier Bulganin, the President did not single out intercontinental ballistic missiles, or even mention them.

General Eisenhower called for an agreement banning all weapons using outer space, which would include both ICBM's and IRBM's. Actually, officials here comment, studies on the implementation of the President's proposal specifically mention a ban on the testing and use of both types of missiles.

These officials also note that the Soviet argument can be turned around. The Soviet Union holds captive all of Eastern Europe except Yugoslavia, refusing to permit free elections. Its ground forces far outnumber those of the NATO alliance. The great allied deterrent to extension of Soviet power is the United States Strategic Air Force.

If the United States is to dismantle its overseas air bases, then, these officials maintain, the Soviet Union should agree to free its satellites, reduce its land forces and withdraw them within the Soviet Union.

Nevertheless, these officials concede the skillfulness with which the Soviet Union is using the argument that they want us to pick up our slingshots but they won't give up their club.

Second, those officials concede that Moscow got the jump on us by suggesting a United Nations agency. They say, somewhat ruefully, that the administration has not followed up the initiative gained by the President's proposal to Premier Bulganin.

Oddly enough, they recall, studies undertaken here immediately after the President's letter suggested that, as soon as the United States successfully launched its first satellite, the President should make a statement urging a United Nations program for the peaceful use of outer space and declaring United States intentions to introduce a resolution to that effect in the next session of the General Assembly.

These officials also note that the same studies made general recommendations parallel with those advanced by the Soviet Union, a missile ban, control and inspection by a United Nations body and coordination of national research programs on peaceful use of space by the United Nations.

SOVIET TEXT CORRECTION

LONDON, March 16.—The text of a statement issued by the Soviet Foreign Ministry yesterday as issued by the Soviet news agency Tass and transmitted by Reuters, omitted through a transmission error a phrase that altered the sense of one sentence.

The sentence in question read: "Why is it then that the American proposals suggest the outlawing of intercontinental ballistic rockets which could be used against objectives on the territory of the United States of America, while evading the question of eliminating American military bases on foreign territories intended to launch rockets possessed by the United States Armed Forces and for the use of American bombers?"

The corrected sentence should read: "Why is it then that the American proposals suggest the outlawing of intercontinental ballistic rockets, which in the case of a retaliatory blow, and only in that case, could be used against objectives, etc."

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE AMERICAN SATELLITE EXPLORER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on Friday, some very anxious moments for our people came to an end. An American satellite was put into orbit and at this moment is circling the globe.

The Explorer is a triumph of persistence against great odds. It represents the dedicated work of men like General Medaris, Wernher von Braun, and numberless scientists and technicians who will never receive their fair share of credit.

Our satellite is very aptly named. It is truly an explorer—a representative of the

free people searching for the facts of a totally new dimension into which men and women will soon step. And, in its search for facts, it brings us face to face with a sharp reality which we cannot ignore.

Neither the Explorer nor its Soviet predecessors can be considered military weapons. They are merely collectors of data which they are transmitting or have transmitted back to earthbound men.

But the facts and figures of the physical world are of a peculiar nature. They have no loyalty, no patriotism, no system of morality and ethics. They are available for the advancement of mankind, or for the destruction of mankind.

The science of biology has given us penicillin and germ warfare. The science of chemistry has given us medicine and poison gas. The science of physics has given us new sources of useful power and the hydrogen bomb.

Now a new science—astronautics—is moving rapidly from the drawing board to the workshop. Will it give us new frontiers or new forms of total devastation?

To continue the arms race at this time will inevitably bring us to the point of no return. There must be action now—now, while there is still time to bring the new forces under control.

It is not difficult to forecast the future if the present situation continues. This will be the world of the manic depressive—high points of elation when "we" make an important advance; low points of despair when "they" outstrip us.

And at some interval when "we" are at a low point and "they" are at a high point, somebody is going to press the button.

There is no point in deluding ourselves that "we" can just call off the arms race on our own initiative. There is no point in debating why they do not call off the arms race at their own initiative.

The only worthwhile discussion is what is said in the effort to find ways and means of breaking the logjam—of bringing the tragedy of the cold war to an end.

This is the time to act—now, while the satellites are searching for facts instead of for targets.

I would hope that our leaders would give urgent consideration to a proposal for joint exploration of outer space by the United Nations. I would hope that this proposal could be pressed earnestly, vigorously, and with all the sincerity at our command.

No one would stand to lose by this proposal. The alternative is a disorderly arms race which can end only in death and destruction.

For the moment, our prestige is at a high point. There is no better time for a display of the generosity, the initiative and the constructive desire for peace which lies in the soul of the American people.

The president of the United Nations General Assembly—Sir Leslie Munro—has spoken the desires of the world. He says the nations are looking for leadership in the drive into outer space.

We have heard this morning that our President has received another letter from Soviet Premier Bulganin. It rejects the idea of a foreign ministers' conference as a precondition to a summit conference.

Whatever the note may say, however, there has never before been a more golden opportunity to bring this war-weary world to peace. A strong and determined proposal to cooperate now may save all of us from a strong and determined—and probably successful—effort to destroy humanity later.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks a United Press dispatch from the United Nations headed "U. N. Talks Urged on Outer Space."

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

"U. N. TALKS URGED ON OUTER SPACE"

"UNITED NATIONS, N. Y., January 31.—General Assembly President Sir Leslie Munro, of New Zealand, tonight suggested a U. N. conference of scientists and diplomats within the next 2 or 3 months to study control of outer space.

"Munro, who has spoken several times of the need to get United Nations action started to deal with the age of space, made the suggestion in a broadcast interview recorded for U. N. radio.

"Munro said that despite many references by President Eisenhower and others to the need for space control, there has been no initiative except in embryo to bring the issue to the U. N."

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LYNDON B. JOHNSON, OF TEXAS, BEFORE A MEETING OF CBS AFFILIATES, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 14, 1958

I am here today to speak to a group which has a grave responsibility for informing our people.

In the Chamber of the Senate of the United States, I am the designated leader of the majority party. That is a title of which I am proud but one which carries with it responsibilities that would cause any man to be humble. But it is a designation which, for this occasion, I have left behind.

I am not here as a Democrat.

I am not here as a leader of the Senate.

I am here as an American.

In this town, we have the habit of dividing all things by lines of affiliation: the offices, the jobs, the various positions, and sometimes even our judgments.

At this hour in our history, I, for one, believe that there are certain facts which cannot be divided along such lines and certain judgments we must reach and decisions we must make together, as Americans, and as Americans only.

Even as we sit here at these tables there orbits in the sky above us—around and around this earth—the most compelling fact of our times.

The sputniks out in space have only one meaning.

There is no Democratic meaning.

There is no Republican meaning.

There is, in truth, no narrow American meaning.

In all history, mankind has never faced so great a challenge—or so great an opportunity. If outer space is allowed to become the province of the earth's imperialists, then the freedom we have fashioned at so high a price shall fall into eternal jeopardy.

If, however, free men set their sails for this new world as our forebears did when this continent was opened, then we have the opportunity of adding a new dimension to freedom—and, with it, the very real prospect of reaching our goal of total peace.

These are exciting thoughts, exciting goals.

We would be out of character with our American heritage if we were not stirred by what we can now see on ahead in this new age.

We would be even more out of character—both as Americans and as free men—if we should lose this hour of opportunity in preoccupation with partisan thoughts of who is to receive the credit and who is to receive the blame.

Facts are not partisan, and the facts are these:

For a decade now, the Free World—led by the United States—has summoned up its resources and resourcefulness to contain the most powerful and most ruthless aggressor ever to appear among the governments of the earth.

The physical containment has, in large part, succeeded.

It has succeeded, I should say, until now.

Today no responsible man can say or would say continued success of our past policies is assured.

There is now abundant evidence that a pattern of history is repeating. We, like the dynasties of ancient China on down to the Republic of France, have built a wall against aggression, but now we find that we are the imprisoned.

The Soviet has, dramatically, leaped over our wall.

More importantly, we are awakened to the reality that advances of Soviet technology and science have made our wall of security a relic of another age.

Let me cite for you certain specifics, certain facts which all of us, as Americans, must sit down and consider together.

These are not facts of my invention. These are facts testified to by our military leadership coming before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, of which I am chairman.

First. The Soviet has under arms nearly as many divisions as do all the free nations combined.

Second. The Soviet air strength is probably close to that of our own.

Third. The Soviet submarine armada now numbers 500, while ours totals only 110.

Fourth. The Soviet shipyards are building 100 new submarines annually, while we are building fewer than ten.

Fifth. The Soviet capacity to launch a one-half ton satellite into space indicates the capacity on their part to launch long-range ballistic missiles against our cities from Soviet soil.

Sixth. The Soviet has now the capacity to launch, from land bases or from its submarines, shorter range missiles against our installations at home and overseas.

These are military facts. They are important. I would mislead you if I did not say that there are more, more which in time I believe should become public knowledge.

What is the sum of these facts? The facts of comparative strength between the two strong powers do not add up to disaster—but they do, clearly, total up to peril.

For the moment, the stalemate is not clearly broken. The Soviet striking power is great and growing greater, but our retaliatory power is great, also. This the Soviet knows, as we know.

The Soviet however, also knows—as we must come to know—that the rate of growth of their striking power far exceeds ours.

We are behind but we are not yet hopelessly behind. Our peril becomes a disaster when we fall so far behind that there is no hope of recovery. It is to the prevention of that disaster all free men must now dedicate their efforts.

How is such disaster to be prevented?

Some, looking back to the past, will answer only that the Nation must retool its productive capacity, get ready for a massive effort, and move forward to match the Soviet sputnik for sputnik, missile for missile, sub for sub.

If war were inevitable, I would join in such a call.

But no man who looks beyond the moment will suggest that war is the inevitable consequence of mankind's new adventure into space. I, myself, am confident that it is not.

Space may well be the sea in which the human race will some day find an island of peace.

To reach that island, we need more than weapons.

We need, in fact, to free ourselves of the bonds of a weapon psychology.

Our greatest need in this hour is to unlash the pioneering spirit and the daring and brilliance of our people and set this Nation's course on the pursuit of peace.

We cannot, of course, ignore the need for weapons now.

We need a faster rate of production for our missiles, far faster than any yet permitted or any yet envisioned.

As Prime Minister Churchill told the House of Commons on June 18, 1940:

"If we open a quarrel between the past and the present, we shall find that we have lost the future."

I say that such must be our creed at this hour.

It is with that creed before us that we must proceed, as responsible men, to assess the position of free men in the world today.

I see no gain in picking petty quarrels with the past.

I myself am willing to draw a line at the here and now, and measure responsibility in terms of what is done for the future rather than in terms of what was done in the past.

From this base, I believe we can take a more honest look at the problems we face.

What are those problems? Let me call them as I see them.

First and foremost, I believe that we are paying too high a price for conformity.

Ours has been, always, a Nation built by the greatness of men's hearts and spirits and minds. America's vigor has come from the originality, the freshness, the vision of our people—all our people, not merely an intellectual elite.

For a decade now, we have seen growing a climate of contempt for these values. We are paying a price for that.

Our investigating committee has found, in some most striking examples, that this has been at the heart of some of our preparedness difficulties.

The fight to build for this Nation an atomic submarine is a record of the persistence against great odds of one man, Admiral Rickover, who believed that it could be built. Because he was more determined to perform than to conform, this brilliant man was—on numerous occasions—shunted into obscurity and his services to the Nation were very nearly lost.

This past few days, in our committee room, I sat 2 feet away from a great Army general and watched him choke back the tears of deep emotion. He told us that his decision to retire from service was final. He said he could not speak freely and he could not support a policy which meant placing American troops in the range of enemy missiles without adequate weapons of defense.

Over and over again, I have heard—and our committee has heard—the leading military men of this Nation come before us and say that a conventional system has cut back on our programs for unconventional developments.

Over and over, we have heard them say that we are not, even yet, doing all that we could and should be doing to move forward in this hour of challenge.

This is not the road to strength.

This is not the road America should travel. We must turn to the dedicated men of vision and welcome them into the councils of respect and dignity.

We must provide a climate in which the men and women of our universities, our research centers, our career services, our world of journalism and communications, can make a full contribution of their talents.

Let me make this point clear.

It is not true that the abilities of Soviet science far exceed those of our American scientists.

As free men, who respect the freedom of man's mind, we must not allow political policies to chain our most priceless resource.

As we face this problem of removing the fetters from our capacity, we must also remove the fetters of tradition from our policy.

Our defensive strategies, in a military sense, are undergoing reappraisal and reexamination.

It would be a mistake to stop there.

Our foreign policies require the same reappraisal.

So, also, do our domestic policies and values.

We have, for long, held a position of strength in world affairs. That position is no longer secure. We must not be so inflexible that we can imagine no changed policy to cope with a changed position.

Domestically, likewise, each of you as businessmen know that our economy is now undergoing a period of change. This change is not merely a cycle through which we are passing. There are new problems, new challenges arising to the very functioning of our system.

Channels of distribution are undergoing change.

Changes are evident in consumer demand and consumer taste.

Profoundly important population shifts are continuing.

We must not wait for calamity before undertaking a cure.

Just as we erred in our estimate of what Soviet gains might mean in the realm of technology, so can we err by complacency in our estimate of what domestic losses might mean in the realm of our economic health.

These things I mention only briefly, to emphasize that in this challenging period we need more, far more, than a purely military response to the Soviet challenge.

We need the marshaling of our resources, physical and mental, such as we have never had before.

We need imagination and freshness.

We need force and boldness in our leadership.

We need, further, I believe, to look beyond the danger evident now to see the horizons of peace in outer space.

I am no scientist and I do not pretend to be.

But the brilliant men of this age—the brilliant minds of America—tell us things that we cannot ignore.

Out in space, there is the power to control the earth's weather, to change the climate where we live, to alter the tides and direct the Gulf Stream on a different course.

From space, snapshots can be taken of your backyard.

The whole technology of communication can be changed.

It is a fascinating, daring, exciting world.

The frontier it opens for human advancement exceeds any man has ever faced.

Surely we cannot, as leaders of free men, ignore it.

Surely we cannot, with this opportunity before us, fail to see that this affords us the one clear course to recapture the initiative for freedom.

Here is an opportunity to bring men together in common cause as never before.

Here is an opportunity for us to sponsor the flourishing of mankind's genius.

Before this session of Congress ends, I am hopeful that we shall be able to establish in our Government a proper agency for direction of a new national effort in this realm.

I am hopeful, also, that we shall be able to provide a program for the enlargement of our research activities, making the laboratories and the equipment available to draw the best from the minds of our people.

I am hopeful that, furthermore, we shall be able to foster the strengthening of our total educational process, not to produce an army of technicians, but, rather, to pour forth legions of broadly-educated men and women.

As we do these things, I trust that in our relations with other nations we shall be imaginative, and that we shall make it evident that America's Free World leadership is not sterile.

We should, certainly, make provisions for inviting together the scientists of other nations to work in concert on projects to extend the frontiers of man and to find solutions to the troubles of this earth.

Our President, holding as he does the esteem of men throughout the world, has a rare opportunity to lead in this labor boldly and forcefully, and in the vigorous pursuit of peace he will find the Nation undivided in his support.

Further, it would be appropriate and fitting for our Nation to demonstrate its initiative before the United Nations by inviting all member nations to join in this adventure into outer space together.

The dimensions of space dwarf our national differences on earth.

If we are to win space as the outpost of peace, all men may—and should—share in that endeavor.

We, with our great resources and our great abilities, must not allow the leadership to slip from our grasp.

The world in which we live is a world in which danger abounds.

There is no greater danger, though, than for us to shrink from the responsibilities of the hour.

Ahead, if we move with speed, if we move with daring, we shall find fulfillment of our quest for peace.

If we are to reach such a goal, our response must begin now. This, more than we realize, is the year of decision, the year our course is set.

In such a year, we need be responsible men, loyal to our nation, faithful to freedom, strangers to partisanship, and friends with the imagination that has been so much a part of our heritage.

THE GOAL IS TOTAL PEACE—EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENTS BY UNITED STATES SENATOR LYNDON B. JOHNSON

ADDRESS IN HOUSTON, TEX., DECEMBER 4, 1957

There is something much bigger and more important in front of us than a few pieces of military hardware. Ballistic missiles and the other fantastic weapons now on the drawing boards are not to be despised.

But they do not hold the key to the future. They are only a small part of the future—a part which will become obsolete almost as soon as it is developed.

What is really before us is something that should have a deep appeal to the American soul. It is a new frontier—a new age—that is exciting and challenging.

What we are doing is stepping into the age of space.

ADDRESS BEFORE MEETING OF DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE, JANUARY 7, 1958

Within the short weeks since October 4, man has become master of horizons far beyond our imagination. We must respect this mastery, and from that respect we must, more than ever, seek to bring all men together in cooperative effort. The goals now within reach of the human race are too great to be divided as spoils, too great for the world to waste its efforts in a blind race between competitive nations. The conference table is more important now than ever it has been, and we should welcome to its chairs all men of all nations.

ADDRESS BEFORE MEETING OF CBS AFFILIATES, JANUARY 14, 1958

Our greatest need in this hour is to unleash the pioneering spirit and the daring and brilliance of our people and set this Nation's course on the pursuit of peace.

It would be appropriate and fitting for our Nation to demonstrate its initiative before the United Nations by inviting all member nations to join in this adventure into outer space together.

ADDRESS ON THE FLOOR OF THE SENATE, JANUARY 27, 1958

I do, however, have a great deal of faith in efforts to outlaw war when they are accompanied by positive steps to bring people together in cooperation.

When people work together to face a great challenge, they tend to lose their suspicion of each other. They become absorbed in the task before them—and fighting as an instrument of policy fades from the picture.

It is for this reason that I believe the current situation affords us such a great opportunity. There are positive steps which we can take in concert with the other nations of the world to face the great challenge presented by outer space.

ADDRESS ON THE FLOOR OF THE SENATE, FEBRUARY 4, 1958

Our plans for peace must progress jointly and must be as firm as our plans for defense. In other words, this must be a joint effort.

We must not spend all our billions of dollars and make all our plans to fight a war which may never be fought. But in preparing our Nation and in purchasing the implements, the missiles, the planes, and the submarines which may be necessary to prevent a war, we should also have some positive, affirmative plan for peace, to go alongside our preparedness efforts.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This development disturbs me very much. The headline, indicating that the Soviets are taking a suggestion which was made long ago—and I recall particularly the majority leader's statement early in the session about the control of space—and are now using the same ideas as great propaganda, confuses me very much.

I do not quite understand what was the attitude of the administration toward the suggestion by the majority leader. My attention was distracted a moment ago, and I did not hear what the Senator said about what occurred concerning the suggestion made by the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is the \$64,000 question. The Secretary of State did not think it was a bad idea. The minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]; the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], all gave their approval to it. Mr. Stassen, the President's adviser on disarmament, likewise favored it.

Nothing was done. That is why I am taking the floor this afternoon. I was shocked to read the article by Mr. Kenworthy, according to which the administration admitted that the Soviet Union had performed a major propaganda achievement, had achieved a victory in the field of propaganda, even though the idea had originally been brought forth by the distinguished majority leader, even though several months had passed, during which the administration could have made use of the proposal, and even though the President of the United Nations General Assembly, Sir Leslie Munro, had advocated the idea and was waiting for someone to propose it.

Nothing was done until the Soviet Union took advantage of the idea proposed by the majority leader, and dropped a bomb, so to speak, in the lap

of the administration. The result is that the administration says that the Soviet Union has achieved a great propaganda victory.

I do not know why the suggestion was not taken up; why Henry Cabot Lodge, the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, did not advance the proposal; why someone in the State Department did not call it to the President's attention; why, in general, we were found to be lagging; why, once again, we are reacting, instead of acting; and why, once again, we have to admit that the Soviet Union is on the offensive and is on the job, adding another victory to its lengthy string of propaganda victories.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Montana for the explanation. It is certainly most discouraging to have ideas developed by Americans taken advantage of by the Communists. I do not know what the answer is, unless some way can be found to alert the State Department to take the initiative in following up the activity of the Soviets.

Mr. MANSFIELD. So far as the Soviet Union is concerned, I think they do not mean what they say, because tied to the proposal is the corollary that before it would be acceptable to the Soviet Union, we would have to withdraw from our air base complex in Europe and in other areas ringing the Soviet Union.

The Senator from Arkansas knows, as well as I do, that ever since the creation of NATO, the one overriding, predominant aim of the Soviet Union has been to get this country, with its forces, out of Europe—not so much our ground forces in Germany and northern Italy, but to break up the infrastructure of airfields. The Soviets know that in that infrastructure lies our only weapon which can be considered as a really retaliatory one and as a deterrent to aggressive action on their part.

The fact that the Soviet Union has coupled our withdrawal from Europe with the Johnson idea, or the Johnson plan, of a cooperative effort with respect to outer space indicates to me the falsity of their position. They are using an American idea to develop one of their own, and at the same time to put us on the defensive, so that we are once again made to look as though we are in a weak and ineffective position before the nations of the world.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I certainly would not wish to derogate the importance and broad scope of the proposal made by the distinguished majority leader several weeks ago, nor the importance of the subject to which the distinguished Senator from Montana has addressed himself. I wish that it were possible that the questions of security and peace to which he is speaking could be above partisanship. I do not believe it is possible, but we can hope that partisanship will be minimized. I know that would be the desire of the Senator from Montana.

Simply to keep the record straight, I know the Senator from Montana will agree with me that more than a month ago the President of the United States addressed a letter to Mr. Bulganin, in which he proposed the banning of weapons in outer space.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. I believe that was the first proposal about the peaceful control of outer space, either by the Soviet Union or the United States, and it was made by the President.

Second, I think the Senator from Montana knows that recent negotiations, proposals, exchanges of letters have been conducted in the context of possible meetings, the assumption of a possible summit meeting, in which disarmament, missiles as well as conventional weapons, as well as other political questions would come into discussion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator repeat the last part of his statement?

Mr. COOPER. The discussions which have been going forward between the President and Mr. Bulganin have dealt with the question of a summit meeting, subjects which might be discussed, including disarmament, and missiles.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. So the proposal of the President to Bulganin is in context with the subjects to be discussed between the United States and Russia, if a meeting should be held, and in advance of the Russian proposal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is a relationship, but I point out that as far back as January 7, the majority leader advocated a meeting of this kind through the United Nations. The proposal was taken up by both Democrats and Republicans and was advocated, but nothing was done. There is a relationship, but all the other activities must be considered, too.

Mr. COOPER. As I have said, I am not derogating the importance of the situation or the breadth of the majority leader's proposal. But I thought I should show the full story, by saying that several weeks ago the President of the United States in a note to Mr. Bulganin, made the first proposal about outer space, to bar the use of missiles in outer space.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Kentucky is always fair and accurate. I am glad he has straightened out the record to that extent.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Montana for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate today. I offer, perhaps belatedly, commendation to the distinguished majority leader for having had the wisdom to make the first suggestion in this regard.

I express my complete accord with the views of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] that, to the extent it is possible, these matters should be treated on a bipartisan basis. I know there is no Member of the Senate who feels that way more strongly than does the majority leader.

I think it is clear from what has been said today that mistakes have been made

in our foreign policy concerning the handling of the question of outer space. Perhaps it is not for us to fix the blame; but our responsibility is to look forward and to see what we, as a body charged by the Constitution with the duty of advising with the President on matters of foreign policy, can do to persuade the President to pursue the matter further. It is my strong view that the simple fact that the Soviet Union has won a propaganda victory by taking up a suggestion first made by the distinguished majority leader, is no reason for running away from that suggestion now.

It is still a good idea to have the United Nations take up the matter of outer space and determine whether some kind of binding international agreement can be worked out. In fact, I think everything we can do at this time to strengthen the United Nations and support the President in his efforts to do that and to see whether, even now, we can move ahead with the suggestion the majority leader has made, and to make it fully effective, should be done. I know that those in the White House and those on the other side of the aisle in this Chamber will not discourage the taking of action on that suggestion merely because it came from the majority leader of the Senate.

I hope that, from now on, we shall move forward and get something done, rather than to attempt to assess the blame for the mistakes of the past.

Again, Mr. President, I wish to commend my friend, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], for having the good judgment to raise this question now, while something can be done.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania has put his finger directly on the head of this particular matter. I believe it should be considered in the United Nations, only, however, on the basis of its own merits, and away from any corollary proposal which would seek to achieve a diplomatic, strategic, or propaganda objective of the Soviet Union. I believe the latter is the second part of the proposal, and I believe the second part should be ignored. But I believe consideration should be given to the first part, namely, to have the United Nations consider the matter seriously.

Mr. CLARK. Yes; and that was the point I made.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to express full agreement with the point which has been made by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], namely, that we have been left in the lurch.

I also wish to concur fully in the suggestion which has been made by the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], namely, that it is not too late to act, not even at this late date.

Mr. President, we in this country have been made to appear in a very false light before the eyes of the rest of the world.

We cannot exercise indefinitely our leadership of the Free World, so long as we merely react to Soviet proposals. Freedom cannot be sustained on the basis

of negative reactions to shrewdly timed moves by a very aggressive power.

There is no need for us to be caught in such a position. We have tremendous advantages on our side, if we shall just use them:

First, our country is founded upon a philosophy which has a deep and moving appeal to all men.

Second, we have a record of good-faith dealings to promote the independence of other peoples.

Third, we have the strongest industrial unit that has ever been built in the entire history of humanity.

Yet, Mr. President, somehow, in the eyes of the world, our philosophy is obscured; our record has been perverted; our strength has been pictured as a mere device for imperialism.

Mr. President, it does not take cleverness to advance our position. We do not need advertising experts or skilled propagandists. We have tried them, and they have been found wanting.

What we in this country need is confidence in ourselves and confidence in the willingness of humanity to respond to honorable proposals, honorably advanced.

Although it is late—as the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has said—it is not too late. We have lost a propaganda battle; but we have not lost the battle between freedom and aggression.

We can still go before the United Nations with a proposal stripped of all propaganda trappings and founded upon an honest desire to achieve peace through international cooperation.

The overriding importance of outer space to the future of the world was highlighted again just this morning. The Vanguard satellite that we placed in orbit is small; but it is the forerunner of things that are to come—things that are going to come quickly, Mr. President. Soon the skies will be filled with satellites which will do much more than merely go "beep." They will also do much more than merely collect information.

There is a point of no return in the affairs of mankind. There is a stage at which actions become irreversible.

Right now, the world is uncertain and hesitant. We are standing on the threshold of mighty achievements, but we are not certain just what those mighty achievements may be.

In a few years—a distressingly short few years—the uncertain future will become a present reality. There will be a vested interest in the instruments of destruction. Attitudes will have been hardened. What should be mankind's greatest cooperative adventure will be, instead, a savage battle for the control of the universe.

Mr. President, I am convinced that no one nation can ever achieve the goal of controlling outer space. But if two great nations try to achieve such a goal, the end result will be destruction on a scale beyond our wildest nightmares.

Let us forget about propaganda battles. Let us forget about slogans and catchwords. Let us forget about transitory advantages.

Instead, Mr. President, let us push forward as boldly in peace as we would in war. Let us trust the good judgment and the good will of humanity. It is a force which, if properly tapped, can be greater than the hydrogen bomb.

I hope this country will go forward and will offer boldly and without reservation to engage in a joint venture, through the United Nations, for the exploration of outer space.

We do not know what lies out there. We do not know what such exploration will bring.

But, Mr. President, we do know that men who work together can live together and can build the kind of world and the kind of universe in which all of us want our descendants to live.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair) 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.)

AID TO INDIA

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the Federal Government has recently decided to allot an additional one-quarter of a billion dollars to India. This means we have given India an estimated 1½ billion American dollars since she obtained her independence. Furthermore, we know that this is not the end.

India says she needs \$1 billion right now. Here we are again, asking the same old questions, which are never answered. Why should we take this money from American producers and give it to India? Why should we not do it? Why should we do it now?

The Senator who preceded me, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER], explained the very serious situation that exists in his State. Similar situations exist in other States. Are we to ask the American people at this time to dig down in their pockets and give another quarter of a billion dollars to India?

We are told we must give India this sum, or her 5-year plan will collapse and we are told that in that event India will then probably fall into the open arms of the Soviet Union. So we are to buy her aloofness from Soviet wiles, but we must never, never, never ask her to declare herself opposed to the Communist attack on the freedom of the whole world.

Why should we not give India this money? There are two reasons: First, the United States cannot afford it; second, I cannot believe such a grant would truly be a help to the people of India.

First, we have a national debt of over \$275 billion, and at the rate legislation

is being enacted by this Congress, although only recently we raised the debt ceiling to \$280 billion, we will have to raise it again before Congress adjourns. We are spending money that fast.

So, the Federal Government has spent \$275 billion of money it did not have, over and above what it spent from its monumental tax collections, and the windfall from reducing the value of the dollar to less than 50 cents.

To pay that debt, you and I, Mr. President, and the young people of today, will have to earn this \$275 billion over and above all our current expenditures for our families, and all our taxes for defense and other Government expenditures, including war, if that should befall.

This has all been said before, again and again and again.

The present budget now going through Congress depends on revenues the estimates of which are likely to prove too high. Yet it is proposed that we raise the expenditure side, by stepping up outlays for defense, for roads, for housing, urban renewal, farm aid, schooling, reclamation, rivers and harbors, unemployment insurance, loans to small business, loans for foreign trade, and credits to the CCC to give away American farm products to foreign governments, through soft loans.

There are two bills coming up this week, one providing \$3½ billion for the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the other to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank by \$2 billion. Thus, before the week is over the Senate will have committed \$5½ billion.

How clever is the curtain of propaganda over foreign aid, which hides these grim facts about our economic crisis from the public gaze.

Now we come to the second point. Why should we believe the fairy tale that this outlay will help India? Our American money will go to bolster the 5-year plan, but what is the 5-year plan but Socialist economy tyranny over the Indian people?

Socialism has never given the people of any country anything. What have their socialism and all their 5-year plans given the people of the Soviet Union? They have the mightiest war machine in their history. They have an all-powerful secret police at home to keep their own people in a state of terror. But do they have more to eat? More to wear? Better homes to live in?

Even czarist Russia had a superb system for admitting the sons of poor families to the universities.

Why should the people of the United States help to maintain the yoke of socialism about the necks of the Indian people?

The 5-year plan is a Communist governing device, which succeeded in Russia only because of the vast amount of machinery and statistical help supplied by American industry, and because of gifts by this country during and since World War II, and the deals made at Potsdam and Yalta.

The 5-year plan of India is in trouble because it promised too much, because it sent prices too high, because it was not efficiently managed by experienced men.

Are we going to bail out all the Socialist governments which do not know how, properly, to invest the capital wrung from their people, or donated by us?

Let me remind Senators, the Indians are famous traders and businessmen.

They have carried on a large part of the trading in Asia.

They operate throughout eastern Africa, and even in our West Indies.

They probably could teach us plenty about business operations.

The Indians, years ago, built up enterprises such as a fine steel mill operation, with private capital and the help of private American citizens, who were employed by private business without having the American Government involved at all.

Why should we penalize the producing classes of India by building up a government-controlled economy in place of a rapidly growing private economy?

Why should we help put the Indian people under the economic rule of planners, when Indian native commonsense and business acumen would bring them in increasing measure, both higher earnings and genuine liberty?

I believe the United States cannot offer the world any genuinely anti-Communist program, unless that program is dedicated to liberty, and socialism is not liberty.

That means we must end our policy of helping governments establish economic dominion over their people, which is not efficient enough really to raise living standards, and which we must bail out by adding to the heavy taxes our people are already paying.

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

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I have just listened to my friend and colleague, the junior Senator from Indiana. We came to the Senate at the same time, in 1947. We are good personal friends, but I disagree with his speech.

I did not expect this afternoon to be called upon to rebut the speech of my friend from Indiana, who is a member of my party.

As Senators know, I had the honor of serving for a time as Ambassador to India in 1955-56. I went to a country which I had never visited. Since my return to the Senate I have not attempted to lecture in the Senate about India. I think I have been fairly quiet.

Nevertheless, as a man of some maturity, I believe, and one of reasonable powers of observation, I had to make my judgment about India during my stay in that country. I was called twice to return to the United States to testify before the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations of the Senate and House, and before the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate, to give my views upon the economic and political situation in India; and our relations with that country.

I have always been pleased that in 1955 and 1956, in addition to the regular group to whom I made those presentations, many other groups in the Congress asked me to talk to them. When I had finished, I numbered up those in the groups and from that I had talked to

some 250 Members of the House and Senate. They were very much interested in what was happening in India and anxious that our relations should be harmonious. I was pleased that they had interest and, I believe, confidence in the views which I expressed.

I know there are some persons who say that American representatives are "taken in." I do not live very far from the distinguished Senator from Indiana. We both live in the same kind of community—a small, rural community. We grew up with the same kind of people, who had the same backgrounds. We both served in the armed service. We have had many, many experiences which were similar; but we disagree politically on the issue of foreign aid, and on other international issues.

I think the Senator from Indiana, whatever he may think about my views, on these issues on which we disagree, believes that my judgment is my own.

In the few articles I have written about India and the speeches I have made, I have tried to be objective and to refrain from speaking of things which might appeal deeply to me, such as human goodness which would lead a people more highly favored, helping other people. I have spoken chiefly on the basis of self-interest, the self-interest of our country, the United States.

The distinguished Senator and I disagree upon the subject of foreign aid. He is not very strong for foreign aid.

Mr. JENNER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. I favor a foreign-aid program, and I hope it will be made more effective and more useful. I expect, before the debate takes place on that subject, to express some views, drawn from my experience, which I hope will make the program more effective and in time more economical.

If the Senator debates the loan to India on the basis of the fact that he disagrees with the foreign-aid program, that is understandable.

I recognize there is a great appeal now to an opposition to a foreign-aid program, on the ground that we are in a recession. The argument has appeal. I know back home, in Pulaski County, Ky., and in many other counties in the eastern area of the State where I live—and I am very proud of the people who reside in the mountain section there—there are those who are out of work. Many ask me, "Why do you support a foreign-aid program, when we need so many improvements in our own State and in our own country?"

We are having our economic troubles today but I think of foreign aid as I think of defense. Whatever the situation in our country, we cannot forget that the defense and the security of the United States, are issues that stay with us.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. Those words sound good. The defense of our country is a great thing. But will the Senator point out to me one instance in which India, after the gift of \$1½ billion from our

people to the Government of India, has decided any question of foreign policy, in connection with any major problem, on the side of this country? She either remains neutral or sides with Russia. We are spending \$40 billion this year to prepare a defense against communism; yet India, of which the Senator speaks so kindly, will take our money and either remain neutral or side with Russia, on every problem.

Can the Senator point out another example?

Mr. COOPER. I disagree with the Senator's statement.

Mr. JENNER. Can the Senator cite another example?

Mr. COOPER. The Senator's ideas about other countries, and what effect their policies have upon our security, differ from mine.

Mr. JENNER. I am not talking about other countries. I am talking about India. So far as aid to Poland is concerned, the situation is worse and less justifiable. Can the Senator point out one instance of India having sided with this country, which has given her \$1½ billion?

Mr. COOPER. I would be very happy if every country in the world would agree with the United States. But every country in the world is not going to agree with the United States on every issue. One of the mistakes this country would make, would be to insist that every other country in the world must agree with the United States on everything, if they are to have our friendship and support.

What is it that we are seeking in the world? We are seeking, I think, security. We want this country to be safe. We want it to be free. We want it to be secure.

One thing which will determine our security in the long run, will be whether other great countries of the world which are now democratic, will remain democratic or will fall under the domination of Russia. I have heard the distinguished Senator and other colleagues, stand on the floor of the Senate during the past 10 years and speak about the loss of China to communism. For 10 years we have cried about China. I agree with my colleague that if China were not a Communist country today, the balance of world power would, without question, be upon the side of the democracies of the world, and security and freedom in the world would be brighter. But now China is gone.

Mr. JENNER. I agree with the Senator. China is gone. But will not the Senator admit that the policies which this country carried out helped her to go.

Mr. COOPER. I certainly believe we could have done more; that we should have made the greatest effort for our Chinese allies. The next largest country in the world, in point of population, is India. Years ago Lenin said—and I quote rather loosely—that the path to the conquest of the West and the democracies was through Asia, through China and India.

The China mainland is with Russia. Together they have a population of

nearly 800 million. If the Government of India should fail, if its economic programs should fail, and their people should lose confidence in their government—and I say to the distinguished Senator that it is a democratic government; not in our own image, but a democratic government—and if her leaders could not produce economic advancement for her people by democratic means, the great risk is that the people of India, or of any new country seeking better living standards, might turn in another direction, to communism, for advancement.

Those who have talked about China for the past 10 years, would, if they had it in their power, give unlimited sums to the economic advancement of China, if it were free, to help it keep free and among the free countries of the world.

In some respects we are faced with a similar situation with regard to India, except that we have the advantage of the example of China. Are we to be so blind as to repeat our mistake? Let me say to my good friend from Indiana, that I think we have a much better chance to see India remain on the democratic side and grow stronger than was true in the case of China in 1947.

Whatever free China's chances were in the early 1920's and 1930's and after World War II—and I have a great admiration for the Nationalists, as our World War II allies, and as allies today; and I wish they were in power today on the mainland of China—yet they could not bring economic well being to their country and their people. There was a tremendous Communist force in China, with strong leaders, and they won China. The attrition of war, the broken treaties of Soviet Russia, our failure to give adequate help contributed—

Mr. JENNER. The Communist forces won with our help. Let us keep the record straight.

Mr. COOPER. Let us keep the same thing from happening in India.

Mr. JENNER. Let us keep the record straight. Did we not pull the rug out from under Nationalist China?

Mr. COOPER. I think we did; at least—when we failed wholeheartedly to give our aid.

Mr. JENNER. There is no question about it.

I think the Senator has misunderstood my premise. I stated, in the first place, that I did not know how we could ask our people to send to India a quarter of a billion dollars recently—and \$1½ billion in all—when only a few days ago we increased our debt ceiling from \$275 billion to \$280 billion, and when we are expected to make further contingent commitments this week of more than \$5 billion.

Only 30 minutes ago the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] introduced a bill calling for a commitment of another \$2 billion. It is billions here and billions there. I do not know how long America can continue at this rate, trying to support and defend herself, and trying to take care of the rest of the world, particularly when nations like India, in the crucial tests of history, are not even kind

enough to take our side. She is always on the side of our opponents.

If we go down the drain, what will happen to India and all the other countries of the world when there is no one left but us and we are bankrupt? It is important to begin thinking about that issue.

In the first 100 days of the session, God only knows how many billions of dollars we have given out. We shall not have the money to keep the budget balanced. We shall have to raise the debt ceiling again. Some are advocating removing the debt ceiling entirely. We have had inflation in this country in the past 10 years which has reduced the value of the dollar to 40 cents. Do we want a 10-cent dollar?

We have some terrible problems. India may be the finest country in the world. In the first place, I do not think we can afford these programs; and in the second place, I am not in favor of financing socialism, because socialism will not bring liberty; and communism is only socialism with a Russian name.

Mr. COOPER. It is difficult, I will admit, in a time of recession, to make a foreign-aid program popular; yet I make the point that the problems of defense and of security continue, and we cannot cut them off for a few months because we are in a recession. I have confidence that the present recession is temporary. But we cannot remove ourselves from the issue of our defense and security because we are in a recession.

Mr. JENNER. What defense benefits are we getting from India? I think she is siding with Russia.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is mistaken.

Mr. JENNER. We have not time to go into that question at length, but the record will clearly show that my statement is correct.

Mr. COOPER. I have been in India, and I have been in Asia. Among the Asian countries, with the exception of the Philippines, and perhaps Japan, there is none which is striving harder for democratic government, for independence, and advancement than India.

Mr. JENNER. I am talking about defense. What good do these programs do us from the standpoint of defense?

Mr. COOPER. If India can become economically stable and maintain its democracy in the years ahead, it will be an influence for security and peace.

What is the alternative? Suppose India fails. Suppose she loses, and her people should turn to communism. Where would we stand then?

Mr. JENNER. I will ask my question again. What will happen to us if we go broke? Where will we stand, if we become a bankrupt and destroyed nation?

How could we have a defense? Does the Senator think India would come over here and defend us? If so, with what? Only with what we give her, apparently.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is arguing the issue of foreign aid. We disagree upon the question of foreign aid.

Mr. JENNER. Of course, we disagree.

Mr. COOPER. I wished to answer the Senator's statement that we were financing and aiding a Communist country. There is nothing further from the true facts than that.

Mr. JENNER. I said a Socialist country, not a Communist country.

Mr. COOPER. India, in its plan, has adopted certain principles of governmental ownership. They are not what I would approve for this country. However, I will say there is less public ownership in India than there is in the United States. That might be of interest to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. Yes; it would be.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill which I introduced for myself and on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3502) to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. YARBOROUGH), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the bill would immediately provide \$75 million in emergency airport aid and extend to Federal Aid to Airport Act for 4 years, which act will expire in 1959.

In the present program the Federal Government matches 50 percent of the money spent by cities or local authorities in the construction of airports. The program is working well, but the funds provided in the present act are insufficient to meet the needs of the local communities which have voted airport funds and are now waiting in a long line to receive the money that has been promised them for their airport-construction work.

Mr. President, within a few months, and certainly before the end of the year, there will be in use both on the trunk airlines and on the international airlines many of the huge jet transport planes, carrying 125 to 150 passengers, and requiring new types of runways with lengths of up to 12,000 feet and new types of aprons.

Under the present act it is impossible to allocate more than \$1 million of the \$63 million a year to any single airport. I know from personal experience that major improvements will have to be made to meet the requirements of the jet transport age. Cities which expect to be on the jet transport schedules will have to spend between five and fifteen million dollars or more in order to be ready. If

there are available only the limited funds which we prorate at a maximum of \$1 million a year to any one airport—to match the funds that have been voted by the cities—we will stretch out the work program by perhaps 5 to 7 years.

We cannot afford to wait that long, because the jet air age is upon us. For that reason, and for the reason that there is a vast growing unemployment in the country, I feel, and the coauthors of the bill feel, it would be wise to add at least \$75 million of additional matching funds to the Airport Aid Act. This would mean the work could start immediately upon the passage of the bill, and in that way put literally thousands of unemployed people to work.

As I said, the bill would provide immediately \$75 million in emergency airport aid and extend the Federal Aid to Airport Act for 4 more years at a rate of \$100 million a year, rather than at the present annual rate of \$63 million.

This is the type of program that the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] has been pleading with Congress to accelerate. It is the type of work that has been necessary and needed, but which has been slowed down or stretched out or made expensive because of the small dribbles of Federal money which have been made available.

I discussed the bill with the majority leader before I introduced it, and he has urged us to include the proposed amount. When the Aviation Subcommittee takes up the bill, we will consider enlarging the amount if the municipalities involved can show us that they have work ready and blueprinted and in a condition that can be made less expensive by expediting the program through the immediate authorization and appropriation of this emergency depression erasing device.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the legislation proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma is of far-reaching importance.

It is a challenge to act with speed worthy of the jet age.

The airport construction and improvement projects that would be made possible under this program are both desirable and necessary.

At a time when we are rightly concerned about the number of people who are out of work, these projects would provide constructive jobs in communities all over the Nation.

Mr. President, in my own State of Texas 25 communities are prepared to move forward with airport construction and improvement projects during the 1959 fiscal year if Federal assistance is provided.

The sponsors are asking a total of some \$3,300,000 for this work. They will match that sum locally in the various communities affected.

The situation in Texas is paralleled in other States.

The bill offered by the Senator from Oklahoma is a constructive proposal. It is in tune with the times. It is in accord with the sound principle of cooperative effort between the Federal Government and local units of government for the good of the people generally.

I believe in building airports and in improving airports. And I consider there is economic wisdom in planning to accelerate the work at this time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the

RECORD at this point in my remarks a list of airport projects in the State of Texas which sponsors are prepared to undertake during fiscal year 1959, and for which they have requested Federal financial assistance.

The list was prepared by the Office of Airports, of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

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

Texas

Location, sponsor, and airport	Description of work requested by sponsor	Federal funds requested
Ablene, city of Abilene, municipal airport.....	Construct new control tower, lengthen north-south runway 850 feet to north with necessary storm sewers and taxiways, extend ramp to north and taxiways from new T-hangars.	\$200,000
Alice, city of Alice, municipal airport.....	Construction of new lighting system on northwest-southeast runway, reconstruct base and paving on outer 10 feet of north-south, northwest-southeast runways.	16,912
Alpine, city of Alpine, Starnes Field Municipal	Pave northeast-southwest runway 3,600 by 100 feet.....	22,000
Andrews, Andrews County, Andrews County Airport.....	Acquire land, extend north-south runway and northeast-southwest runway, additional taxiways.....	37,691
Austin, city of Austin, Robert Mueller Municipal Airport.....	New administration building, grading, pave ramps, access roads, parking areas, acquire land and utility connections; reconstruct north-south runway and remaining portion of northeast-southwest runway and connecting taxiways and acquire clear zone, medium intensity lights on north-south and northeast-southwest runways and connecting taxiways.	930,000
Beaumont, county of Jefferson, Jefferson County Airport.....	Construct taxiways, taxiway and holding apron lighting, construct holding apron north-south runway, construct holding apron northwest-southeast runway.	144,240
College Station, A. and M. College of Texas, Easterwood Field.	Rehabilitate field lighting and install taxiway lights at turnoff points, runway marking.....	6,000
Colorado City, city of Colorado City, municipal airport.....	Purchase of land, grade north-south runway 4,200 by 100 feet, construct and pave north-south runway, install lights north-south runway, construct taxiway and apron.	102,750
Corpus Christi, city of Corpus Christi, municipal airport (new).....	Light runways and taxiways, entrance road and auto parking, construct terminal building, terminal annex and walkways, construct equipment yard, fencing, utilities, service roads, taxiways to public hangars.	999,113
Del Rio, city of Del Rio and Val Verde County, Val Verde County Airport.	Land acquisition—reimbursement, construct runway, pave taxi strip and apron, install lights, construct administration building, move and rehabilitate hangars.	58,400
El Paso, city of El Paso, El Paso International Airport.....	Extend northeast-southwest runway 2,850 by 150 feet including taxiway, plus high speed taxiway turnoff system, entire 1 runway; extend high intensity lights and taxiway lights, resurface and strengthen existing taxiway, reconstruct entrance road and auto parking area, install underground gasoline storage and drainage systems, construct aprons.	425,700
Gladewater, city of Gladewater, municipal airport.....	Pave north-south runway 60 by 2,300 feet, airport roads, aircraft parking apron; drainage.....	7,800
Hereford, city of Hereford, municipal airport.....	Airport lighting (northeast-southwest-runway), pave hangar apron and access road.....	16,705
Hillsboro, city of Hillsboro, municipal airport.....	Acquire land site, grade and pave north-south runway (4,000 by 75 feet), pave apron, turn areas and taxiway, administration building and utilities, light north-south runway, access road and auto parking, fence area, grade and drain taxiway, easements.	55,000
Houston, city of Houston, Houston International Airport.....	Northeast-southwest runway extension 735 by 150 feet, taxiway No. 1, 1,600 by 75 feet; terminal building addition, apron pavement, loading finger, auto parking, new northwest-southeast runway, taxiway No. 12, 4,250 by 75 feet, storm sewers, remodel old terminal building, taxiway No. 3.	2,426,500
Houston, city of Houston, municipal airport (new).....	Purchase 3,126 acres of land for new airport.....	930,469
Kingsville, Kleberg County, Kleberg Airport.....	Acquire site and grade, pave runway northwest-southeast 3,500 by 75 feet, pave taxiways and apron, auto parking, administration building, lighting runway northwest-southeast.	75,000
Lamesa, city of Lamesa and County of Dawson, municipal airport.	Pave road and auto parking, construct administration building.....	12,500
Laredo, city of Laredo, Laredo municipal airport.....	Land acquisition, runway 4,900 by 75 feet, taxiways and aprons, runway and taxiway lighting, terminal building 30 by 40 feet.	134,325
Lubbock, city of Lubbock, municipal airport.....	Enlarge and remodel terminal, sewage line to disposal plant, enlarge auto parking, enlarge and strengthen aircraft parking, center taxiway, taxiway lighting, parallel north-south runway.	355,220
Palestine, city of Palestine, municipal airport.....	Install waterline.....	5,000
Perryton, city of Perryton and Ochiltree County, municipal airport.	Pave runway and apron.....	44,620
Plainview, city of Plainview and Hale County, Hale County airport.	Acquire land, aviation easement and reroute road, extend northeast-southwest runway 800 feet and taxiway, control tower.	65,000
Port Mansfield, Willacy County, municipal airport.....	Land acquisition and clear zones, site preparation, pave north-south runway 3,500 by 60 feet, pave parking area 200 by 800 feet, pave access road, lighting of runway and parking, boundary fencing.	12,750
San Antonio, city of San Antonio, San Antonio International Airport.	Reconstruction and lengthening northwest-southeast runway (12-30) overlay 17-35 and taxiways 6, 9, 11, and 14; additional taxiways, aprons, and lighting; terminal and apron extension, service roadways and utilities, cargo building.	1,188,098
Waco, city of Waco, municipal airport.....	Install high intensity lights runway 18/36, install medium intensity lights runway 14/32, acquire north-south runway clear zone, acquire northeast-southwest runway clear zone, auto parking.	57,794

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I congratulate my beloved friend from Oklahoma for his prompt and constructive action this afternoon.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished majority leader. The same situation that prevails in his State prevails in the States of many other Senators, with whom I discussed the proposed legislation before it was introduced.

Both of these programs—the 4-year \$100 million a year Federal aid program, beginning in fiscal 1960, and the emergency program of \$75 million—are on a 50-50 matching basis for long-range public improvements of a permanent nature. This offers the best opportunity for absorbing a considerable amount of unemployment.

The request for an immediate \$75 million is based on the fact that many cities already have voted bonds and could provide their share of faster-tempo construction, but are prevented from doing so by the lack of matching Federal funds. The emergency fund would be available at once for airports already under construction or under contract.

Many cities are moving as fast as Federal matching funds permit to provide the longer and heavier runways and improved taxiways which jet planes require—before inability to handle jets forces their airports off major airline schedules.

At the same time it offers a chance to get lower rates than usually prevail with contractors and earth movers and paving layers and other contractors in the building of airport buildings—prices that have been impossible to obtain. This is actually strongly supported by facts which have come to us from a national airport survey which has been conducted at their own expense by the Airport Operators Council, and affiliated groups. That survey showed the need for Federal funds of \$150 million a year. Therefore, the proposed annual increase is actually conservative.

The bill which we are introducing today has another feature which will appeal to many Members of the Senate. It would prohibit the use of Federal funds for the construction of parking lots, bars, cafes, and other space rented to concessionaires. We hope and in-

tend to limit the 50-50 percent Federal matching funds to those facilities which serve the public, and which are not rented for revenue-producing concessions which are found at many of the larger airports.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like the Senate to be on notice that later this week, perhaps tomorrow, Wednesday, or Thursday, it is planned to proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 706, S. 1356, to amend the antitrust laws by vesting in the Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction to prevent monopolistic acts by certain persons engaged in commerce in meat and meat products, and for other purposes.

I point out that the bill was reported from the Judiciary Committee on July 18, 1957, and it has been on the calendar since that time. I rather think we shall bring it up by motion, later.

Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEATH OF ROSE WALLACE BENNETT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I believe today we all wish to join in expressing our deep sympathy to our distinguished fellow Senator, WALLACE F. BENNETT, and to the members of his family, upon the death of Rose Wallace Bennett, the Senator's mother.

An eminent daughter of an illustrious Utah pioneer family, Rose Bennett exemplified many of the virtues we cherish and honor. In part her life is a reflection of the life and development of Utah.

Her parents Henry and Elen Harper Wallace came from England, as converts to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, being married in Salt Lake City in 1863. Elen Harper Wallace was among those hardy women who walked the way West.

Henry Wallace worked for Brigham Young, then became an able business executive, a member of the Salt Lake City Council, a patriarch of the 18th Latter-day Saints Ward. Five times he returned to England, on church work and family affairs.

Rose Wallace followed in her mother's footsteps, as a member of the now famed Latter-day Saints Tabernacle Choir, with which she sang not only in Utah but at the Chicago World's Fair in 1893 and in San Francisco in 1896. She received her education at the University of Deseret, from which she gained a teacher's certificate in 1889. Her poetry won place in Utah and English publications.

Her marriage to John Foster Bennett was an event of November 1897. To them were born 3 sons and 2 daughters. Mrs. Bennett—always devoted to her church—faithfully carried out many assignments. In 1896 she was called to the Young Women's General Board of the Mutual Improvement Association, as a member of which she served for 41 years. In 1916 she came to Washington as a delegate to the National Council of Women, and as such long remembered a reception given by President and Mrs. Wilson at the White House, honoring the delegates.

John Bennett had a long and able record in the church and in western business affairs, being senior officer in many business and industrial firms, notably Bennett's Glass & Paint Co.

To John and Rose Bennett their sons and daughters were their chief joy, and the sons have followed their father's example with credit and distinction, in business, in the church. Bennett's today is one of our best-known western firms.

To Senator BENNETT and to his family, I wish—on behalf of us all—to express our condolences. Rose Wallace Bennett

was a mother whose faith in God and man is an inspiration and a guiding light to us all.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I did not have the pleasure of knowing the mother of the distinguished junior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], but she must have been a wonderful woman to have produced such a distinguished, able, patriotic and kind son as the junior Senator from Utah.

Mr. President, I should like to extend my deepest sympathy to the distinguished Senator from Utah and the members of his family.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his kind expressions.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I also join my colleague, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and other Senators in their expressions of sympathy for our colleague and friend, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] in the loss of his mother.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). The present occupant of the chair would also like to join the distinguished senior Senator from Utah in expressing his sympathy for the loss of the mother of a truly distinguished public servant and a great American, the junior Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Utah and his family, I greatly appreciate the expressions just made.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 17, 1958, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1519) for the relief of Isaac Lidji, Henry Isaac Lidji, and Sylvio Isaac Gattegno.

RECESS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate recessed, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 18, 1958, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 17, 1958:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Horace H. Smith, of Ohio, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Laos, vice J. Graham Parsons.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Herbert E. Warburton, of Delaware, to be General Counsel of the Post Office Department.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Walter H. Hodge, of Alaska, to be United States district judge, division No. 2, district

of Alaska, for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 2, 1958.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Duncan Wilmer Daugherty, of West Virginia, to be United States attorney for the southern district of West Virginia for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Fred Elledge, Jr., of Tennessee, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Tennessee for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Clarence Edwin Luckey, of Oregon, to be United States attorney for the district of Oregon for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

N. Welch Morrisette, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of South Carolina for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

John Burke Dennis, of Missouri, to be United States marshal for the western district of Missouri for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Eugene Levi Kemper, of Kansas, to be United States marshal for the district of Kansas for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 17, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Proverbs 3: 5: Trust in the Lord with all thine heart; and lean not on thine own understanding.

Almighty God, we humbly and penitently confess that again and again we enter upon a new day hesitatingly and wistfully for we fail to put our trust in Thy grace and goodness.

Inspire us to follow Thy leading with a firm step and with a courage of heart which nothing can daunt and a splendor of faith which will never be eclipsed by doubt and despair.

Grant that our plans and purposes for the health and happiness of our beloved country and all mankind may receive Thy benediction and redound to Thy glory.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 13, 1958, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 483. Joint resolution to amend the act of August 20, 1954, establishing a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton.

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. 1519. An act for the relief of Isaac Lidji, Henry Isaac Lidji, and Sylvio Isaac Gattegno.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolu-

tion of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution favoring the acceleration of military-construction programs for which appropriations have been made.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 5822) entitled "An act to amend section 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 with respect to the reinvestment by air carriers of the proceeds from the sale or other disposition of certain operating property and equipment," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. SCHOEPEL, and Mr. PAYNE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1582) entitled "An act for the relief of Helen Demouchikous."

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

MARCH 15, 1958.

The honorable the SPEAKER,

House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on March 13, 1958, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate on Saturday, March 15, 1958, the following message:

That the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 10021), entitled "An act to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life-insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1957."

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, United States House of Representatives.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLERSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had on March 15, 1958, examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10021. An act to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1957.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Thursday, March 13, 1958, he did on March 15, 1958, sign the following enrolled bill of the House: H. R. 10021—An act to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1957.

APPOINTMENT TO JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 42, section 2251, United States Code, the Chair appoints as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] to fill an existing vacancy.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY GUAM LEGISLATURE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a letter and a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on February 19, 1958, the Honorable A. B. Won Pat, speaker of the Fourth Guam Legislature, addressed a letter to our beloved Speaker as follows:

FEBRUARY 19, 1958.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,

*Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR HONORABLE RAYBURN: Forwarded herewith is a certified copy of Resolution No. 282, relative to expressing the appreciation of the people of Guam to the military services of the United States for their extensive defense establishments within the Territory, and emphasizing the continued desire and interest in welcoming even more extensive military utilization of this Territory, duly and regularly adopted by the Guam Legislature on February 11, 1958.

Sincerely yours,

A. B. WON PAT.

FOURTH GUAM LEGISLATURE, 1958 (SECOND) REGULAR SESSION—CERTIFICATION OF ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION

This is to certify that Resolution 282, relative to expressing the appreciation of the people of Guam to the military services of the United States for their extensive defense establishments within the Territory, and emphasizing the continued desire and interest in welcoming even more extensive military utilization of this Territory, was on the 11th day of February 1958 duly and regularly adopted.

A. B. WON PAT,
Speaker.

Attested:

V. B. BAMBA,
Legislative Secretary.

(Introduced by J. C. Okiyama, A. B. Won Pat, A. L. Cristobal, F. T. Ramirez, G. M. Bamba, M. G. Sablan, V. B. Bamba.)

Resolution relative to expressing the appreciation of the people of Guam to the military services of the United States for their extensive defense establishments with the Territory, and emphasizing the continued desire and interest in welcoming even more extensive military utilization of this Territory

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam:

Whereas in other areas of the world wherein the United States have established extensive military facilities as part of the global battle to defend the Free World, dissatisfaction and annoyance over the necessary changes and imbalances attendant upon such establishments have been expressed by the people of such areas; and

Whereas the United States Armed Forces have in this Territory also established large and extensive military facilities which have by their very size and complexity necessarily caused changes and deviations from a normal civilian economy for Guam; and

Whereas despite such initial strains the people of this Territory have been enormously benefited by the opportunities provided for employment in connection with such military bases and in addition have appreciated the knowledge that such bases are playing a vital role in protecting the American and democratic system; and

Whereas the highly satisfactory relationship existing between the Armed Forces on Guam and the people of the Territory demonstrated convincingly the ability of the American system of representative government, even when operating in comparatively small arena to handle with dispatch and fairness the problems and difficulties large military establishments bring about: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Fourth Guam Legislature does hereby on behalf of the people of Guam express to the Armed Forces of the United States gratitude and appreciation for the extensive military establishments within the Territory which play such an important part in the economic well-being of this island; and be it further.

Resolved, That the Fourth Guam Legislature on behalf of the people of Guam does hereby extend a wholehearted invitation to the defense agencies of the United States to establish additional military and related facilities on Guam as such are required in the continuing defense effort necessitated by the cold war; and be it further

Resolved, That such invitation be extended in the comforting knowledge that the democratic process, whose practice and procedures are now routine in this, the newest American Territory, assures meaningful and successful cooperation by the people of Guam with the efforts of our Armed Forces in such further establishment of defense facilities on Guam, which guarantees the absence of the ill will and dissatisfaction expressed in other areas wherein the American Constitution does not, as it does here, hold full sway; and be it further

Resolved, That the speaker certify to and the legislative secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, Commander in Chief, United States Armed Forces; the Honorable Richard Nixon, President of the House of Senate; the Honorable Neil McElroy, Secretary of Defense of the United States; the Honorable Thomas S. Gates, Jr., Secretary of the Navy; the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives; Rear Adm. W. B. Ammon, United States Navy, commander, naval forces, Marianas; Maj. Gen. Charles W. Schott, commander, Third Air Division, Strategic Air Command; Lt. Col. Victor Gray, United States Army, 809th Engineer Battalion; and to the Honorable Richard Barrett Lowe, Governor of Guam.

This is a very constructive, a very forward-looking, and a very courageous action.

SUCCESSFUL LAUNCHING OF SATELLITE

Mr. McCORMACK. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, like all of my colleagues, I have read with pleasure that another satellite has been projected into orbit. The headlines state: "Vanguard Launching a Success."

The bulletin in connection with this item states:

President Eisenhower announced at 9:45 a. m., eastern standard time, today that the Navy's Vanguard is in orbit.

We all sincerely hope that it will be the success we are looking for. In view of the fact that this launching, and particularly if it is a success, is made on

the anniversary of St. Patrick's birthday, it might be well to call it Shamrock No. 1.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, through good offices of the beloved chairman of the Democratic Congressional committee, MICHAEL KIRWAN, of Ohio, we are blessed with these beautiful green carnations that point up the birthday of the great patron saint of Ireland.

The Ancient Order of Hibernians, a great organization which has done so much to preserve Irish culture, has favored us with these flowers today and they salute you and wish you "Erin go bragh." The "wearing of the green" is most aptly symbolized in these carnations.

In honoring St. Patrick, we are conversant with the fact that this great saint who freed Ireland is not the sole possession of his homeland. To the millions of Irish everywhere and to all freedom-loving people, St. Patrick represents true hope and inspiration for a more peaceful and better world. Let us hope the enslaved nations of the world with little in which to rejoice can visualize the day, decade, or the generation when a "great man with a mighty crozier will rid them of their snakes."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate a great day, St. Patrick's Day. To many this is nothing more than an excuse to break out their green ties and socks or for the ladies to go out and buy a new hat, also green, of course.

But the day of the shamrock is more than this. It is, to be sure, a happy occasion. Irish men and women around the world are joined by like-minded peoples in every land in the festivities. The glories of Ireland, its people and traditions are proclaimed far and wide. And rightfully so, for the contributions they have made to our civilization, our way of life, almost defy measurement. But all too often the real meaning of St. Patrick is lost in the superficial trappings that have come to symbolize the occasion.

For St. Patrick was first and last a dedicated Christian. His great mission was carrying the Word of God the length and breadth of Ireland. In the course of his life he established over 300 churches throughout the Emerald Isle.

Born in England and trained in France, this man was no narrow patriot. His was and is a universal calling—the call of God. The qualities he exemplified are limited to no one country, no one faith. They are the qualities of God as they manifest themselves in man.

It has been over 1,500 years since St. Patrick strode the green hills and dales of Ireland. These years have seen man's everlasting struggle upward, through

the Dark Ages, through the age of slavery, to the present time. They have seen a corresponding growth in man's ability to destroy himself, by bow and arrow, by cannon, by atomic bomb. Yet through all this the spirit of Christianity has endured.

Perhaps as never before the qualities possessed by St. Patrick are those we must call upon today. Faith in God, perseverance in His work, understanding and sympathy for your fellows; given these, the task before us cannot but be accomplished.

So, Mr. Speaker, let the wearing of the green proceed. Let the shamrocks wave. We join with the Irish in their pride of their great land and traditions. But as we do, we are also mindful of the sober truths by which this great man, whose name is honored this day, lived. It is for these he would want to be remembered.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Small Business Committee may sit during general debate Monday and Tuesday of this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me for March 19 be vacated, and that I may address the House for 1 hour on March 25.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN SATELLITES

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I know that Secretary of the Navy Tom Gates, a fellow Pennsylvanian, must be enormously gratified today, and I extend my congratulations to him and to all of the Navy on the successful orbiting of the Vanguard. The day on which we commemorate the driving of the snakes out of Ireland by St. Patrick we have succeeded in driving the bugs out of Vanguard.

Russia now has one satellite in the air, the only one which is loyal to her; we have two. Russia has 13 satellites, all on the ground, all disloyal, all striving for freedom. She has one dead dog in the air, and that is not the only thing that is dead in Russia; freedom, too, is dead in Russia.

FATHER HARTKE DIRECTS SUPERB PRODUCTION OF THE SONG OF BERNADETTE WHICH WILL TOUR SOUTH AMERICA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, Washingtonians will be treated to some very special theater fare, thanks to the imaginative and able work of the Catholic University Theater. Under the skilled guidance of the famed director, Father Gilbert V. Hartke, the players in the Song of Bernadette are presenting a deftly placed and moving masterpiece.

The play was adapted by Jean and Walter Kerr from the novel by Franz Werfel and first presented at Catholic University in 1944. Its subsequent successes are known to all.

The present production is of special interest because it has been selected to make a South American tour under the auspices of the President's special international program for cultural presentations.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that some of this country's efforts to communicate our culture to other nations have been severely criticized. At times, these criticisms have been justified. The Song of Bernadette is exactly the kind of thing we need to silence such criticisms. Wherever it goes in South America I am confident it will not only be a smashing artistic success, but will convey eloquently America's deep religious convictions and our strong cultural traditions. It is productions such as this which can most effectively dispel many of the misconceptions and misleading notions held by many of our neighbors around the world.

I want to urge every Member of Congress, if he is able, to attend a performance of the Song of Bernadette. He will be rewarded not only with a finely acted and superbly directed production. He will also come away with an increased awareness of the tremendous possibilities which such cultural presentations have in transmitting the true concept of America abroad.

Father Hartke and his coworkers deserve a ringing round of applause and a firm word of thanks from all of us for this grand production. It is American theater at its very best.

GOVERNMENT-CREATED JOBS FOR THE UNEMPLOYED

Mr. HOFFMAN. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week the officials of certain unions and some others went down to the White House asking for legislation, presumably to be followed by appropriations, to assist in unemployment, lessening unemployment and its harmful effects.

The query that comes from some of the folks back home is whether if that legislation is enacted, if appropriations are made, as we assume they will be, to

create jobs, will those jobs be open to individuals who are unemployed and who are not members of a union? Or are we to appropriate and legislate only for those who are members or join unions?

CURRENT UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS

Mr. MCGREGOR. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said in recent weeks about current unemployment and I have heard proposal after proposal advocating increased spending for highways, increased spending for housing, increased spending for public works, increased spending for foreign aid—all these proposals being advertised as the answer to the current unemployment problems. The situation has gotten to the place where New Dealers, who are still in the majority in Congress and therefore have a majority in every committee, are actually competing with each other to see who can promote the biggest spending program. I for one am of the opinion that it is time for us to stop and take a long, hard look at these proposals before we give them our approval. Unless we do, I am extremely fearful that we are in danger of becoming another New Deal—rubberstamp Congress.

There is not one of us here who is not 100 percent in accord with doing everything within reason to promote a sound economy. There is not one of us who is opposed to any worthwhile program to provide employment for every one of our citizens who wants the opportunity to work and provide a decent living for himself and his family. But, Mr. Speaker, let us remember that we cannot spend ourselves out of debt, and that every single dollar that we Members of Congress vote to spend must come from taxes assessed against the people of our respective districts. There is no such thing as free money, and every cent that we in Congress agree to spend today must eventually be paid for by the millions of citizens throughout our country.

Let us be certain, Mr. Speaker, that every penny we agree to spend will be on worthwhile projects, and will be beneficial to all. We do not want any more of the leaf-raking type of make-work projects which were so unsuccessfully used during the depression of a few years ago. Let us make certain in every single case that we are appropriating only the necessary and reasonable amount of money for projects and assistance of such a character that they will continue to be of value even after our economy is once more back to normal.

THE LATE RAMON MAGSAYSAY, FORMER PRESIDENT OF THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. VORYS. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, this is the first anniversary of the tragic death, in an airplane crash, of Ramon Magsaysay, President of the Philippines. From the perspective of a year in time and 10,000 miles in distance, his career stands out as a rugged peak of achievement, character, and inspiration in our times.

A guerrilla fighter in World War II, he helped rid his land of its enemies, then plunged into politics in meeting the new perils for his country that came after the Japanese surrender. With unflinching personal courage, he helped subdue the Huks as Minister of Defense, then went on to become a great leader as President.

He was the unswerving friend of the United States, and the incorruptible friend of the common people of his country.

I met him in Washington and again in Manila when he was President. His powerful personality, his courage and confidence, his energy, were magnetic, infectious. He drew men to him in life. His story will draw men to him forever for inspiration and renewed devotion to the cause of freedom.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report on Senate Joint Resolution 162.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us what that bill is?

Mr. ALBERT. That is the bill to freeze price supports and acreage allotments.

Mr. HALLECK. That is the bill that is generally applicable to all agricultural products?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it contemplated that measure will be called up next week or can the gentleman say?

Mr. ALBERT. The majority leader is present. I will yield to him.

Mr. McCORMACK. What is the question? Is that an agricultural bill?

Mr. HALLECK. I was inquiring as to what bill was involved in the gentleman's request because there has been some suggestion or report here that this measure might be called up this week. I was inquiring as to what the measure was and what action might be contemplated by the majority leader in order that we may know what to expect.

Mr. ALBERT. My request is to have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, of course, I have to pick this up in the air. Is this the agricultural bill that passed the Senate, or a bill along that line which passed the Senate the other day?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct. It is the Senate bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to answer the question now. I do not program a bill without exploring it, and I am unable to answer definitely except to say that, if the chairman of the committee wants it brought up this week, if a rule is obtained I shall do everything possible to cooperate. That is about the only answer I can give now because no one has discussed it with me as yet.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, this is a very important measure. As I understand, the measure that comes from the Senate is not a freeze on agricultural support prices for 1958 but is permanent legislation. It involves many other areas, and, certainly, if the bill should be reported by the committee in that form, then there should be some adequate notice to the membership before it is called to the floor for action; because, as I say, it is a matter of extreme importance and consequence.

Mr. McCORMACK. Nobody has discussed it with me as yet, except, if the bill is reported out today, as I hear it is likely to be, then action could be taken. Has it been reported?

Mr. ALBERT. No; it has not been reported.

Mr. McCORMACK. If I was requested and it could be brought up this week, I would cooperate as far as possible.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, we have all known that this measure is here, and the request for leave to file the report by midnight tonight would indicate that action is contemplated in the committee today, and certainly that would indicate some possibility, if not probability, that the measure would be called on the floor very shortly. So, I understand the majority leader's position, and he has told us just about everything that he can as of this time, and my inquiry was not intended or calculated to delay consideration at all.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I suggest to my good friend from Oklahoma that he defer his request until later on today?

Mr. ALBERT. I withdraw my request, Mr. Speaker.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

BENEFITS TO WIDOWS OF EMPLOYEES OF LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 235) to increase from \$50 to \$75 per month the amount of benefits payable to widows

of certain former employees of the Lighthouse Service.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN UNCOMPLETED NAVAL VESSELS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8547) to authorize the disposal of certain uncompleted vessels.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, in view of the fact that a rule has been granted on H. R. 8547, that it be stricken from the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

BENEFITS TO WIDOWS OF EMPLOYEES OF LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that S. 235, the first bill on the calendar, be stricken. It will be brought up under suspension of the rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

REMOVE OTTAWA COUNTY, MICH., FROM CORN AREA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10316) to exclude Ottawa County, Mich., from the commercial corn-producing area during 1958.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CONVEYANCE OF TITLE TO CERTAIN LANDS IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2042) to authorize the conveyance of a fee-simple title to certain lands in the Territory of Alaska underlying war-housing project Alaska-50083, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is hereby authorized to convey, pursuant to the terms of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, and notwithstanding any limitations or requirements of section 2 of the act of May 14, 1898 (30 Stat. 409; 48 U. S. C. 411), or of any other law with respect to the use or disposition of lands of the United States in Alaska, a fee simple title to the lands or any part thereof underlying war-housing project

Alaska-50083 located in Juneau, Alaska, together with such easements in, over, through, or upon the adjacent tidal flats as may be necessary to continue the existing main sewer line to deep water.

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.

TRANSFER OF FUNDS TO HAWAIIAN HOME DEVELOPMENT FUND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7149) to provide for the periodic transfer to the Hawaiian home-development fund of certain excess funds in the Hawaiian Home Administration account.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (3) of subsection (f) of section 213 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended (48 U. S. C. 707), is amended by striking out "general fund of the treasury of the Territory," and inserting in lieu thereof "Hawaiian home-development fund."

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.

NAVIGATION RULES FOR THE GREAT LAKES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7226) to clarify the application of navigation rules for the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of February 8, 1895, entitled "An act to regulate navigation on the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters" (ch. 64, 28 Stat. 645; 33 U. S. C. 241), is amended by deleting the first sentence and substituting the following: "The following rules for preventing collisions shall be followed in the navigation of all public and private vessels of the United States upon the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters as far east as Montreal and in the navigation of all other vessels upon such lakes and waters while within the territorial waters of the United States.

Sec. 2. Section 2 of the act of February 8, 1895 (ch. 64, 28 Stat. 649; 33 U. S. C. 244), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Every licensed or unlicensed pilot, engineer, mate, or master of any vessel subject to section 1 of this act who neglects or refuses to observe the provisions of this act or the regulations established pursuant hereto shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding \$500.

"(b) Every private vessel subject to section 1 of this act that shall be navigated without complying with the provisions of this act or the regulations established pursuant hereto shall be liable to a penalty of \$500, for which sum such vessel may be seized and proceeded against by way of libel in any district court of the United States of any district within which such vessel may be found."

Sec. 3. Sections 4412 and 4413 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (46 U. S. C. 381) are hereby repealed.

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.

CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY TO THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9410) to authorize and direct the transfer and conveyance of certain property in the Virgin Islands to the government of the Virgin Islands.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Virgin Islands Corporation is authorized and directed to transfer and convey to the government of the Virgin Islands upon request of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, without cost, the following-described property:

(a) A tract comprising 5 acres, more or less, of parcel No. 3, Estate Upper Bethlehem, Kingshill, Saint Croix, now in use by the government of the Virgin Islands for educational purposes; and

(b) A tract comprising 12.44 acres, more or less, of Bluebeard's Castle Estate, Saint Thomas, Virgin Islands, now in use by the government of the Virgin Islands as a catchment area.

Sec. 2. Upon the transfer and conveyance of such property by the Virgin Islands Corporation to the government of the Virgin Islands, the interest-bearing investment of the United States in the Corporation shall be reduced by the appraised value of such tracts.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING MIGRATORY BIRD HUNTING STAMP ACT OF MARCH 16, 1934

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10679) to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to utilize funds available under section 4 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451), as amended, and such other funds as may be appropriated, to acquire by lease, purchase, or exchange, small wetland and pothole areas to be designated as "Waterfowl Production Areas." Such small areas shall not be classified as "National Wildlife Refuges," and shall not be subject to the inviolate sanctuary provisions of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE MIGRATORY BIRD HUNTING STAMP ACT OF MARCH 16, 1934

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10803) to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934, as amended.

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

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 10803) be recommitted to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

PROTECTING THE ALASKAN FISHERIES

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 451) requesting the Secretary of the Interior and all departments of Government to protect Alaska-spawned salmon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the salmon fisheries of the Territory of Alaska are a valuable natural resource capable of producing several hundred million pounds of rich protein food annually; and

Whereas this resource provides employment for thousands of United States fishermen and shoreside employees; and

Whereas the resource provides incomes for such fishermen totaling more than \$50 million annually, and provides additional incomes for other employees; and

Whereas the Alaska salmon is spawned in Alaska streams, and returns to those streams at the end of its life cycle for reproduction purposes; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has heretofore recognized the value of said fisheries and the necessity for protecting it, and has enacted laws regulating the taking of salmon by citizens of the United States; and

Whereas, in order to further protect and conserve said fishery resource, the United States Government has entered a treaty with the Governments of Japan and Canada whereby it is understood that citizens of Japan will abstain from taking salmon spawned in Alaskan waters; and

Whereas, notwithstanding such treaty, citizens of Japan have been taking millions of Alaska spawned salmon annually in recent years from international waters where such salmon grow to maturity; and

Whereas citizens of the United States are prohibited from taking such salmon in such international waters; and

Whereas such taking of Alaska salmon by citizens of Japan will destroy the valuable Alaska salmon resource if permitted to continue, and will deprive citizens of the United States of an important protein food resource, employment, and income: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of Interior and all departments of Government immediately take such steps as are necessary to protect the salmon fisheries of the Territory of Alaska.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, strike lines marked "1, 2, 3, and 4", and in lieu thereof insert the following: "*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Interior is instructed to urge all departments of Government affected to immediately take such steps as are necessary to protect the salmon fisheries of the Territory of Alaska."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is well that we pause today on the birthday anniversary of St. Patrick, the patron saint of Ireland, to honor his memory and, in our recollections, to gain inspiration from the life and the faith of this notable saint.

It is unnecessary to go into detail on the life of St. Patrick, for his life of deep faith is known to all. For, without regard to creed, race, or color, St. Patrick and his memory are esteemed and deeply respected.

Throughout the generations the influence of St. Patrick has been tremendous in the minds of those of Irish blood, and also to countless of millions of those of non-Irish blood.

From the little island of Ireland throughout the centuries have gone her sons and daughters to all corners of the world.

While the population of Ireland is small in relation to that of other countries, the descendants are numerous throughout the world. Their influence is also far reaching; this is particularly so in our own beloved country.

The constructive influence of St. Patrick has grown from generation to generation, and will continue to grow.

His deep faith, his missionary spirit, his wonderful life in the service of God and of mankind have left for all time their indelible imprint upon those of non-Irish blood, as well as those of Irish blood, and upon all persons of religious mind, whether Catholic, Protestant, or Jew.

By pausing today to honor this great man and notable saint, and to reflect upon his life and its meaning and significance, in terms of our own lives, we are better persons for doing so. For St. Patrick's life is an inspiration for all persons to follow.

Mr. Speaker, I insert as part of my remarks the following editorial from the New York Times of Monday, March 17, 1958:

EVERYBODY'S SAINT

One doesn't have to be Irish in order to have an affection for St. Patrick—St. Patrick wasn't Irish, either, not by birth. This doesn't prevent St. Patrick's Day from being the festival of a particular faith and an especial nation, but it does make it possible for those among us who never walked down O'Connell Street or kissed the Blarney Stone or rode in a jaunting car around the Lakes of Killarney to be glad when this saint's day rolls around.

St. Patrick's Day doesn't come in what the calendar says is spring, and that is fair warning. However, there is a kind of spring thought in it. Its green is for Ireland, which is indeed a fair, green land, but it is also because it won't be long now before the turn of the year will be at hand, and we can all relax and live happy ever after.

But St. Patrick's Day is mainly a day when everybody is, or ought to be, good-natured and in a kindly mood toward everybody else. It is true that the Irish have done enough fighting in their day—too much, to be sure, like the rest of the world. They are not a docile people, putting up gently with injustice. When there was no fighting to do at home they often went out and looked for it: they defended liberty in our own Revolution; they fought for the Union (and for the Confederacy, too, for that matter) in our own Civil War, and they were almost as numerous on freedom's side of the Second World War as they would have been if their Government had joined in it with the other democracies.

St. Patrick was willing enough to fight when necessary: against sin, against snakes, against anything that he judged was hostile to God's will. But it isn't fighting we think about today—and this day, in this year, in

this generation, in this often sad and tragic time, is a good day to think of a saint who was full to the brim of his heart with goodwill and a cheerful love for all mankind.

And he loved life, too—the parade would surprise him, for he was not a proud man, but he'd keep time to the drums, the pipes, and the brasses like the rest of us, and he wouldn't find any irreverence, where none is meant, in those who love his humanity as well as his saintliness.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, my commendations go to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON], for having introduced House Resolution 451, now before the House. This is a further demonstration of his interest in the welfare of the American fishing industry. Several different suggestions have been made as to how the critical situation arising from Japanese fishing of salmon on the high seas may be remedied. This is one of them. I am sure it will be helpful and the people of Alaska are grateful to the gentleman from Washington for his leadership in this matter.

Very little is known about the life of salmon from the time they leave the streams in which they were born until they return to fresh water again to spawn and die. When the North Pacific Treaty was ratified by the other body in 1952 it was assumed that the line marked by the 175th parallel west, east of which the Japanese were not permitted to fish for salmon, would be fully protective of fish of American origin. The treaty provided for research and for moving that line farther west if it were discovered that Japanese fishing was based in substantial part upon fish which otherwise would return to the Alaska coast. The start of the research program was regrettably delayed. Even now it is far from completed. But evidence which cannot be questioned was developed last summer proving that Japanese are indeed taking salmon of Alaska origin, and in great numbers. To make a bad situation worse, immature fish are being caught.

Japanese nationals are not fishing illegally. I do not contend that, even though it is true that American and Canadian fishermen are barred from fishing in most high-seas areas. Japanese are abiding by the terms of the treaty covenant; notwithstanding, they are making devastating inroads upon a great American resource. The need for speed—the need for House Resolution 451 and allied measures—is that if action is not taken outside the framework of the treaty there may be no red salmon left.

Most of these salmon came from Bristol Bay. It is the site of the greatest red salmon fishery in the world. The resource is immensely valuable. Properly conserved, it will never be exhausted; fish will return every year to furnish needed human food and to provide employment for American citizens. On the other hand, if high seas fishing on the part of Japanese continues as it has for the last 2 or 3 years there will be no salmon left to return to spawn and to insure future stocks.

In a letter quoted in the report from Assistant Secretary William B. Macomber, Jr., of the State Department it is said:

The Department understands that the Japanese Government recognizes the problems involved and the Department expects that measures will be taken to assure the continued productivity of the affected salmon resources of North American origin.

It is imperative that this be done this spring before 1958 fishing starts. The fishery simply will not stand repetition of that which occurred in 1957.

This resource is an important one for the Nation. It is even more important for Alaska. The red salmon fishery—which has been chiefly affected but which research may disclose is not exclusively concerned—is an important tax producer for the Territorial government of Alaska. There is another consideration so far as I am concerned which outweighs this. It is the welfare of several thousands of my constituents who live on the shores of Bristol Bay. They depend chiefly on fishing for their livelihood. Even before the Japanese encroachment, they were having a hard time. Three times the region has been declared a disaster area by President Eisenhower. These people are willing to work. They want to work. They must be permitted to work at an occupation which they have every right to expect will be protected for them. I realize that the Japanese have great need for fish but my sympathies in this case lie entirely with the Alaskans whose need is infinitely greater.

Therefore, I believe House Resolution 451 should be passed and the corrective steps under its provisions should be taken without further delay.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support House Resolution 451, which was introduced by our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. TOLLEFSON). I am sure there is no need to say to the Members of this House, because they cannot have failed to have noticed it, that the author of this resolution is always in the forefront of efforts to help our fishing industry. In particular, Mr. TOLLEFSON has been tireless in his efforts to protect the salmon resources of the Pacific Northwest and Alaska.

I hope most sincerely, Mr. Speaker, that we can pass this measure today. A somewhat similar resolution, I believe, authored by the senior Senator of the State of Washington, has passed the other body. I think time is important because the Japanese fishing fleets sail, as I understand, for the North Pacific early in May. Any discussions of our Government officials with Japan would have to be concluded before that date.

Actually, our red salmon runs that originate and spawn in Bristol Bay, Alaska, will be destroyed unless the Japanese can be prevailed upon to refrain from catching these salmon west of the 175th meridian west. If the Japanese would agree to keep their fishing boats west of the 175th meridian east, as I

understand, it is thought that these Alaska salmon would be protected.

I introduced a somewhat similar resolution and, as I said, favor passage of this measure, but I am frank to say I do not feel House Resolution 451 is strong enough. It is a step, but if it does not succeed then we should pass legislation of a different kind. For example, the Japanese take fish by means illegal and not permissible in the interest of conservation to American fishermen. Since the United States is a substantial market for those fish, I introduced a bill to prohibit the import of any such fish caught by methods unlawful according to American standards.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, the United States and the Congress is going to have to meet this situation and simply refuse to allow any imports of those Alaska-spawned salmon. The Japanese fish 7 days a week and use nets that take the young, small fish so that very few salmon are left to return to their native Alaska rivers to plant their eggs and then die.

Accordingly, there has been very strong support for my bill, H. R. 10244, but I think we should pass House Resolution 451 today and see what happens. If our officials get results, all well and good; if not, let us prescribe a stronger remedy.

Mr. Speaker, in Geneva, Switzerland, the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea is presently discussing the International Law Commission's proposals for freedom of fishing on the high seas. An international law will not solve an individual fishery problem such as exists in the North Pacific Ocean. Treaties between interested nations are the answer.

Protection by agreement is needed not only for salmon but for halibut, herring and other species of fish, as well as the king crab.

The tripartite treaty between the United States, Canada, and Japan recognized that a nation which conserved and utilized a fishery had rights which other nations could not claim. This is the principle of abstention where a nation has, over a long period of time, scientifically regulated and made substantial use on a basis of sustained yield of its world fisheries, then it would have the legal right to the exclusive use of such fisheries regardless of the distance off shore such fisheries extended.

Our colleague, the author of House Resolution 451, is to be congratulated for his efforts in behalf of conservation of our fisheries. If our United Nations representatives and our State Department do not insist on these inherent rights we will wake up soon and find a rich national food supply and the basis of livelihood and income to our fishermen is lost forever.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING TO KERR COUNTY, TEX., THE REVERSIONARY INTEREST OF THE UNITED STATES IN CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 427) to grant to Kerr County, Tex., the reversionary interest of the United States in certain real property.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That (a) the second paragraph of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to provide for the conveyance to the Texas Hill Country Development Foundation of certain surplus land situated in Kerr County, Texas," approved June 28, 1954 (Private Law 48, 83d Cong.), and section 2 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the Texas Hill Country Development Foundation to convey certain land to Kerr County, Texas," approved August 9, 1955 (Public Law 291, 84th Cong.), are hereby repealed.

(b) The Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to convey, without consideration, to Kerr County, Tex., all right, title, and interest of the United States in the real property conveyed under authority of such joint resolutions.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, strike all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That notwithstanding any provision of Private Law 480, 83d Congress, or of Public Law 291, 84th Congress, or any of the terms, reservations, restrictions, or conditions of any deed granted under authority of either such law, the use and maintenance for park, amusement, or other recreational purposes of all or any part of the real property conveyed under authority of such laws shall not operate to cause or permit all or any portion of such property to revert to the United States.

"Sec. 2. The right to use and maintain such real property for the purposes specified in the first section of this joint resolution shall be evidenced by an instrument of conveyance prepared and delivered to Kerr County, Tex., by the Administrator of General Services."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to permit use of certain real property in Kerr County, Tex., for recreational purposes without causing such property to revert to the United States."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 73 (L) OF THE HAWAIIAN ORGANIC ACT, AS AMENDED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9502) to authorize certain exchanges of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii.

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I note that the Department of the Interior had some objections to the bill as introduced. Have those objections been reconciled by the bill as amended?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, they have entirely.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act (48 U. S. C. 673) is amended by striking out "No sale of lands for other than homestead purposes, except as herein provided, and no exchange by which the Territory shall convey lands exceeding either 40 acres in an area of \$5,000 in value shall be made." and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "No sale of lands for other than homestead purposes, except as herein provided, shall be made. No exchange of lands shall be made by the Territory except for lands of equal or greater value."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act (31 Stat. 141, 154) as amended (48 U. S. C. 673), is hereby further amended by increasing the amount of '\$5,000' appearing therein to '\$15,000.'"

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.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ISSUANCE OF AVIATION REVENUE BONDS AND AUTHORIZING CERTAIN LAND EXCHANGES IN HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10347) to amend section 73 (q) of the Hawaiian Organic Act; to approve and ratify joint resolution 32, session laws of Hawaii, 1957, authorizing the issuance of \$14 million in aviation revenue bonds; to authorize certain land exchanges at Honolulu, Oahu, T. H., for the development of the Honolulu airport complex; and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 73 (q) of the Hawaiian Organic Act (31 Stat. 141), as amended (48 U. S. C. 677), is further amended as follows:

(a) By inserting in the first sentence, after the words "all sales and other dispositions of such land shall" a comma and the following: "except as otherwise provided by the Congress."

(b) By inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Within the meaning of this section, the management of lands set aside for public purposes may, if within the scope of authority conferred by the legislature, include the making of leases by the Hawaii Aeronautics Commission with respect to land set aside to it, on reasonable terms, for carrying out the purposes for which such land was set aside to it, such as for occupancy of land at an airport for facilities or carriers or to serve the traveling public. No such lease shall continue in effect in the event of withdrawal by the Governor, unless at the time of the making of the lease, the Governor shall have approved the

same, or in any event for a longer term than 55 years.

SEC. 2. (a) Joint Resolution 32, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1957, is hereby amended by inserting in the place provided in section 137-94 thereof the public law number assigned to this act.

(b) The Territory of Hawaii, any provision of the Hawaiian Organic Act or any other act of Congress to the contrary notwithstanding, is authorized and empowered to issue aviation revenue bonds in a sum not to exceed \$14 million payable from funds derived from aviation fuel taxes and all other revenues of the Hawaii Aeronautics Commission, including rents, fees, and other charges for the purpose of providing for the construction, operation, and maintenance of airports and air navigation facilities, including acquisition of real property and interests therein, in the Territory, and for expenses incurred for engraving, printing, advertising, legal services, financial consultant's services, or otherwise, with respect to the issuance of such aviation revenue bonds. The issuance of such aviation revenue bonds shall not constitute the incurrance of an indebtedness within the meaning of the Hawaiian Organic Act, and shall not require the approval of the President of the United States.

(c) All aviation revenue bonds issued under authority of section 2 above shall be issued pursuant to legislation enacted by the legislature of the Territory which shall provide (1) that, so long as any of the bonds are outstanding, aviation fuel taxes shall be levied and collected in amounts at least sufficient to provide for the payment of the principal of the bonds and the interest thereon, as such principal and interest become due, and for such reserve funds and sinking funds as may be provided therefor; (2) that the Hawaii Aeronautics Commission or any officer or agency succeeding to its powers and duties, shall have the power to issue and sell the bonds and to expend the proceeds thereof and provide for the repayment thereof, in accordance with standards and pursuant to provisions which shall be set forth in such legislation; and (3) that the Hawaii Aeronautics Commission, or any officer or agency succeeding to the powers and duties of that commission, shall be continued in existence and shall retain the powers and duties set forth in such legislation, so long as any of the bonds are outstanding.

(d) Nothing in this act shall be deemed to prevent the application of Federal funds to aid in the retirement of said bonds, to the extent now or hereafter permitted by the acts of Congress relating to the use of such funds.

(3) As used in this act, the term "aviation fuel taxes" shall have the same meaning as is now or hereafter ascribed to it by the laws of the Territory of Hawaii.

(f) Joint resolution 32 of the session laws of Hawaii, 1957, as amended by subsection (a) hereof, is hereby approved and ratified.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to convey without reimbursement, to the Territory of Hawaii, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to those portions of the former naval air facility, Honolulu, and the general supply depot, Damon Tract, naval supply center, Pearl Harbor, comprising an area of 77 acres, more or less, and described as follows:

LAND SITUATE AT MOANALUA, HONOLULU, OAHU, T. H.

Being lot 35, area 12.973 acres, as shown on map 77, and lot 36-B, area 63.678 acres, as shown on map 144, said maps having been filed with the assistant registrar of the land court of the Territory of Hawaii in land court application No. 1074 of the trustees under the will and of the estate of Samuel M. Damon, deceased. Said lot 35 being the

land described in transfer certificate of title No. 38090, and lot 36-B being a portion of the land described in transfer certificate of title No. 38094, both issued to the United States of America.

Together with any or all improvements or utilities thereon or used in connection therewith.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to convey without reimbursement, to the Territory of Hawaii, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that portion of Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, comprising an area of 170 acres, more or less, and described as follows:

A PORTION OF HICKAM AIR FORCE BASE

Being a portion of Hickam Field, United States Military Reservation (portion of parcel III, final order of condemnation, United States of America civil No. 289 dated April 9, 1935). Being also a portion of R. P. 7858 land court award 7715 Apana 2 to Lot Kamehameha and a portion of grant 4776 to Samuel M. Damon.

LAND SITUATE AT MOANALUA, HONOLULU, OAHU, T. H.

Beginning at the northeast corner of this piece of land, on the west side of John Rodgers-Keel Lagoon Access Road, Hawaii project DA-NR 10-B (1), and on the south side of lot C-4-B-1, map 136 of land court application 1074, the true azimuth and distance from the southeast corner of said lot C-4-B-1 being 97 degrees 20 minutes 15.99 feet, and the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government survey triangulation station "Salt Lake" being 10,524.00 feet south and 5,894.95 feet west, thence running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

SOUTH

1. 00 degrees 00 minutes 626.01 feet along lot C-6, map 74 of land court application 1074, along Territorial law numbered 17194;
2. 00 degrees 00 minutes 563.79 feet along lot 36, map 77 of land court application 1074, along United States civil numbered 527;
3. 349 degrees 19 minutes 24 seconds 3,178.18 feet along present Honolulu International Airport, Governor's executive order No. 1016;
4. 90 degrees 03 minutes 20 seconds 1,922.84 feet along the remainder of Hickam Air Force Base to a pipe;
5. 180 degrees 03 minutes 20 seconds 1,760.25 feet along same to a spike in pavement;
6. 90 degrees 03 minutes 20 seconds 400.00 feet along same to a pipe;
7. 180 degrees 03 minutes 20 seconds 1,908.49 feet along same to a spike in pavement;
8. 276 degrees 29 minutes 450.90 feet along same to a spike in pavement;
9. 186 degrees 29 minutes 851.01 feet along same;
10. 277 degrees 20 minutes 1,196.15 feet along lot C-4-B-1, map 136 of land court application 1074, along United States civil numbered 436 to the point of beginning and containing an area of 170.990 acres.

Together with any or all improvements or utilities thereon or used in connection therewith.

SEC. 5. The Governor of the Territory of Hawaii is authorized to convey without reimbursement to the United States all of the right, title, and interest of the Territory of Hawaii in and to that portion of the Honolulu International Airport, comprising an area of 174 acres, more or less, and described as follows:

LAND SITUATE AT MOANALUA, HONOLULU, OAHU, T. H.

Being a portion of the Honolulu International (formerly John Rodgers) Airport as described in and set aside by the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii by executive order

numbered 1016, and being also a portion of the land as described in and title transferred to the Territory of Hawaii by Presidential Executive Order Numbered 10121.

Beginning at the westerly corner of this tract of land, being also a point in common on the converging boundaries of Hickam Field and Fort Kamehameha Military Reservations, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government survey triangulation station "Salt Lake" being 16,874.10 feet south and 5,896.30 feet west, and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. 228 degrees 49 minutes 0.35 foot along Hickam Field, United States Military Reservation (United States civil No. 289), being along parcel 2 of proposed Navy seadrome area;

2. 244 degrees 22 minutes 33.00 feet along same;

3. 231 degrees 55 minutes 30 seconds 298.50 feet along same;

4. 222 degrees 20 minutes 30 seconds 401.40 feet along same;

5. 212 degrees 53 minutes 139.80 feet along same;

6. 207 degrees 57 minutes 30 seconds 222.80 feet along same;

7. 201 degrees 40 minutes 104.87 feet along same;

8. 233 degrees 00 minutes 878.84 feet along the remainder of Honolulu International Airport, being a portion of reclaimed lands transferred to the Territory of Hawaii by Presidential Executive Order No. 10121;

9. 270 degrees 00 minutes 3,607.69 feet along same, along the remainder of area 3 as reserved for purposes of the United States of America in Presidential Executive Order No. 10121, to highwater mark at seaplane docking basin; thence along the seaplane docking basin and seaplane runway "A" following along highwater mark for the next three courses the direct azimuth and distance between points at said highwater mark being:

10. 52 degrees 30 minutes 1,871.69 feet;

11. 16 degrees 00 minutes 767.64 feet;

12. 52 degrees 59 minutes 05 seconds 1,722.70 feet;

13. 110 degrees 00 minutes 414.47 feet along the remainder of Honolulu International Airport; along the remainder of Moanalua fishery (Territory of Hawaii final order of condemnation law No. 16653) to a point on the easterly boundary of Fort Kamehameha United States Military Reservation;

14. 216 degrees 30 minutes 421.10 feet along Fort Kamehameha United States Military Reservation, and along area 9 of the United States Naval Reservation;

15. 163 degrees 00 minutes 260.00 feet along area 9 of the United States Naval Reservation (formerly portion of Fort Kamehameha United States Military Reservation);

16. 105 degrees 44 minutes 1,607.00 feet along same, and along Fort Kamehameha United States Military Reservation;

17. 143 degrees 45 minutes 389.25 feet along Fort Kamehameha United States Military Reservation to the point of beginning and containing an area of 174 acres, more or less.

Together with access thereto and easements for utilities to be used in connection therewith.

SEC. 6. The Governor of the Territory of Hawaii is authorized to convey without reimbursement to the United States all of the right, title, and interest which the Territory may have in and to those portions of the Halawa and Moanalua fisheries, and the submerged lands subjacent thereto, comprising an area of 156 acres, more or less, and described as follows:

Being a portion of Moanalua fishery (Governor's executive order No. 1016) and a portion of Halawa fishery.

SITUATE AT MOANALUA, HONOLULU, AND HALAWA, EWA, OAHU, T. H.

Beginning at the northeasterly corner of this piece of land, on the easterly side of Fort Kamehameha Military Reservation, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government survey triangulation station "Salt Lake" being 18,210.90 feet south and 4,293.81 feet west, thence running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. 290 degrees 00 minutes 414.49 feet along the remainder of Moanalua fishery (Governor's executive order No. 1016);

2. 52 degrees 59 minutes 05 seconds 2,503.69 feet along same;

3. 110 degrees 00 minutes 7,986.50 feet along same;

4. 110 degrees 00 minutes 957.00 feet along the remainder of Halawa fishery; thence along shoreline, along Fort Kamehameha Military Reservation for the next 19 courses, the direct azimuths and distances from point to point along said shoreline being:

5. 270 degrees 35 minutes 20 seconds 225.02 feet;

6. 280 degrees 05 minutes 40 seconds 290.85 feet;

7. 257 degrees 50 minutes 239.14 feet;

8. 243 degrees 05 minutes 142.51 feet;

9. 233 degrees 12 minutes 92.13 feet to Kamumau;

10. 268 degrees 46 minutes 1,342.70 feet;

11. 285 degrees 45 minutes 1,560.00 feet;

12. 301 degrees 53 minutes 1,208.00 feet;

13. 287 degrees 00 minutes 30 seconds 311.80 feet;

14. 290 degrees 41 minutes 980.80 feet;

15. 298 degrees 23 minutes 30 seconds 797.00 feet;

16. 293 degrees 26 minutes 768.70 feet;

17. 318 degrees 40 minutes 498.20 feet;

18. 278 degrees 48 minutes 494.10 feet;

19. 268 degrees 30 minutes 568.80 feet;

20. 256 degrees 00 minutes 360.00 feet;

21. 187 degrees 00 minutes 235.00 feet;

22. 232 degrees 00 minutes 790.00 feet;

23. 216 degrees 30 minutes 318.90 feet to the point of beginning and containing an area of 156.844 acres, more or less.

Together with access thereto and easements for utilities to be used in connection therewith.

SEC. 7. The Governor of the Territory of Hawaii is authorized to convey without reimbursement to the United States all of the right, title, and interest which the Territory may have in and to those portions of the Halawa and Moanalua fisheries, and the submerged lands subjacent thereto, comprising an area of 344 acres, more or less, and described as follows:

Being a strip of land 1,000 feet wide and 15,000 feet long, and being a portion of Moanalua fishery (Governor's executive order No. 1016) and a portion of Halawa fishery.

Situated offshore of Moanalua, District of Honolulu, and Halawa, District of Ewa, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii. Beginning at the most easterly corner of this piece of land, on the southeasterly side and offshore of Fort Kamehameha Military Reservation, the true azimuth and distance from the most southerly corner of proposed Navy seaplane base being 329 degrees 35 minutes 51 seconds 4,029.15 feet, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government survey triangulation station "Salt Lake" being 21,827.75 feet south and 1,865.30 feet west, thence running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. 19 degrees 00 minutes 1,000.00 feet along the remainder of Moanalua fishery (Governor's executive order No. 1016);

2. 109 degrees 00 minutes 15,000.00 feet along same and along the remainder of Halawa fishery;

3. 199 degrees 00 minutes 1,000.00 feet along the remainder of Halawa fishery;

4. 289 degrees 00 minutes 15,000.00 feet along same and along the remainder of Moanalua fishery (Governor's executive order No. 1016) to the point of beginning and containing an area of 344.353 acres.

nalua fishery (Governor's executive order No. 1016) to the point of beginning and containing an area of 344.353 acres.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 11, strike the words "or carriers" and insert "for carriers."

Page 2, strike the sentence appearing on lines 12 to 16, inclusive, and insert the following sentences in lieu thereof: "No such lease shall continue in effect for a longer term than 55 years. If, at the time of the execution of any such lease, the Governor shall have approved the same, then and in that event the Governor shall have no further authority under this or any other act to set aside any or all of the lands subject to such lease for any other public purpose during the term of such lease."

Page 2, line 20, change the period to a comma and add the words "and by striking the words 'first session.'"

Page 4, line 12, strike the figure "(3)" and insert in lieu thereof the letter "(e)."

Page 6, line 2, strike the word "court" and insert the word "commission."

Page 10, line 16, strike the words "172.212 acres," and insert the words "174 acres, more or less."

Page 12, line 2, strike the word "Kamumau;" and insert the word "Kumumau;"

Page 13, line 16, strike the figure "21,827.75" and insert the figure "21,827.76."

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.

AMENDING HAWAIIAN ORGANIC ACT RELATING TO TRANSFER OF THE TITLE OF CEDED LAND BY THE PRESIDENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9543) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property used by the University of Hawaii to the board of regents of such university, for the use and benefit of such university.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey, without consideration therefor, to the board of regents of the University of Hawaii, for the use and benefit of such university, all rights, title, and interest of the United States in and to the lands of the United States which are being devoted to the use and benefit of such university on the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That section 91 of the Hawaiian Organic Act (31 Stat. 159), as amended (48 U. S. C. 511), is amended further by inserting after the words "other political subdivision thereof" a comma and the words "or the University of Hawaii,"

"Sec. 2. Joint Resolution 5 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1957, shall be construed as authorization by the legislature for the transfer of title by direction of the Governor to the University of Hawaii of any lands title to which may be transferred to the Territory by direction of the President for educational institutions under the provisions of said section 91 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended."

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.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act relating to the transfer of the title of ceded land by the President."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YUMA IRRIGATION DISTRICT, ARIZONA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2037) to amend the act of June 28, 1946, authorizing the performance of necessary protection work between the Yuma project and Boulder Dam by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 161 OF REVISED STATUTES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2767) to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand why this particular bill was put on the Consent Calendar in view of the fact that the committee itself filed a minority report. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be stricken from the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PETRIFIED FOREST NATIONAL PARK, ARIZ.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8250) to authorize the establishment of the Petrified Forest National Park in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to permit the establishment of the Petrified Forest National Monument, Ariz., and other lands as provided for herein, as the Petrified Forest National Park, such national park shall be established (a) after title to all of the lands described in section 2 of this act shall have been vested in the United States, with the exception of such easements and rights-of-way for railroad and highway purposes as may be acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior, and (b) when notification of the effective date of such establishment of the park, as determined by the said Secretary, is published in the Federal Register. Disestablishment of the Petrified Forest National Monument shall be effected concurrently with the establishment of the park.

The Petrified Forest National Park shall be preserved and administered in its natural condition by the Secretary of the Interior for the public benefit in accordance with the

general laws governing areas of the National Park System and in accordance with the basic policies relating thereto as prescribed by the act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U. S. C., 1592 edition, secs. 1-3).

The exchange authority prescribed for the Petrified Forest National Monument in the act of May 14, 1930 (46 Stat. 278; 16 U. S. C., 1952 edition, secs. 444, 444a), is hereby extended to all the lands within the Petrified Forest National Park as herein authorized.

For the purposes of this act, the Secretary is authorized to acquire, in such manner as he shall consider to be in the public interest, any non-Federal land or interests in land within the area hereby authorized to be established as the Petrified Forest National Park. In acquiring any State-owned land or interests therein within the aforesaid area, such property may be procured by the United States without regard to any limitations heretofore prescribed by the Congress relating to the disposal of State-owned properties.

Upon establishment of the Petrified Forest National Park, as authorized by this act, any remaining balance of funds that may be available for purposes of the Petrified Forest National Monument shall thereafter be available for expenditure for purposes of the Petrified Forest National Park.

Sec. 2. The Petrified Forest National Park, authorized to be established pursuant to section 1 of this act, shall comprise the following described lands:

GILA AND SALT RIVER MERIDIAN

Township 20 north, range 23 east: Sections 1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 34, 35, 36, all.

Township 20 north, range 24 east: All.

Township 20 north, range 25 east: Sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 16, 17, 18, all.

Township 19 north, range 23 east: Sections 1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, all.

Township 19 north, range 24 east: Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, all; section 11, northwest quarter and north half northeast quarter; sections 16, 17, 18, 21, 28, 33, all.

Township 18 north, range 24 east: Sections 4, 9, 10 (southwest quarter), 13, 14, 15, 16, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 33, 34, 35, 36, all.

Township 17 north, range 24 east: Sections 2, 11, 14, 23, 26, west half; sections 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, all.

Township 17 north, range 23 east: Sections 34, 35, 36, all.

Township 16 north, range 24 east: Sections 3 and 10, west half; sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, all.

Township 16 north, range 23 east: Sections 1, 2, 11, 12, all; sections 3, 10, east half.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, following the word "railroad" insert ", public utilities."

Page 2, line 24, strike the word "prescribed" and insert "prescribed."

Page 3, strike out all of lines 21, 22, and 23, and insert in lieu thereof: "Township 18 north, range 24 east: Sections 4, 9, all; section 10, southwest quarter; sections 13, 14, 15, 16, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 33, 34, 35, 36, all."

Page 3, line 25, strike the word "half;" and insert halves;"

Page 4, line 5, strike the word "half;" and insert "halves;"

Page 7, strike the word "half." and insert "halves."

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.

RECONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY TO NEWAYGO, MICH.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10009) to provide for the reconveyance of certain surplus real property to Newaygo, Mich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services shall convey all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property described in section 2 of this act to the village of Newaygo, Mich., in consideration of \$1. Such real property was acquired by such village and conveyed to the United States for \$1 for use as a post-office site; however, such real property has not been so used, and has been declared surplus property and plans have been made for its sale.

Sec. 2. The real property referred to in the first section of this act is more particularly described as follows:

"A parcel in the southeasterly corner of Brooks Park, village of Newaygo, State of Michigan, 100 feet east and west and 175 feet north and south, lines being parallel with adjoining streets, and more particularly described as beginning at the northwesterly corner of the intersection of Quarterline and Justice Streets, thence north 16 degrees 45 minutes east 175 feet, thence north 73 degrees 30 minutes west 100 feet, thence south 16 degrees 45 minutes west 175 feet, thence south 73 degrees 30 minutes east 100 feet to place of beginning."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the Administrator of General Services is hereby directed to convey to the village of Newaygo, Mich., by quitclaim deed and without monetary consideration therefor all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that certain parcel comprising approximately 17,000 square feet of land in the village of Newaygo, county of Newaygo, State of Michigan, more particularly described in the proceeding in condemnation entitled United States against certain land in the village of Newaygo, county of Newaygo, State of Michigan; and the village of Newaygo, et al., civil action No. 125, in the United States District Court in the Western District of Michigan, together with easements for rights-of-way acquired in connection therewith."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That is the last eligible bill on the Consent Calendar.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, revise and extend my remarks and to include some correspondence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the League of Women Voters is engaged in a campaign the purpose of which is to prevent the House from acting on a

bill which is designed to undo the decision of the Supreme Court when it invaded the legislative field in the case of Cole against Young. It just seems inconceivable to me that this organization or any organization or any individual for that matter would be in favor of preventing the discharge from the Government service of a person who is not loyal. As a matter of fact, nobody works for the Government of the United States as a matter of right. It is a matter of high personal privilege, and it seems to me that anyone enjoying that privilege should at least be loyal to our Government.

The correspondence referred to is as follows:

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF EASTON, PA.,
Easton, Pa., March 7, 1958.
The Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WALTER: The League of Women Voters of the United States has gone on record as believing that, in the interest of strengthening national security and maintaining our traditional concepts of freedom, the Federal loyalty-security programs should be modified so as to limit coverage to sensitive positions. The league also opposes any extension of these programs.

In keeping with this position, the League of Women Voters is taking action to oppose Senate bill 1411 because this bill, in opposition to the Cole v. Young decision, deems all Government workers to be employed in an activity of the Government involving national security, and is thus an effort to reextend the coverage of the Federal loyalty-security programs to nonsensitive as well as sensitive positions.

The league has taken this position after a 4-year study of individual liberty as related to the public interest. The last 2 years were concentrated upon an evaluation of the Federal loyalty-security programs. The Easton League is one of more than 1,000 local leagues whose conclusions were pooled to formulate the national position. Membership thinking within the Easton League is clearly in line with this position.

We believe that legislation such as S. 1411 will not increase our national security. We fear that such legislation may provide undesirable and unnecessary limitations on individual liberty.

Sincerely yours,

WINFRED K. LILIENTHAL
Mrs. Paul F. Lilienthal,
President.

MARCH 17, 1958.

MRS. PAUL F. LILIENTHAL,
President, League of Women Voters of
Easton, Easton, Pa.

DEAR MRS. LILIENTHAL: I am deeply shocked and concerned at the campaign to defeat enactment of S. 1411, a bill to strengthen the Federal employee security program, that apparently has been touched off throughout the country as a result of certain material emanating from the League of Women Voters of the United States.

The article entitled "Loyalty-Security" under the column Keeping Up With Program in the March 1958 issue of The National Voter evidence a complete and, in my judgment, dangerous misconception of the condition at which S. 1411 is directed. The issue is as simple as this: Do you want to have Communists working in any position in the Federal Government? S. 1411 as reported by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee would be a valuable preventive measure in this regard. Failure of its approval, on the other hand, would leave the door open

for employment of Communists, subversives, and dangerous security risks in many of the approximately 2,400,000 positions in our Federal Government.

The language of the mentioned article is at best an exposition of how badly it misses the point. S. 1411 will extend the Federal employee security program to cover all Government positions because all such positions are sensitive. In other words, it will spell out in the law what is and has been a fact. There is no question of extending the program to nonsensitive Federal positions. There are none.

Similarly, the third paragraph of the article lends itself to a misconception of the effect of the Supreme Court decision in Cole v. Young. The Court decided, in effect, that under Public Law 733 only positions in those departments and agencies specifically named in such law by the Congress could be deemed to be sensitive positions within the meaning of that law and that further provision of section 3 of the law—authorizing the President to extend its application to other departments and agencies—is inoperative. There is no implication, as indicated by the language in the article, that some Federal positions by nature are sensitive and some by nature are not.

The result is that no adequate procedure now is provided by law whereby even a known Communist may be removed promptly from a Federal position, having completed the probationary period, if the position is not in one of the departments and agencies specifically named by the Congress in Public Law 733. Already a number of known members of Communist cells have had to be restored to positions from which they were removed under Public Law 733 before the Court decision. Many newspapers throughout the Nation carried press accounts of some 11 of these restorations, in which cases the Department of Justice has been forced to withdraw because of the Supreme Court decision.

Sensitivity in Government positions, and the need for maximum security therein, by no means is limited to military activities, nuclear functions, or procurement and operation of planes, missiles, tanks, and guns. Every Federal program exists solely to serve the national welfare and interest—to promote our economy, culture, and American way of life. Every such program is, therefore, inescapably and directly linked to the national security. Soviet Russia devotes a tremendous part of its energy, time, and substance to attacking our economy, culture, lines of communication, and other essential day-to-day activities. They, at least, by their unceasing efforts recognize that weakening America in these respects necessarily weakens our national security.

As one example of the fallacy implicit in the position taken by your organization, you should know that, under the Supreme Court decision, none of the 518,000 positions in the United States postal service may be termed sensitive. A number of Communists and fellow travelers already have been restored to this service under the Court decision. Bear in mind that the postal service is the greatest communications system in the world. It is vital to our national security. Yet, following the league's position to a logical conclusion, it would be perfectly all right to permit Communists to work in this vital communications system.

High officials of the Department of Defense testified last fall before my Committee on Un-American Activities that American communications are a prime objective of Soviet infiltration and sabotage. The postal service carries all but top secret Government communications. It should be obvious to everyone that a few well-placed agents in this communications network could wreak havoc in our Government in time of emergency. These officials unqualifiedly urged the

strengthening of our Federal employee security program, which will be accomplished by S. 1411 as reported to the House of Representatives, as well as a separate program to strengthen employee security procedures in private enterprise that could have an adverse effect on the national security.

From the tenor of some of the letters and telegrams from local units of the League of Women Voters it seems very probably that they have not been fully informed of the content of the majority report of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. In a number of instances they emphasize, and quote favorably from, the minority views filed with this report. Suffice it to say that certain statements in the minority views are not factual and completely avoid the real issue. Moreover, only 2 of the 25 committee members signed the minority views. S. 1411 as reported had the overwhelming approval of the committee, which conducted a thorough study and held exhaustive hearings.

The extreme urgency and importance of this matter has impelled me to address the League of Women Voters of the United States and point out pertinent facts in our Federal employee security situation which I feel must have been overlooked or misunderstood in the league's taking its present position. I cannot too strongly emphasize that a course of action directed at obstructing necessary security legislation in the present critical period is fraught with real danger to our national security. It is my hope that the league will carefully review and reconsider its position in the light of all the facts and circumstances which in the unanimous judgment of our national leaders is both well-conceived and essential to close existing loopholes in the law protecting our national security.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS E. WALTER.

SUBSCRIPTION TELEVISION

Mr. ASHLEY. 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 Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with some reluctance that I take the floor today to discuss the highly controversial proposal that subscription television be given a controlled test before a final decision is reached by the Federal Communications Commission as to whether this means of transcription is in the best interests of the American public.

In the first place, I do not have any particular desire to engage in an argument as to the relative merits of so-called free TV versus paid TV. I recognize that tens of millions of American families have bought television sets with the understanding that there would be no further charge for their use. For this reason, I will steadfastly oppose any device that would deprive the viewing public of free television shows.

But this is not the issue which Congress must decide. The real issue is whether the three network companies which presently control and dominate the television industry, together with organized owners of movie theaters and their affiliates, shall be allowed to coerce Congress into arbitrarily rejecting any new idea that poses any measure of competition to these vested interests.

No doubt the companies of which I speak will assume an air of injured innocence to have their motives so questioned. But we must not forget that back in the days of radio it was part of this same cast of characters that used every means imaginable to protect the established amplitude interests from the then new and infinitely superior frequency modulation.

Many of us will recall that when Maj. Edwin Armstrong, inventor of so many basic communication devices, committed suicide, the funeral oration was delivered by the Reverend Thornton B. Penfield, Jr., of the First Presbyterian Church of Yonkers. That was in February 1954. Among his memorable words were these:

His [Armstrong's] late years were unfortunately clouded with a battle to secure for the children of his inventive genius the full opportunity to serve mankind. Frequency modulation, in particular, involved a fundamental change in radio broadcasting, and its introduction was resisted, using every possible means, by the older, already established amplitude interests.

What established interests? The same that today resist any invasion of the new television medium which they have come to regard as their own private property: Radio Corporation of America and the National Broadcasting Co.

Mr. Speaker, it must be clear to all of us that NBC, ABC, and CBS are only competing within a monopoly they jointly share and that they collectively maintain an ascendancy over the airwaves. In economic and political fact, there are just three men who have possession of this power. They are Frank Stanton of CBS, Robert Sarnoff of NBC, and Leonard Goldenson of ABC.

These three men now control the programs seen by some 47 million TV-set owners. And it should come as no great surprise to us that it is these three men who have undertaken the campaign against paid TV in order to maintain their power and control over the industry they dominate.

Not only have the networks and their affiliates utilized the airwaves and their licenses for the purpose of perpetuating their domination of the TV channels, but they have done so through a campaign based on the most flagrant kind of misinformation. In dozens of cities throughout the country, TV stations have been organized to send out scare messages during time breaks. Even children watching their special programs are being urged to have their parents write to Congress to stop the menace of subscription TV. One slogan utilized in the saturation brainwashing told the youngsters themselves to tell Congress that "we don't want to pay for Rin Tin Tin." Throughout the campaign, stations have openly flaunted the regulations of the Federal Communications Commission which require that in dealing with controversial questions a fair presentation of both sides be made, and which prohibit exactly the kind of propaganda buildup that the networks have been conducting.

The purpose of the campaign, of course, has been to generate a flood of

mail designed to intimidate Members of Congress and coerce them into opposing tests of a new service which might be competitive with the networks. It seems to me that this frightening demonstration of network power to influence the very workings of our National Government is worthy of Congressional inquiry.

Nor should we overlook the letter campaign launched by the owners of movie theaters. An example of their efforts to edify the American public is the leaflet issued by a joint committee on toll TV, which, according to a press release from the theater owners of America, was established to inform Congress that the public is opposed to subscription TV. Let me read to you and enter into the RECORD the kind of appeal these showmen are making. I will read the simulated headlines at the top of this leaflet: "City Declares Emergency, Business Blames Toll TV—5,000 Theater Owners Closed During Last 5 Years—Divorce Is Up, Paid TV Cause of Domestic Unrest—No Free TV for Baseball Majors, To Go to Pay TV—Paid TV Health Menace to the Nation—Slot Machines Gobble Up Public TV Money—Unemployment Increase, Paid TV Blamed—Government Seeks Remedy."

Readers are then advised that "you can argue that toll TV is illegal, that it will cause unemployment, that it deprives you of a fundamental right to use the airwaves, it will kill good quality TV programs, it will put all TV in the pay-or-you-don't-see class, it closes stores, it curtails business, increases the burden of taxes if business folds, it's un-American."

In addition to using airwaves, direct mail, and speeches, the networks have assailed the public—with a view to assailing Congress—with newspaper advertising chiefly placed by CBS affiliates on instructions from one Howard Lane, apparently of that network. This advertisement was first printed in TV Guide, as a CBS ad and then matted for newspaper advertising by CBS affiliates throughout the country.

I have no quarrel with CBS purchase of advertising for any purpose whatsoever. It certainly has a right to do so, but I do object to the improper classification of such advertising. It is outright propaganda similar to that on the network air. It is part of the same propaganda campaign, part of the network effort to exert pressure on us. I resent such methods.

These sentiments were expressed by Senator RUSSELL B. LONG recently on the floor. He said he had written to the chairman of the FCC asking for an investigation of the methods and procedures used by the networks to influence the public regarding the subscription TV test already scheduled by that Commission. I quote from Senator Long's speech:

Immediately thereafter, and before I had even received an answer from the Chairman of the Commission, I began to receive thousands of letters and postcards from northeast Louisiana. I learned that Station KNOW-TV in that area had been presenting programs in which it was represented to the public that pay television would mean that there

would be no more free programs. The public was told that they would be required to pay for the same programs they are presently seeing.

I know, Mr. President, that other Senators have been receiving the same type of pressure. The public has been misinformed about this issue and the campaign of misinformation continues.

To fully appreciate the irony of a situation in which the very mediums we are supposed to regulate are used in an effort to regulate us, we must bear in mind the character of the participants in this battle. We find RCA, parent company of NBC, indignantly fighting the Federal Government's antitrust suit on the basis that it is an invasion of private enterprise, at the same time appealing frantically to the other agencies of the Federal Government to restrain other businessmen in their private endeavors.

But the situation really is not so strange, Mr. Speaker, when you consider the stakes involved. From the very first Federal Communications Act of 1934, all legislation relating to air communications has presumed that the airwaves are the possession of the American people. It now appears, however, that the airwaves belong only to the networks—a tidy possession worth protecting. Last year, for instance, the Columbia Broadcasting System reported earnings of about \$35 million before taxes on an investment of land, buildings, and equipment valued at \$53 million. According to Standard & Poor data, their net profits for the first 9 months of 1957 were 48 percent greater than for the same period in 1956. Except for operation of some relatively minor phases of the business, all of these earnings came from the public, through sales of airwave use to advertisers. And neither CBS, NBC, ABC, nor any TV station paid a cent to the United States for the use of these publicly owned channels.

Mr. Speaker, all of us understand the profit motive upon which our private enterprise system is based; we understand too that competition within this system can take the form of freezing out potential members of an industry before they can get a toe hold.

It is hard to imagine a clearer example of these economic facts of life than the assault on subscription TV by the established networks and movie interests. And it is for the very reasons that the three established networks do control the entire TV industry and possess the enormous economic leverage which comes from such control that the Congress and the FCC must act as arbiter of the public interest in this vital area.

FOR 2 WHOLE DAYS HIS CHILDREN DID NOT HAVE A BITE TO EAT

Mrs. SULLIVAN. 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 gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, we can amuse or entertain ourselves here on the

House floor debating whether this recession is really serious or not or who is to blame or whether things might once have been worse under the Democrats in 1939. Good, clean political fun. Or is it?

I hope none of the Members here regard me as a sob sister. I try to be pretty practical in my outlook on legislative issues and problems. But frankly, Mr. Speaker, after reading an article in our Post-Dispatch in St. Louis, I was in tears. It is a story of a couple with five children—a hard-working, conscientious husband out of work and unable to find work—and these children went 2 whole days without a bite to eat. This news article, by Dickson Terry of the Post-Dispatch staff is really frightening. I am placing it in the RECORD. I hope the Members will read it. I am sure those who do will have the same sick feeling I did that such suffering can be permitted in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the article referred to may be printed at this point in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ST. LOUIS FAMILIES IN DEPRESSION—CHILDREN HUNGRY, SOME HAVE NO SHOES AND CANNOT ATTEND SCHOOL—FATHERS ARE INELIGIBLE FOR RELIEF OR UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

(By Dickson Terry)

The man is 41 years old and he has 5 children who range in age from 3 to 13. The family has never been well off, but they've been properly fed, well clothed and reasonably secure. Two weeks ago, however, this man went through an ordeal that was almost more than he could endure. For 2 whole days his children didn't have a bite to eat.

"I never would have believed that I'd ever hear my children crying for food," he told me.

As a father, my question was involuntary: What does a man do?

He looked at the floor and it was plain to see that even the memory was almost too painful to recall. "There isn't much you can do," he said finally. "You just suffer and try to pacify them."

He had gone out and gathered some beer and soda bottles off the street and on the highway, washed and sold them for enough to buy a little milk.

Then he went to the Salvation Army. It was the first time in his life he had ever had to ask for help. It was a hard decision but there was nothing left to do. He couldn't see the children go hungry again.

This family is one of the estimated 1,000 or more in St. Louis whose breadwinner is out of work, unable to find work and is ineligible for State relief or unemployment compensation. These families are virtually destitute.

With most of these families it isn't a matter of relative hard times, or a mere setback coming on the heels of prosperity. In many cases it has meant near starvation.

In the course of several days' investigation I have encountered families who have been without food, without even milk for babies and small children, and without fuel for heat.

In many cases they have been helped by friends, relatives and neighbors. Some have found aid at the Salvation Army, but the recent wave of unemployment, particularly

among factory workers and unskilled laborers, already has overtaken that agency.

Last month the Salvation Army gave out \$4,446 for direct relief, which was \$700 more than their budget. And even then 40 percent of those who applied had to be turned away.

Miss Mary Taylor, head of the Salvation Army's Family Service, said: "These are not the usual unemployables or people who don't want to work. They're a different type, people who have been self-supporting, paying taxes, even buying homes, but who suddenly found themselves out of work, and who have appealed, for the first time in their lives, for help—because they're desperate."

The father of the five children, to whom we were talking, had been a construction worker for 10 years. There was nearly always plenty of work. Before that he had been a tree-trimmer, self-employed, and when construction work fell off periodically, he could always find tree work to do, or some other kind of a job.

Late last summer he started buying a home of his own, near Fenton. It was a summer cottage, made over into a year-round house, and he had plans for remodeling it into a good home with his own hands.

Then in October he was laid off the construction job he had been working on. But this time it was different. He started looking for tree work, but there wasn't any. He started looking for any kind of work. There wasn't any.

"I raked some leaves, and cleaned some gutters," he said. "Anything to try to get by and get some food in the house."

But there wasn't much of that, and it takes a lot of food for five kids.

In November things got so bad he had to sell his truck, even though, if he hoped to pick up any tree work, it was almost indispensable. But he had to buy food. After that went his last chance for independent earning—his chain saw.

He had contracted to buy the house for \$2,800, with payments of \$50 a month. He is now 2 months behind in his payments. A week ago he got 1 day's work with another tree man. He made \$10. He owed a \$34 electric bill and had to pay \$10 on that to keep the electricity from being turned off.

The electric bill is high because the mother has been cooking on a two-burner electric plate. They have a gas stove, but no money to buy bottled gas. The house is heated by a furnace. It is not far from the river, and the family has a ready supply of fuel in driftwood. Otherwise they would be without heat.

All 5 children were at home, although 4 are of school age. Two of the little ones have no shoes and were barefoot. It is more than a mile to the place where they catch the school bus. Their father used to take them there in his 1948 automobile, about his only remaining possession, but has no money for gasoline.

He has job applications in at more than a dozen places, and in the meantime he answers advertisements and walks the streets looking for work. The Salvation Army, he said, has given his family two food orders. "I don't know what we'd have done, but they said they could help us only one more time," he reported.

His wife stood in the kitchen door, her arms folded, a look of fear and desperation in her eyes. "I don't know what we're going to eat after this week," she said. Her husband made a not very convincing effort to reassure her. "If the weather'll straighten up," he said, "I'll get something."

In North St. Louis a 53-year-old man, Harold Hamilton, sat in his kitchen after a fruitless day of job hunting. He has a wife and five boys at home (a sixth is in the Army). The sons range in age from 5 to 15. They live in a five-room apartment ("if you

want to call that little bathroom a room") and he, too, for the first time in his life, has had to ask for help.

Hamilton had been working for 12 years for a storm-window company, installing windows and doors. Now he is out of work, and has been since November. Unemployment compensation?

"That's just the point," he explains, "I can't qualify. I have my truck, and I'm sort of self-employed, in that I install the windows for them on a contract basis.

"And anyway, if you qualify for unemployment compensation you can't draw even 1 day's pay, or it disqualifies you, and mister, I prefer to work for a living, even if it's only 1 day a week. I've maintained my family for years."

He went to the kitchen wall and took a piece of paper from a nail. "Here's some of the places I've tried to get a job." Listed were 19 factories and other plants. They had been checked off, one by one. "They're all very nice about it," he said, "but there's just nothing doing."

He pays \$30 a month rent, but he's far behind. How much does it cost to feed his family? "Depends," he said, "on how you look at it. There's existing eating, and there's setting down to really eat. We're existing. Beans, oatmeal, spaghetti, that's about it. The kids, they like milk, but we've had to give it up. They like butter too, but they don't see much of that."

They have the living room closed off now, to save fuel. He wouldn't say how much he owes for groceries. "But the bill's getting mighty big, and that's for sure," he acknowledged. There was no money for even things like soap and soap powder. "The man at the grocery store is being mighty good to us until we get on our feet," he added.

Although Hamilton finally went to the Salvation Army for a food order, he proudly insists "We're not destitute. Our son in the Army sends us a few dollars, the relatives help what they can, and I get a day's work now and then."

But everywhere he looks for work, he says, there are other men just like him looking for the same jobs. And other men like him are scouring the town for odd jobs. He hangs on to his truck.

"Gasoline money is about gone," he said, "but you have to have some way to get around looking for something, and not only that, but I can carry my tools with me, and if I get some kind of an odd job or a repair job, I can go right to work."

"I may be 53, but I got plenty of life in me yet. I've always provided, and I always will."

In Missouri no State relief funds can be given to a family which has an employable member, even though the employable member is unable to find a job.

The employment insurance program, which pays up to \$33 a week for 26 weeks, is restricted mainly to men who are steadily employed most of each year. Many workers, particularly construction workers who move from one job to another and work intermittently, cannot qualify.

Furthermore, the law does not require firms with four or fewer employees to carry unemployment compensation. This eliminates many more workers from unemployment insurance. Thus a man who is employable but not covered by unemployment compensation, has no place to turn but to private agencies. For all practical purposes this means the Salvation Army. The Red Cross is not a direct aid agency for unemployed. The Family and Children Service, a United Fund agency, has been doing what it can, although direct aid is not a part of its program.

Of the 35 families living in an apartment house at 5502 Maple Avenue, the heads of 14 families are out of work, and no better example could be found of people caught up in this situation.

There are 19 children in the unemployed families. Until their plight came to the attention of the manager of the building, most of the children were without milk, some virtually without food, and many of the adults had actually gone hungry for days at a time so that what food they had could go to the children.

When the manager of the building and his wife learned of their tenants' plight, they set out to try to get relief. But all the fathers were employable. Only two in the building qualified for unemployment compensation. The rest knew no place to turn.

One was a maintenance man at a vending machine company. He was laid off in January. He was eligible for unemployment compensation, but there was a waiting period of 2 weeks. In the meantime he ran out of money and out of food, but like many others in this fix, he had never asked for help. It wasn't until there was no milk or food for his two small children that he and his wife revealed their plight to the apartment manager.

"I don't know that I would have done it even then," the woman told me, "but my husband got to talking about going out and holding up a grocery store to get food for the children."

Another tenant, a construction worker, told me he had walked from the apartment on Maple Avenue to the river and back, looking for anything. "I offered to work for 50 cents an hour, just to see my kids get something to eat," he said.

A drill-press operator was laid off 6 weeks ago when his employer went out of business. "They didn't even have enough money to pay me off," the man reported. "If it hadn't been for our landlord and his wife, we wouldn't have eaten."

When this man got desperate he sold a pint of blood for \$5 to buy food. His wife searched the streets picking up soda bottles to sell.

A young pair, 21 and 17 years old, have a 3-month-old baby. They were married while he was working at an aircraft plant. Last June he was laid off. In September he got a job at an auto assembly plant, but was laid off after a month.

In searching for a job, he found one as driver of a taxicab for a small company in the county. He had been there 6 weeks when business got so bad he was laid off again.

Their baby was born in November. The father's last paycheck and his savings came to \$120. "I didn't dare spend any of it," he said, "and I had a hamburger for Thanksgiving dinner. I borrowed a quarter to buy that. I needed every penny I had for the hospital bill." The hospital bill came to \$119, and the couple went home with a new baby and \$1.

"For a while I managed to get a little work here and there," he continued, "to get milk for the baby and some food for us." Another couple in the same fix, also with a small baby, lives across the hall.

"We would pool what money we had," the young man related, "and buy a little meat and some vegetables, and make a big pot of stew. One pot of stew would keep us for 2 days or more. Then we would cook spaghetti; that would be good for 2 or 3 more days. But the day came when we didn't have any food, or money for the rent. I ain't a guy that goes around asking for things, but I had to ask somebody."

The apartment manager and his wife, who had seen hard times themselves, took it upon themselves to help out the tenants. Those who had food, shared it, and the manager and his wife have been running sort of a soup kitchen in their apartment.

"They spent all their money buying food for us, and even borrowed money," one of the tenants reported to me. "If it hadn't

been for them, a lot of us would have gone hungry."

When news of the situation in the apartment was disclosed by the Post-Dispatch last Sunday, it brought some response. A local dairy sent a check for \$100 to provide milk for the children. Private citizens sent about \$35 in small donations. The money was divided among the families. They bought a case of peas and a case of corn. And somebody sent a 24-pound turkey.

"We didn't have any Thanksgiving here," the manager's wife said. "About the most anybody had was a hamburger. So this Sunday we're going to cook that turkey and all have a Thanksgiving dinner."

SBA LOANS

Mr. COFFIN. 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 Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, in our present warfare against recession we are facing the same temptation that threatens in the military field. In our desperate search for ultimate weapons, we tend as in military defense, to overlook our capabilities to wage limited war.

We have, Mr. Speaker, weapons and capabilities which we are not using. There is, for example, the danger that we are focusing our major energies on devising area assistance legislation which cannot be debated, voted, signed, and implemented in time to change the economic picture substantially for some months. This does not mean that we should relax our efforts in this direction any more than we should slow down research and production in missiles. What it does mean is that we should also look at the weapons at hand and use them.

One tool that is at hand for waging more effective economic warfare is the Small Business Administration. In addition to its other loan authority, SBA started out with a limited charter to move into areas suffering from flash-type disasters. As Members of Congress have run up against particular kinds of trouble, they have turned, significantly, to the Small Business Administration as a vehicle for other forms of constructive help. In recent months Congress has approved separate bills giving SBA authority first to provide help in case of drought and then for disaster resulting from excessive rainfall. There are bills pending to assist where businesses have been hurt by urban renewal progress, the highway program, and by the Soil Bank program.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the urgent need for many such forms of disaster assistance will recur frequently. But I believe that this trend, while paying a compliment to the potential of SBA, necessitates a piecemeal Topsylike accretion of responsibilities that is, on the whole, undesirable. It seems to me preferable to recognize that the Small Business Administration can and should be empowered to play a role in any area where disaster strikes, whether it is a disaster of nature or the economy. It was with this thought that I introduced

a year ago H. R. 5650 to empower SBA to make loans when the President or his designee determines help is necessary to avoid or alleviate the effect of a serious economic disaster, depression, or dislocation. I felt that the reasons for such action then were adequate justification; I now feel that they are compelling.

Let me point out a few facts about Government which should be taken into account as we plot our countermoves against economic depression. No matter how well devised is any long overdue legislation for area assistance, no matter how strong and flexible a new agency is, it will for some time exist only on paper. It takes time to establish procedures. It takes even more time to attract the kind of technical and financial experts needed to staff an effective area assistance agency. In the meantime, until such an agency is organized, equipped, and staffed, businessmen face no moratorium on their crises. The Small Business Administration has now been functioning, with, I believe, increased competence, for 5 years. It has procedures. It has the core of personnel necessary to deal with economic disasters resulting from any cause. If a simple amendment, enlarging its disaster-loan powers, were to be adopted, and if additional funds could be provided, this agency would be in a position immediately to help reverse the tide of recession.

I cannot urge too strongly, Mr. Speaker, that we not overlook the hand tool on the bench dreaming of the power tool in the mail-order catalog. I can think of no more immediately effective step for the Committee on Banking and Currency, and this House, to take than to equip the Small Business Administration for the emergency we face today.

CONSTITUTIONAL OBLIGATION

Mr. HÉBERT. 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. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which I hope is so clear in language, so unmistakable in its terms, that for once and for all Congress will assume its constitutional obligation.

My bill makes it "unlawful for any officer, agent, or employee of the United States or any department, bureau or agency thereof to withhold or impound or otherwise prevent any moneys appropriated by the Congress" from being promptly used for the purpose for which they were appropriated.

Section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution gives Congress the power to lay and collect taxes, the duty to determine what the revenue shall be and the obligation to fix by rate and source the levies needed to support the appropriations which Congress makes.

There are 16 duties imposed upon Congress in section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution.

But the 17th provision in section 8 is this, and I quote: "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution—and I underscore 'execution'—the foregoing powers."

Among these, of particular interest to me are my constitutional duties as a member of the Armed Services Committee, whose jurisdiction includes the constitutional obligation "to raise and support armies" and "to provide and maintain a Navy" and "make rules and regulations for the Government thereof" only to find that nonelected officials in the executive department of the Government are apparently free to, and do, in fact, frustrate the will of Congress and determine whether moneys appropriated by the Congress shall be used for the projects for which they were designed and appropriated and when.

Last week, the majority leader of the Senate announced that the \$32 million appropriated by Congress for armories, to train and maintain our National Guard—another constitutional requirement of the Congress—were not going to be used for the purpose for which they were appropriated.

What had happened was this: Congress appropriated \$32 million. Someone, somewhere in the executive department decided that only \$10 million should be used; and picked the places where this appropriation would be used.

I cannot imagine the Congress of the United States or a Member of Congress going home to his District and reporting to his people that after he has collected the money in taxes from his constituents and appropriated it for a constitutional purpose, must report later to his people that a nonelected official has withheld that appropriation.

This secret, third party, in the dark above the Senate and the House, exercising powers neither designed nor anticipated by our constitutional founders, is defeating and frustrating the will of the people.

I am perfectly willing to stand up to the people in my District and tell them exactly what I have done as a Member of Congress. But I am unable to explain to them why, after I have voted for an appropriation and specified the purpose for which it is to be used, someone, in the dark, behind me, can substitute his whims for my expressed judgment and my constitutional responsibility.

How long is Congress to remain mute? How long will the voice be Jacob's and the hands Esau's?

This bill will keep the voice and the hands in the same person—the constitutionally elected representatives of the Government of the United States.

This bill is not a plea nor a prayerful hope for something to be done. This bill is designed to reach by direct action, the heart of the problem. It is time Congress stops talking about these abuses and does something about them. This bill gives Congress the opportunity.

A DEBT ACKNOWLEDGED—AN ACHIEVEMENT APPLAUDED

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, on April 24 men of all faiths in this country will extend their greetings to the State of Israel on the 10th anniversary of its national independence. The date marks an occasion of special significance. The action of the United Nations 10 years ago which established Israel as an independent nation was an act of faith in the hundreds of thousands of its present and future citizens. By making possible the long awaited Jewish homeland, the United Nations gave its sanction to the just and moral foundation of the fulfillment of that age-old dream.

In the 10 years just past, Israel has herself fulfilled the faith of the world many times over. Conceived in liberty and freedom for her people, and rooted in democratic principles, Israel has built cities and villages, reclaimed the wilderness and integrated her ever growing numbers into the economy and the culture of the country. The infant of the community of free nations has truly grown to adulthood—a valued friend and strategic ally in the Middle East.

Our special affection for Israel may well stem from our historic identification with the struggle for our own independence. The democratic ideals which we hold in common have given rise in both cases to examples of great courage and patriotism, often on the part of men whose home has been another land.

The people of Israel will never forget David Marcus, the brilliant young American military man who left his home to organize the defense of Jerusalem against the Arab Legion and who was instrumental in opening the corridor between the capital and the coast. When a sniper's bullet killed him, they knew that they had lost one of their own.

Woven into the fabric of our war for independence is the thread of the life of one of our own most courageous although lesser known patriots. He was Haym Salomon, whose selfless devotion to the cause of freedom tells a story of courage, romance, and tragedy.

Haym Salomon learned the basic elements of democracy from his intimate association with Pulaski and Kosciusko in his native Poland through the struggle to maintain the independence of their country, and against its partition. When their efforts failed in 1772 and Poland fell under the rule of Austria, Prussia, and Russia, Salomon fled to England and then to America.

Here he was naturally drawn to the cause of liberty. He was by profession a merchant, banker, and financier, and it was in this capacity that he performed the services for the Revolution that have most perpetuated his name. There were many men who risked their lives for a future that meant freedom for themselves and their children. Haym Salomon was certainly one of these. He was arrested twice by the British as a spy, the second time charged with being an accomplice in a plot to destroy the King's fleet. He was confined to the infamous

prison, the Provost, and condemned to death. But the power of wealth is not new, and a string of golden guineas, which he had judiciously concealed on his person, persuaded the jailer to aid in his escape to the American lines.

His imprisonment had taken its toll, and Haym Salomon, whose health and strength had all but been destroyed, was to die before his time, leaving his widow and four small children in poverty. But in the few years between his escape and his death, he earned the affection and gratitude of the Revolutionary Congress and of the statesmen of his time by his enormous contribution to the common cause.

Haym Salomon's contribution was direct and effective. He provided almost limitless funds to the then bankrupt Federal Treasury. At a time when the Government's credit was in a perilous condition and the Treasury exhausted; when Army officers were without clothes and public officials were going without pay, Salomon willingly loaned both the Government and individuals money, without asking security or any guaranty other than that freedom be secure in his adopted land.

Many of the records of the Treasury have been lost or destroyed, and so we can only guess at the real extent of his help. We do know, however, that he held Government obligations for money advances, and promissory notes that totaled \$658,007.43. This figure has been authenticated. On the record, too, is a promissory note from Robert Morris for \$20,000. As Superintendent of Finance, Morris was then engaged exclusively in financing for the Government, and it is likely that the proceeds of this note also went to meet its desperate needs.

It was Morris who wrote to the President of Congress in 1781:

The Treasury was so much in arrears to the servants in public offices that many of them could not, without payment, perform their duties, but must have gone to jail for debts they have contracted to enable them to live.

Haym Salomon took it as his responsibility to see that they did not go to jail.

His generosity and high principle, and the esteem and affection in which he was held is typified by the words of James Madison, who in 1782 wrote to Edmund Randolph:

I am almost ashamed to acknowledge my wants so incessantly to you, but they begin to be so urgent that it is impossible to suppress them. The kindness of our little friend in Front Street near the coffeehouse, is a fund that will preserve me from the extremities, but I never resort to it without great mortification, as he obstinately rejects all recompense. The price of money is so usurious that he thinks it ought to be extorted from none but those whose aim is profitable speculations. To a necessitous delegate he gratuitously spares a supply out of his private stock.

From his private stock, too, Haym Salomon supported the ambassadors and agents of friendly foreign powers when the British blockade cut off the avenues of communication. It was he who made possible the continued good offices in this country of the Ambassador of Spain. In a report to the 31st Con-

gress is the statement that Mr. Salomon "maintained from his own private purse Don Francesco Rendon, the secret Ambassador of that monarch for nearly 2 years, or up to the death of Mr. S. during which Rendon's supplies were cut off."

America's debt to Haym Salomon is largely one of gratitude. In one sense, he has been repaid through the growth of the very democratic traditions which he worked to establish. The Government's debt of money has never in any part been paid to him or to his heirs, however. His death in 1785 came when the affairs of the Government were in great confusion, and although his wealth had been so freely applied to the Revolutionary cause that he died penniless, attempts to settle his claim have been futile, and no real recognition has ever been given his patriotism and devotion to the democratic ideal.

This year we have an opportunity to make what I believe to be a fitting memorial to Haym Salomon—consistent with the principles that governed his life. At the same time, we can send a most meaningful message of congratulation to the State of Israel on the 10th anniversary of its independence. That opportunity lies in the program of State of Israel bonds.

Designed to enrich the economy of the country through the development of Israel's resources and industries, bonds have been one of the most significant factors in providing homes and job opportunities to the million immigrants who have entered the country in the last 10 years. We must realize that the fact of a Jewish homeland would be a hollow thing indeed if that fact were one of mere geography. Implicit in the dream has always been the opportunity for a full, happy life for the men and women who would make the dream a reality. State of Israel bonds have provided the opportunity.

I have introduced a joint resolution providing that the Secretary of the Treasury be given the discretion to purchase State of Israel bonds, which bear 4 percent interest, in the amount of \$60 million. This figure has been arrived at by taking the authenticated debt of \$658,007.43 plus interest at approximately 2½ percent. I would point out that the original figure is one which excludes the cost of all but direct loans to the Federal Treasury.

Additionally, it should be noted that I have not directed the Secretary of the Treasury to make this investment, but merely authorized him to do so, because of my awareness that while it may be the wish of the Congress to express forthrightly the sentiments included in the resolution, nevertheless, implementation of the foreign policy of the United States must remain with the executive branch of the Government, and be subject to its appraisal of the effectiveness of each and every action which is taken in the name of the United States.

Not only would the adoption of this resolution afford long overdue recognition to Haym Salomon, it would also authorize a financially sound investment, particularly of the trust funds of various

Federal programs such as the civil service retirement and disability fund.

Israel has proven herself in the last 10 years to be both economically and financially on firm foundation. Her record of repayment on loans made under our foreign aid program is 100 percent. In light of past history dating from World War I, I cannot believe that any argument based on a question of the security of such an investment can have any validity. We continue to incur the financial obligations of countries which have almost completely fallen down on their commitments. The amount of the allied war debt which was funded in 1932 totaled \$11,577,300,000, with interest, and would now come to \$18,174,570,000. Of those nations concerned, only Finland has continued to pay on her debt.

And yet, when Great Britain in 1956 and 1957 asked for an extension of the loan of \$4,022,000,000 which we granted in 1945, that extension was given when it was demonstrated that England could pay nothing on the debt in those 2 years. Nor has our generosity to other nations been limited to Great Britain.

If it has been sound for our Government to make such gestures of faith in our allies in the past, certainly the patriotism of Haym Salomon and the 10-year record of the State of Israel justifies us now in extending in this form our heartfelt congratulations to our newest ally; and will demonstrate our faith that Israel's devotion to freedom, justice, and morality will survive the future challenge to her independence. Her success in securing for her people economic security and stability in the years to come will be the cornerstone upon which peace can and will be brought to all the peoples of the Middle East, and with it the end of aggressive domination for the benefit of any one community alone.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the House pass this resolution at the earliest possible moment, so that our message of friendship and admiration may reach all the free people of the world.

CHICAGO'S INTERNATIONAL HOUSE

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it will be of interest to my colleagues, especially at this time when committee hearings on the mutual-security bill are under way, to learn more of the grassroots approach to world understanding as promoted by the University of Chicago and its world-famed International House, which is the campus home and center of activities of students from two-thirds or more of the nations of the world.

During my recent visit to Africa as a member of the study group from the Committee on Foreign Affairs I met in Uganda a young man who had lived at International House and had received his degree from the University of Chi-

cago some 4 or 5 years ago. He now is a schoolteacher in his native land, a virile leader in the work of education among an awakened people reaching out for a fuller share in all things that make for the dignity of man. His associations at International House, his rubbing elbows with his fellow students, his occasional visits in American homes, have given him an understanding of us, and the things we live by, that is reflected in his present work.

By unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the following article from the January 1958 issue of Tower Topics, the alumni publication of the University of Chicago:

THANKSGIVING IN PARIS—A GRASSROOTS APPROACH TO WORLD UNDERSTANDING

Every schoolchild has heard of Paris—Paris, France, that is. Relatively few, however, have heard of Paris, Ill. Yet, in the short span of less than 2 years, this city of 10,000 population, 165 miles south of Chicago, has established itself in the minds and hearts of citizens from countries throughout the world as the most hospitable town in the United States. For many a foreign student it has afforded the only "true" glimpse of America he has had since coming to this country for studies.

Paris, Ill., has been put on the world map by Mrs. T. J. Trogdon, Jr., and fellow residents of Paris, who for the last 2 years have opened their homes to share Thanksgiving with foreign students from the Chicago metropolitan area. The first year of the program, Thanksgiving, 1956, 142 foreign students and their families, including wives and children ranging from 7 months to 8 years in age, were guests of Paris over the 5-day Thanksgiving vacation. Last Thanksgiving, 121 adults were in the group which entrained from Chicago, representing approximately 40 nations. Over half of the student guests were from the University of Chicago, one reason being the large number of foreign students enrolled on campus and another the support given the program from its inception by Jack R. Kerridge, foreign-student adviser at International House. The program also has had active participation from Northwestern University, Illinois Institute of Technology, Roosevelt College, DePaul University, and other Chicago area institutions.

Basic idea of the Thanksgiving fellowship, conceived by Mrs. Trogdon, is to aid world relations and world peace at the grassroots level by giving foreign students a chance to observe and take part in the daily life of an average American family and by giving their American hosts, at the same time, a chance to acquaint themselves with the thoughts and ideas of their foreign-student guests.

Most foreign students in large centers of population have little or no opportunity to gain knowledge of the United States other than from their stay in the metropolitan area, where, by the necessities of their studies, they more or less remain in a small, closed group.

Wrote a student from India to his host: "Had it not been for me to know you all, my visit to the States would have been an utterly dry one, and I would have gone back from here with an entirely different outlook for the people of the United States. Now I know that there are really good people, and their goodness is beyond my reach or thought."

Saiyid M. Naqvi, a student resident of International House from Pakistan, who has spent his last two Thanksgivings in Paris and has made a host of friends there, is one of the most enthusiastic supporters of the program and is hopeful other towns will follow

Paris' lead. He has been foreign-student representative from International House at orientation and planning meetings in Paris from the inception of the Thanksgiving fellowship program.

Summing up the value of the program, Harry Evans, a Commonwealth Fund fellow, wrote last fall: "It is a year since I visited Paris as an English student taking part in the Thanksgiving fellowship organized by Mrs. Tom Trogon, Jr. Since then I have traveled 20,000 miles in this great country over a period of 8 months, but I think I can honestly say I have never had a better glimpse of America than those few days in Paris with Mr. and Mrs. Ed Gumm and Kathy (his hosts). America to the European too often means simply Elvis Presley, glossy cars, and high buildings—as if there were just space between New York and Los Angeles, and every American wore sideburns and played a guitar.

"There is nothing wrong with Mr. Presley or skyscrapers, but America is not just that—and the trip to Paris proved it more than anything. What a wonderful thing it was that Paris initiated the International Thanksgiving fellowship. At home the Midwest has somehow always been thought of as the center of an unfriendly isolationism that wanted to have nothing to do with the outside world. It was a wonderful experience for me to learn that this dangerous old conception was wrong, and my friends at home were equally delighted.

"I like to think, too, that my friends in Paris learned 1 or 2 new truths about my country in the good, frank discussions we had. It was a time of great education, and friendliness, from which nothing but good came for the relations between countries. Paris will always be the real America for me. When my wife joined me in America this year, it was the one place I wanted her to visit, and we spent a happy weekend with Mr. and Mrs. Gumm and the people of Paris."

Students are guests of individual families and of the city of Paris. Church, fraternal, business and professional, and civic organizations, as well as schoolchildren from kindergarten through high school, participate in the program of activities. Guests are under no expense, their train transportation being arranged from Chicago to Paris and return. Costs are covered by the community.

The first year of the program \$1,100 was contributed by residents of Paris without any personal solicitation. The response last Thanksgiving was even more enthusiastic, with many more families volunteering their homes to house and entertain the guests.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on this St. Patrick's Day, when we pay our tribute to the Emerald Isle and her sons and daughters who have carried Irish cheer and Irish love of freedom into every clime and every country, I am addressing my remarks to the part played by the Irish in the writing of the greatest document of government the world has ever known, the Constitution of the United States. It is worthy of mention, certainly on the 17th of March, that of the 39 men who signed the Constitution 7 were of Irish birth or descent.

Fifty-five delegates attended the Constitutional Convention; 39 remained and signed the document. Sixteen either left before the work was completed or refused to sign. Eight of the original fifty-five members were of Irish blood. Of this number 4 were Irish immigrants, 3 were

the sons of Irish immigrants, and 1 was of Irish descent.

Of the 39 who signed the Constitution, 4 were Irish immigrants; 2, the sons of Irish immigrants; 1 of Irish descent. Here are the Irish seven:

PIERCE BUTLER

Pierce Butler, born in Ireland 1744; major in His Majesty's army, resigned his commission 1773 and married Mary Middleton, of South Carolina. As a member of the South Carolina Legislature, to which he was elected several times, he was a champion of backwoods democracy.

DANIEL CARROLL

Daniel Carroll, brother of the archbishop of Baltimore, Irish descent; member Constitutional Convention; signed the Constitution and worked for its ratification; Member of the Senate from Maryland in First Congress. Arguably supported the first amendment to the Constitution which provided for religious toleration.

THOMAS FITZSIMMONS

Thomas Fitzsimmons, born in Ireland; emigrated to Philadelphia as a youth. During the War for Independence he recruited and commanded a company of volunteers. He also aided the American cause by supplying fireships and equipment. At a crucial time during the war he and his brother-in-law contributed \$25,000 for the use of the Army.

As a Member of the Congress of the Confederation he championed the cause of the veterans of the War for Independence, insisting that they be paid back wages in full before demobilization. He was elected to the first House of Representatives, 1789, and reelected to the Second and Third Congresses.

JAMES M'HENRY

James McHenry, Irish immigrant who became Washington's senior surgeon at Valley Forge; later he was Secretary of War. His son inspired the writing of the National Anthem. Born in County Antrim, educated in Dublin; he studied medicine in Philadelphia under Dr. Benjamin Rush. At the outbreak of the War for Independence he hurried to Cambridge where he offered his services to Washington. Hospital facilities were crude; experienced workers few. Dr. McHenry's services were so outstanding that the Continental Congress gave him public recognition.

However, the Irish blood cried for the combat. He was transferred to the Pennsylvania battalion and during the retreat of the American Army across New Jersey he became a prisoner. He managed, somehow, to secure a parole; for he served as senior surgeon at Valley Forge, although his formal exchange was not completed until March 1778. After Valley Forge he was appointed to Lafayette's staff where he served until the close of the war.

Dr. McHenry's son, John, during the War of 1812, commanded the fort which bears the family name. After a night of anxiety, Francis Scott Key, inspired by the sight of the Stars and Stripes still floating over the fort, wrote the Star-Spangled Banner.

WILLIAM PATTERSON

William Patterson, born in County Antrim, 1745. William Patterson was brought to Delaware at the age of 2. During the War for Independence he served as an officer in the Somerset County Battalion of Minute Men. He was one of the two Senators from New Jersey in the First Congress. In 1793 he was appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States.

GEORGE REED

George Reed, son of an Irish father and Welsh mother. He was one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence as well as the Constitution. Appointed to the United States Senate, he resigned as Senator in 1793 to become chief justice of Delaware.

RICHARD D. SPAIGHT

Richard D. Spaight, the son of an Irish immigrant. His mother died when he was 8 years of age and his father sent him first to Ireland for his education. When he reached college age Spaight was transferred to the University of Glasgow. He served in the Army as aide-de-camp to General Caswell and was present at the Battle of Camden.

He was a Member of the Continental Congress, 1783-85. He was elected Governor of North Carolina three times and later was elected to the House of Representatives. In the House he advocated repeal of the alien and sedition laws.

MERCER MISSED THE BOAT

Of the 16 who missed a great opportunity by not signing the Constitution, only 1 was of Irish blood, the son of an Irish immigrant. He was John Francis Mercer of Maryland. While he took an active part in the debate in the Convention, he left without signing the Constitution.

ARCHBISHOP CICOGNANI, APOSTOLIC DELEGATE TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, today is the 25th anniversary of the naming and designation of the Most Reverend Amleto Giovanni Cicognani as the apostolic delegate to the United States, as the personal representative of His Holiness, the spiritual head of the Catholic Church.

I congratulate Archbishop Cicognani on the silver jubilee of his service as apostolic delegate, in which post the archbishop has served longer than any apostolic delegate before him.

It is only a few years ago, 1955, that Archbishop Cicognani observed the golden jubilee of his ordination to the holy priesthood.

The entire life of the archbishop has been dedicated to the service of God and mankind. His life is an example and inspiration for all to follow.

Archbishop Cicognani has performed the responsible duties of apostolic delegate with outstanding ability, with dignity and strength, and with tactfulness that commands widespread respect.

The archbishop is highly esteemed and deeply respected by countless millions of persons here and abroad, members of all other creeds, as well as communicants of the Catholic Church.

I know that all such persons join with me today in congratulating Archbishop Cicognani on the 25th anniversary of his designation as apostolic delegate to the United States, and in hoping and praying that God will continue to bestow upon him His choicest blessings for countless years to come, thereby enabling the archbishop to carry on his dedicated work for God and mankind.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE USES PUBLIC FUNDS TO LOBBY TRADE AGREEMENTS BILL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Commerce has undertaken a clever little maneuver to help the beleaguered trade agreements bill across the goal line in Congress. The gambit is in the form of surveys of Congressional Districts conducted by the Department. These surveys or reports have a way of showing how important exports are to the individual Congressman's district in providing employment and how necessary imports are because they supply many essential materials for the manufacture of this or that.

These surveys or studies are of highly questionable standing in view of their preconceived purpose, their method of preparation and their one-sided presentation. No public funds should be allowed to be funneled into the production of such biased reports. These funds come from all the taxpayers and not only from the export and import interests. Those who oppose the trade agreements program or its present manner of administration should not be asked to contribute to the support of legislation that is contrary to their views.

The executive branch has already built up a wholly unjustified control over the foreign commerce of this country. When we now find the Department of Commerce sliding its hand into the public till to pay for propaganda designed to tighten this executive control it is time to call a halt.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to chapter 93 of the Federal Code, section 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 the 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.

And, in addition:

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 a superior office vested with the power of removing him, shall be removed from office or employment.

If the Secretary of Commerce persists in carrying out these "surveys" he should be rebuked for callous disregard of the elementary requirements of fair play. If the Department is to make surveys they should be made in a fair and objective manner. They should show the impact of low-cost imports upon industry and agriculture no less than simply loosely estimating how many jobs may be ascribed to exports.

In recent testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee, and in other public statements, proponents of the Executive's request for broader authority to reduce tariffs have claimed that 4.5 million Americans owe their jobs to foreign trade.

The figure itself is open to question. In addition, many observers have misinterpreted this statistical argument to mean that 4.5 million jobs are linked to export trade alone and that these jobs would be jeopardized unless the administration's proposals are approved.

The American Tariff League has analyzed the employment claims advanced on behalf of the Trade Agreements Act, and their research brings to light important statistical weaknesses.

Briefly, permit me to analyze the statistics used by those who favor the administration's foreign trade bill:

First. The recent job estimates are a projection of an earlier compilation made by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics in 1952. Furthermore, that 1952 study had its origin in findings of an industry-by-industry survey covering nonagricultural employment levels in 1947. This information applied only to a portion of the total workers, that portion allegedly dependent on export trade. In other words, the only existing detailed basis for the 4.5 million job figure appears to be already 11 years old, and solely applicable to the export subtotal.

Second. According to BLS, a total of 2,526,600 nonagricultural workers were dependent on United States export trade in 1947. According to latest estimates, by the United States Department of Labor, a total of 2,516,000 were dependent on export trade in 1956, even though exports had increased 32 percent during this period. In other words, a 32-percent gain in our export trade seems to have resulted in a reduction of 10,600 jobs.

Third. On May 5, 1953, the Department of Commerce presented to Congress an estimate that 4,376,000 American jobs depended on the volume of our gross foreign trade in 1952. The Randall Commission's staff papers cited these figures. The current Department of Labor estimate of 4,500,000 is presumably based on the volume of trade in 1956. In the period, 1952 through 1956, the volume of United States trade rose 23 percent, yet apparently produced an in-

crease of 124,000 jobs, or less than 5 percent in employment.

Fourth. Furthermore, the BLS survey classified as directly dependent on exports some 400,000 workers—as distinguished from indirectly dependent—in service industries such as coal, gas, and electric power, railroad and other transportation, marketing, communications, and other nonmanufacturing pursuits. This is a dubious classification, since these same jobs and similar services would also be required to support import-vulnerable industries producing for the domestic market.

Fifth. The Labor Department further estimated that 1.4 million workers are engaged in processing, transporting, and distributing imported materials. However, industries which process imported materials include automatically such import-distressed industries as woolen manufacturing, rope and twine production, aluminum wares, and lead and zinc refining. Clearly, these last-named industries are not dependent on foreign trade in the sense of seeking still lower tariffs as a condition of prosperity. As a matter of fact, important segments of each of these industries have been severely disrupted by excessive imports.

Overall, we note that the Department of Commerce, in estimating trade-dependent jobs in 1952—from which current estimates are projected—stated that: "There is no regular reporting system to any of the Government departments on the number of persons dependent for their employment on foreign trade." In the absence of controlled and reliable sources of information, can we assume that the resulting estimates represent anything more than guesswork?

The league recognizes that there are American jobs linked to our exports, just as there are American jobs in jeopardy from imports. However, the league believes it a disservice to Congress for proponents of H. R. 10368 to continue repeating the dubious figure of 4.5 million jobs as tied to our foreign trade, and at the same time to minimize the number of American workers who can be displaced by imports.

There should be recognition that jobs are at stake on both sides of the issue and that the difficult task facing Congress is to determine policy so that the least amount of job disturbance occurs, particularly at this time of increasing economic distress and unemployment.

Such surveys should also estimate the extent of reliance of a number of important raw material producers on protection, which if torn away would greatly shake strong segments of the economy. Wheat grain and wheat flour are highly protected by import quotas; so is raw cotton; so is sugar. Dairy products also benefit from tariffs and quotas. Shipbuilding and ship operation are supported by subsidies to make possible competition with foreign shipyards and foreign merchant marine.

Rip away this protection and the exporters in various Congressional Districts might find the domestic market, which in nearly all areas still looms as the great absorbent of domestic production, shrinking badly and leaving exports as a

very poor substitute. Yet in going into any Congressional District these facts are overlooked. The economy as it is taken for granted.

Thus a distorted picture is drawn of the question at issue. The issue is not one of cutting off imports of materials needed by our industry for production. It is ridiculous even to insinuate that such a proposal is involved. Nor for that matter is there any disposition to cripple imports in general. The goal is fair import competition in place of destructive competition that springs from low wages paid in foreign countries. None of this would be guessed from the Department of Commerce's approach in its Congressional District surveys. Again, it is clear that some 20 percent of our exports originate not from private commercial considerations but from Government-sponsored program, such as foreign aid and agricultural surplus export program.

The Department of Commerce is setting a very poor example for executive department behavior. These Departments should serve all the people and not a favored few. From the behavior of the Department of Commerce in this matter one would easily conclude that it is nothing more than the servant of export and import interests. If that is in fact the case we should examine closely the appropriations for surveys and reports and stop at the source the abuse of public trust that is involved in making highly slanted reports on the foreign trade interests of particular Congressional Districts.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission at this point to insert into the Record an article from the New York Times, headlined "United States Studies Back Trade Extension."

(The article referred to follows:)

UNITED STATES STUDIES BACK TRADE EXTENSION—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE IS FURNISHING SURVEYS FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS

(By Richard E. Mooney)

WASHINGTON, March 8.—The administration has developed a new weapon in the battle over foreign trade. It is a series of reports on how exports and imports affect the average citizen of Bristol, Conn., Flint, Mich., and Bessemer, Ala., among other places.

The Department of Commerce has made a foreign trade impact study of 2 Congressional Districts in Connecticut, 2 in Michigan, and 1 in Alabama, and is working on more. The studies were requested by the Representatives whose districts were surveyed, an official of the Department said.

Four of the five say that foreign trade contributes very greatly to the welfare of the people in the district. The fifth says it is essential.

The reason for studies is the administration's request to Congress that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act be renewed for 5 or more years.

Strong opposition to the program has been generated by industries that tell their Representatives that imports of competing products are forcing unemployment in the constituency.

AID TO EMPLOYMENT CITED

The Commerce Department studies do not deal so much with unemployment caused by imports as with employment that is based on both exports and imports. Export sales provide employment as any sales do, and with-

out imported raw materials certain manufacturers would not be in business at all.

While acknowledging that competitive imports may be causing some unemployment, each study concludes that the net effect of imports is overwhelmingly favorable in the district surveyed.

The 5 districts reported on so far are: Connecticut's First, around Hartford, where the aircraft industry is the highest manufacturing employer; Connecticut's Fourth, around Bridgeport, nonelectrical machinery; Michigan's Sixth, around Flint, automobiles; Michigan's Eighteenth, around Pontiac; and Alabama's Ninth—where trade is called essential—around Birmingham, iron and steel and other primary metals.

The studies have not been publicized by the Department for fear that opponents of the administration's liberal trade policy would accuse the White House of lobbying. However, the Department does not balk at answering questions about them, nor at making copies available on request.

Department officials say they will make a study for any Member of Congress who requests it. The reports, ranging in length from 17 to 22 pages, are in such form that the Representatives can relay them directly to interested constituents.

If all reports were to describe such net benefits from foreign trade, however, it is not likely that a convinced protectionist would ask for one on his district.

The report on Connecticut's Fourth District concedes that some segments of the machine tool industry are being affected adversely, but said the tool and die industry as a whole exports more than several times as much as is imported.

PETROLEUM RESERVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, Sputnik I and the era of the ballistics missile have jarred the Nation into a defense alert. We have crash programs on space research, rocket development, and anti-missile missiles. The Secretary of Defense has said we need to spend \$1½ billion immediately for additional B-52's. The Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, is looking into the possibility of accelerating a number of military construction programs.

In short, we are a nation determined to meet any and all challenges to our position of strength which is so vital in maintaining the peace. Our Government and the American people are of one mind in this matter: We will do what must be done to meet our security needs.

While we are engaged in the costliest and most far-reaching preparedness efforts in our peacetime history, I was distressed by the sobering news that, for the first time in 15 years, the Nation lost ground in development of its most vital munition of war, petroleum. The American Petroleum Institute has released its annual report on reserves showing that domestic petroleum reserves declined by 349 million barrels in 1957. This means we produced 349 million barrels more petroleum fuels than was discovered and developed by the domestic industry last year.

This is shocking and somber news, Mr. Speaker. No material is more essential to our security than oil. We must not forget that 2 pounds out of every 3 that

we shipped to the allied fighting forces in World War II—including men, machines, munitions, foodstuffs, everything used in that war—2 pounds out of every 3 consisted of petroleum and its products.

Experience has proved that this country cannot have a mobilization base without oil. Oil is the basis of our industrial and military strength. Without abundant supplies of petroleum fuels, we could not hope to maintain the strength required to maintain leadership of the Free World. We could not hope to sustain a global striking Air Force—composed of aircraft which use many times the fuel required by the B-29's of World War II.

Because of our ever-expanding requirements, and the essential nature of petroleum fuels as the primary defense fuel, I submit that we have much at stake in maintaining adequate oil supplies. We, likewise, have a deep concern as to any threat to our future supplies of petroleum.

The fact that our oil reserves declined in 1957 cannot be attributed to a lack of oil to be found. Only last week, the industrial publication, Petroleum Week, published an estimate that the ultimate recoverable reserves of petroleum in the United States exceed 430 billion of barrels. We have not exhausted the places to drill. Why, then, did our proved reserves decline?

There is only one answer. We found less oil because we drilled fewer wells. The first significant decline in domestic well drilling since 1942 occurred in 1957. The Independent Petroleum Association of America has said this drilling decline represented a loss of 7,500 wells below average drilling trends of the previous 10 years. Based on oil found per well drilled since World War II, the domestic industry would have added more than half a billion barrels of reserves in 1957 had drilling followed its normal course. Instead, the decline in drilling resulted in the first net decline in proved petroleum reserves in 15 years.

The failure in drilling and the resulting failure to add to our national reserves of our most vital material of war resulted from the simple economic fact that domestic oil producers did not have the funds and incentives to maintain drilling, development and reserves in keeping with our expanding national oil requirements. The domestic industry was denied these funds, in my opinion, largely by reason of the fact that imported foreign oil has taken a larger and larger share of the domestic oil market, year after year, and these imports have now clearly reached the point of undermining one of our most essential defense industries.

My colleagues know that the problem of oil imports is not new. It has been before the Congress for a number of years. Repeatedly, there have been warnings that there must be a breaking point at which our security as to oil would be undermined through excessive use of foreign oil and that, as a nation, we would then become dependent on foreign oil.

These many warnings apparently are now being fulfilled, and the dangers resulting cannot be overstated. It was

ironic, Mr. Speaker, that the headline, "Oil Reserves Off After 14-Year Rise," in the Oil Daily for March 12, was followed the same day by a headline emblazoned across the front page of the Washington Evening Star, which read, "Indonesians Seize United States Oil Field."

This latter headline came as a timely and mute warning of the dangers of reliance on foreign oil. It is significant that the oilfields developed by American interests in Sumatra, which now face an uncertain future in the civil strife which has brought war to Indonesia, has recently become the largest single sources of imports to the United States west coast.

The Indonesian problem is only another of a long succession of incidents which leave no doubt as to the folly of reliance on foreign oil. One of the first and most memorable of these incidents was the expropriation of American oil properties by Mexico. The nationalization of Iranian oil properties in 1951 was another dramatic example of why we must avoid dependence on remote oil supplies. Last year, the Suez crisis in midwinter denied oil to all of Western Europe. Economic distress was prevented in Europe only by immediate large shipments of oil from the United States.

Venezuela recently again changed governments at gunpoint, and while there is every indication that economic relationships may not be affected, such political instability serves to illustrate the importance of full development of our own petroleum supplies within our own arsenal and our own control.

Remember, that the coalition between Egypt and Syria, in the politically unpredictable Middle East, gives those two countries control over both the Suez Canal and the pipelines from Middle Eastern oilfields to the eastern Mediterranean port of Sidon. Is the Middle East, then, an oil source on which we wish to rely in any manner for our security as to essential petroleum supplies?

In face of these historic facts, Mr. Speaker, we find our domestic oil producing industry drilling less, developing less, and proving up less reserves for the future. At a time when provision for our security is the watchword of Government and of our people, we are witnessing the fearsome spectacle of our defense-vital oil-producing industry being submerged in a flood of foreign oil to which we have access only so long as we do not need it.

As if the picture were not already bleak enough, the worst is yet to come. I have inquired into how the domestic petroleum industry is faring in 1958, following the year 1957 in which it lost ground for the first time in 15 years. The answers I received are not encouraging.

What about drilling? Mr. Speaker, in the latest week the number of drilling rigs operating in the United States were at a 10-year low. Drilling is not below the depressed levels of 1957; not below 5 years ago, but below the levels of 1947.

My inquiry to industry sources also revealed that so far in 1958, the domestic oil producing industry has drilled 10 per-

cent fewer wells than in the same period in 1957, and 25 percent fewer exploratory wells on which we depend for new additions to our oil bank of proved oil reserves.

I submit to my colleagues that these are shocking trends. They are shocking because once the domestic industry is undermined, once its skilled technical workers are forced into other fields, once we have lost our strength as to oil, it will be impossible to call the industry back into service overnight. We cannot just turn on an oil spigot when the going gets rough. The acquisition of lands, exploratory work by seismic and geophysical crews, drilling, development, and completion of an oilfield from the time when it is envisioned by a geologist is a process that requires 7 to 15 years. This, the maintenance of oil supply, must by the nature of the industry be a continuing and constantly expanding operation.

Therein lies the fallacy of the arguments sometimes advanced that we should import foreign oil and save our own. In theory this sounds plausible. In practice it is unworkable, impractical and impossible. Only by the process of producing more and more oil can the industry finance more and more efforts to maintain our supplies. The more oil we use, the more oil we find; this has always been true. To whatever extent we would quit using domestic oil, the industry is constricted in its operations, and our supplies of a primary defense fuel are diminished.

The decline in the domestic oil producing industry is clearly the result, primarily, of the fact that domestic producers have been increasingly displaced in their own market by foreign oil.

This is a condition that can no longer be condoned. The importance of a healthy oil producing industry to our security is such that the Congress would be derelict in its duty to our national safety if it now fails to provide some reasonable limits on oil imports. We cannot further postpone a solution to this problem. To do so is to risk placing our country at the end of an oil lifeline reaching halfway around the world—a lifeline which at any time could be served by any one of a dozen monarchs or dictators.

I submit that to spend billions for defense on one hand, and then allow our most vital defense industry to deteriorate through excessive imports which primarily benefit the handful of American importing oil companies, is the height of folly. Without oil, no plane can fly, and no tank can roll. By failure now to impose proper limits on oil imports we will hasten the day when we will be without oil. We would thus lose the power resource which enables the leadership for which the Free World now looks to our country.

I hope my colleagues will keep these few facts in mind as we consider the proposition of extending the trade-agreements program. If any extension of this act should fail to recognize the plight of the domestic oil industry by providing a definite and specific limit on oil imports the consequence could be

further diminution of our petroleum reserves and back-door destruction of the most costly mobilization program in history.

RELIEF FOR THE AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. NIMTZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. NIMTZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I, and those to whom I yield, may have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. NIMTZ. Mr. Speaker, in January of last year, shortly after Congress convened, I introduced a bill to provide much-needed tax relief to an important segment of our economy—the owners of more than 60 million motor vehicles in America and the approximately 9 million workers who depend for a living on the automotive and associated industries.

My bill, H. R. 3854, introduced January 28, 1957, called for repeal of the burdensome excise tax on automobiles and trucks as a means of giving the auto industry—the most vital segment in our entire economy—"a shot in the arm."

Unfortunately, the House had no opportunity to vote on this or similar proposals in March of last year when we had under consideration H. R. 4090 to extend corporation and excise tax rates. Under the usual "closed rule," the excise tax on autos was lumped with luxury taxes on alcoholic beverages and tobacco. No amendments were permitted. We had to vote either for or against the entire package. There was no chance to consider the auto tax as a separate measure and on its merits.

Since that time the need for some form of tax relief to help spur activity in the auto industry has become more apparent. Auto production dropped more than 24 percent between January 1957 and January of this year—from 641,591 cars in the first month of last year to only 487,700 cars during January 1958.

Production figures for the month of February were even worse. The figures show that auto plants were turning out cars and trucks at a rate 31 percent below a year ago.

During the first 2 months of this year, automobile retailers sold fewer than 700,000 new cars, according to an Associated Press report.

The total, based on unofficial computations, will give you an idea of the pickup that will be needed if this year's total sales are to reach 5½ million units. It will take a substantial upsurge of boom proportions to reach that total.

The industry does not usually experience a boom in the last half of the year. That is when dealers are struggling to sell outgoing models. The best marketing period, generally, is in the April-June quarter.

Severe weather in February may have kept many would-be car buyers away

from showrooms. But inventories have mounted. Dealers probably have twice as many cars as they need. Dealer stocks of passenger cars, as reported by Ward's Reports, Inc., were about 900,000 on March 1, exceeding their record high of early 1956.

Sales during the month of March are traditionally looked upon by the industry as an indication of the total expected volume for the year. There is no present indication, however, that this month's total will equal the 572,917 sales made in March of last year.

It is evident that a great selling job must be done by retailers to get this year's total above the 5 million unit mark. The drop in retail sales is a cause for real concern in the industry.

This situation, in the opinion of many economists, is directly related to the high cost of cars. And taxes, of course, are a big factor in this cost. It is estimated that more than 25 percent of the cost of cars is the result of taxes.

Anything we in Congress can do to bring auto costs down and instill new life in America's No. 1 industry is bound to have a beneficial effect on the entire economy. If tax relief is granted—and if auto sales start to pick up in the next few months—you can be sure that consumer and business confidence will pick up everywhere.

I sincerely hope that members of the Ways and Means Committee will keep these facts in mind when they consider extending the excise tax on automobiles. I hope they will not again treat this as a luxury tax in the same class as liquor and tobacco taxes. I hope they will give us the opportunity to discuss the auto tax on its merits and consider it in relation to its effect on the entire business economy.

Administration leaders have indicated that if business fails to pick up by spring, consideration will be given to applying tax relief to sagging parts of the economy. This also is the thinking of many members of the Ways and Means Committee.

If tax relief is recommended, I say that top consideration should be given to the auto industry for, in my opinion, it would benefit not only every car-owning family in America but every aspect of the economy as well.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to read a splendid editorial on this subject which appeared on March 11 in the South Bend, Ind., Tribune.

The Tribune is one of Indiana's most influential newspapers. Its editorials are read with respect by thousands of citizens in northern Indiana and southern Michigan.

Here is what the South Bend Tribune had to say last week about the auto tax and the responsibility Congress has to act immediately to repeal it. The editorial is entitled, "End This Depressing Tax." It reads as follows:

END THIS DEPRESSING TAX

Members of Congress talking about tax reduction as a means of stopping the business recession still have to prove that they are thinking straight. The failure of most of them to mention abolition of the wartime excise tax on automobiles brings their sincerity into question.

As an emergency wartime measure Congress slapped a 10 percent tax on cars at the manufacturing level. The war that needed financing then is long past but that tax remains.

Right now it is one of the factors in the business recession. Abolition of the 10 percent tax would cut car prices substantially. That could stimulate automobile buying.

This is vitally important. The automotive industry influences a lot of other industry. Depression in the automotive area means depression in many other areas. It looks as if we can't expect the end of this recession until the automotive industry and its supplying industries are stimulated.

The Federal Government needs a lot of money. But depending on a tax that is obviously intensifying and expanding this business recession is dangerous nonsense.

This 10-percent excise tax on automobiles should have been rescinded at least 11 years ago. When World War II ended it became an unjust, grossly discriminatory tax. Now it is promoting human misery.

Walter Reuther, of the UAW, recently proposed a \$100 reduction in automobile prices. But he hasn't mentioned repeal of the 10-percent excise tax, which would cut the price on each car far more than that. For example, it would mean a car now selling for \$3,000 could be bought for \$2,700.

Rescinding this unjust discriminatory tax could be the most effective single anti-recession move.

Mr. Speaker, my home city of South Bend, Ind., is also the home city of the Studebaker-Packard Corp.—one of the oldest and one of the last of America's independent automobile manufacturers. We in South Bend are proud of this firm and the craftsmanship of its thousands of workers. We are proud of the cars that it turns out and the great contribution it has made over the years to improvements in car styling.

The Studebaker-Packard Corp. also has taken the lead in the movement to keep car costs down. It produces the lowest-cost car in America today—the Studebaker Scotsman, which retails for under \$1,800.

The president of the Studebaker-Packard Corp. is Harold E. Churchill. Last week, after obtaining a special order to speak today on automobile excise taxes, I sent a telegram to Mr. Churchill asking him to comment on this problem. I received his reply just a few moments ago and I would like to read it in the RECORD at this point:

SOUTH BEND, IND., March 17, 1958.

Congressman F. JAY NIMTZ,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Downward revision or elimination of the excise tax upon automobiles enacted during a wartime emergency should increase the sale of cars and have a stimulating effect on the economy of the whole Nation. One out of every seven jobs in the Nation is dependent upon the automotive industry. The business that creates these jobs has slowed today. The effect is apparent.

Studebaker-Packard will pass on to its dealers any reduction in auto excise taxes so they in turn may pass it on to the customer; thus, the general public can promptly benefit and the constructive effects be felt swiftly by the entire country. This important action should be taken without delay and should be made retroactive on all unsold new car inventories so that while legislation is pending potential retail buyers will be assured they will not be penalized by buying now. As a resident of South Bend you are aware

of what elimination of this tax would mean to our neighbors and friends.

HAROLD E. CHURCHILL.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] has been interested and most active in this effort to repeal the excise tax on automobiles and trucks. It was on January 16, 1957, that he introduced H. R. 3022 for such repeal. He has contacted Henry Ford II, president of the Ford Motor Co.; H. H. Curtice, president of the General Motors Corp.; George Romney, president of the American Motors Corp.; and L. L. Colbert, president of the Chrysler Corp., as to their attitude and the position of their respective companies concerning the repeal of this tax. The responses from these gentlemen to our colleague, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, are as follows:

DEARBORN, MICH., March 6, 1958.

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Your recent letter is a thoughtful appraisal of the current economic situation as it affects the automobile industry and I am glad to have had the opportunity to read it and discuss it with my associates at Ford Motor Co.

The atmosphere of uncertainty to which you refer is a strong deterrent in the minds of many thousands of people who have the means to buy but who are putting off their buying decisions because they lack confidence in the future. Uncertainty breeds more uncertainty and can lead only to increasing difficulty for all segments of the national economy.

We have reached a crucial point in the recession—the point where optimistic words are of little avail and where prompt and direct action is indicated. Repealing the excise tax on automobiles is certainly the sort of action that will help to reverse the present unfortunate trend. This one step cannot by itself cure every problem, but it could produce beneficial results for an industry which exerts an important influence on the entire American economy.

As far as Ford Motor Co. is concerned, any reduction in the excise tax will be excluded from our charges to our dealers with the specific recommendation that they, in turn, exclude it from their charges to their customers.

With regard to your suggestion for a thorough reevaluation of our prices, I want to assure you that the prices of our products are under constant study. Price reductions, however, cannot be made in the face of rising costs. In the past 10 years, for example, while our labor costs were rising 70 percent the price of a typical Ford car was increased only 30 percent.

Although it would not be appropriate for me to comment on your proposal to Mr. Reuther, I naturally would be interested to hear his response to this point.

Thank you again for your expression of constructive interest.

Very sincerely,

HENRY FORD II.

GENERAL MOTORS CORP.,
Detroit, February 21, 1958.

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.,

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I take pleasure in acknowledging your letter of February 17 and attachments. I am in full agreement with the points you make, namely, that public confidence is an importantly significant factor as regards the business outlook; that assurance of a realistic and peaceful settlement of the collective bargaining issues in

the automobile industry would strengthen public confidence, and, finally, that a tax reduction would be most helpful with respect to both the willingness and ability of consumers to buy.

I am enclosing a copy of my year-end statement and copies of two letters I have written to the UAW-CIO. As you will note, I spoke out on the first 2 of these 3 points in these documents. As you may be aware, I suggested an across-the-board tax reduction in my recent appearance before the United States Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly. I am confident that such a move would revitalize confidence on the part of both consumers and the business community. My suggestion was given excellent visibility by the press, as indicated in the enclosed brochure with excerpts from news articles and editorials on this subject.

Thank you for writing to me. I appreciate your point of view and your evident willingness to take constructive action regarding these important matters.

Sincerely yours,

H. H. CURTICE.

AMERICAN MOTORS CORP.,
Detroit, February 20, 1958.

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CHAMBERLAIN: I have read with care and interest your thoughtful letter of February 17. You suggest three programs to encourage employment: (1) A 1-year continuation of present agreements with the UAW; (2) a reevaluation of automobile prices, and (3) the repeal of the excise taxes on automobiles.

We have, of course, been studying the causes of the present business decline insofar as they are ascertainable. We believe that the fundamental cause of the drop in automobile sales is the excess concentration of power in both industry and the union. The result of this excess concentration has been to force labor costs and consequently prices to such high levels that buyers are postponing car purchases.

Furthermore, in our opinion, this excess concentration has resulted in a lack of product competition with the Big Three automobile manufacturers offering excessively bulky and costly vehicles. This point of view is expressed more fully in my recent statement to the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, a copy of which I am attaching.

We believe there is considerable merit to your proposal that the automobile industry and the UAW agree now to a continuation for at least 1 year of present union agreements. We wish to point out, however, that any such continuation would extend for another year the present inequities between American Motors agreements with the UAW and those of the Big Three. These inequities involve our paying higher wages and more costly economic benefits and practices than do the Big Three.

We have studied and restudied the pricing of our vehicles. We have been eager to keep our prices at a minimum consistent with our costs and the imperative need of being in the black. As nearly as last September, in order to generate more sales and employment, I proposed to our automotive employees and their unions that we explore the possibility of a \$100 price rebate. This possibility could become an actuality if our employees, through their unions, would reduce our labor costs to Big Three levels and if, through the cooperation of suppliers and dealers, we could generate additional volume and lower costs per unit. We are still awaiting a reply from the union to this proposal.

We believe that the repeal of the excise taxes on automobiles as suggested in your

bill would stimulate automobile sales and employment through the price reduction it would make possible. We hope that the House Ways and Means Committee will act favorably at the earliest possible moment.

Sincerely,

GEORGE ROMNEY, President.

CHRYSLER CORP.,
Detroit, Mich., February 21, 1958.
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I want to express my sincere thanks to you for your thoughtful letter of February 17 and complete agreement with the goal of stimulating business and employment by strengthening confidence.

With regard to your suggestion concerning a reevaluation of automotive price structures, I want to assure you that Chrysler Corp. has a long-standing policy of pricing our vehicles at the lowest possible level, consistent with labor, materials, and other costs and our obligations to the public, our employees, and the people who have invested their money in our company. As recently as February 6, I reaffirmed this policy at some length before the United States Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, chaired by Senator KEFAUVER.

Concerning automotive excise taxes, as you know the automobile industry has consistently opposed the singling out of the automobile for a discriminatory tax burden. We have never been willing to accept the concept that a product as essential to the progress and growth of our Nation's economy should be treated the same taxwise as are luxury items.

I deeply appreciate your interest in matters so vital to the automobile industry and I want to thank you again for your thoughts.

Sincerely,

L. L. COLBERT.

As to the attitude of the automobile dealers of the country and whether they will pass on to the customer the savings and reduction in price the repeal of this tax would bring, Frederick J. Bell, executive vice president, National Automobile Dealers Association, has wired President Eisenhower as follows:

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

The 25,000 franchised automobile dealers who comprise the National Automobile Dealers Association urge most respectfully and emphatically that the manufacturers' excise tax on automobiles, parts, and accessories be removed. Our members have pledged themselves to pass along immediately to the consumer the cost benefits that would thus accrue when passed to the dealer by the manufacturer. In the opinion of these many thousands of small-business men, this action would be dramatic, heartening, and of immediate benefit in removing the logjam that seems to be bottling up consumer confidence in the current state of the economy.

FREDERICK J. BELL,
Executive Vice President, National
Automobile Dealers Association.

Mr. Speaker, all of these letters and telegrams indicate that there is compelling necessity for a repeal of this excise tax without delay. It is my hope that we here in the House may have early opportunity to vote on the repeal of this excise tax on automobiles and trucks.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIMTZ. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I am prompted to rise, Mr. Speaker, to commend the gentleman from Indiana for bringing this matter to our attention. I am inclined to agree with him that the elimination of this excise tax would be the most effective method of helping to cure the unemployment situation in the automobile industry. I want to add that it seems to me the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana are typical of the attention which he has given to the affairs of his District since he has come to the Congress. I have been very much impressed with the performance of the gentleman from Indiana and realize in this particular matter how both he and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] have been hammering away at this problem of the excise tax on automobiles for so long. I certainly hope that their vigorous and able efforts will bear fruit.

Mr. NIMTZ. I thank the gentleman from New York, my senior colleague and the ranking member on the Committee on the Judiciary, for his kind remarks.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIMTZ. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan whose district adjoins mine on the north.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the people of the South Bend district are to be congratulated on the wonderfully fine service which their Representative has given since he came here. I have been wondering whether the purpose of eliminating this tax is to give employment to those especially in the automobile industry and the companies which supply that industry as well as the people who work for the companies making farm machinery. Does the gentleman think that eliminating the tax would be helpful?

Mr. NIMTZ. The gentleman is correct. It would start the production line in the factories so that new cars could be manufactured. It would give added employment, undoubtedly, to salesmen and agents who must now seek other lines of endeavor because they are not selling automobiles. It would give employment to suppliers of accessories and parts.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In the gentleman's opinion, would it lessen the burden on the workers or employees of those industries?

Mr. NIMTZ. It would.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I wonder if it would also lessen the burden if there would be a moratorium on union dues; that is to say, if we left the excise taxes off and helped them that way, how would it be if those in control of the unions postponed the collection of dues? Would that better living conditions, give them more money, so that they could apply it on the rent and the grocery bills?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIMTZ. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, who has been so active in this field of legislation.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If I may respond to the question of the gentleman

from Michigan, my colleague [Mr. HOFFMAN], I should like to tell him that I have had many communications from my constituents indicating that very thing, that these dues that they are being compelled to pay are a great burden, particularly in this time of unemployment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. NIMTZ. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It has occurred to me, and several suggestions have been made, that some of the union men who happen to be Republicans object to the payment of assessments or dues which are used to support candidates of the opposite party.

I do not ask the gentleman for an expression of opinion as to what the folks in his District think, but it does seem to me that it is a little unfair to compel Republicans to pay in order to elect Democratic candidates, or vice versa. I do not see how that can be.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. NIMTZ. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I respond to my colleague from Michigan again by saying that the responses to the questionnaire that I circulated widely throughout the Sixth Congressional District indicate that very thing.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend my colleague from Indiana [Mr. NIMTZ] for his splendid presentation of this problem that has become so important to our economy. As he knows, I have also been interested in this since last year. I should like to ask the gentleman if he has given any thought to the retroactive aspects of this problem. I have been told that, since we have been considering repeal or reduction of this excise tax in Congress, there have been those who have suggested that this may have a depressing effect upon automobile sales. For that reason it has been urged that any action we may take should be retroactive to a certain date, March 1, for example, as I have suggested myself. How does the gentleman feel about that?

Mr. NIMTZ. Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentleman has been most active in this field. As has been said by our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] has been interested in the repeal of the excise tax on automobiles and trucks from the time he took his seat in this House. I believe on the 16th day of January 1957 he introduced his bill H. R. 3022 to repeal this tax.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That is correct.

Mr. NIMTZ. Of course, that provides for repeal. I believe the gentleman's bill and my bill and bills introduced by other Members are similar in that they call for outright repeal. With respect to the retroactive feature of such legislation, I believe that the Committee on Ways and Means with their knowledge of these matters and in their wisdom and experience could write a bill which would be retroactive in nature and which would eliminate the ill effects

concerning sales to which the gentleman from Michigan has referred.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Our purpose is, is it not, to help the automotive industry and to do nothing that would depress or retard sales; is that not correct?

Mr. NIMTZ. That is correct.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If the gentleman will yield further, Mr. Speaker, I should like to put in the RECORD at this point some information that I have relative to unemployment in the Sixth Congressional District of Michigan. I would like to say that, according to the latest figures available to me we have more than 71,000 automobile workers in my District, more automobile workers than in any other Congressional District. The report I have for February indicates that there were 14,500 workers unemployed in the Flint area during the month of February, which constitutes approximately 9.6 percent of the total labor force.

Since I received that report, I have had telephone conversations with people in the Michigan Employment Security Commission in Flint with respect to unemployment there. They indicate, in a letter addressed to me on February 13, that in addition to the 14,500 unemployed there were 5,500 additional automotive workers who had been laid off. Then in a letter I received in this morning's mail I am told that layoffs in the Flint area for the week ending Thursday, March 14, 1958, numbered 1,950, and that about 200 of the reduction occurred in smaller-sized plants, while the rest were in the motor vehicle supplier class. So we have 14,500, plus 5,500, and now we have approximately 2,000 more. I say, how long are we going to sit here while this unemployment continues without taking action? I certainly would urge that the Committee on Ways and Means give this early consideration. I am grateful for the support we have had from our colleagues here in the House with respect to this legislation and the other bills that have been introduced. I should also like to pay tribute to our senior Senator from Michigan for his spirited fight for reduction or repeal of this measure in the other body this past week.

Mr. NIMTZ. I thank the gentleman for his fine contribution.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIMTZ. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is making a very, very constructive speech. If there is anything I say that is going to interfere with his thoughts, I wish he would put it at the end.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIMTZ. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DIXON. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Indiana on his fine statement. If the recession continues tax reduction is imminent. When that occurs, I have the feeling that this question of reduction in the excise taxes would be one of the finest steps we could take to relieve this unemployment.

I also was glad that the discussion indicated that the Government should not be expected to do everything. That manufacturers, labor, and all concerned should unite to reduce prices, because automobiles are being priced out of the market.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIMTZ. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BEAMER. I want to compliment my colleague from the Third District of Indiana for his forthright statement. We are neighbors in Indiana. We have the same problem. In fact, the Fifth District has a large number of automotive industries located in it.

I think in addition to the comments the gentleman has made is the fact that not only those people who are making and selling automobiles but those people also who are supplying automotive parts to the industry should receive some of the benefits that are accruing to the automotive industry as such.

I think another point to bring out in this discussion is the fact that some States, and the gentleman from Michigan can attest to it, have a tax structure that is set up under the present administrations of those States that is driving industry into other areas. They are coming into Indiana at the rate of about 10 per month. We welcome these new industries. In welcoming them to our State, we like to feel we are doing our part in trying to help them. For that reason, I am going to lend my support to the bills in regard to the excise taxes and the nuisance taxes.

Mr. NIMTZ. I thank the gentleman. May I say to the gentleman from Indiana on behalf of my colleagues that we appreciate his support. I know the gentleman has been very active in regard to the matter of which he speaks.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIMTZ. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I wonder if the gentleman knows what effect the raise that Reuther and the leaders on the part of the workmen are now seeking might have in wiping out whatever we do on the part of the Government. Does the gentleman know what they are asking at their next meeting with the automobile manufacturers in the way of increased wages, fringe benefits, and so forth?

Mr. NIMTZ. I would say to the gentleman I do not know the answer to that question. Our distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], as I informed the House earlier in my remarks, has contacted the leaders in the auto industry to get their opinion in this regard. I believe he has also written Mr. Reuther. I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan as to any answer he has received from the labor leaders in this regard.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I would be very happy to answer that question. Four weeks ago tomorrow I addressed a letter to Mr. Reuther and also to the major automobile manufacturers in the country. I suggested to Mr. Reuther that

because of the economic conditions that now prevail throughout our country it might be well for him to consider forgoing his demands for a 1-year period and agree to an extension of the present contracts. I also called upon the major automobile companies to reevaluate their price structure and do everything they possibly could to reduce the price of their cars. I had replies from all of the automobile manufacturers, but as yet Mr. Reuther has not given me the courtesy of even acknowledging my letter. As I understand it from the information which has been made available, he is asking for certain increases in wages as well as a profit-sharing plan. I do not have any further details here before me with respect to what the current situation is, but, to me, it is obvious that with the economic situation as it is, this is no time to rock the boat any more with such demands and threats of strikes. If he would just come out and say that he would go along with the present contract for another year, it would be like pouring oil on the water, and a tremendous boost to our whole economy.

Mr. NIMTZ. I thank the gentleman.
Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIMTZ. I yield to the gentleman.
Mr. VURSELL. As I recall, last year the President of the United States sent a letter or a communication to the big labor leaders and the big business organizations asking them to help hold the line against inflation. Two or three times he was queried about that afterward in his press conferences. At one time, and I am quoting him as nearly as I can remember it, but it is substantially correct, he said that unless the big labor leaders of the Nation, and the big business organizations of the Nation, and the people generally, cooperated with the Government to stop the constant rise in the cost of living to stop inflation that we are lost. So my thought was the other day, when I noticed that Mr. Reuther and Mr. Meany went down to tell the President what they thought should be done in order to get the people back to work that if we had passed a resolution in the Congress of the type that I introduced last year urging the Members of the Congress to join with the President in a unanimous voice, both Democrats and Republicans, urging that they help to stop this inflationary rise and not continue to increase wages, and the same appeal was addressed to the business organizations to stop increasing prices if they would have followed that, and if the Congress had acted last year, in my judgment, there would have been such a power behind the Congress speaking with the President at that time that probably Reuther and the labor leaders would have forgone, I think, their request for an increase at this time. Now, if they want to know how to put people back to work, I would suggest to Mr. Reuther and Mr. Meany and all the labor leaders of the Nation that they stop pyramiding these wages year after year because of the power that they have, and that they quit pricing the rank and file of labor out of jobs. The facts are that there is no question but there are two elements

in this. The cost of material and increase in wages has pushed the price of the cars too high, and there is a sort of a buyers' strike on. The other thing is that the public is probably waiting for the Congress to reduce excise taxes, and people who are able to buy cars and who would otherwise buy them, are waiting.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIMTZ. I yield.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, may I say the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. NIMTZ] is making a very valuable contribution to our thinking not only in connection with the tax field, but in reference to our economic situation in general. The gentleman is speaking with particular and specific reference to the automotive industry. I am sure the gentleman would also agree that the transportation industry, which is allied in many respects to the automotive industry, is in urgent need of some relief in the excise-tax field. I have reference to the 3-percent and 10-percent excise taxes on the transportation of passengers and freight.

Mr. NIMTZ. I cannot speak for my colleagues who are acting with me in this particular field on automotive taxes, but I would agree with the gentleman in regard to his thinking on the tax on transportation.

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIMTZ. I yield.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in this commendation of the gentleman for presenting this matter to the House at this time. It is obviously a matter of deep importance not only to the local communities concerned, but to our Nation as a whole and, of course, to our national economy.

I think the gentleman is performing a great service in presenting this question at this time.

Mr. NIMTZ. I thank the gentleman, and I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McINTOSH].

Mr. McINTOSH. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to join in the many remarks that have been made complimenting the gentleman upon the beneficial presentation he is making, with his usual fine ability to vigorously bring to the attention of the House the needs of the people of his District.

But I would also like to express my feeling that this is a wholesome presentation because I feel it is important that the House and Senate realize that this is not a relief-for-Michigan proposal. It is indicative of the importance of the automobile industry generally that the gentleman feels the urgency of this problem enough to make a presentation on this floor. It was apparent in the debate last week in the Senate that a great many Senators felt that this was purely a Michigan proposal, designed to alleviate the serious problems we have; whereas, as a matter of fact, the automobile industry is important in almost every State. In fact, the automobile industry directly or indirectly affects one out of seven of the employed people of the United States. This is a national prob-

lem, and particularly so when we realize that the bulk of this present recession is being felt in factory employment, not in service industries; and that there is no greater stimulus than the manufacturing segment of our country could have than a sizable increase in automobile production. So I join the many colleagues who have mentioned their admiration for the gentleman from Indiana, and join with him in hoping that something can be done in the near future on this excise tax.

Mr. NIMTZ. I thank the gentleman for his excellent contribution. With his typical thorough analysis he has hit the point, that this is not just a Michigan or Indiana problem; it affects every Member's community and it runs through every segment of our economy. It is not a problem of just one State or one community.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIMTZ. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KNOX. I should like to associate myself with the gentleman from Indiana in this legislation which is pending. I have introduced legislation which would set up a retroactive date as of March 1 to reduce excise taxes on automobiles and parts. My bill does not reduce the excise tax on trucks because of implications on highway funds involved as far as the Interstate Highway System funds are concerned.

It is my hope, however, that in the deliberation by the Committee on Ways and Means it may be able to devise some method by which any reduction in excise taxes will also apply to trucks and buses. I think we all recognize, though, and understand the fact that anything which interferes with tax revenues earmarked for the Interstate System might slow down the highway construction program instead of advancing it; and it is my hope that there will be some advancement this year.

But I certainly am wholeheartedly in favor of the gentleman's position and also those expressions of opinion from automobile manufacturers and others. It does not affect just the States of Michigan, and Indiana, but it is an operation that affects the entire Nation. The entire Nation is closely geared to the automotive industry, and anything that reflects on the automotive industry will in turn reflect upon the general economy.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIMTZ. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. NIMTZ] for bringing to the attention of the Congress the importance of repealing the excise tax on automobiles. I have also introduced a bill, H. R. 11390, for this purpose. There is, however, a problem involved in this legislation which should be considered by the Committee on Ways and Means. Most auto dealers have a large number of new cars on hand on which the excise tax has already been paid. To repeal the tax but not provide for compensating dealers for taxes paid on cars

in inventory could cause great injury to our automobile dealers. This matter can be taken care of by the Committee on Ways and Means in any legislation reported out by the committee.

The automotive industry is one of the most vital segments of our economy. Approximately 9 million workers earn their livelihood from the automotive and associated industries and one out of seven Americans is directly affected by this industry, and the effects of economic ups and downs in the auto industry are felt throughout the entire economy.

Auto production is down about one-third from this period last year. New-car inventories are at a record high, and recent sales figures show no sign of a quick return to the expected market for these cars. In this industry we can pinpoint one of the major causes of the economic downturn of recent months; it is well worth our time and attention if we can find ways to restore a healthier condition to the auto trade for it will prime the pumps of business all over the Nation.

More than 60 million motor vehicles travel the roads and highways of the United States. The demand for cars and trucks has been unprecedented in recent years, and the auto industry has met that demand. As a result we have seen more and more of the newer cars, with many improvements designed to increase auto safety, on our roads. The public has demonstrated its need and desire for these autos, but in recent months, as a result of several economic factors, price has become more of a deterrent to new-car sales. A very significant factor of the cost of new cars and trucks is the Federal excise tax, and its immediate repeal would, in my opinion, do much to stimulate sales in the auto industry and grant relief from this burdensome tax to the millions of auto and truckowners.

This excise tax on trucks and autos is a carryover from World War II days. It is one of several taxes imposed to discourage sales and production in some fields so that the materials and productive energies thus saved could be turned to things more urgently required. Some of these taxes were known as luxury taxes, although that appellation does not fit many of the products or services to which the taxes were applied. I believe all of these taxes should be reviewed and many reduced or eliminated, but the auto and truck tax stands out particularly as unnecessary and is today a significant hindrance to a giant industry which we should be endeavoring to help in every reasonable way.

There is today no reason to discourage, through taxation, the buying of cars and trucks. We have the capacity to supply the materials that go into auto production without in any way reducing the supplies necessary for defense production or for other nondefense industries. Not only do we have the resources in steel, rubber, and oil to supply full production in the auto industry, but these allied industries are in fact geared to production at that level and suffer when the auto industry suffers. No defense effort is harmed by full auto production; as a matter of fact, the tre-

mendous facilities and pool of trained labor in auto manufacturing are among the great resources we want to keep available for immediate use should we ever have to mobilize completely.

There seems no justification for a tax to discourage in any way car and truck production and sales. There are reasons of public policy that the public should be allowed to satisfy its demand for new cars and trucks without having to overcome this obstacle placed in its path by the Government. There are good economic reasons why this form of tax relief would be felt directly or indirectly by the great majority of American families. There are good reasons in terms of auto safety and users comfort which argue in favor of Government encouragement of auto production and distribution to the extent that public demand warrants.

I hope the members of the Committee on Ways and Means will consider these many reasons which, it seems to me, call for quick repeal of this tax. Repeal of the tax will not solve all of the problems which face our auto makers; it will not put new cars in the price range of our lower income families, and it will not remedy all of the economic factors which have caused the downturn of recent months. But it will contribute to reaching all of these objectives. I believe its results would more than offset the revenue which would be lost. It is one action we can take simply and quickly which will show immediate benefits to the public, the auto industry, and the economy of America. I hope that the Ways and Means Committee will report favorably on this legislation, so that the House may act on it in the very near future.

Mr. NIMTZ. I thank the gentleman for his excellent contribution.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIMTZ. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. Will the gentleman tell me how much in revenue the Treasury would lose if the entire tax were taken off and how much the Treasury would lose if only 50 percent of the excise tax on automobiles was taken off?

Mr. NIMTZ. Various figures have been quoted and the amount of expected loss is debatable but one authority estimates that the loss of revenue would amount to \$1,100,000,000. That is if the entire tax was removed. However, one can say that because of increased employment which would result, part of that would be recaptured in the form of withholding and other types of taxes which would be paid because of increased employment.

Mr. VURSELL. If half of it was taken off, it would result in the loss of half of \$1,100,000,000. Of course the gentleman knows, I know, we all know, that this was a wartime measure. Furthermore, we all know that this Congress keeps spending and spending and increasing the national debt with inflation now which gets nobody anywhere. It simply burns up the money. There has been a 5-percent inflation in the last 4 years as against a much greater inflation prior to that time. If

we do not find some way of stopping this constant inflationary trend, even though I agree that these taxes should have been taken off, what we do here makes no difference. There was some talk about the tax being repealed or that it should be reduced, and I am in sympathy with the arguments that have been offered here today in that direction. I think it is time to do something. I think some relief should be given. At the same time unless this Congress shows some interest in getting at the core of this problem, that is, to stabilize the price line and the wage line of this country, what we do here today, if we could do it today, or what we do in this session, would amount to nothing of a permanent nature. If the increase in wages is to go on unlimited and unimpeded, there will only be a temporary ease to a few people, yet, all would be swallowed up by more inflation, more expenses, higher priced cars, another buyer slowdown, or strike, and we are in trouble again. I hope that the Congress before this session is over will come to grips with what I believe to be one of the real problems, that is, the constant pyramiding of wages at the hands of certain organizations who have the power to do it, which penalizes those living on social security, on annuities and with low fixed incomes, the farmers and all of the people, and ultimately penalizes the men that are in the ranks of labor as much as anyone else, not only with inflation but pricing themselves out of jobs. I hold the hope that maybe the Congress will really take an interest in this thing before this session adjourns.

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. NIMTZ. I yield.

Mr. McINTOSH. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding further. I am disappointed that we have not had a more responsive participation in this discussion from the other side of the aisle, because this is certainly one thing that we can all be united on. The major push for this revision in the excise-tax field in the Committee on Ways and Means has come from the distinguished gentleman representing the First District of Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ], and we were all very shocked and disappointed here a few days ago when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ] was reported in the press to have said that the leadership of the majority party in the House had refused to give us any urgent or priority consideration, because we feel this is one method on the tax front that can strike directly at the unemployment situation, not only in the automotive field but all through the industrial plants. So I had hoped that we could in this discussion have a greater degree of participation and interest expressed from the majority side. Obviously, since we represent a minority both in the subcommittee and the committee and in the House itself, excise-tax reduction cannot be accomplished without the blessing and support of the majority leadership, and I hope they will reconsider their present position.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIMTZ. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri who so adequately covered this field of excise taxation several days ago.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman, and I want to commend the gentleman for taking the floor. Possibly some good results have come from the speech I made on the floor last Thursday in which I was pointing out that the Democratic leadership in this Congress was doing an awful lot of talking and not doing very much acting. At least, judging from the silence here today, they have stopped talking. Now maybe we can hope that there will be some action. But I point out, as I tried to point out Thursday, that sitting over in the other body are two very large, comprehensive tax-revision bills, and there is no sense in talking about new proposals to cut taxes or do anything with taxes if they do not move on the bills that have already been studied, upon which public hearings have been held. Certainly there is one thing we do not want, and that is talk, and I am glad that the talk has died down, and now perhaps we can get some action.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that these proposals of just spending a great deal of extra money on public works, without providing their financing, is nothing more than printing money. Those proposals are part of the talk that has been going around about which I complained.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIMTZ. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Has the President of the United States ever indicated that in his mind it is time for Congress to consider a tax cut?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for an answer to that question?

Mr. NIMTZ. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes, on these two bills that are sitting over in the other body. One on excise tax revision, introduced by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] as a result of 2 years of study. The administration sat in on those hearings through Treasury Department officials and has gone along and approved almost all the features of that bill. The same is true of the Mills bill, which passed the House in January 1958, revising the Internal Revenue Code. Almost all those provisions have the approval of and were worked out with this administration.

We have just completed rather lengthy hearings on many features of revising the tax laws upon which the administration has made recommendations; provisions for revising taxes in regard to small business being a measure that the administration has supported. Yes, this administration has requested the Congress to act and has worked very hard to bring action about. Now it is up to the Congress to do something, and certainly it is not up to Congressmen to do a lot of talking, when they control the Congress but still do not act.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. NIMTZ. I yield further to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. How much would those two bills in the other body cut taxes, to which the gentleman has referred?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield to me to answer, these are not tax cuts.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. But that is what I am talking about—tax cuts.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I should like to explain that.

Mr. NIMTZ. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The point is this: According to most economists who have studied the matter, or problem, particularly in this recession, is primarily these impediments to growth and stability that have been written into and embedded in our tax laws. That is where we can move ahead. All this talk about tax cutting is not going to help this recession, let me say to the gentleman, because that will come too late. What I am saying is this. If you are interested in revising our taxes to remove these impediments to growth and stability, such as impediments to small-business growth, some may argue they are actually tax reductions, and in a sense they are tax reductions to particular segments of our economy; but the overall effect, strangely enough, is that the Federal Government will get more revenue, not less revenue, if we remove these impediments.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I am very suspicious of a tax revision that makes me pay more taxes instead of less.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIMTZ. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] must be a little put out with his own party, since the only tax reductions in recent history have come from this side, the Republican side, of the aisle, in the 80th and 83d Congresses and action to raise additional taxes has come from the gentleman's side of the aisle.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further to me?

Mr. NIMTZ. I yield further to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would give the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] a good example of a tax cut—in one sense it was a cut—that actually produced more revenue for the Federal Government. That is when we eliminated the so-called excess profits tax which was essentially a tax on new and growing businesses, primarily the smaller ones. When we completely eliminated that tax we ended up, within a year and a half, taking in more revenue at the Federal level from corporations as a whole. That is what I mean by an adjustment where you take the burden off one segment of the economy and balance that with the greater growth that we gain through the removal of uneconomic taxes.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIMTZ. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SMITH of California. I wish to commend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. NIMTZ] on his remarks here today and associate myself with them. It seems to me we have had a number of suggestions here in the past few weeks on how to take care of this recession, many of which are simply pump-priming thoughts. It will take possibly 2 or 3 years before some of them can be placed in effect or the results appreciated by the public. Here we have a wartime tax that was placed on in time of necessity. Right now, if we would take off this excise tax or at least cut it in two, we would help the people buying cars and help the dealers.

I have received a number of telegrams, calls, and letters from the dealers in Los Angeles County. Some of them I have written back for their assurance, or wired them, to see if this excise tax was taken off whether they would extend the benefit to the buyers of the automobiles and not simply raise the price. They have assured me that they would extend that benefit to the buyer. They are having some difficulty in selling automobiles in Los Angeles County. I think this would help the problem. More people could buy automobiles and in turn get money into circulation. Again, I want to commend the gentleman and associate myself with his remarks. I think it would be a wonderful thing if we could cut down this excise tax. I think it would stimulate business and would help remove some of this recession.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIMTZ. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BROWNSON. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. NIMTZ] for his constructive suggestion. I cannot help but realize that in a very few weeks we are going to be asked to stand up here and be counted on a reciprocal trade bill. This reciprocal trade bill will gradually lower the tariffs on products imported into the United States, yet at the present time we are actually placing a tariff on products manufactured within the United States in the form of excise taxes on automobiles, making it even more difficult for our domestic manufacturers to compete with the small cars that are coming from foreign countries. These excise taxes actually serve to make it more difficult for our people who want automobiles and need automobiles in their daily business and social life to make these purchases, which would be a very definite spur to the economy.

I have heard from many of my automobile dealers. They are concerned about dwindling sales. I know there is unemployment in the district of the gentleman from Indiana, particularly in South Bend. There is growing unemployment in every district in Indianapolis in the assembly plants and branch factories of the large automobile concerns. I feel that a step in this direction is very worthwhile and would give a quick impetus to what seems to be one of the truly ailing industries in our entire economic complex at the present time.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I may ask a question of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. NIMTZ. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Has not President Eisenhower asked for an extension of the reciprocal trade agreements?

Mr. BROWNSON. Yes, he has, as did President Truman. As a matter of fact, I have supported reciprocal trade in the past. May I point out the untenable position in which we in the Congress are placed when we are asked to back reciprocal trade recommendations which have been made by Presidents of both the political parties, and which I have supported, yet at the same time we are working this excise tax hardship against some of our American industries which are not doing very well. It puts us on a spot. I think the gentleman from Missouri will agree.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIMTZ. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COLLIER. First, I want to compliment the gentleman from Indiana for handling this matter in his usual able manner. I think today it is probably more timely than ever before to do something about the automobile excise tax.

About a week or so ago on the floor of this House I pointed out that during the past year we imported into this country some 200,000 more passenger automobiles from the western European markets than we exported to the same countries. I think basically the problem that we face today in a very important area of our economy is to bring the automobile prices down to a point where many who want automobiles can afford them, because there is no question that not only the dealers but the unemployed folks in the automotive industry are suffering today. I do not think there is any question—as long as there is a problem of selling American-made automobiles that that excise tax would be passed on to the consumer in the form of a cut in automobile prices.

I might add we must face the sad reality that the western European manufactured automobiles from Sweden, France and Germany have practically taken the entire market in Spain, which at one time was almost entirely a market for American-made automobiles. We must realize too that the automotive industry in Western Europe today is geared to double its production, in most cases, with the specific purpose of shipping their automobiles to this country. So that in view of all that, in looking at it on a long range basis, I do not think there was ever a time when it was more timely, shall I say, to drop the excise taxes on automobiles. I might add also they should be dropped on many other articles where the tax was placed on the articles as a wartime measure. Here it is 13 years later and we are still suffering with these taxes which impose an additional cost to the consumer. I think that we had better take the bull by the horns now and get rid of some of these excise taxes, and particu-

larly the one on automobiles which should have been eliminated years ago. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. NIMTZ. Mr. Speaker, by way of emphasis, may I say again in closing, it is my hope that we here in the House may have an early opportunity to vote on the repeal of this excise tax on automobiles and trucks.

Mr. DENNISON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. NIMTZ] has convincingly demonstrated the importance and the value to our economy in these difficult times of reducing the Federal excise tax on automobiles. I congratulate my distinguished colleague from Indiana and wish to associate myself with his remarks.

Certainly if an equitable reduction could be made, many who are now refraining from buying automobiles in the expectation of the reduction in tax would enter the automobile market.

In addition, such a reduction in this excise tax would give a long range stimulus to the basic steel industry and to distribution of raw materials for the steel industry and would provide a real shot in the arm for the many diversified industrial facilities located in north-eastern Ohio.

My congratulations to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana for his clarity and forthrightness. This is but another example of the distinguished service which he is rendering, not only to the people of his District, but to the entire Nation as a Member of the United States House of Representatives.

THE REPUBLICAN RECESSION

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I had a 30-minute special order today, but I was not on the floor when my name was called. I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized at this time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I want to assure my colleagues on the left-hand side of the aisle that if I get an opportunity to vote to repeal the excise taxes on automobiles, I will be glad to vote to repeal that tax. I feel sure that when that measure comes to the floor of the House, no doubt there will be more Democrats supporting it than there will be Republicans. That is the way I feel about the folks on the right-hand side of the aisle.

I have before me an editorial, which appeared on page 2 of the last issue of the U. S. News & World Report. They are doing a little predicting. They say:

That a tax cut now appears to be as certain as anything can be in this world.

Well, maybe they are right.

They predict that it will go clear across the board.

They predict the personal exemptions will be raised from \$600 to \$700;

They predict a 5-percent tax cut for all taxpayers across the board;

That the corporation tax will be reduced from 52 percent as it is at the present time to 50 percent;

That the tax cut on cars will save about \$100 an automobile on the purchase price;

That transportation taxes will be cut in half for passengers and will be completely eliminated on freight.

They predict that the effective date will be about July 1 for income taxes.

Mr. Speaker, such a tax cut should be a stimulant to business, of course. But, how about the Government's finances. It is liable to leave them in rather bad shape. We have to consider the budget outgo. Since the advent of sputnik when Russia showed the world that she is even with us and maybe in front of us in technical knowhow, it does not seem possible to me that anything can happen but that our national defense budget will go up. Foreign aid so-called will be fought to some extent on the floor of this House, but it is my opinion that some foreign aid will be again voted by the House.

I would say although the request of the President may be cut some, this House will finish up by recommending somewhere between \$2 billion and \$3 billion for foreign aid during this coming year. So it seems reasonable to suppose that if we are going to do something about this recession, which nobody denies now, we are liable to come up with a deficit of eight to ten billion dollars during the fiscal year that will begin July 1. We will be back in red ink once more. We recently raised the debt limit in this House by \$5 billion, and if things go like it looks like they must go now, we will probably have to raise it to \$290 billion before a year from today.

We have this recession, and nobody denies it, but everybody has different ideas as to what caused it. Perhaps it is not important what caused it. The only thing that makes important what caused it is to take steps to eliminate the cause of this recession and to take steps to keep the same thing from occurring again.

I would like to compare the national economy, if I may, to a building, a good strong building, with adequate foundation, not a crack in the wall, not a leak in the roof. It was such a building in 1952, because in 1952 the farmer received 100-percent parity for the food and fiber produced on the American farms for the 11th consecutive year. Labor was fully employed. Freight car loadings were high. Steel production stood at 102 percent of capacity.

I called up the Bureau of Labor Statistics and asked them how that could be possible. They replied that it was because of overtime; that the demand for steel was all the steel industry in the United States could produce, and they were giving some extra employees overtime above 8 hours a day and producing 2 percent excess above 100 percent capacity. Automobiles and trucks were selling well. There was nothing wrong with the economy. It was such a building then. But let us go down to the basement and find out what the foundation under that building is like now. The foundation under the building, which is our economic structure, is the dollars that were paid to the pro-

ducers of new wealth in these United States every year. What do I mean by "new wealth"? I mean coal, iron, raw aluminum, all petroleum products, natural gas, the products of our forests, the products of our fisheries, and the food and fiber produced on the American farms. That is the new wealth that is produced every year in these United States, and every bit of it comes out of the ground, out of the sea, and out of the rivers. That is the foundation for our economy.

The copper, lead, and zinc industries have been depressed recently and they have not received 100 percent of parity for the raw materials they produce. That has been one of the causes of this recession.

Another cause of this recession has been the selfish interest rates and tight credit policies of the Eisenhower administration that has siphoned off the purchasing power of the American people into the coffers of the great banking institutions in these United States, where that money ceases to be productive of anything except dividends for the people who own it, who already have so much money that they are piling it up in piles instead of spending it. That is another cause of this recession—a very grievous cause—and it has had its impact from one side of this Nation to the other.

Then, the American farmer has been paid \$6 billion a year less than 100 percent of parity gross for the food and fiber produced on the American farms, an average of \$6 billion a year less, each year since 1952. When you take all that from the foundation that is under this building which is our national economy, the building sagged. Nobody seems to be able to see anything except the roof leaks. The bedroom floors are sprung and the walls have cracked, but they have never gone down into the basement to see why those things happened. I knew they were going to happen in 1955 and I said so on the floor of this House. Now, what has happened? I tried to get a few figures together. I take the following from the March 14 issue of the Washington Evening Star:

Unemployment benefits claims in New York City increased 33.8 percent in January of this year over January 1957.

This farm recession has reached New York City.

Motor vehicle output last week totaled 87,882 cars and 15,520 trucks compared with 141,038 cars and 20,866 trucks in the like week a year ago. Those figures were taken from the World Automotive Report. Cars do not sell like they used to.

Business failures in the United States, the first week in March 1958, 338. That does not mean businesses that voluntarily sold out; those were involuntary bankruptcies. This would indicate a yearly rate, if conditions did not worsen, of 18,616 failures for the year 1958.

Persons who drew unemployment compensation for the week ending February 15, 1958: 3,130,200 were drawing unemployment compensation. This total is the highest since the unemployment

insurance program began to pay benefits in 1938.

In the first 10 weeks of 1952 there were 7,185,920 freight cars loaded in the United States. In the first 10 weeks of 1958 there were 5,370,372 freight cars loaded in the United States. Freight car loadings are down 39.5 percent over that period.

Nineteen thirty-six was the high period for carloadings, but in that year there were 372,513 less cars loaded than were loaded in 1952.

Steel is now operating at 52 percent capacity instead of 102 percent of capacity as in 1952. You can see what is happening to business.

The total bankruptcies from 1953 to 1957 was 57,342. These figures do not include voluntary closings, they do not include mergers with larger firms which averaged over 350,000 firms annually, according to Dun & Bradstreet.

What has happened to the housing program? The slump in the housing program is directly traceable to the high interest rates and tight-money policy of this administration. In 1952 FHA financed 485,900 housing units, in 1957 168,400, a drop of 317,500 in 1957 below 1952.

The Veterans' Administration financed 200,000 veterans' housing projects in 1950, in 1957 128,200, down 71,800. The total new nonfarm housing is down 389,300 units for the 5-year period.

I realize that the Democrats in this Congress are more or less on the spot. Something has to be done about this depression. We are not responsible for the depression. The Eisenhower-Benson administration is responsible for the depression. But we have to cure it. The Republican Party is famous for driving the economy of the country into a depression that the Democrats have to pull it out of.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. NEAL. I want to know if the Democrats desire to resort to the same policies to cure this depression that they resorted to in 1933 when it took 10 years to get 12 to 13 million unemployed people down to 9 million?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. The Democratic Party is not going to permit this country to get into the depths that it reached in 1933, but if it should do that we would be lucky if we ever got out 10 years or 20 years from now.

Mr. NEAL. Does the gentleman believe that by continuing deficit spending, appropriating for every Tom and Dick and Harry game you can think of, thereby contributing to the decrease in the purchasing power of the dollar, will eventually mean that the financial condition of the country can remain stable?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. You will never cure a depression by cutting wages, reducing farm prices, driving all prices down. You are never going to cure a depression by doing that. We have an expanding economy; we have an expanding population. The 1st day of January every year finds 900,000 wage earners in

the United States who were not here the year before. If you have the same number of jobs on the 1st day of January 1959 that we had on the 1st of January 1958, we will have 900,000 more people unemployed than we had on January 1 of this year.

Mr. NEAL. Does the gentleman believe that any plan that has ever been devised by the Democrats has ever succeeded in curing a depression so far?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Yes. We cured the 1930 depression. We pulled our economy out of that depression. It would take me an hour to tell the gentleman about that depression. I know that it branded on my heart a situation and I could spend an hour telling the gentleman what it was like. If it had not been for Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Democratic Party, this country would have gone down to absolute financial ruin.

Mr. NEAL. May I ask another question?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Yes; a question.

Mr. NEAL. What does the gentleman really mean by curing a depression?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Putting the banks back on their feet after over 9,000 of them had failed, putting 15 million people back to work so that they could make a living, passing a Social Security Act so there would be some security for people when they reached the age 65, establishing a minimum wage, guaranteeing bank deposits, establishing an REA system in the country, a system of price supports, that the Republicans have not been quite able to destroy as yet for the American farmer, make this country prosperous, putting it in shape so that it could fight World Wars I and II and keep the swastika from flying over the Capitol of the United States.

That is what I call curing a depression. And we did it.

Mr. NEAL. Does the gentleman believe, if we are going to have a depression now similar to the one we had in 1930, that the economy of this country would be able to delve into the credit to the extent that it did in the 1930 depression without breaking up the financial system of the country?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I doubt it, and I hope we will never get to the point of a depression like that again, and I am sure the Democrats do not intend to allow the Republicans to draw us into a depression as deep as they did in the thirties.

Mr. NEAL. I am very glad to have you say you do not intend to.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. We do not intend to.

I called the FDIC this morning and I asked them what their backlog of funds amounted to, and they said \$1,850,459,429. This is the amount of premiums collected that they had not had to use. So, FDIC is still sound.

Now, the farm situation is this: Since 1952 the farmer's net income has gone down 23 percent, the parity index has gone down 20 percent, and their debt has gone up 58 percent. I do not like that. While that has been happening, the cost of living, which was at 113.5 in 1952, is now at 122.6, up 9.1 percent.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman will remember not so many years ago when our Republican friends used to take the well of the House and talk about the 53-cent Democratic dollar. Well, it is now a 48½-cent Republican dollar.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I will say that the Republicans used to say that the farmer had no reason to love the Democrats because they got his dollar down to 48 cents. Now, this administration has got it down to 38 cents.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, if these spenders go on, it will be down to 30 cents pretty quick; will it not?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Yes, it just might.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, sure.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. The reason I say if this country is to be pulled out of this depression the Democrats will have to do it was demonstrated on the floor of this House just last week when we had S. 497 here on this floor for consideration. That was a bill to authorize the construction of projects all over the United States that needed to be done, that should be done, that would put people to work and make a market for material. What did the left-hand side of this House do? They offered a substitute, a crippling, gutting, quartering substitute, and when this House voted it down they were not content but cut that substitute up in little pieces and offered it as amendments piecemeal. And, we had to sit here all day and fight them down. And then they offered a motion to recommit the bill. What was the vote? One hundred and sixty-seven Republicans voted to recommit that bill and 21 of them voted to keep it. Now, on the Democratic side of the aisle not a single Democrat voted to recommit that bill, not one, and 213 Democrats voted not to recommit it. What happened on the final rollcall? Seventy-six Republicans voted the same way on final passage as they did on recommittal. Five Democrats voted against the bill on final rollcall, and 167 Republicans voted to recommit that bill. But only 76 voted against it on final rollcall. So the Democrats saved that authorization bill for public works in the United States. And if the people in the United States have those projects constructed, and people are put to work, and a market is established for materials, it will not be with the aid and support of the left-hand side of this aisle, but in spite of every roadblock that they could throw in our way.

I say that the Democrats are going to cure this depression. And the Democrats are going to have to cure this depression, because the Republicans do not know how to cure a depression, and never did. But they know how to get us into one and they do it every time. They have never failed, in my recollection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Conceding all that, and that the gentleman is thoroughly convinced that the Republicans are not any good and that the Democrats are all right, since the Democrats have had a majority here and in the other body, why do they not do something about it?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. We are going to; just watch our smoke.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, you are always going to.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. We have not appointed 16 different commissions to investigate, to find out whether or not we are in a recession. We have not done that. You Republicans are good at that. Even my good friend from Missouri, the Honorable James P. Blair, realizes what the situation is. Here is a copy of a telegram sent to the President of the United States:

Since my telegram to you of February 8 regarding the economic recession in Missouri, the situation has worsened and the recession has deepened. I note by newspaper accounts that your administration now recognizes the gravity of the economic condition of our country, and that the Congress is also aware of the situation and taking action on proposals to cure our ailing economy. Most of the measures proposed, however, as reported by the newspapers, appear to be of a long-range type, rather than those which would offer more prompt remedies.

About 10 days ago I appeared before Senator Gore's Subcommittee on Public Roads and urged that the Congress take prompt action to increase Federal highway funds to the States. Missouri is in a position now to spend matching State highway dollars if additional Federal highway funds can be made available. I assume many other States are in like position. Senator Gore assured me that he intends to push highway development immediately and substantially.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman said, just a few moments ago, when I asked why the Democrats had not done something, that, "We are just agoing to." Let me tell the gentleman about my sister. When we were little tykes, mother used to give us some candy. There never was very much of it. I used to eat mine and sister saved hers. Mother used to say to sister not to eat hers in front of her brother, and sister used to say, "I am just going to divide." The gentleman is just going to do it, but he just does not get around to doing it.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. We have done most of the things that have been done in this House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And most of them are bad, the gentleman says.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Michigan will admit that this recession would be a lot worse than it is if it were not for unemployment compensation that is being paid to people at the present time. Will not the gentleman admit that?

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the gentleman will yield to me further, that money is being paid by the employers who charge it back to those of us who buy what they make.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Does not the gentleman think that was a brake on the recession and kept it from getting worse?

Mr. HOFFMAN. It has been helpful, surely, just the same as if the gentleman gave me some of his money, it would help me.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Let me quote what the gentleman said on the floor of this House on April 18, 1935, page 5983 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Speaking of that very bill that made that unemployment compensation possible:

The bill itself * * * takes from thrifty, saving Peter to pay unfortunate Paul, whether that misfortune be due to his lack of opportunity, lack of thrift, aversion to labor, or to misfortune over which he has no control.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. So I draw the conclusion that the gentleman was in opposition to the passage of the law that made unemployment compensation possible. Did the gentleman vote for it or did he vote against it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Whatever the RECORD shows, and I have not any apology to make. All you are trying to do and always have been trying to do for the last 20 years is to take something from the fellow who earned and saved his money, and give it to somebody else who has not worked, perhaps. I have no objection to giving it to those who, because of something beyond their control, are in need. But I do object to the consumers over the country having to pay—well, some say 52 weeks of unemployment compensation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. A moment ago my friend from Michigan said that unemployment compensation was good.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no, no.

Mr. McCORMACK. He did not?

Mr. HOFFMAN. If I did, I said it was helpful to those who got it. There is no question about that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then in 1935 he opposed what is helpful.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, wait a minute. That is just the same as though the gentleman from Massachusetts would give me a part of whatever his fortune may be. It would surely be helpful to me. But I know of no reason why he should work to support me and let me live in idleness.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will trade my income for the gentleman's interests.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not want to hold the gentleman to that because he would sure lose on that one.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Let me proceed. I know you gentleman are enjoying yourselves, but when this unemployment question is before the House I want to say to my esteemed friend, whom I love very much, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] that he is in distinguished company when he takes the attitude he does, because many of the most distinguished people in his party think the same way he does.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Not now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just to admit I am regular with the party?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. You are.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is no more accurate than what the gentleman said before.

Mr. McCORMACK. Which party does the gentleman mean? I cannot understand.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The sound conservative party.

Mr. McCORMACK. Who is the leader of it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Who is the leader? We have three or four.

Mr. McCORMACK. Who?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is one, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] is one, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] is one, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is another one.

Mr. McCORMACK. What about the President?

Mr. HOFFMAN. He is leading you fellows.

Mr. McCORMACK. He is not the leader of your party, is he?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The Democratic moneybags nominated him, they elected him, and now they have repudiated him.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I have many quotations here that I found in the old CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CHRISTOPHER was permitted to proceed for 10 additional minutes.)

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I have some good quotations here, but the men who said these things on the floor of the House have either passed away or are no longer in Congress, and I am not going to read them. But I have two quotations regarding unemployment compensation down here on the bottom of the page from men who I think are still in the House. One of these men said:

You seek to compel every wage earner to pay for an insurance policy even though he cannot afford it.

That could have been said at that time about most anybody, because we were just beginning to get our nose out of that Republican depression and few men could afford anything.

He goes on to say:

The Government, by virtue of the passage of this act, will tax out of the poor people of this coming generation the greatest surplus ever contemplated by the brain of any businessman.

That quotation is from the Honorable THOMAS A. JENKINS, Republican, of Ohio, April 18, 1935.

Never in the history of the world has any measure been brought in here so insiduously as to prevent business recovery, to enslave workers, and to prevent any possibility of the employers providing work for the people.

That is a quotation from the gentleman from New York, the Honorable JOHN TABER, April 19, 1935. He evidently believes just like my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. Therefore, I think I am on safe

ground when I say that if we are pulled out of this depression the Democrats are again going to have to do the pulling, because when the Republicans start out after a depression they always get there too late and do not have anything when they arrive.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I share the gentleman's concern for the unemployed in this country and I think people on both sides are generally concerned about the unemployed. We differ on some of the answers. I recall some history that goes back to 1939. If my memory serves me right, we have a labor force estimated at some 42 million people and the official figures of the administration which the gentleman boasts about was in charge at that time and indicate that there were some 9 million people unemployed, and that was after the administration had been in power some 7 years, and that was after this legislation that you are talking about was passed; is that not right?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I will admit it took the Democratic Party a long time to pull the economy of the United States out of that depression that the Republicans had for 12 long, worried and bitter years been building. But, we did the job. I think instead of you fellows finding fault with that situation, you ought to thank us for correcting your mistakes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. How long after 1939 did we reach a time when there was less unemployed than there are now?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I have not checked those old unemployment figures, and I cannot tell the gentleman exactly, but perhaps the gentleman can enlighten us.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Is it not true that the unemployment problem did not really solve itself in that administration until we were in a World War?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I notice the Republicans always try to retreat behind war. They do that invariably.

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. McINTOSH. In the interest of statistical recollection such as we have been going through here for a while, you have been discussing the loss of value of the dollar over recent years. I believe you have used the figure 5 cents, depending on how you set the index up. We now have a 48 and some fraction dollar. Is it not correct that we achieved that roughly 5-cent figure at the period of time that the present administration was in power and the balance of it at the rate of about 4 cents a year for 12 years going back to 1939 was during the administration which you are speaking of?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I will say to the gentleman that I would rather have a 48-cent dollar that I can get than to have a 98-cent dollar that I cannot get.

Mr. McINTOSH. Are those figures accurate—that is what I was interested in?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I am not sure.

Mr. McINTOSH. May I ask the gentleman another question, if he will yield further? The gentleman was discussing

the public-works bill that was passed here the other day which you seem to feel would have some significant and immediate effect on unemployment.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. No; I did not say that. I said that was an authorization bill to permit us to start projects that ought to be done in this United States and which would at some future time put men to work; and if it did not help to cure this depression, it might help to cure or prevent another depression. You see, we still have 3 more years of Republican administration to live under and we had better shore up the House a little.

Mr. McINTOSH. Does the gentleman recall whether this figure would be accurate, that we now have \$8 billion worth of authorized projects in a backlog or ready in some degree.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I think that is probably true.

Mr. McINTOSH. So you cannot really support the final passage of that bill and cannot really look at that and explain that particular move as an anti-recession bill; can we?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I am of the opinion that the Committee on Appropriations of the House led by my dean, the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. CLARENCE CANNON, will probably bring in an appropriation bill big enough so that most of the Republicans will fight it.

Mr. McINTOSH. I entirely agree with the gentleman.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Let me close by reading a little poem:

THE MAN WITH THE DINNER PAIL

(By Mrs. James H. Pratt)

Don't boast of the man with the diamond mines;

Of the man whom the gold controls;
Of the one high up, or the one low down
Who barbers in human souls.

But talk of the man who is back of it all,
Who weathers the roughest gale
To give us the bread and the meat to eat,
The man with the dinner pail.

He sallies forth in the blinding storm

Or out in the blackest night;
He excavates in the deepest mines,
Or climbs to a dizzy height;

He sweats where the factory furnace roars,
Mid fumes that are dank and stale;
He stands by the ship when the heavens growl
And adjusts the topmost sail.

With nerves of steel, an arm of iron

He pushes the thing called work;
He possesses brain with his mighty brawn,
And fingers that never shirk.

And though you be laden with untold wealth,

It would be of little avail,
If it weren't backed by your brother man,
The man with the dinner pail.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I presume in your opinion the first individual is a Republican and the other is a Democrat?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Well, I never checked on this fellow. I know there are misguided laboring people who are Republicans, but the number is growing less all the time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And the fellow who supplies the job is a crook?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Not always.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But most of the time?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Well, he is usually a Republican, and I will not say anything more about it. I think that criticism is enough.

FACE THE NATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER made an accurate and convincing statement on Face the Nation. A transcript of the program follows:

Mr. NOVINS. During the past year, while the Senate Rackets Committee has been investigating practices of labor and management, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, has emerged as one of the leading critics of certain labor practices and certain labor leaders, notably Walter Reuther.

Senator GOLDWATER is here now to face the Nation.

Senator, you have been singled out as a prime political target by some labor groups and it has been suggested that you, in turn, have singled out Walter Reuther as one of your prime political targets.

We want to ask you about that matter, and others, so, if you will, let's take the first question from Mr. Madigan.

Mr. MADIGAN. Senator, your colleague, Senator McNAMARA, of Michigan, and some others, have said that your committee has outlived its usefulness and it should disband. How do you feel about that proposal?

Senator GOLDWATER. Well, first, I don't know how PAT could make an observation like that. He hasn't been there very much.

As far as its having outlived its usefulness, no, I don't think it has. I think we have a lot of work left to do. I think these hearings that we are in now are being rather dull because they are on legal points, and it's the first time we have been on legal points, might lead some people to believe that the committee has gone soft, that the counsel isn't digging in as strongly as he used to, nor the chairman; but I can assure you that's not the case.

Mr. CHURCH. Well, let's be specific, Senator. What about the UAW-Kohler strike examination that you are into now? Are you satisfied with the way that one is going?

Senator GOLDWATER. Yes, I'm satisfied with it so far. I think that we have made some disclosures that had to be made in order to write legislation.

Now, mind you, this is probably the second time in all the hearings we have been in where we are, in effect, studying a union that is violating the law. The case of Hoffa, and the case of Beck, there were isolated instances in there where they violated a law or two, but here we have the UAW violating the law of Wisconsin and the law of the Federal Government.

And now we have to find out what to do to protect the public, when there is violence in striking. We have to find a definition for "peaceful picketing"; and some other things that are going to come out in this investigation, of course, will be the unlawful use of the secondary boycott, which we will get into, I understand, tomorrow or Tuesday.

Then certainly the case of Mr. Gosser, who was head of local No. 12, in Toledo, about

whom is a story that's just as interesting as any of Mr. Hoffa's or Mr. Beck's. I feel that that, in fact, I know that is being looked into by the committee; and then I understand that the flower funds of the UAW, these unaccounted for, unaudited and, as I am informed, compulsory funds that are used for the reelection of UAW officials, will come in for investigation.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Senator GOLDWATER, you spoke of law violations here.

Senator GOLDWATER. Yes.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Federal law violations.

Under those circumstances, are you critical of what our Justice Department has done or hasn't done in this area?

Do you feel our Justice Department has done an adequate job?

Senator GOLDWATER. Mr. Mollenhoff, I couldn't answer that question honestly, because I don't know if they have even been asked to get into the case of violence in striking where—I think—where it violates section 8 (b) (1) or 8 (e) (1) of the Taft-Hartley.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Well, is there anything that your committee has gotten hold of that the FBI couldn't have gotten hold of if they had gone into the field and worked on it?

Senator GOLDWATER. No. The FBI could have gotten all of this, Mr. Mollenhoff. As you know, there are some 20,000 pages of testimony on this subject that have been presented before the NLRB.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Well, if there are law violations, as you state, why hasn't the FBI gotten into it, and what specific law violations do you charge the UAW with?

Senator GOLDWATER. I can't answer the first question, because I don't even know if the FBI is on it. They may be on it.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Well, haven't you called it to their attention? Hasn't someone—what is the reason for them not being on it?

Senator GOLDWATER. Well, put it this way: Our contacts with the FBI in relationship to law enforcement are matters that I have always felt are top security, and I don't, I don't tell about them except to the FBI. I have worked with the FBI in this field many times.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Could you tell us, is the FBI in this now?

Senator GOLDWATER. Not that I know of. I can say that honestly. I can't, if you ask me some other question, I might not be able to be so blunt about it, but in this particular field—no.

Mr. NOVINS. Senator, you mentioned a Mr. Gosser. Will you identify him and tell us why you think his particular story is so important?

Senator GOLDWATER. Well Mr. Gosser is at present a, one of the vice presidents of the UAW. Back around 1949 or 1950 he was a head of a local 12 in Toledo. His own members rebelled against his misuse of union funds for the purchase of lands, for the sale of lands to his benefit, for the operation of a hardware store to sell hardware to a camp maintained by the UAW, for his own personal benefit. It involves the purchase of a boat for his personal benefit.

The hearings on that are documented and are available, and they point out that Mr. Gosser was not reprimanded as other people in their own union feel he should have been reprimanded.

Mr. NOVINS. Are you suggesting that he broke the law?

Senator GOLDWATER. No. I am not suggesting that he broke the law any more than I am suggesting that Mr. Beck or Mr. Hoffa in their taking money from their union funds actually broke the law. But what Mr. Gosser did, as I am informed from the evidence that we have, is precisely the same things that Mr. Hoffa and Mr. Beck did.

Now that, I don't think it's against the law, it's against the moral code certainly

and it might be against the union constitution.

Mr. MADIGAN. Senator—

Mr. CHURCH. Is he going to be called before the committee soon?

Senator GOLDWATER. I can't say that, but I do know that two investigators are working on the case.

Mr. MADIGAN. Senator, you said a moment ago that there were some that thought the counsel and Senator McCLELLAN perhaps weren't working as busily as they had in the past. I recall some months ago when a national magazine indicated in a lead article that there was some reluctance on the part of the Kennedys, the Senator and his brother, to go into the Kohler matter, and the UAW particularly, and you were confronted in open session by Senator KENNEDY.

Senator GOLDWATER. Uh-huh.

Mr. MADIGAN. As to a meeting on the stairs. Senator GOLDWATER. Yes.

Mr. MADIGAN. Now, do you accuse Senator KENNEDY in any way of trying to further his political ambition in these hearings, or in trying to withhold these hearings?

Senator GOLDWATER. Well, let me first clear up the point that your opening statement indicates that you might be wrong on.

Now, I didn't say that the counsel or the Chairman were working less diligently on this.

Mr. MADIGAN. No, you said some people said so.

Senator GOLDWATER. No. I said it might appear to some people because this is a, more of a routine, a legal type of investigation than the flamboyant exciting investigations that we have been into up to now.

Now, I can't say whether Mr. KENNEDY is using this to further his political ambitions because I very rarely see Senator KENNEDY in the council room. I can't say. I don't know what he is doing on the outside.

Mr. MADIGAN. Do you mean to imply, by your failure to see him, is that a tone of derogation his failure to attend?

Senator GOLDWATER. No, no. Everyone of us are out of council room as much as anybody else.

Mr. MADIGAN. Well, prior to the hearings, do you accuse him of attempting to withhold their start or his brother, Bob Kennedy, the counsel, from attempting to withhold the investigation of the UAW because of political reasons.

Senator GOLDWATER. Only if you or anybody else can interpret the reluctance of the Democrats to follow the standard procedure that we have followed for 1 solid year. Now, if you attach that as being evidence of wanting to protect Mr. Reuther because he is a big backer of the Democrats, then the answer would have to be yes. I don't detect it that way. I don't know what their reason was for—

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Senator—

Mr. MADIGAN. Look on the other side of the coin, is there any politics in your position in this, as you are the number one man who urged this investigation?

Senator GOLDWATER. Well, let me put you straight on that, too, because I have been accused of that. I urged it, along with everybody else, and I think it was last May we decided on 11 points of investigation. Now three of those points just happened to be points that would be covered by the current activities of the UAW. Now I held out along with the other three Republicans to follow standard procedure because we had done so well with it, and I think our case has been proven. We have now built a case up from the ground level and now if Mr. Reuther, or Mr. Kohler, or both of them feel that they can add to it or subtract from it by being there, that's up to them to ask.

Mr. CHURCH. What about—what about Mr. Gosser? Are you going to have him on the

stand, do you think, before you have Mr. Reuther?

Senator GOLDWATER. I can't answer that question because I don't know when Mr. Reuther is coming on the stand. He was supposed to have been on this last week and the plans changed; now I understand it's scheduled for this week.

I do know this, let me answer your question as far as I know, I would say that the answer would be no. Mr. Reuther will come on immediately following the Kohler violence hearings, and then we will have secondary boycott, the Perfect Circle strike and then Mr. Gosser, if that case proves to have anything to it.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Senator GOLDWATER, you have been quite critical of the United Automobile Workers on a couple of counts, violence and secondary boycotts, among other things. Now, a lot of people have gained the impression, or you have seen the editorial comments that accuse you and some of the others on your side of the aisle of actually taking after the UAW and being on the Kohler side.

Could you tell us if there are any things that you find in the Kohler side that are reprehensible, that you don't like?

Senator GOLDWATER. Yes. I think, in this case, there are skeletons in both closets. I think it's a case of two stubborn men running into each other. I don't know Mr. Kohler, I wouldn't know him if he came in this room, although I have seen him at a dinner once.

But here is Walter Reuther, who has spent over \$10 million of his union's money, and Mr. Kohler, who has spent a considerable sum, I don't know how much, trying to keep the union out.

Now, there again, Mr. Mollenhoff, you get into a basic principle of American freedom. Maybe Mr. Kohler doesn't want a union at all, any union. I maintain it's his right not to have a union, if he can win a strike.

Now, something that we have overlooked in this entire hearing is—a strike is a weapon of labor, and it's a rightful weapon of labor, one that we must protect always.

When they use the strike, they are taking the chance that they'll have the strength to put it over. They are also taking the chance that they won't have the strength to put it over.

In my own humble opinion, the UAW has lost this strike and lost it a long time ago, but I don't say that Mr. Kohler or the Kohler Co. is scot free from blame in this.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Well, could you tell us a few of the things, I mean we put it on the record very clearly what you think is wrong with the UAW on some of these things. Could we put on the line just what you think they have done that's wrong on the Kohler side?

Senator GOLDWATER. Again, Mr. Mollenhoff, I have to put myself back where I was before I came to the Senate, as an employer.

And had I been in the fix that Mr. Kohler found himself in when the Wisconsin Labor Board handed down their hearings, I believe that I, BARRY GOLDWATER, would have said to the union, "Now we have reached this point, let's sit down and let's see if we can't work out our differences before you go running off into some more trouble and we go getting involved in other things."

That is the point that immediately comes to my mind.

I think if you were to ask for an overall word, I would have, and of course I am only speaking for myself, I would have tried to be more reasonable and more patient.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Well, what about the purchases of the guns by the Kohler people in '52 to '54?

Senator GOLDWATER. I don't look on that as a terrible misdeed. I think if you will look in any company, whether it is a corner

grocery store or General Motors or General Electric, and I don't say this for a certainty, but I think I am pretty right in saying that you'll find some weapons to protect themselves within the event of holdup, in the event of riot, in the event of any happening where weapons might be needed.

Mr. MADIGAN. Speaking of guns, Senator, a—some national columnists have said that you have changed the locks on your doors here in Washington because you have had some threats of bodily harm.

Is that true?

Senator GOLDWATER. No, I have never been threatened with bodily harm.

Mr. MADIGAN. Some said you carried a gun because of those threats. Had you?

Senator GOLDWATER. No, I have never carried a gun in my life. I'll never carry a gun, and I'll never lock a door. In fact, the door to my apartment was unlocked all night. I didn't intend it to be that way, but I just forgot to lock it.

Mr. NOVINS. Senator, the complete name of your Committee, as I recall it, is the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities of Labor and Management.

How much, in the year of investigation that you have already finished, how much improper activities on the part of management have you found?

Senator GOLDWATER. They all don't come to me quickly, Mr. Novins, but let me point out—collusion is the greatest example that we find, and we will continue to find it, where management and labor get together and make sweetheart contracts that's not to the advantage of the working man, it's to the advantage of the union leader and the management side.

And I am not sure in my own mind that this next one is wrong, but there seems to be a feeling that there is, and we'll thresh that out in debate, the use of outside people in handling labor difficulties, like the case of Mr. Schefferman.

Now, I don't condone what Mr. Schefferman did, the way he did it, but I'm not clear in my own mind that there isn't a place in our operation, particularly with small businesses who don't have the means to hire high priced experts in the field, there isn't a place for a man like Mr. Schefferman, or, say, a man who would operate better than Mr. Schefferman.

Mr. NOVINS. Well Senator, the whole purpose of these investigations, of course, is to provide a groundwork for legislation.

Senator GOLDWATER. That's right.

Mr. NOVINS. What legislation do you think will come out of this, or ought to come out of it?

Senator GOLDWATER. Well, I don't think we know enough yet about the violence in striking to write a good legislation on it. I don't think we know enough about putting unions under antimonopoly laws, and believe you me, that has to be done some day, that has to be done. The power, the uncontrolled, unabridged power of unions has go to be stopped in this country and placed under the same restrictions that business operate under or we're going to have trouble.

Now we don't know enough about it yet. In fact I only know of one book that has been written on the subject in a study way. I think we can get into the fields of democracy in unions, if that is constitutional; I think we can provide better reporting of funds; we can provide for strike ballots before a strike is taken, generally following the lines of the Kennedy bill which was put in the other day but the bill that I like the best is the bill—Senator KNOWLAND's bill of rights for the working man.

Mr. MADIGAN. All these proposals, Senator, deal with restricting the operations of unions.

Senator GOLDWATER. No, they go a little bit further, Mr. Madigan.

Mr. MADIGAN. Well, let me go a little bit further, too.

Senator GOLDWATER. Uh-huh.

Mr. MADIGAN. What are your proposals of some legislation that would correct some of the evils of management as a result of this investigation?

Senator GOLDWATER. I have no specific legislation in mind for any of this. The only piece of legislation that I have put in is to create voluntary unionism in the United States, and I'm going to live to see the day that that happens here. It isn't going to happen soon but it's going to happen.

Mr. MADIGAN. Will your position hurt your run for reelection out in Arizona?

Senator GOLDWATER. No, not at all, because the people in Arizona understand that the right to work is one of our basic rights in America.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Senator GOLDWATER, there has been some talk in the Reuther camp that you are dodging a debate with Walter Reuther. I understand you deny this but you have been unavailable. I wonder if you would meet Walter Reuther in a debate at any time.

Senator GOLDWATER. Mr. Mollenhoff, let's clear this rather childish thing up once and for all.

The 3 different occasions, the 2 different occasions, really, where I haven't been able to accept Mr. Reuther's invitation, I was busy. The same happened in Detroit when I had an engagement with him and he had to break it. I knew he was busy. I didn't go out and say "Reuther is a coward." I just kept quiet about it. Now, in the last month he and I have been asked to debate at the Harvard Law School, we've been asked to debate on two of the national television networks, and he hasn't been able to accept because of business reasons.

Now, I'm not going to sit here and say that Walter Reuther is a coward because he won't accept these dates. You know and I know we get busy in this business.

Mr. MADIGAN. Can you name a date right now, Senator, when you can meet him?

Senator GOLDWATER. Let me tell you what I'm willing to do, this is in the form of a challenge, or, I'd rather say an invitation: Out in Arizona we have wonderful sunshine. Today we are having our annual big rodeo in Phoenix. We are celebrating down in Tucson the selection of that, one of the oldest cities in the United States as the location for the world's largest observatory. We have good clean air out there. People can think in it, and I'd like to have Mr. Reuther come out to Phoenix or Tucson or any other place in the State and he and I will debate one of these two subjects, Right to Work, or Unions in Politics. He can pick the time, I'll get the hall and we'll charge admission to this thing and we'll give all the proceeds to the Samuel Gompers Clinic which is a hospital that has been built by our labor movement out there.

Now I hope that ends it for all, and I expect Mr. Reuther to be out in Arizona with me, when he can, at his convenience.

Mr. MADIGAN. You mean you wouldn't give him a return engagement in Michigan? You just want to go to your home State of Arizona?

Senator GOLDWATER. I'm running for election in Arizona and not in Michigan.

Mr. MADIGAN. Well, that's why you want to hold it there?

Senator GOLDWATER. That's a good reason and I'd like for Mr. Reuther to get out there where he's not so surrounded with all this damp clammy air and coldness, you know. I want him to get out there where there is warmth and sunshine and we can let some of that filter into his soul.

Mr. CHURCH. You said that was an invitation. That sounded mighty like a challenge to me.

Senator GOLDWATER. Well, we people out West quit getting rough about invitations a

long time ago. We just invite him and if he can't accept it because of business reasons, I'm not going to stand on the rooftops and say Walter Reuther is a coward.

Mr. NOVINS. Senator, you are very careful about not calling Walter Reuther a coward but you did call him something else in Detroit, as a matter of fact, in his home grounds. You said at that time that he was more dangerous, he and the UAW, more dangerous than the sputniks or anything that the Russians might do.

Senator GOLDWATER. I don't think I said UAW; but I did say Walter Reuther.

Mr. NOVINS. Well, let's talk about Walter Reuther.

Senator GOLDWATER. Yes, sure.

Mr. NOVINS. In that connection, then.

Senator GOLDWATER. Sure.

Mr. NOVINS. Have you any reason to change your opinion about that?

Senator GOLDWATER. No, no; I haven't. I haven't seen the sputnik, I might have made the degree more or less if I had seen the sputnik.

Mr. CHURCH. Well, spell that out a little bit. Why do you think he is more dangerous than a sputnik?

Senator GOLDWATER. Well, it goes back to something I mentioned just a few moments ago, and that is the power that is contained in the hands of our labor leaders today and when that power is misused, I don't care whether it is misused by government, by labor, or by business, it's wrong.

Now here is a man who has more money to spend in politics than both the Democrat Party and the Republican Party put together. He has openly said that he is going to move into politics this year and I have some figures here, just part of the AFL-CIO expense tab for the year, is, public relations, \$753,000; publications, \$696,000; research, \$221,000; and so on and so on. They are in this political field.

Now, I have said long ago that Mr. Reuther is not interested as much in the—in the workingman as he is a political party, and let me read you his own words, and I read these up in Detroit, and these came out of his President's Column in the United Automobile Worker, August of 1948. He said, and I quote:

"Political action shall have first call upon my time and energy as president of this international union."

Now, if he is moving into the political field with a third party, or by infiltrating the Democrat Party or the Republican Party, then I think that is a serious menace to this country as we shouldn't have third parties nor should we attempt to infiltrate either of the major parties with the type of money and the type of manpower that this organization can put to bear.

I say either he becomes a real fullfledged labor leader or he becomes a political leader, one of the two.

Mr. NOVINS. Senator GOLDWATER, Mr. Reuther will be on this program next week—

Senator GOLDWATER. Yes, I know he will be.

Mr. NOVINS. And he has suggested within the last week or so in a public statement that was issued by the UAW that he would be very happy if a board of clergymen were set up to be selected by you and by Mr. Reuther, and he says that if a majority of that board determined that he was indeed more a menace than anything the Russians might do, he would quit the labor party, and he would assume that you would quit as Senator if the board found otherwise. What message would you like to leave for Mr. Reuther?

Senator GOLDWATER. Well, I sent—he wrote me a 10-page letter and I wrote him an 8-page letter.

Mr. NOVINS. Are you going to have a summit conference?

Senator GOLDWATER. And in that eight-page letter I pointed out that there had already been a committee of clergymen judge

his union, and by that, himself, in Sheboygan, Wis. I didn't have to go any further, I didn't tell him this, but you can do it if you want, I think he knows it: In my State I have to sign an agreement known as the recall before I run for election. Now if he doesn't like what I'm doing and he can go out there and set up a hornet's nest and try to get me recalled.

Mr. NOVINS. Do you think he will?

Senator GOLDWATER. I don't think he will.

Mr. MADIGAN. Senator, I'd like to return to the Committee for a moment.

Is it true that you are hopelessly bogged down now in partisan side, Democrat against Republican, as a result of this Kohler hearing?

Senator GOLDWATER. Mr. Madigan, I hope that is not true.

Mr. MADIGAN. Do you know it isn't true?

Senator GOLDWATER. I feel that it isn't true. I can't say—I don't know that it isn't true, because I can say this to you: As far as the Republicans are concerned, we are not bogged down. Now we've gone at this thing, sure, you sat there, all of you gentlemen have sat there, you have watched we three Republicans interrogate the various witnesses because we feel this is of utmost importance to the American people, not because Mr. Reuther is the head of the union and the union, he happens to be a Democrat, mind you, about 40 percent of that UAW are Republicans according to Wayne University's study.

Mr. CHURCH. Senator, those of us who have been covering it have noticed, well, the past week, just for example, it's always been the three Republicans there and the Chairman, and rarely a Democrat. Now, doesn't that reflect considerable political conflict within the Committee?

Senator GOLDWATER. I think it probably reflects, Mr. Church, that they have other things to do.

Now, we think that the most important thing to do at the moment is to disclose to the American people what has been going on in the Kohler strike, the secondary boycott, the Perfect Circle strike, and these other cases that I mentioned.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Senator GOLDWATER, on that point, is it possible for you to make all of your basic points faster and get them out of the way? I think of this particularly in line with the comment that Senator McNAMARA had with regard to this same questioning. He said it was farcial and that it reflects unfavorably on the Committee, and worse still, reflects on the Senate, too.

Apparently Senator McNAMARA feels that the questioning that has been going on this last week is one of the worst things that could conceivably happen in the Senate.

Senator GOLDWATER. Well, Mr. Mollenhoff, you were there. You were there when the administrative assistant, Mr. Mazy, was on the stand. He out-Jimmied Jimmie Hoffa, he didn't answer any questions yes or no. Now, how do we—we can't tell anything if we let these people sit there and say, "Well, to the best of my recollection," or, "I don't quite remember that," or, "I don't believe this is true."

And I have checked this just because Senator McNAMARA made the remark to me the other day, I went back and looked at some of the questioning in connection with Beck and Hoffa, and particularly where Hoffa was not answering yes or no, but was using the memory gimmick. And the questioning in that time was a little longer than the questioning we are doing today.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. A little earlier, sir, you said PAT, meaning PAT McNAMARA—

Senator GOLDWATER. Yes.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Hasn't been there very much. Do you wish, were you criticizing Senator McNAMARA for not being there?

Senator GOLDWATER. No, I'm not. I just said that it was hard for me to know how he can make a statement as all-encompass-

ing as he made, when he has been busy with other committees. I know he has been tied up with Public Works, he's been on the floor a lot. I'm not critical of that. I'm not there all the time myself. I am a member of some 12 subcommittees, and I have to try to get some other work done once in a while.

Mr. MADIGAN. Senator, what was your thinking before these hearings began when you threatened, if you did, if I have you correctly, to walk out, quit, if Walter Reuther were the first witness and had the chance to get his licks in before the Kohler management?

Senator GOLDWATER. No. That has been misunderstood and I'm glad you asked that, Mr. Madigan, so I can clear it up.

One time in an executive committee hearing we were having an argument, it never got violent on this point at all. I said, "John, I just can't go along with this." Now, that's as far as I got there.

Then one day out in the hall a group of newsmen stopped me and I believe it was Mr. Kelly, of the A. P., said, "What's going to happen?"

And I said, "Well, if they hold a meeting tomorrow, the Republicans probably won't be there."

Now, that didn't mean that we would have quit the committee. It would have probably have meant had we carried on with our temper of that day, that we would have boycotted the appearance of both Mr. Kohler and Mr. Reuther.

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Senator, are you satisfied today with the kind of a job that Chairman JOHN McCLELLAN is doing, and the kind of a job the staff is doing, or are you dissatisfied?

Senator GOLDWATER. I am extremely satisfied with the job that JOHN McCLELLAN has done throughout these hearings. I would be dishonest with myself if I said that I was completely happy with the job that the whole staff has done on the so-called UAW-Kohler hearings.

Mr. MADIGAN. Is that Bob Kennedy, you mean?

Senator GOLDWATER. The whole staff. I don't, I don't feel that there has been the intense interest in this that there was in the Hoffa, Beck, Schefferman, Sears-Roebuck—

Mr. MADIGAN. Are you implying that Counsel Kennedy is dragging his heels?

Senator GOLDWATER. No. I didn't imply that. I just said that I wasn't, I would be dishonest with myself if I sat here and told you that I was completely happy with the job. I know Mr. Bellino, one of the outstanding investigative auditors we have in this country, and I think that he possibly could have gone into the books a little bit more, so that we could have known whether some of these men have been paid off by the International or not.

Now, maybe he has. I haven't heard it, so I don't want to be dishonest with you, I don't want to be dishonest with the friendship that I have for Bob Kennedy.

Mr. NOVINS. Well, Senator GOLDWATER, many thanks, indeed, for coming here today to Face the Nation, and I want to express something that I know you may not want me to say at all, but I know you have been in great pain this last half hour because of a bad back.

Thanks again, indeed, very much.

Senator GOLDWATER. Thanks, Mr. Novins.

Mr. NOVINS. And thanks again to our panel of newsmen today: Clark Mollenhoff, of the Des Moines Register and Tribune; Wells Church, of CBS News; John Madigan, of the Chicago American.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. 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 gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. **ROGERS** of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I may not have agreed with everything the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. **CHRISTOPHER**] said. Some points I could argue about. We all want people to have work and to prosper, as they did up to 9 months ago without a war. Looking back over the years, I sincerely hope we will not have a war to bring back prosperity, as we have had in the past.

I would like to say, in speaking of the gentleman from Missouri, there is no one more gallant in the House of Representatives, in my opinion, than the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. **CHRISTOPHER**]. He is a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. He fights for what he thinks is right. He is fighting today for what he thinks is right. I have great admiration for his endless courage.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. **CUNNINGHAM** of Nebraska (at the request of Mr. **ARENDS**), through Wednesday of this week, on official business.

To Mr. **DOYLE**, from March 17 to 22, inclusive, on account of official business at Boston as member of House Un-American Activities Committee.

To Mr. **KEARNEY** (at the request of Mr. **ARENDS**), on official business, holding hearings of House Un-American Activities Committee.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. **KILDAY**, today, for 15 minutes.

Mr. **PATMAN**, on Thursday next, for 30 minutes, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. **PORTER**, on March 19, for 1 hour.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the **CONGRESSIONAL RECORD**, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. **FORRESTER** and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. **ENGLE** (at the request of Mr. **ASPINALL**) in two instances.

Mr. **O'HARA** of Illinois.

Mr. **SANTANGELO** (at the request of Mr. **O'HARA** of Illinois).

Mr. **ROOSEVELT**.

Mr. **HÉBERT** and include an editorial.
Mr. **PORTER** and include extraneous matter.

Mr. **DAVIS** of Georgia and to include extraneous material.

Mr. **MCGREGOR** and to include certain charts.

Mr. **ALGER** in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. **MCCORMACK** (at the request of Mr. **ALBERT**) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. **LANKFORD**.

Mr. **RODINO** (at the request of Mr. **BAILEY**) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. **CURTIS** of Missouri in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. **MACK** of Washington in two instances and include extraneous material.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. **BURLESON**, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

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.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The **SPEAKER** announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1519. An act for the relief of Isaac Lidji, Henry Isaac Lidji, and Sylvio Isaac Gattegno.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. **BURLESON**, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 15, 1958, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10021. An act to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1957.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. **LANKFORD**. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 18, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1719. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1959, involving increases in the amount of \$136,980 for the legislative branch; \$125,250,000 for the Department of Defense—Civil Functions; and \$46,200,000 for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (H. Doc. No. 354); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1720. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, United States Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report concerning agreements concluded during January 1958 under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.), pursuant to Public Law 128, 85th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1721. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the 28th Report on Property Acquisitions for the quarter ending December 31, 1957, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1722. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Material), relative to the proposed transfer of a 35-foot plane rearming boat, hull No. C-51554, and engine PNS No. 77615, to the Department of Agriculture and Conservation of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations to be used as a quahaug dredge boat, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 7308; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1723. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the annual report of the activities of the Division of Coal Mine Inspection, Bureau of Mines, for the calendar year January 1 through December 31, 1957, pursuant to the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 692; 30 U. S. C., secs. 451-483); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1724. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., United States Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report of the Directors of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year 1957, pursuant to the act approved June 23, 1934 (18 U. S. C. 4127); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1725. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the annual report with respect to tort claims paid during the calendar year 1957, pursuant to Public Law 601, 79th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1726. A letter from the Governor, Canal Zone Government, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the preparation of a proposed revision of the Canal Zone Code, together with appropriate ancillary material; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. **ASPINALL**: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1031. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain four units of the Greater Wenatchee project, Washington, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1504). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. **COOLEY**: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 7953. A bill to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1505). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. **COOLEY**: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 11058. A bill to amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments; without amendment (Rept. No. 1506). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. **MACK** of Illinois: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 11234. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, to provide that the Federal Trade Commission shall have jurisdiction over unfair trade practices in connection with purchases and sales in commerce by meatpackers of all products other than livestock and live poultry, and to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture shall have jurisdiction over unfair trade practices in connection with all purchases and sales of livestock and live poultry in designated cities, and for other

purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1507). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 11436. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the direct and guaranteed loan programs for 2 years; to provide that the rate of interest on direct and guaranteed loans shall be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to eliminate discount controls on such loans; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H. R. 11437. A bill to permit postal patrons to avoid the delivery of third-class mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 11438. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to make the transitional parity formula inoperative for basic agricultural commodities for 1958; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 11439. A bill to reduce income taxes, to provide relief for small business, to repeal the taxes on the transportation of property, to reduce the taxes on the transportation of persons, on communications, on automobiles, on automotive parts and accessories, and on radio and television sets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H. R. 11440. A bill to amend sections 4081 and 4082 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include wholesale distributors within the definition of "producers" of gasoline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEBERT:

H. R. 11441. A bill to prohibit the withholding or impoundment of appropriations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 11442. A bill to provide a 10 percent credit against the individual income tax for the period beginning July 1, 1957, and ending March 31, 1959, to reduce corporate income taxes, to provide an additional deduction for employers who increase their payrolls, to provide relief for small business, to reduce or repeal certain excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCINTOSH:

H. R. 11443. A bill to permit postal patrons to avoid the delivery of third-class mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 11444. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so

as to increase the benefits payable under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, to provide insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, and surgical service for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 11445. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1956 to extend the period during which loans and grants may be made for the construction of hospitals under the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Service Act of 1951, and to make additional funds available for that purpose; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 11446. A bill to provide a pension of \$100 per month for veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 11447. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on passenger automobiles, parts, and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 11448. A bill to permit the Secretary of the Interior to fix the size of farm units on the Seedskaadee reclamation project at more than 160 irrigable acres in certain circumstances; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 11449. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H. R. 11450. A bill to provide for the beneficiation of certain low-grade manganese ores purchased by the General Services Administration; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 11451. A bill to authorize the construction and sale by the Federal Maritime Board of a superliner passenger vessel equivalent to the steamship *United States*, and a superliner passenger vessel for operation in the Pacific Ocean, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 11452. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KNOX:

H. R. 11453. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose an import quota on iron ore; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 11454. A bill to provide for the beneficiation of certain low-grade manganese ores purchased by the General Services Administration; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 11455. A bill to authorize a 40-foot channel in the Mississippi River from Baton Rouge to connect with the authorized 40-

foot channel from New Orleans to the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H. R. 11456. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain real property heretofore conveyed to the city of El Paso, Tex., by the United States for other real property of equal value, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. J. Res. 578. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase certain bonds issued by the State of Israel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Federal Constitution relative to the imposition and collection of taxes on income in the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 11457. A bill for the relief of Arturo L. Espinosa and Flora Quijano Espinosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 11458. A bill to authorize John C. Green, Director of the Office of Technical Services, Department of Commerce, to accept and wear the award of the King's Medal for Service in the Cause of Freedom tendered him by the Government of Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 11459. A bill for the relief of four Polish escapees; 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:

475. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city clerk, Youngstown, Ohio, relative to urging Congressional leaders to alleviate the unemployment situation in the Youngstown area; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

476. Also, petition of the chairman, Kaul Economic Development Association, Kaul, T. H., relative to requesting Congressional legislation for the establishment of a bauxite industry in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Alcoholic Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1958

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, as the author of H. R. 4835, a bill to prohibit

the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, it is my privilege and high honor to speak in advocacy of my bill and to tell you of its salutariness and desirability and constitutionality.

My bill would, in my opinion, if enacted into law stop practically all advertising of alcohol beverages by publication or radio or television all over America, because practically all of these mediums cross State lines in the flow of

interstate commerce. Such a result would be entirely good and beneficial for the boys and girls of our country and even for confirmed alcoholics by way of removing the sight of these temptations from before their very eyes. Many eminent physicians and well known scientists have gone on record placing alcohol in the same category with narcotic poison. Of course, all of us would be shocked and repulsed at any kind of advertising of narcotics for daily consump-

tion. Yet we constantly have this blatant advertising of "booze" in all its harmful forms and although we know "booze" is truly the handmaiden of narcotic poison itself, still many will only yawn complacently as they gaze at its colorful pictures on the advertising page or as they hear it and see it through radio and television. National Safety Council tells us that about one out of four highway accidents comes from "booze," which stalks up and down the country like a hatchman destroying many youthful lives and much valuable property. Now, if a real honest-to-goodness hatchman were loose on our streets with all his deadly fury unleashed daily upon innocent men, women and children, we would immediately organize a strong posse to curtail him to the very point of extinction. Certainly we would never countenance respectable advertising of his supposed virtues. And if we, as a people, permit legal advertising of any imagined value of a 25 percent killer loose on the highways, such as "booze," then we are very deficient in common wisdom and completely callous about the priceless values of the lives of our children and other members of our family circles. I am quite confident that when Judge Braude of Chicago stated some time ago that 33 percent of child delinquency comes from alcohol drinking, he knew whereof he spoke and had full authority for his statement. Not for one moment would we allow some harsh hussy to advertise the open door of her place of prostitution for the allurements of our schoolchildren. And yet we permit the worst of hussies, a 33 percent child delinquency promoter, to call daily upon our boys and girls to continue to consort with her in all her destructive efforts against common decency. It surely must be time to quash advertising of this narcotic, this hatchman, this hussy for the sake of a better country and a more salutary civilization.

It is certainly true that a great many worthy people all over America have a strong and powerful desire to stop "booze" solicitation that constantly comes into their homes through publications and through radio and television advertising. My own office has received hundreds of letters from Maine to Texas and from the Carolinas to California expressing profound interest in H. R. 4835 and urged that everything possible be done to promote passage and enactment of the bill into the law of our land. One Congressman told me he had a laundry basket full of letters approving my bill. I have heard of but few letters of disapproval and these have emanated entirely from the "booze" interests, in my opinion. One of my colleagues stated that his arms were worn out from carrying the scores of letters he received in support of the Siler bill to ban "booze" advertising. Looking at the World Almanac of 1955, I find it shows a total membership of all the religious bodies in America, Catholics, Jewish, Protestant, and others, in excess of 95 million, or more than 60 percent of our last official census. It is my firm belief that close to 90 percent of those bodies, or 85 million of people here in America,

would vote in favor of Congressional passage of this proposed legislation. Many good Americans are shocked and mortified at the uninvited solicitation that constantly comes into their sacred homes in behalf of "booze," and always it is dressed as a nice white little lamb of decency when underneath are the sharp fangs of a black and uncivilized wolf ready to destroy all the unwary. I do not have the slightest doubt about the sincere desire of the majority of our American citizenship for early passage of H. R. 4835 and the complete banning of alcoholic advertising all across our land.

Now some good and patriotic people have sincerely harbored considerable doubts about the constitutionality of H. R. 4835, fearing that it may encroach upon the first amendment to our Constitution guaranteeing freedom of speech and of the press. I personally do not entertain those doubts and I speak just now as a lawyer and former Judge of the Kentucky Court of Appeals, our tribunal of last resort in my State. The United States Supreme Court declared in 315 United States Reports, page 568:

There are certain well-defined and narrowly limited classes of speech, the prevention, and punishment of which have never been thought to raise any constitutional problem. These include the lewd and obscene, the profane, the libelous, and the insulting or fighting words—those which by their very utterance inflict injury or tend to incite an immediate breach of the peace. It has been well observed that such are no essential part of any exposition of ideas, and are of such slight social value as a step to truth that any benefit that may be derived from them is clearly outweighed by the social interest in order and morality.

I submit that all words of advertisement of "booze" are considerably insulting and degrading to average Americans—an estimated 85 million of them. Such words "by their very utterance inflict injury." Such words "are no essential part of any exposition of ideas." Such words are of "such slight social value as a step to truth that any benefit that may be derived from them is clearly outweighed by the social interest in order and morality." Again it was stated by Justice Reed of the United States Supreme Court in 336 United States Reports, page 77 as follows:

The preferred position of freedom of speech in a society that cherishes liberty for all does not require legislators (that is Congressmen) to be insensible to claims by citizens to comfort and convenience. To enforce freedom of speech in disregard of the rights of others would be harsh and arbitrary in itself.

Our Supreme Court in the opinion just quoted stated a great and sound principle to the effect that the courts should not enforce freedom of speech in disregard of the rights of others. But if our lawmakers and courts should uphold freedom of speech to the disregard of the rights of 85 million of Americans who do not like to have the sanctity of their homes invaded by "booze" advertising, then such an attitude would be "harsh and arbitrary in itself," as Justice Reed so aptly stated. If H. R. 4835 should have any possible

constitutional deficiency, it will be determined and declared in due time by our judicial tribunals and the sponsors of the bill will meet that issue and cross that bridge in due season. But able lawyers and judges have looked at the bill and have found no such deficiency in it. We are willing to take our chances on constitutionality. If a lion is loose in the streets we go forth with a halter and we have faith in the strength of the halter to do the job. This bill is our halter and we are quite confident it is constitutionally strong enough to hem the lion of "booze" advertising that constantly seeks to come into our doors.

I believe I can truthfully say that I do not know of any "booze" advertising that is not harmful and misleading. A current piece of full-page advertising in Life magazine, beautifully colored and eye appealing, is now advertising a leading whisky made in my own State, and it calls this pictured drink Manhattan Melody. This is entirely misleading, for it would be called Funeral Dirge of Hell instead of Manhattan Melody if it stated the real truth.

In conclusion, I can say that I am always honored to be called a "dry." It is worth while to realize that the people of my own State will get out the ginger ale and the tomato juice when they see me coming to social events, for these are my "cocktails" and I am not ashamed of them. And now I would express the sincere hope that H. R. 4835 will eventually be enacted into the law of our land for the sake of all of our children and for a more glorious and powerful America under God. This proposed legislation is salutary and desirable and constitutional. So, I hope it may have much support for the good of all the youth of America, who are truly the trustees of the future of our country and I am certain they should be completely sober trustees at all times.

Voluntary Plywood Quotas Do No Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1958

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER] and myself, last Thursday on the House floor, debated the issue of Japanese plywood imports and their effect on Pacific Northwest prosperity and employment. The gentleman from Oregon claimed the Japanese have imposed voluntary limits on the amount of plywood Japan will allow her plywood industry to ship into the United States.

It is true Japan, last year, placed a voluntary quota on the quantity of plywood that she would ship into the United States. But once Japan imposed that voluntary plywood quota she forgot about it and paid no attention to that so-called voluntary quota.

In 1957 Japan announced she had placed a voluntary quota on plywood shipments to the United States of 435 million square feet. Instead of observing her voluntarily imposed quota limit, Japan shipped into the United States in that year 679 million square feet or almost 250 million square feet more than her voluntarily imposed quota.

Voluntary quotas that are not observed are no better than no quota at all.

The voluntary plywood quota Japan said she was imposing upon herself by quarters for 1957 and the actual amount of plywood by quarters she shipped into the country were as follows:

	Quarters of 1957	
	Voluntary plywood quota of Japan	Actual imports of Japanese plywood
January-March.....	89,993,000	161,000,000
April-June.....	91,800,000	177,000,000
July-September.....	98,970,000	173,000,000
October-December.....	155,000,000	168,000,000
Total.....	435,763,000	679,000,000

In every single quarter of 1957, Japan exceeded the voluntary quota she said she was going to observe.

If American plywood workers are to be saved from unemployment and loss of income, quotas must be imposed by the United States Congress on plywood imports. Experience has demonstrated that voluntary quotas do no good.

Statement of Hon. William E. Jenner on S. 2646, Relating to Appellate Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 17, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me regarding my bill, S. 2646.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAM E. JENNER

I want to take this opportunity to make a public answer to several letters which I have received privately.

The letters have come to me from several different points of the country, and they have had to do with my bill S. 2646.

The reason I want to talk about these letters here is that they have contained common errors.

For one thing, these letters have expressed, in one form or another, the view which one of the writers expressed by saying that he thought a person who was "otherwise qualified" should be entitled to practice law whether he is Communist, anarchist, Republican, or Democrat.

The writer of that letter has "bought" one of the important Communist propaganda "lines"—the line that being a Communist is just a matter of politics, like being a Democrat. Actually, of course, being

a Communist means being a part of a worldwide conspiracy seeking the overthrow by force and violence of all free governments, including the Government of the United States of America.

The matter came up in these letters because my bill S. 2646 would divest the Supreme Court of appellate jurisdiction with respect to any law, rule or regulation of any State, or of any board of bar examiners, or similar body, or of any action or proceeding taken pursuant to any such law, rule, or regulation pertaining to the admission of persons to the practice of law within the particular State.

The writers of these letters assume that what I am driving at in this bill is to keep Communists from practicing law. That is not the basic purpose of the bill. I have explained this point many times, but I want to explain it once more. I am opposed to Communists being permitted to practice law anywhere, because no Communist is fit to serve as an officer of any court. No man can remain a Communist and be true to his oath as a member of the bar.

But, what concerns me even more than the fact that in two recent cases the Supreme Court of the United States has seemed to favor Communists is the fact that in these cases the Supreme Court has elected to interfere with the rights of sovereign States and their duly constituted officials to control admissions to the respective bars of those States.

I cannot think of any question that is more a matter for local option than the question of who shall be officers of the courts of a State. This is a political matter with which the Federal courts should never interfere. This is a question for the people of the State to determine, because it is a question of the public policy of the State. There is no reason for having any uniformity about this matter. In fact, there are good reasons why there should not be uniformity—why each State should decide the question for itself and without regard to what any other State may do.

I would bitterly oppose Supreme Court invasion of this field no matter what policy the Supreme Court sought to impose upon the States. When that imposed policy is favorable to the admission of Communists to the practice of law—as in the Schware and Konigsberg cases—of course, my opposition is not lessened.

Now, there is another error common to a number of letters which I have received, to which I wish to direct attention.

The writers of these letters—and there have been 3 or 4 of them—have asked me if my bill, S. 2646, is in accordance with the philosophy of our Government.

Our philosophy of government is set forth in the Constitution of the United States. I don't think there is anything in that Constitution which got there by chance. I believe the framers of the Constitution knew, with perhaps greater vision than any group since, just what they were doing. I believe article III, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution is one of the check and balance provisions of the Constitution, put there to provide a means by which the Congress may exercise a check on the Supreme Court when necessary to prevent the Court from usurping legislative powers. There is no doubt in my mind that the Court has usurped legislative powers to a tremendous degree in recent years, and that unless this is halted we are going to wind up with a different kind of Government than the Constitution provides for. Since my bill, S. 2646, is designed to call a halt to these judicial incursions into the legislative field, I think very definitely my bill is in line with our basic philosophy of government as that term should be understood.

Now, let me bring up another point. This concerns a single letter which I got from a

friend who lives in Indiana. I do not wish to identify him, and I will not quote from his letter. But I should like to read two paragraphs from my reply, because they cover a point which cannot be too fully explained.

This is what I wrote my friend:

"You seem to equate review by the Supreme Court of the United States with the right to have a day in court. Actually, they are not the same. I will agree with you if you feel that any person should have an opportunity to have his rights protected in a court action, even against the Chief Executive of the United States or the Congress of the United States. But you miss the point when you talk about browbeating, harassing, belittling, and putting on exhibition witnesses before Congressional committees. There was no browbeating, harassing, belittling, or exhibitionism involved in the Watkins case. What was involved was the question of whether Congress must explain the pertinency of each question to the satisfaction of the witness, whether the Supreme Court is the arbiter of Congressional procedure in the exercise of its legislative functions, including the function of informing itself; and whether the Supreme Court can properly insert itself between the parent body and a Congressional committee to determine if the committee is satisfactorily performing the mandate of the parent body.

"A man always has a right to his day in court, but he does not have the right to any specific appellate procedure; that is always a matter of grace. It may be argued that for the sake of uniformity and 'stare decisis' we need Supreme Court review in all fields. But the framers of the Constitution obviously believed there were fields in which, under certain circumstances, the Congress might properly dispense with appellate review by the Supreme Court. Actually, in many areas it is recent decisions of the Supreme Court which have unsettled the law and done violence to the principle of stare decisis."

No, I spoke a moment ago about the Schware and Konigsberg cases. In this connection, there are one or two points which need to be made, and I might as well make them now, for the record.

These two cases came up on certiorari to the respective State Supreme Courts of New Mexico and California.

It has been said that a man should not be barred from the practice of law because of his past associations.

This statement is obviously too broad to cover all cases.

Schware was for 8 years a member of a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence. If the State of New Mexico in its good judgment wants to bar from the practice of law in its courts persons who were members of that conspiracy, I think that is a political matter with which the Supreme Court of the United States should not interfere.

There is no question but that the Supreme Court substituted its judgment for the judgment of the New Mexico Board of Bar Examiners, as to whether Schware was of good conduct. This it had no right to do. And the Court, knowing that it was dealing with the case of a former Communist, nevertheless cited the case of *Yick Wo v. The United States* and said "obviously an applicant could not be excluded merely because he was a Republican or a Negro or a member of a particular church. Even in applying permissible standards, officers of the State cannot exclude an applicant when there is no basis for their finding that he fails to meet these standards, or when their action is invidiously discriminatory." The Court said that the view that when Schware was a member of the Communist Party it was dominated by a foreign power and was dedicated to the violent overthrow of the Government and that every member was

aware of this, "did not purport to be a factual finding" and "obviously cannot be used as a substitute for evidence in this case to show that petitioner participated in any illegal activity or did anything morally reprehensible as a member of that party."

The Court then went on "during the period when Schware was a member, the Communist Party was a lawful political party with candidates on the ballot in most States. There is nothing in the record that gives any indication that his association with that party was anything more than a political faith in a political party."

This clearly indicates that the Court does not understand the nature of the Communist Party. The Communist Party had and has a policy of indoctrinating its new members, beginning with their membership. No one could be a member of the party over a period of 8 years and not know of its conspiratorial nature, and its objective of overthrowing the Government by force and violence. The Supreme Court seems to feel that at most Schware was guilty of political unorthodoxy.

The Schware decision also takes at face value the various self-serving declarations of the Communist Party with respect to its own nature, its objectives, and its policies. When the Court says "assuming that some members of the Communist Party during the period from 1932 to 1940 had illegal aims and engaged in illegal activities, it cannot automatically be inferred that all members shared their evil purposes or participated in their illegal conduct," it is missing the point. There is plenty of evidence to support a judgment that any member of the Communist Party during the period from 1932 to 1940 knew the aims of the party, that those aims were to overthrow the Government of the United States, and that the party planned to accomplish this overthrow by force and violence. The question properly before the Supreme Court was not whether it had been proved that Schware had illegal aims and engaged in illegal activities, but rather whether there was any reasonable basis for the classification of former Communists as persons whose moral character was so deficient as to render them unfit to practice law in New Mexico.

In the *Konigsberg* case there is misunderstanding about whether he denied that he was a Communist. *Konigsberg* would make no statement at all about Communist Party membership, and refused to answer questions about it. When there is testimony that a man has been a member of a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence—and the Communist Party is such a conspiracy—and the man himself will not deny it, I do not think it is high-handed and arbitrary to conclude that he has not borne the burden of showing fitness for membership in the bar, no matter how many persons testify to his high moral character.

In the *Konigsberg* case, again, the Court characterized questions about membership in the Communist Party as inquiries into his political association, and seemed to warn, in not too guarded language, that if any State makes failure to answer questions about Communist membership a basis for exclusion from the bar, the Court will declare this not constitutionally permissible.

The Court also declared that it did not approve or disapprove *Konigsberg's* refusal to answer the questions about his Communist Party membership.

Konigsberg did deny that he was a "small-c" Communist (in the philosophical sense, as distinguished from a member of the Communist Party); but this denial could have been a typical Communist dialectical exercise. The important question was not *Konigsberg's* philosophy, but his membership in a conspiracy.

It seems to me what the Court has said in both the *Schware* and *Konigsberg* cases is this: The fact that the people of New Mexico and the people of California (and the people of the United States generally) did not recognize the Communist Party for what it was in the 1930's has the effect of absolving anyone who was a member of the party at that time. I cannot go along with this reasoning.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my newsletter of March 15, 1958, as follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER)

The Vanguard stood alone, tall and slender, the gantry having moved away. White vapor escaped. The count-down cycle, many hours and pages long, was almost complete. At 35 seconds the count-down stopped. The helium lines wouldn't come loose. So it was that the multi-million-dollar effort to launch our most sophisticated intercontinental missile (with earth satellite aboard) was postponed. Before the difficulty could be corrected, surface winds built up and fog moved in. So the try was scrubbed. It was said that with 37,000 separate missile items, if each item is so reliable that it would fail only once in 100,000 times, the mathematical chances are that 1 missile in 3 would misfire. And we've fired hundreds. Not bad. The Cape Canaveral area is a beehive of activity with many launching towers. We inspected the Atlas (the beast), as big as a multistory building, the Thor, Jupiter, and the Snark. A successful Snark launching and flight took place. Cape Canaveral, a multi-million-dollar technical installation, is a sight to behold. Security is very tight, of course. It is located halfway up the east Florida coast. Stretching to the southeast are the islands which serve as tracking stations. At the Vanguard site, in a maze of technically complex and unrecognizable equipment, a workman shouted, "Hey, Joe, throw up a screwdriver." So we felt a little more at home. The sprawling complex Cape again demonstrates our missile prowess, advanced far beyond comprehension of the grassroots citizens—and the politicians, who tried to paint us last fall at sputnik time as doing nothing.

The F-104, Lockheed Starfighter, is a sleek (flying stovepipe) jet with a wing only 7 feet long on either side of the fuselage. In 2 minutes from a standing start we were at 35,000 feet going faster than sound, or in 5 minutes from the standing start we were 100 miles from Washington 7 miles up, going twice the speed of sound (1,400 m. p. h.). Cabin air pressure was maintained at 16,000 feet, although the pilot and I wore oxygen masks breathing oxygen from the ground up. At 35,000 feet if both cabin pressure and oxygen masks failed, we would have had between 18 to 60 seconds before losing consciousness and 2 minutes to death. The performance of the plane is unbelievable. These statistics have not yet been revealed. This can be said—it travels as fast climbing as cruising. The razor sharp, down-sloping wings change shape through front and back flaps, thus permitting slower flight, under 200 m. p. h. to take off and land. Also, there are air brakes to slow it down in flight. The

safety of the pilot has been carefully planned. Pilot ejection in seat harness is down, not up, and entirely automatic even to the chute opening. Automatic protection to legs and arms is given though "balling up" the pilot at ejection. It was a real thrill to fly this plane through rolls, turns, climbs, and dives. Indeed, I felt and was close to space travel. At various times I felt terrific acceleration, weightlessness, and the force of many G's (gravities).

The weapons, missiles, nuclear explosives, conquest of space are all a result of the technology of our national defense. The destructive potential of the United States defense "in being" at this time is frightening. And the new weapons are almost incomprehensible. As Secretary of Defense McElroy said, "We are moving into a period of increasing danger—not only to ourselves but also to the U. S. S. R., and indeed to the peoples of all the world. This situation is not the result of anything we alone have done or failed to do. It is the inevitable consequence of the explosive progress in science and technology which is making available a succession of weapons of ever increasing destructiveness and speed of delivery." Is it inevitable, too, that these totally destructive weapons will be used—as man has always used developed weapons in the past? It must not be. Our type of society and ideals could not survive—there would only be rubble left. Has there ever been a world situation and danger to match ours today? Is our citizenry aware of the danger?

The omnibus rivers and harbors bill seems almost an unreal experience. Here were 130 public-works projects totaling \$1.4 billion, with 18 projects included that were not even subjected to the usual Congressional procedure (Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Budget, and Interior Department study). Where were those who last year deplored the big budget with its necessary high taxes (and lurking behind, the big debt)? Where were those who recognized (as the President did in his budget message this year) that because of increased defense expenditures we must cut back elsewhere? Finally, where are those who believe a sound dollar is better than deficits, inflation, and devaluation of everyone's money? This is no time for a tax increase, and tax increases we must have if we spend more than we take in. Public works, particularly those not fully approved, should be postponed or abandoned, Government costs decreased and tax cuts made. "Make work," WPA-type is not the answer. Taxing everyone poor is not the way to help the jobless, or do we cure the anemic by bleeding? Is it the role of Government to keep everyone employed? Is Government able to do this even if it tried? Socialists and Communists think so. We'd better face up to this in a hurry. By straight party-line vote, Democrats voted for the projects, Republicans against.

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1958

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to join with many of my colleagues in commending this great Irish holiday, St. Patrick's Day.

From the earliest period of our country's history until the present time, St. Patrick's Day has become an integral

part of our way of life. Brought to America's shore by the Irish, St. Patrick is shared by all. From few celebrations in the mid-18th century, the observance of St. Patrick's Day has become a fixed institution in most American cities and towns. Every community gives welcome and honor to the Irish patron saint's anniversary. From north, south, east, and west, bits of green are worn on March 17 by all races, religions, and creeds. To America, the green, the shamrocks, the harps, these are symbols of Ireland's patron saint.

In recognition of the importance of this day and my warm feelings toward our Americans of Irish descent, many of whom are constituents of my District of the East Side of New York City, I wish to add my voice as we mark the day in honoring this saint—a saint who from slavery, became a symbol of peace, Christianity, and freedom to all of Ireland and all of America.

Zellerbach Commission Makes Sensible Recommendations on Our Emergency Refugee Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1958

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, for the past 5 years we have been talking about the injustices of the McCarran-Walter Act and the inadequacies of our emergency refugee programs. Tensions on the international scene continue to increase and we are long overdue in reviewing our immigration laws. There have been a number of announcements that hearings will be scheduled in the near future on Congressman CELLER's omnibus immigration bill, H. R. 3364, to revise the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. I hope this will be soon. I will be proud to join in the fight to get favorable action on this legislation.

If we are to prove ourselves true to the American heritage, we must show by example that we mean what we say. Today there are nearly a quarter of a million homeless people existing in camps throughout Western Europe—people who risked their lives to escape the tyranny of communism. Thirty thousand of these alone are brave Hungarians who managed to escape during the revolution over a year ago. These are people whom we have encouraged in their resistance to communism—people who believed in our message of hope. They need more than our expressions of hope. They need and deserve our help, and that help must come now. It is a sad fact that America has not accepted its fair share of the responsibilities to these unfortunate people. In the case of Hungary, for example, the United States ranks 13th among the nations affording asylum.

What course shall we follow?

The situation has been carefully studied by a group of outstanding Americans, appointed by the International Rescue Commission and headed by Harold Zellerbach. This group, known as the Zellerbach Commission, has given us some solid answers to this critical problem.

First, it recommends that the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act be liberalized to permit the entry of 75,000 Iron Curtain refugees into the United States—to achieve the goal, in concert with other Western nations, of emptying the refugee camps by 1958.

Second, the Commission recommends—and I concur—that our officials in Europe must be freed from Washington redtape and given authority to make on-the-spot decisions.

Third, it recommends that the United States escapee program be given adequate discretionary funds to do the job.

Fourth, it urges countries giving asylum to these refugees to consciously make every effort to see that they get a friendly reception and humane treatment—an important step in rehabilitating their damaged morale.

Failure on the part of the United States to take this kind of decisive action will play into the hands of the Russians and materially weaken us in the cold war. Our best friends in Europe feel that positive American leadership is indispensable in coping with the problem. For example, a high-ranking member of the Austrian Government told the Commission that if the United States were prepared to open its doors immediately to only 1,000 of the 20,000 refugees left in his country, Austria herself would absorb 10,000 into her own economy. Other nations would be stimulated into taking the remainder and the whole problem would be resolved.

The course I commend is not new to us. Historically, the United States has always beckoned to the politically oppressed of all lands, and it is a source of our strength that we number among our people a diversification of national origins, races, and religions. To turn our backs on this opportunity now would be inimical to our national heritage and a denial of our faith in free men.

Irresponsible Charges of the Leaders of the Democratic Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, March 13, 1958, I took the floor for an hour to discuss the current economic situation and in particular to ask the leaders of the Democratic Party just what they meant by their gloom and doom talk in regard to the present recession when they were doing nothing about it. They control both the House and the Senate. I

notified the majority leader the day before that I intended to take the floor to make these criticisms so that he could be present to make any rebuttal he chose to make. He was present and he attempted to make a rebuttal.

Significantly he did not retract his statement of Tuesday last which I challenged. In this statement he associated the Republican Party with recessions. I pointed out that was dangerous logic to use because the same logic clearly made the Democratic Party the war party. Now let us have no squealing if Republican leaders go out to document the charge that the Democratic Party is the war party. The following is the way it might be done. The inability of the leaders of the Democratic Party to distinguish between an economy based upon war and an economy based upon peace leads one to the conclusion that the Democratic leaders would be prone to accept war as a solution to economic problems of peace. The majority whip, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], said in his remarks in conjunction with the remarks of the majority leader that the Democratic leaders had solved the depression of the thirties by the measures of the New Deal. History clearly shows that the depression of the 1930's was not solved by the New Deal, but rather by World War II, if, indeed, that was a solution.

So, the recession of 1949-50 was solved by the Korean war, if indeed that was a solution. Indeed, one can wonder if the Korean war would have come about if the leaders of the Democratic Party had been sufficiently aware of the differences between a wartime and a peacetime economy. Perhaps if they had some knowledge of how to handle prosperity based upon a peacetime economy there would have been a greater search to solve international problems other than by war. Certainly, the insidious knowledge that war can solve economic recessions can water down the will to avoid war.

The failure of the leaders of the Democratic Party to tell the people about the truth of the 1954 recession is a further indication that they either do not understand the difference between a war economy and a peace economy or that they do not care to have the people understand it. Indeed, they conducted their election campaign of 1954 on the recession of that year without once giving recognition to the fact that the Korean hot war was over and that our economy was adjusting from a war economy to a peacetime economy. Hundreds of thousands of young men were being let out of uniform, hundreds of thousands of employees in munition and other "hot war" plants were being let out. Peacetime jobs had to be found for them. Of course, there was an increase in unemployment. But it was a temporary matter and certainly not a basis for trying to frighten the people into believing a depression was just around the corner, as was done.

Our present farm problem is to a large degree a problem of adjusting from a war economy to a peacetime economy. In World War II we asked our farmers to plow up additional lands, to take an

additional overhead in machinery and other equipment to utilize the land in order to produce food for the warring world. When the war was over and the European battlefields went back into wheat and the oriental battlefields into rice, the European soldier and the oriental soldier went back to farming again, of course there was not going to be the market for the increased agricultural production of America.

Rightly the Federal Government took the position that it was going to protect the American farmers as he adjusted to a peacetime demand for his product. But what should have been only an adjustment was carried out as a permanent program by the Democrat administration. The Democrat administration did not tell the farmer he was going to have to adjust from a war economy to a peacetime economy. Quite the contrary, Democrat leaders did all they could to insinuate that the agricultural economy could continue just as it had. They compounded their sin by accusing those who suggested proposals to adjust from a war economy to a peacetime economy of not being interested in the welfare of the farmer. They are still at it, telling the farmer that those who want to get agriculture on a peacetime economy basis are trying to drive the farmer off the farm. Well, this is untrue. But it gives rise to another thought. Of course, the farm problem can be solved right now by going to war. Indeed, the Democratic leaders proved it by the Korean war. Now is that the way to meet this problem? Or is the way to meet the problem by analyzing it and seeing how we can adjust the agricultural problem from the economy of World War II to peace, as it should have been long ago, within a couple of years after the end of World War II?

Any political party led by men who have been so calloused as the record shows they have been in their disregard of the difference between a wartime and a peacetime economy, is certainly not the party in which the people of this country should entrust the peace of the world. And the leaders of this party arrogantly maintain at this very minute this same calloused position.

This is the way the argument that the Democratic Party is the war party might be documented. I again suggest, however, that the best debate would be one which avoids name calling. The Republican Party is not the recession party; nor, in my judgment, is the Democratic Party the war party.

After I finished my talk Thursday and the gentleman from Massachusetts had finished his rebuttal, saying among other things that the only person he had ever heard refer to the present recession as a depression was a Republican, President Eisenhower, when he made a slip of the tongue in a press conference, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MOULDER], took the floor for 15 minutes to discuss, as he entitled it, "Depression Grows From the Farms." The irony of this title, and the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MOULDER], in light of Mr. McCORMACK's pious denial that Democratic spokesmen were using the word depression or hinting that a de-

pression was just around the corner was apparently lost on him. He rose to praise the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MOULDER], for his remarks and added of his own account this amazing self-contradicting statement:

When we have a sharp recession affecting agriculture—in fact, there is a deep depression going on there—it is only a matter of time when it catches up with the factory workers in the city.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], rose to read some statistics, which were supposedly in support of the position that the gentleman from Missouri was trying to make, that there was a depression in the agricultural section of our economy.

In answer to all three of these gentlemen, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MOULDER] I pointed out that their statements and incomplete statistics were at complete variance with the studies recently completed by the subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee on Agricultural Policy. This committee was chaired by Senator SPARKMAN, of Alabama. Further, I stated that the gentleman from Massachusetts would find difficulty in finding any economist supporting the statement he made about the condition of American agriculture. I further stated I would put some figures into the RECORD which would give a more complete and clearer picture of American agriculture. Regretably, I could not find in the RECORD the next morning the statistics that I thought I heard the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] read. However, the following data will give a more accurate picture of the farm economy than the statements of my three Democratic colleagues:

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-EIGHT FARM FACTS

Income per person on farms last year was highest on record, up 2 percent over 1951, the previous high year.

Farm assets are an alltime high, \$188 billion as of January 1, 1958.

Farmers have less than \$11 in debts for each \$100 of assets.

In 1940 the ratio was \$19 for each \$100.

Owner equities rose 7 percent during 1957 to a peak of \$168.4 billion.

Farm ownership is also at a record high; only 1 in 3 farms has a mortgage.

The postwar downtrend in prices which started in 1951 has been stopped.

Prices received by farmers in February were 8 percent above a year ago and 11 percent above 2 years ago.

The family farm continues to dominate agriculture. Ninety-six percent of our farms and ranches are family operations, about the same as 30 years ago.

The level of living on farms is highest in history.

Farm exports in fiscal 1957 set a new record of \$4.7 billion, 68 percent higher than in fiscal 1953. The surplus production of American farms is being made available for hungry people at home and abroad.

The buildup of surpluses has been reversed. Government investment in sur-

plus farm products owned and under loan has dropped about one-sixth in the past year and a half.

The inventory value of livestock on farms for January 1, 1958, was \$14.2 billion, higher by \$3 billion than a year ago.

The spiraling inflation of the war years has been almost halted. During the period from 1939 to 1952, the index of prices paid by farmers, including interest, taxes, and wage rates, increased more than 100 percent. From January 1953, when this administration took office, to January 1958, this index rose only 6 percent.

In the report of the Joint Economic Committee on the President's Economic Report of 1956, March 1956, 5 of the 6 Republican members had this to say on the farm economy in their supplemental views:

THE FARM ECONOMY

More words are expended in recommendation 8 on the farm economy than on any other recommendation. Yet the basic economic factors involved in the farm industry are not even posed, let alone discussed. We list a few which certainly must be considered in an analysis of the farm problem.

1. The ratio of farm income to national income has been declining since the establishment of our Republic in 1789, as our society has continued to industrialize. Looking ahead to the future, we may assume that this ratio will continue to decline if our country continues to industrialize.

2. The ratio of farm population to national population has continued to decline also as the Nation has industrialized. It may be assumed that this ratio will continue to decline if our country continues to industrialize.

3. Farm production has continued to rise. This is largely the result of mechanization, use of fertilizer, botanical research, etc. It appears that this, too, is a continuing trend.

4. Factories have moved into rural areas. The distributive industries have expanded as the demands of the people for service, packaging treatment, etc., have increased. All this has opened up part-time employment to the farm family. Today about one-third of the farm family's income comes from nonagricultural pursuits. What about this trend? Will it continue? What is its significance in the farm economy?

5. World War II brought unusual demands upon American agricultural production. The American farmer met those demands by increasing his acreage and acquiring the necessary machinery and increasing other overhead to utilize this increased acreage. The increased demand of World War II disappeared as the rest of the world went back to agricultural production. The American farm production was not geared to this lowered demand. Consequently, surpluses developed.

6. Increased efficiency in manufacture brings with it lower unit cost, which, in turn, if the laws of economics are operating, will be reflected in some lower cost per unit to the consumer. The same law operates in some degree in regard to efficiency in farm production resulting from mechanization. This situation is accentuated if supply is already well ahead of demand.

7. Although the per capita farm income (the standard of living of the farmer) has been decreasing since 1951 the great rises experienced during World War II have still left the percentage increase in per capita income of the farmer in 1955 (from 1934 the date figures are first available) considerably above the national per capita income increases.

8. Mechanization and increased overhead place a premium on larger operations at the expense of smaller operations.

9. The prices of farmlands (the basic investment of the farmer) are the highest in history.

10. Farm foreclosures are about the lowest in history.

Now, we do have a farm problem, but it is hardly in the area that most recent political discussion has been placing it. It must be within the confines of the economic factors we have set out, plus some others. We believe this committee would serve the farmers much better by taking the farm problem out of politics and placing it back into economics; at least until agreement is reached upon the economic factors. Then it can be referred back to the political area with some possibilities of solution; certainly with greater assurance that it won't be made worse by failing to pay attention to the few reliable economic facts we do have.

The creation of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Policy and the studies and hearings conducted by this subcommittee in 1957 with its report of January 1958 were largely the result of the expression of these views.

We now have the economics of American agriculture out in the open for any fair-minded person to review. The top agricultural economists participated in this work by preparing papers and appearing as panel witnesses in the hearings held by the subcommittee.

There is no excuse for the responsible leaders of the Democratic Party or anyone else, including certain of my Republican colleagues, playing the role of ignoramus on the subject any longer. Now let us get on with the job of making America strong. There is plenty of room for honest political debate in the area of what to do about agriculture and indeed about all segments of our economy. Honest political debate is the real way to move ahead to solve the problems, not self-serving press releases appealing to emotions rather than facts.

In this world the amount of human knowledge is so little in light of what there is to know that it is tragic for political partisanship ever to operate on the level of ignoring and distorting what little we do know.

Hungarian Freedom Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, today our country, unique because of its tremendous variety of national religious, racial, and cultural background, pays tribute to the Hungarian people. The great contributions of Hungarians to America and to the world can be traced to the event we are celebrating today.

March 15, 1948, was a turning point for Hungary, for America, and for the world. When Louis Kossuth, an outstanding statesman, led the Hungarian people in 1948 to demand independence from the Austrian Empire, his action was to have far-reaching effects. On March 15 of that year a charter of freedom granted

several economic and political reforms and the virtual independence of the Hungarian nation. But the Hungarian people had hardly begun to enjoy their new-found freedom when, once again, they were overcome by the Austrian and Russian Empires. Forced to flee their country, many Hungarian revolutionaries were welcomed to our country. Their fight for freedom had inspired reformers the world over and their settlement in America was the beginning of the magnificent contributions of the Hungarian people to our Nation.

In the early 20th century Hungarians came in great numbers to our shores. Leaving a country torn by the ravages of war, they sought economic as well as political freedom in America. Today the recent Hungarian revolution against the Russian regime is foremost in our minds. Again a wave of Hungarian immigrants are finding welcome and opportunity in our land.

Ever since the failure of the Hungarian war for independence, which began so gloriously on March 15, 1848, America has opened her arms to the Hungarian people. And we have received a people who have strengthened our Nation morally and enriched it culturally and scientifically. As Walt Whitman so ably said, we are "not merely a nation but a teeming of nations." The Hungarian nation is a vital part of this teeming nation.

Address by Hon. William E. Jenner at the Indiana State Republican Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 17, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address I delivered at the Indiana State Republican dinner on October 14, 1957.

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

We have with us tonight most of the leaders of the Republican Party of Indiana.

I would like to speak frankly. There's a fresh wind blowing in the world. An epoch is coming to an end, as suddenly as an epoch ended in 1929. People everywhere see the realities of socialism and its power seekers.

Now is the time for the Republican Party to offer the American people a program for the world of today.

President Eisenhower has given us a second era of good feeling. After 20 years of crisis government, this era of good feeling helped restore national unity.

An era of good feeling is, however, not a policy. It is a breathing spell, in which a nation renews its energies. It is a lull, in which the road is cleared for a new advance.

The second era of good feeling is now coming to an end.

Will the Republican Party be ready? I propose, my friends, that the Republican Party of Indiana decide it will be ready.

Governor Handley has urged our party to uproot socialist and centralist policies,

especially grants-in-aid, which reduce our States to provinces of Washington.

I will speak about foreign policy. During the Presidential campaign last year, Soviet plotting in the Middle East led to open war. The war in Egypt ended with public humiliation of our allies, England and France. It gave the Soviet Union enough time to crush the war of independence in Hungary.

Congress appropriated more foreign aid, and the President promptly allotted \$175 million to the Middle East. Syria shows how much the Communists were impressed.

Recently the Soviet Union sent its U. N. representatives from Moscow to New York, in a spectacular flight of jet planes.

They plan, we are told, to set up a jet plane service from Moscow to Syria, which would reach out to Pakistan, India, Burma, and Indonesia.

Look at the strategy behind this move. The Indian Ocean, once a British lake, will be so no longer.

The Soviet hammer and sickle will fly over the whole route. Trade will follow the new channel. Travelers, businessmen, and students, from every country on the route, will travel to Moscow. Moscow agents will travel outward, disguised as travelers, businessmen, and students, to do what they did in China.

The line will soon be extended to Australia and Tokyo, to North Africa, Egypt, and the rest of Africa.

This or something like this is what we shall get—economic competition at war pitch.

To 19th century imperialism, communism adds the fifth column. The Soviet Union has its agents in all Asia and Africa. But Lord Van Sittart, chief permanent official of the British Foreign Office, told Parliament British Communists were directing Communist penetration of India, and of Malaya where British planters and their wives slept with guns beside them. British Communist intellectuals were, he said, entrenched in the British civil service in Africa.

Remember, Britain has never had a Parliamentary inquiry into Communist subversion, such as we have had in Congress, as the Canadians had in 1945, and Australia not long ago.

Now I ask: Can our country meet this peril by sending ex-Congressmen, with checkbooks, to the proud Asian leaders, to ask, like the Ambassador in Call Me Madam, "Money, money, money. Need any money today?"

Can we safeguard our country while State Department officials who aided the agrarian reformers in China, or undermined the Free Chinese on Formosa, are transferred, by an invisible hand, to critical posts in the Middle East?

Millions of words have been printed on our foreign policy since 1941, but it has never been anything but a global giveaway. It is still a giveaway.

Senator Vandenberg realized early that Dean Acheson was setting up a series of postwar agencies to be financed with our money, but under international control, so Congress would have no jurisdiction. Vandenberg urged the Republicans to make foreign policy the issue in the 1944 campaign. But John Foster Dulles, who worked closely with Dean Acheson, brought a directive from Dewey that the Republicans would not challenge New Deal foreign policy.

When the Korean casualty lists told the score, Republicans in Congress led the fight against Dean Acheson, Alger Hiss, and their handiwork in China and Korea. But the work of uprooting the bipartisan foreign policy is still unfinished.

What should our policy be?

Let me tell you how the Republican Party met danger to our security, at the turn of the century.

After the long depression of 1893, the Republicans were elected on a platform of high employment, through free enterprise. The Bryan Democrats had offered only debasement of the currency.

Suddenly, war with Spain, and the Boxer Rebellion in China, plunged us into the turmoil in Asia.

Secretary of State John Hay, of Indiana, true to American principles, proclaimed freedom for Cuba, independence for the Philippines, and the open door in China.

Hoosier Senator Beveridge journeyed to China and Siberia, to study the Russian advance in Asia.

The Russians had completed the Trans-Siberian Railroad linking European Russia with the Pacific. Immigrants were pouring into Siberia. Soldiers were drilling, drilling, drilling. Beveridge decided the Russians had the greatest untapped reservoir of human energy in the world.

The czar had forced a concession from the Chinese emperor, for a railway across Manchuria linking Russia with China's ice-free harbor at Port Arthur.

Beveridge saw the Russians did not intend to leave Manchuria. They knew it was the key to control of all China and the Far East.

"So it is," said Beveridge in 1901, "that Russian statesmen are extending their network of power over Asia. * * * So it is that * * * by the lasting methods of material constructiveness Russia has achieved the first of her plans for the capture of the only remaining uncaptured markets of the world."

Was Beveridge overawed by Russia? Did he warn Americans to speak gently for fear the Russians would be angry?

Beveridge decided the United States had all the advantages. Baldwin locomotives from Philadelphia were pulling trains in Manchuria. American mining machinery, American reapers and plows were on sale in Siberia. American industrial organization was the best. Our consular service was vastly superior. We had a shorter haul to Asia, by sea, than European countries.

We had, he warned, neglected shipping, banking, and large-scale enterprise, but the Asian people liked us, because our traders were not followed by our soldiers.

A Chinese merchant said to Beveridge, "This port was once filled with your flowery, starry banner. Where has your flowery starry banner gone?"

Did our Indiana Senator propose Government aid? No, he urged American businessmen to turn their imagination to the China trade, as a market for our goods, and a source of employment.

"Perhaps," he said, "Americans are taking too much for granted as to our future. * * * It may turn out in the course of a few decades, that we have not been farseeing enough, that our eyes are fixed so immovably upon the steady stream of gold pouring into our coffers at this particular moment that we look not to the sources which must continue that stream into the future."

Let John Hay sum up how the Republican Party met its second great crisis. "The party," he said, "redeemed our paper currency, and made * * * our credit the best in the world. By persistent honesty in our finances—in the face of obstacles which might have daunted the hardest statesman—it has reduced our interest charges, so that in any mart on earth, we can borrow money cheaper than any other people." I ask: Is that problem obsolete today?

"In the relation between labor and capital," Hay continued, "we have improved both the letter and the spirit. Labor knows that McKinley and Roosevelt have watched over its interests as a brother might, and capital knows that its rights will be sacredly guarded, so long as it is true to its duties."

I ask: Is there anything here we ought to change today?

In foreign policy, he said, "adhering with religious care to the precepts of Washington and the traditions of a century, and avoiding all entangling alliances * * * McKinley and Roosevelt have gone steadily forward protecting * * * American interests everywhere, and gaining, by deserving it, the goodwill of the world. Their advice has been constantly sought and sparingly given * * * We do not covet the territory nor the control of any other people. We hold ourselves absolutely apart from any combination or group of powers. We favor no national interest but our own.

"We stand today in independent though amicable relations to all the rest of the world—without an ally and without an enemy." I ask: Do we manage better today?

Hay continued: "For 50 years the Republican Party has believed in the country and labored for it in hope and joy; it has revered the flag and followed it, it has carried it under strange skies and planted it on far-reaching horizon. * * * By just dealing, by intelligent labor, by a genius for enterprise, it has seen the country extend its intercourse and its influence to regions unknown to our fathers. Yet it has never abated one jot or tittle of the ancient law imposed on us by our God-fearing ancestors. We have fought a good fight, but also we have kept the faith. The Constitution of our fathers has been the light to our feet; our path is, and will ever remain, that of ordered progress, of liberty under the law."

I ask: Isn't that true Republican doctrine today?

Fifty years ago we were prosperous, confident, and happy. What happened? The Democrats were elected in 1912, and Woodrow Wilson turned the clock back. He undertook to settle Europe's quarrels. We have not extricated ourselves since.

I propose that the Republican Party of Indiana lead the return to Republican principles, for the next 50 years.

This will not be easy. We can no more rest on the thinking of the Republicans of 1900, than they could rest on the thinking of Lincoln or Stanton or Chase.

We have to study our world as Hay and Beveridge studied Asia, as Mark Hanna studied industry and employment. We are not doing it. At moments, I think Republicans have forgotten how to look at the world they live in.

You know the story of the novel "On the Beach." You know the pit that opens before us, if we fail. But we must not fail.

On July 5, 1776, John Adams wrote his wife, Abigail, "You will think me transported with enthusiasm, but I am not. I am well aware of the toil and blood and treasure it will cost us to maintain this declaration, and support and defend these States. Yet through all the gloom I can see the rays of ravishing light and glory."

The same rays of ravishing light and glory sustained Washington at Valley Forge. Men in blue saw them in the watch fires of a hundred circling camps. John Hay shaped his diplomatic papers by their glow, and Asians saw them wherever the American flag flew in the Orient.

How could we have smirched the vision of this light and glory in our day? How could we have let this light be dimmed by such little men?

We must cleanse our minds of all the sordidness, on which we have fed during the past 25 years. We must lift up our hearts. We must make ourselves worthy to see again the rays of ravishing light and glory.

Once we regain our vision of America, we shall have no doubts about whether the Constitution must be preserved. We shall know the defense of America must be free from all nationalist control.

I propose the Republican Party of Indiana put devotion to our country and its Constitution ahead of any question of victory. I too like to win elections. It is important to fight

to win. But we cannot, in the dangerous world of today, bargain with expediency.

I believe the people will flock to our side, and I include the Democrats. John Hay said the Democrats always come over to us in time of crisis, because their party offers them no sustenance.

But I would prefer to belong to a losing Republican Party, which is faithful to the Constitution, than to a winning Republican Party which makes deals with those who would betray America.

You asked who is going to lead this new cycle of the Republican Party. My answer is you. I do not think Indiana Republicans should wait on anybody. We should decide what is right and work with any of our sister States who are ready to work with us.

Washington said, "Let us erect a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hands of God." We can do no more. In this time of peril, dare we try to do less?

Truth About Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY MCGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1958

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with a great deal of interest that some New Deal orators have been telling the public with the usual extravagant political claims of being the party of the "little man" in tax-reduction measures.

Let us look at the record. It is factual, it will speak for itself and it will show that under New Deal philosophies the so-called little fellow has had to pay higher taxes. The records will show it has been the Republican Party which has cut taxes for the lower income groups. Let us not forget that it was a Democrat Congress in 1913 that put on the statute books the first income tax law. Since that time there have been 15 income tax increases. Democrat Congresses voted all but one of these increases.

The New Dealers put the low income people and wage earners on the tax roll. In 1932 there were 1,900,000 taxable Federal returns. In 1952 there were 46,800,000 such returns. Republicans did the cutting 7 out of the 10 times that income taxes have been reduced since 1913.

In 1954, during the 80th Congress, when the Republicans were in the majority, taxes were reduced by a total of \$7.4 billion—the largest cut in any 1 year in history. The Republicans reduced taxes on electric-light bulbs, stoves, refrigerators, electric toasters, telephone and telegraph bills, pharmaceutical supplies, and many other excise taxes. This cut benefited all taxpayers.

During the Republican controlled Congress legislation was put into law which gave 62 cents out of each dollar of tax reduction to individuals with approximately 25 cents of this going to taxpayers with incomes under \$5,000.

The New Dealers have been endeavoring to play politics with tax legislation, claiming that they want to decrease income tax exemptions. Again, I say, let's

look at the record. The following chart shows the exemptions from 1931 to 1954:

	Re- pub- lican	Democratic						Re- pub- lican
		1925-31	1932-39	1940	1941	1942	1944	
Single.....	\$1,500	\$1,000	\$800	\$750	\$500	\$500	\$600	
Married....	3,500	2,500	1,500	1,500	1,200	1,000	1,200	
Dependent..	400	400	400	400	350	500	600	

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1958

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, this is that happy annual occasion when we Americans, of whatever racial and national descent, join the Irish all over the world in doing honor to the memory of that great Catholic bishop and saint, St. Patrick. We revere the apostle who brought the Christian faith to Ireland; we admire the bishop and church organizer, and we love the man of courage and devotion who from his early youth carried on a ceaseless warfare against slavery and oppression. St. Patrick, like his Ireland, stands before the world as the champion of freedom, as the symbol of indomitable resistance to tyranny and oppression.

It is good to recall, in this day when a large part of the world is enslaved by a tyrannical rule, and the rest of the world endangered by the international machinations of a coalition of gangsters, the defiant courage with which St. Patrick met the gangsters in power who were breaking the peace of his world, and killing and enslaving the converts he had been gathering in Ireland. One of the few extant writings known to be from the hand of St. Patrick, the letter to the soldiers of Coroticus, is a masterpiece of tender love for his Christian people and fierce wrath against their attackers, humble submission to God and scornful condemnation of the unrighteous ruler.

This Coroticus is differently identified by various scholars, but from what St. Patrick says it is evident that he is the independent ruler, with a show of authority from the Roman Empire, of the very region of Britain from which St. Patrick himself had come. This region is thought by many to be the northwestern portion of Britain, around the River Clyde in what is now Scotland, and some suppose Coroticus to have made his capital at Dumbarton on the Clyde, and St. Patrick to have come from the nearby town of Kilpatrick. This northern placing of Coroticus is made probable by the fact that St. Patrick accuses him of being allied with the Scots and apostate Picts. Coroticus and his soldiers ostensibly Christian and civilized, had with these wild allies made a raid on the coast of Ireland, burning, killing, and destroying,

and carrying off booty, besides making slaves of many of St. Patrick's converts. From the extant letter of St. Patrick, it appears that the saint had sent a prior letter, by a deputation of clergy, asking for the return of the captives and of some of the stolen goods, and that the letter and deputation had been met with jeers.

In this letter appears all the personal feeling of St. Patrick, the former slave who hates slavery, the fervent Christian who despises hypocrisy, the priest and bishop who loves his ravaged flock with a tender care. Through this letter, too, shines the God-given grace of Christian faith, that makes the saint happy for the sure salvation of the newly baptized who have been slaughtered, that makes him glow with love, even through his wrath, for the robbers and murderers to whom he is addressing his fervent appeal. It is no wonder that the centuries have bestowed honor upon the man who could write such brave and fierce and loving words as these, from the conclusion of the letter:

I beseech very much that whatever servant of God be ready, he be the bearer of this letter, that on no account it be suppressed or concealed by anyone, but much rather be read in the presence of all the people, yea, in the presence of Coroticus himself; if so be that God may inspire them to amend their lives to God sometime; so that even though late they may repent of their impious doings—murderer of the brethren of the Lord—and may liberate the baptized women captives whom they had taken, so that they may deserve to live to God, and be made whole, both here and in eternity.

Surely it is appropriate that the memory of such a man should remain forever green among us.

A Student Loan Program and Scientific Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1958

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the administration's proposal for United States aid in the scientific school program means Federal control of higher education. The Government follows its dollars and sets out its own policies in connection with the expenditure of public funds.

It is the purpose of legislation which I have introduced—H. R. 10908—not only to avoid, but prevent, the encroachment by the Federal Government on the operation of institutions of higher learning. This bill proposes the establishment of a student loan program at the college or university level. The funds made available through the program would not be gifts, but would be loans to be repaid after the completion of the advanced course of study. Such program would be handled through the United States Commissioner of Educa-

tion, but the legislation expressly prohibits "any department, agency, or officer of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum or program of instruction of any educational institution."

The theory behind the proposed legislation is twofold: First, to offer an opportunity for deserving young men and women to obtain a scientific, engineering, technical, or other advanced education to which they may be adapted, through a loan which the United States Government would insure; and second, to establish a \$100 million revolving fund which can be loaned at no interest to institutions of higher education and to lending institutions with the proviso that such amount of money made available by any lending institution or institution of higher education shall not exceed 10 times the difference between the total amount of the funds of such institution currently outstanding in student loans.

Other features of the proposed loan program are: The United States would insure loans made to students for the purpose of entering any field of science or engineering—including mathematics—and on such loans, the insurance liability shall be 100 percent of the unpaid balance, and on all other loans to students not engaged in such specialized fields, the insurance liability of the United States would be limited to 80 percent of the unpaid balance of such loans; the student may select the college or university of his choice; the student loan would be evidenced by a note properly endorsed and secured; provides repayment of the principal amount in installments during the fourth calendar year after the student ceases to devote full time in educational work, and the full amount due would be paid within 6 years thereafter, making a total of 10 years' time for repayment of the full amount due for such schooling; interest on student loans would be limited to not more than 1 percent above the marketable Treasury obligation average interest rate, until the date the first installment payment is due, and thereafter the rate would not exceed 2 percent of the average interest rate of marketable Treasury obligations. The student, if he so desires, may pay off the installments at a faster pace and take advantage of the lower rate of interest.

The benefits of this program are numerous:

First. American youth needs and wants a chance, an opportunity—this program accords them that privilege. They are cognizant of the fact that at the conclusion of their college courses, lucrative jobs would be available to them.

Second. It would eliminate the excessive costs involved in the student-assistance plan which was recommended by the Eisenhower administration.

Third. The appropriation of money by Congress as proposed by the administration does not mean that America will overcome Russia in scientific know-how. The individual's desire to succeed is essential to accomplishing the results sought. The student will master his subjects better if he realizes that eventually

he will have to pay the cost of his college education. This realization would make for better scientists, physicists, engineers, and technicians. A person who pays for a course of instruction is more inclined to grasp the opportunities accorded him and his future usefulness is greatly enhanced. A student who is aware of the value of a dollar makes the better student and the best citizen.

Fourth. This plan is already working most effectively in Arkansas, providing opportunities to young men and women who otherwise would not have the privilege of obtaining a higher education. The Student Air Foundation, Inc., originated by the Luxora Rotary Club and now sponsored by the Luxora, Osceola, and Joiner Rotary Clubs, has a splendid record of successful operations. The plan will work on a nationwide basis and will not deprive higher educational institutions of the control that they now enjoy.

National Farm Organization (NFO) Beaten to Punch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting a portion of an article which appeared in the February 24, 1958, issue of *Lowdown on Farm Affairs* from Washington, authored by Mr. Glenn Martz. I feel that this article will be of real interest to my colleagues.

The Iowa unit of the National Farm Organization—fathered by an ex-feed salesman and nurtured by dollars from the till of Walter Reuther's United Auto Workers—quietly folded its tent last week.

It voted to disband.

Born a little over 2 years ago in the same area of the Corn-Hog Belt which in the early thirties spawned the notorious Communist-front Farm Holiday Association, the organization's two-point platform called for \$20 hogs and \$30 cattle.

It demanded a Government price support program—the Federal purchase of beef and pork—to achieve its goal.

When Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson refused, a third plank was added to its platform—a demand that Mr. Benson resign.

The reason for its disbanding was obvious.

Operation of the free market, as guided by the fundamental law of supply and demand, had beaten NFO to the punch.

Choice and prime beef was selling at many markets for well over the \$30 mark.

Hogs were commanding a stout \$21.75 per hundredweight.

There was no longer any reason for the organization's existence.

LESSON IN ECONOMICS

The death of Iowa's NFO was a lesson in agricultural economics for farmers

everywhere regardless of commodities produced.

It demonstrated the fallacy of farmer dependence on Government subsidies for stable income.

One economist put it this way:

If Secretary Benson had yielded to NFO's demands Federal warehouses would be crammed with costly refrigerated beef and pork—saddling hard-pressed taxpayers with the burden of financing a surplus housing program which is already costing them more than a million dollars a day.

Lured by a high-pegged price, producers, with ample supplies of feed, would have expanded production. New producers would have gone into the business of raising hogs and cattle with a resulting oversupply which would have sent free market prices tumbling to new and unprofitable lows.

Like other high, rigid Government price-support programs, once inaugurated, difficult to abandon—a perpetual problem—another costly adventure into the realm of unworkable economic theories which already has the American farmer so bewildered that he can no longer prudently plan production or guess what Congress may do next to disturb normal patterns of farm operation.

Producers of red meat owe Mr. Benson a debt of gratitude for his courageous refusal to be stampeded into inaugurating a program which would have crippled the industry, made it dependent on the whims and caprices of Congress and Federal bureaucrats for years to come.

And taxpayers everywhere should vigorously applaud their escape from another costly Federal subsidy.

A SELOUT TO REUTHER

The decision of Iowa's NFO to go out of business was made despite the desperate attempt of its national president, Oren Staley, to hold the organization together as a farm-labor coalition movement under the guiding influence of Walter Reuther's UAW.

Months ago Mr. Staley surrendered the organization to Reuther in return for financial aid from union funds.

Records show that Staley was given several checks, each in the amount of \$1,000, from Mr. Reuther's union dues kitty.

An attempt was made to cover up the union subsidy by making the checks payable to an NFO board member who deposited the checks in a Missouri bank under his own name, later transferring them to NFO coffers with his own personal check.

The ruse was discovered by NFO's treasurer and secretary.

Both resigned when they learned Reuther had taken over.

Smoked out into the open, Oren Staley went before the NFO national convention recently and confessed to his financial tieup with Reuther.

Meanwhile, NFO's official publication blossomed out with a full standard sized four pages generously sprinkled with labor propaganda dealing with the proposed farm-labor coalition and bitterly attacking so-called right-to-work legislation pending in several State legislatures.

Thus was NFO converted into a propaganda tool for labor, just as the *Lowdown* predicted it would when it was first organized.

It now talks in terms of farm strikes, the weapon used by the old Farm Holiday Association.

Hon. Francis E. Walter of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on March 3, 1958, on the occasion of his 25th anniversary as a Member of the Congress, at the Hotel Easton, Easton, Pa., a splendid and deserving testimonial dinner was tendered to our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

I had the honor to be present and to address the more than 900 persons, an overflow gathering, with hundreds of others who desired to attend, but who could not be accommodated.

It was clearly indicated by those present that the people of his district are proud, and justifiably so, of Congressman WALTER and the manner in which he represents them in the Halls of Congress.

I include in my extension, remarks I made on that occasion:

Mr. Toastmaster, it is a pleasure for me, not only from an official, but particularly from a personal, angle, to be with you tonight, and to join with you in honoring one of the ablest Members of Congress—a great American—my close friend and valued colleague—and one who so ably represents you in the Halls of Congress, Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER.

The Congress of the United States is the greatest legislative body in the world. The Congress, and particularly the House of Representatives, is the people's body.

Speaking of the National House of Representatives, its collective ability and stability is not exceeded by any other legislative body in the world.

And one of the outstanding, as well as courageous, Members of the House of Representatives is the gentleman who represents you in an honorable and outstanding manner, your distinguished Representative in that body, Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER.

And in speaking to you tonight I have been asked by Speaker RAYBURN to convey to you his high regard for Congressman WALTER. Your distinguished Congressman enjoys the complete confidence and respect of Speaker RAYBURN and myself. In joining with you tonight in honoring Congressman WALTER, at his specific request I am also representing Speaker RAYBURN, which it is a pleasure for me to do.

You are well aware that we are living in a most trying period of the world's history. You are well aware that the vicious forces of atheistic communism are bent on world revolution and world domination, with the enslavement of peoples, and the persecution and imprisonment, and even death and martyrdom itself following in the wake of such a catastrophe as any land and people coming under communistic control.

You are well aware that this goal cannot be attained until the Kremlin conquers America. And as long as we have men and women with the spirit and determination and intense love of our country, as Congressman WALTER has, that will never happen.

As indicating the high respect and deep confidence Speaker RAYBURN and I have in Congressman WALTER, several years ago when we were confronted with a delicate situation in connection with the, then open, chairmanship of the Committee on Un-American Activities, we decided that FRANCIS WALTER was the Member of the House well fitted for this important as well as trying assignment. In other words, we drafted him.

When the Speaker called him to his office and told him our views, and that we hoped he would respond to our request and our draft of him, Congressman WALTER did not hesitate for one second—looked the Speaker directly in the eyes and said "Mr. Speaker, as you know, with my other duties, I am a very busy Member, but if you want me, I will accept."

This shows the type of a Congressman that FRANCIS WALTER is—willing to accept any assignment, no matter how trying it may be.

In these trying days we need in the Halls of Congress representatives of the people like Congressman WALTER. For there is no Member of the Congress who has more fearlessly dedicated his public service to driving out of our ranks Communist traitors to God and country as has Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER.

Giving other Members full credit for the part they have played, I think I am one Member of Congress who can make that appraisal and statement. Because, in 1934, I was chairman of the then special committee that investigated communism, nazism, fascism, and bigotry. I know the evil intent of communism as well as the vicious mind of the Communist. And so does Congressman WALTER.

There is no Member of the Congress today who more clearly understands the intent and purposes of communism, as well as the vicious, inhuman mind of the Communist than does your distinguished Representative in Congress.

The people of America owe a debt of gratitude to Congressman WALTER for his outstanding work in exposing Communists and their fellow travelers, and in combating successfully their damnable efforts. By doing that, he has cleansed America from Communist infiltration and thereby strengthened our institutions of Government.

Our country needs Congressman WALTER in the Halls of Congress to give to America his continued leadership in this field of great importance to all Americans, north, east, south, and west.

By you, the people of your Congressional District, keeping him in Congress, you are rendering a great service to our country.

But do not deceive yourselves for one second, the Kremlin is bent on world domination.

For Congressman WALTER, as chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee, and by reason of his years of service on that committee, is recognized as the leader in the vitally important field of detecting and exposing Communist efforts and attempts to undermine our institutions of Government. Congressman WALTER is also recognized as one of the ablest Members of Congress in all other fields of legislative activity. There is no harder working Member on Capitol Hill than he.

He is always found fighting for the best interests of the people of his district.

A sound legislator, he is always found fighting for forward-looking legislation, particularly legislation that will strengthen the family life of his district, your State, our country.

And such a person is the finest type of a legislator. Such a legislator is Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER.

And I might say that you are justified in feeling proud of his service in the Halls of Congress—for he is your contribution to American history.

He serves you with distinction, with great ability and courage. He reflects credit upon you, the people of his Congressional District, Democrats, Republicans, Independents, and over and above all political consideration, as Americans.

When anyone asks you who your Congressman is, you can state with justifiable pride, Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER.

I am happy to come to Easton this evening to join with you in honoring this outstanding legislator, this great American, FRANCIS E. WALTER, who is your contribution to a stronger and greater America.

Hungarian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1958

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in November I visited the Hungarian refugee camps in Austria and drove to the Austria-Hungary border where brave Hungarian men, women, and children crossed over in their flight from Soviet brutality after the collapse of the Hungarian revolt. Memories of this came to me on Saturday, March 15, the Hungarian Independence Day, when the House was not in session. So today I address myself to the subject of Hungary's birthday of freedom and join with my colleagues in the Congress of the United States in the fervent prayer that soon again the people of Hungary will be free.

On the Ides of March in 1848 Hungary revolted against Austrian oppression, against the feudal system and against the Hapsburg dynasty. Louis Kossuth, the leader of that revolution, courageously challenged the might of the Austrian Empire and gained for his people freedom and independence. Kossuth was hailed by the world as one of the greatest statesmen of the age. When Hungary's independence was lost again to Austria in 1849, Kossuth fled into exile and in 1851 this world-renowned hero visited our own country. The ovation he received as he traveled throughout the land pleading the cause of human rights and the independence of Hungary was comparable to that received by Lafayette during the days of our own war for independence.

Louis Kossuth returned to Europe but many Hungarian revolutionaries sought permanent residence in this country. In the words of Kossuth these people "were received by the people and Government of the United States in the most generous manner—yes; like brothers they welcomed the humble exiles to partake of that glorious American liberty more to be valued than the glitter of the crowns."

In October 1956 Hungary again stunned the world by rebelling against one of the most oppressive regimes in history, the Soviet Union. Unable to regain the independence of their country, thousands of Hungarians escaped to our country as their ancestors had in the 19th century. In traditional American spirit these people have been welcomed

into our way of life. The regrettable part is that, officially, most of these people have been admitted only temporarily.

Of the 38,000 Hungarians reaching the United States under the Refugee Relief Act, only 6,130 have received immigration visas under the special provisions of that law. The others have been admitted as "parolees" under the provisions of Immigration and Nationality Act. As parolees these Hungarian freedom fighters do not have the right of permanent residence nor the right to apply for citizenship.

People who have fought so gallantly for freedom against such overwhelming odds surely deserve the opportunity to find permanent freedom in our land of liberty. The Hungarians know how valuable freedom is because they have lived in slavery. Let us receive them with the same degree of enthusiasm extended to Louis Kossuth and his fellow Hungarians—as brothers and as future citizens, holding high freedom's torch for these "huddled masses yearning to breathe free."

Alterations on East Front of Capitol Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1958

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have received a number of communications from my District protesting the projected alteration to the east front of the Capitol Building. I have not received one approving the proposed change. The following telegram represents the position of a great American patriotic organization whose views are entitled to serious consideration:

ATHENS, GA., March 12, 1958.

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS,

Member of Congress,

House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

The following resolution was today adopted by the 60th State Conference Georgia Society Daughters of the American Revolution:

"Whereas plans have been formed by high ranking Government officials to extend by 32 feet the east central section part of the Capitol Building at a cost of \$10 million in money and the destruction of the scene of United States Presidential inaugurations for over 150 years; and

"Whereas the cost of this proposed alteration would be achieved at an unbelievable high figure of \$200 per square foot of usable space which is a cost of 4 times higher than construction of equal space elsewhere:

"We urge your support of the proposed legislation to stop this project."

Mrs. H. BENSON FORD,

State Corresponding Secretary.

I understand that the American Institute of Architects is also strongly opposed to this proposed desecration of the Capitol. Thus patriots and professions have joined hands in recording their strenuous objection to this indefensible project. The Capitol is regarded by all Americans as a national shrine. It oc-

copies a unique and revered place in our national heritage. It might well be called the history of our country in stone. Congress has occupied this building almost continuously since 1800 with only a few brief interludes, as during the War of 1812 when the British burned part of the building. Much of the history of this country was written here.

Daniel Webster recognized this with his usual eloquence when he wrote the following in 1851:

And all here assembled, whether belonging to public life or to private life, with hearts devoted, thankful to Almighty God for the preservation of the liberty and happiness of the country, unite in sincere and fervent prayers that this deposit, and the walls and arches, the domes and towers, the columns and embleatures, now erected over it, may endure forever. God save the United States of America.

I feel that the alleged crumbling and deterioration of the sandstone front has been greatly exaggerated. It is also to be regretted that there were no hearings, nor any floor debate, at the time that the funds for this alteration were voted on as part of the general legislative appropriations bill for 1956. Proponents claim that this defacement will add some 45,000 square feet of badly needed space for offices and two additional restaurants. At approximately \$200 per square foot, this office space is too expensive.

The third House Office Building will cost well over \$64 million, and the new Senate Office Building some \$23 million. The new House Office Building, the Architect's Office informs me, will give us some 1,375,000 square feet of space, plus a million square feet for a three-floor garage. The new Senate building will add another 700,000 square feet. This Senate Office Building will be ready for occupancy in a few months. With some 1,375,000 additional square feet available in the new House building, surely the need for a mere 45,000 square feet can be deferred until that building is completed.

Far more important, however, than money saved is the fact that the Capitol belongs to every American—not just those who presently happen to be in Congress. Tinkering and endlessly altering an old historic shrine is offending to most Americans. The last bit of vandalism practiced on this Capitol was during the War of 1812 when Admiral Cockburn, of the British Navy, ordered the edifice to be set afire. I regard this contemplated alteration as a comparable piece of totally unnecessary vandalism, and I sincerely trust that this body will find ways and means of blocking it.

District NAACP Hails Rise in Equality All Over the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. L. FORRESTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1958

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday Star, March 16, 1958, page A-20,

carried a news item captioned "District NAACP Hails Rise in Equality All Over World," reading as follows:

DISTRICT NAACP HAILS RISE IN EQUALITY
ALL OVER WORLD

The District branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People was urged last night to muster renewed courage in the fight for equality and to forgive those who discriminate against Negroes.

Eugene Davidson, District NAACP president, told about 350 persons attending its Man of the Year awards dinner at the Presidential Arms, that the colored man is in the ascendency all over the world.

When he reaches the point where his majority is controlling the world, Mr. Davidson said the colored man must not discriminate against those who have discriminated against him.

He said Negroes in the United States must let the world know that discrimination still practiced in the South and elsewhere in the country is ending.

Receiving the awards were:

Ambassador Daniel A. Chapman of Ghana, because of the inspiration given Negroes everywhere by Ghana's independence. Mr. Chapman's award is the first international award given by the local chapter.

David H. Scull, Arlington printer, for his efforts to make the District a true citadel of democracy.

Mrs. L. C. Bates, of Little Rock, Ark., president of the Arkansas branch of the NAACP, for her efforts to end school segregation in Little Rock. The award to Mrs. Bates, who was not present, was accepted for her by Mrs. Anna J. Steen, member of the executive board of the local NAACP.

I wonder if the speech of the District NAACP president as quoted does not make even the wild-eyed leftwinger and pinko sick on his stomach?

I wonder if the do-gooders do not shudder over the statement that the world will be under the control of a race which knows only the law of the jungle?

Certainly, everyone who knows anything about Eugene Davidson, District NAACP president, knows that Davidson is the one who, a short time ago, made the asinine charges against the Chief of Police of the District to the effect that the Chief of Police had discriminated against colored people, and cited examples such as the charge that the police department had mistreated a colored woman who had been arrested over 100 times, and whose record showed that she was a moral bankrupt. Not only did Davidson make those asinine charges, but he scared the daylight out of the Commissioners of the District, and those Commissioners weakly kowtowed, and spent tax money for the purpose of investigating those wild-eyed charges and humiliating the Chief of Police.

Davidson will also be remembered as the man who vigorously denounced the police department for rounding up around 90 persons for the purpose of trying to discover just who the devils were that were robbing, raping, and yoking upon the streets of the District of Columbia, and even invading homes for the purpose of making sexual assaults and committing robberies and larcenies. It is my understanding that Davidson was successful in obtaining from the Commissioners a ruling to the effect that hereafter the Police Department of the District of Columbia would not be per-

mitted to round up suspects for the purpose of trying to detect crime.

It will also be remembered that never at any time has Davidson ever made the slightest effort to assist the Police Department in the detection of crime, nor has he ever done anything to try to cause his race to take any pride in their race, or to have any respect whatsoever for the law.

It will also be noted that the above article says that David H. Scull received a reward for his efforts to make the District a true citadel of democracy. Now, we understand what is meant by the phrase "true citadel of democracy." That phrase simply means that in a citadel of democracy you will walk the streets of the Nation's Capital with the understanding that you will be robbed, raped, or yoked, and probably murdered, and that every effort will be made to protect the criminal, and no assistance whatsoever will be rendered the complainant. It means that if the Police Department does, under severe handicap, apprehend the criminal, they cannot even question him, and every obstacle will be thrown in the path of those who would enforce the law.

This article also means that the poor fools who have been contending that all the NAACP wants was equality before the law are now proven wrong by the NAACP itself.

Mr. Speaker, this article also portrays vividly just why the people in Little Rock do not want integrated schools. It also demonstrates just why the people in the South are willing to even close their public schools before they will bring the law of the jungle into the schoolrooms, and before they will place the lives of their precious children in jeopardy.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I might add, the white race has no idea of delivering the control of this world to the colored race.

Veterans' Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt from an address of Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER, First District of Florida, before District Conference of the Veterans of World War I, February 10, 1958. My colleague specifically and ably expressed to Florida veterans the viewpoint and aims of the administration in the field of veterans affairs. I am honored to request inclusion of his speech in the RECORD. Certainly we can all benefit by this opportunity to share Mr. CRAMER's thoughts:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, BEFORE DISTRICT CONFERENCE OF THE VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I

You, along with myself, are primarily interested in the Communist challenge that is

being made this year to our technological and military superiority—and may I say at the outset that it is my firm belief that we still maintain total military superiority. You are interested in knowing what Congress and the President are doing about the challenge that has been made. You are entitled to an answer.

Already Congress has appropriated supplemental funds for fiscal 1958 in the amount of almost \$1½ billion to be used in a missile step-up program as recommended by the President—and we have also appropriated \$500 million for military construction for the Air Force in specialized fields. I am proud to advise that Congress responded promptly to this immediate need; that action was unanimously taken within the first 3 weeks of Congress.

The President's message on the state of the Union proposed adequate spending to stay ahead of the Russians in all fields of defense—and provides money to catch up in very specific areas where there is some indication that the Communists have gained a temporary advantage.

It has also recommended reorganization of the Armed Forces to avoid duplication and to assure maximum results in all fields of endeavor. Just a few days later the President recommended some \$3.5 billion more for defense in presenting his budget message. McElroy has streamlined missile and antispace planning and development, most recently appointing an outer-space civilian head.

The Congress of the United States has been thoroughly investigating the proper and best approach to the problem of catching up in the fields in which a temporary Russian advantage is indicated. This study got under way with the sound of the opening gavel as it fell on January 7. The Senate has appointed a Special Space Age Committee of 13.

Thus, I can assure you, the executive and legislative branches of your Government are following their dedicated purpose of making sure that the United States safety stays ahead both technologically and militarily. With this teamwork—success is assured. I have no fear of our position at this time—I can assure you we may all have faith in the future of our defenses. Russia dare not strike at the Free World today without suffering the most calamitous disaster.

Now to specific veterans' problems.

May I first say that this country—the men, women, and children of this era, as well as those who have gone before, owe a tremendous debt to those who have borne arms in defense of their homeland. I shall never fail to recognize that debt.

There has been a rumor going around that the administration is going to send to Congress a message on veterans' affairs that is going to substantially curtail present veterans' services, pensions and benefits. I simply do not believe this to be the intent of the President or the administration.

I have discussed this coming message many times with the White House and with the office of the new Director of Veterans' Administration, Mr. Sumner G. Whittier. It is my belief as a result of these conferences that there will be no substantial change recommended and no reduction in present programs will be suggested. Even if such a suggestion should be made, it is my considered opinion that Congress would not enact any such cutback of veterans' programs. I can personally assure you I would be right in the middle of any such fight on the side of the veterans.

Let's examine what is reflected in the budget message this year that we may get a better view of the attitude of the administration on this matter.

The total Veterans' Administration budget as proposed by the President for the 1959 fiscal year—that's the year beginning this

coming July 1—is a little higher than it has been for the current 1958 fiscal year.

The budget for the year coming up allows VA to spend \$4,967,000,000. That's \$7 million more than VA can spend this year.

Now, total budgets do not tell the inside story of exactly how a Federal agency plans to spend its money. We must take a closer look at the VA budget which, by the way, is printed in a book thicker than the telephone directory we use back in Washington, D. C.

We see four major items, and I want to say a word about each.

We see one category called readjustment benefits—benefits such as war orphans' education, grants for homes for paraplegic veterans, G. I. training benefits and the like. And we note a decided drop—from \$814 million this year to \$718 million next year.

The reason is simple. VA expects fewer veterans to avail themselves of the educational benefits of the Korean G. I. bill. The peak of the program is passing, and from here on out there's only one way for it to go—downward.

We see another category, compensation and pensions. And this one goes up—from a little over \$3 billion this year to \$3,232 million next year.

There's a reason for this, too. Last fall, you will remember, Congress raised disability compensation rates. And it obviously will take more money to pay these deservedly higher rates.

I was interested to learn that 80,000 Florida veterans now are on VA's compensation and pension rolls. Thirty thousand of them are veterans of World War I.

Thumbing through the pages of the VA budget, we came across another major item, medical care. Nearly \$811 million has been earmarked for VA medical care for the fiscal year coming up. That's just a trifle higher than the figure for this present year.

We find two items of particular interest to all Florida veterans, as we study the budget section on medical care.

We see one entry of more than \$1,500,000 for the architectural design of a new VA hospital to replace its present hospital facility at Coral Gables. Total cost of this replacement project will be in the neighborhood of \$15 million.

And we see another entry of \$645,300 for architectural work in connection with the first phase of modernizing the VA hospital in Bay Pines. This entire first phase is expected to cost some \$7,500,000—and will result in the construction of a modern, new medical building, making available additional necessary beds and operational rooms, with latest equipment.

Present plans, in phase I, are to provide five new operating rooms together with recovery rooms and clinical and X-ray laboratories. This will be a new wing added to present building facilities. Upon completion of the new area and when use has begun the VA will then be able to renovate older space areas for more efficient use—phase II. There will not, through this addition, be provided any more beds for Bay Pines such as requested in my bill that is now before the Veterans Affairs Committee in Congress. However, it is felt that with the more efficient facilities crowding will be lowered and that a much faster turnover of patients will result. This will have the effect of less patient-days in a bed and, consequently, more accommodations for your deserving veterans.

Returning for a moment to my bill to provide more beds—I have asked for an additional 1,000—I am hopeful that this will prove to be stage III of the improvement program. You and I know of the desperate need for this space here in an area that is one of the concentration points for the disabled veteran—a tribute to our wonderful

climate and the atmosphere of welcome to the serviceman—but a burden on the present facilities at Bay Pines. It will take a great effort—the work of your Congressman and your organized veteran associations—to provide this space because of the present legal disability of the VA to construct additional beds anywhere in the United States—I know I may call on you for support and action when needed.

And, now, we come to one final major item in the VA budget which always gladdens the hearts of us taxpayers. VA's general operating expenses are expected to go down—from \$161 million to \$149 million.

Why the decline? Greater efficiency of operations, for one thing. Increased use of high-speed electronic equipment, for another. And don't forget VA's rapidly dwindling GI loan program, and its equally rapidly dwindling staff of GI loan officials.

One note about the drop in VA's operating expenses. VA assures me that despite the decline, service to veterans will in no way be impaired. I'll repeat that: Service to veterans will in no way be impaired. I am sure you join with me in demanding frugality in the administration of all VA's programs.

VA's total budget represents a lot of money. There's no doubt about that. Only two items rank ahead of it; defense expenditures of nearly \$46 billion. And interest on the national debt, totaling nearly \$8 billion.

But I prefer not to look at the VA budget merely as money spent by the United States Government in behalf of the veteran and his widow and his orphan.

I prefer to look upon it as an investment in our fellow men—an investment in those who responded to the call when America was in distress—an investment that helps our veterans maintain decency, self-respect, and a spirit of independence so that they might contribute in peace just as they contributed in war.

The \$127 million which went to Florida veterans alone this past year, in the form of VA benefits and services, is a case in point. As many of you no doubt can testify, this did not represent a throwaway or a giveaway. Instead, it represented an investment in well-being—in independence.

Touching briefly on the field of recent legislation, you will recall that the President signed into law last August a bill providing higher compensation payments for more than 2 million disabled veterans with service-connected disabilities. This increase was about 10-percent across the board, except for those veterans 100 percent disabled whose payments went up about 25 percent.

Incidentally, this was the second increase in disability compensation payments in the last 3½ years. A law passed in August 1954 by the 83d Congress providing a 5-percent increase for these disabled veterans, and the same law increased compensation paid widows and dependents of veterans by more than 5 percent.

In a companion law, the 83d Congress increased by 5 percent the monthly rates of pension payable to veterans and their dependents.

Other legislation enacted during the first session of the current Congress included consolidating of widespread VA laws into a simplified "Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957"; amendment of the Social Security Act to bar deduction from social security disability payments the amount veterans received from VA for service-connected disability payments; authority for the Post Office to forward VA benefit checks, and a law providing that State war bonuses will not be counted as income for VA pension purposes.

Here, in brief, are some other figures which will give you an indication of what veterans benefits have meant to our veterans and to our State.

All told, about 125,000 Florida veterans of World War II and Korea have obtained GI

loans amounting to a little more than \$1 billion.

Florida veterans of these two conflicts have utilized GI bill training and education for the benefit of themselves and the State. So far, more than 186,000 World War II veterans have received training, as have 55,000 Korean conflict veterans.

Compensation and pension, in the amount of \$68 million of cash, is being paid to some 80,000 disabled Florida veterans of all wars. Widows, children, and dependent parents of another 22,000 veterans are receiving nearly \$20 million in death compensation and pension payments.

As you know, incompetent veterans and their minor dependents, or incompetent beneficiaries are entitled to VA protection of their estates derived from veterans benefits payments. In our State, 8,400 wards are receiving this VA protection. They include 1,600 incompetent veterans; 6,100 minor dependents of these veterans, and 200 incompetent beneficiaries.

Thousands of our veterans, of course, have received hospital care at VA hospitals at Coral Gables and Lake City and hospital and domiciliary care at our Bay Pines Hospital.

The Charles County Tercentenary, 1658-1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1958

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention of my colleagues to the fact that Charles County, Md., 1 of the 6 counties comprising the Fifth Maryland Congressional District which I have the honor to represent in Congress, this year is celebrating the 300th anniversary of its founding. Today the celebration will be kicked off with the lighting of a huge 300th-birthday cake which has been erected on route 301 at the county line. The cake, 24 feet in diameter and 30 feet high, is topped by 3 great fluorescent candles that are to burn throughout the 6-month celebration.

One in the series of events planned in celebration of the county's 300th anniversary includes a reenactment of the 1814 landing of the British at Benedict, Md. The British have been requested to send a warship with marines to Benedict to land in longboats as they did in 1814.

The official beginning of the celebration is scheduled for May 10 when a memorial wellhouse at Port Tobacco will be dedicated.

July 4 will be marked with special fireworks displays, parades, and caravans.

A huge festival will be held at Benedict on August 16 and 17. In addition to the British landing reenactment, other major events planned include a parade of illuminated vessels after dark; a night fireworks display; a carnival and water show.

On behalf of the Charles County Tercentennial Commission, I would like to

extend a cordial invitation to the Members of Congress to visit Charles County during this celebration. The heart of Charles County, its county seat, La Plata, is located just 20 scenic miles from the Capitol. Charles County was founded April 13, 1658. It is more than one hundred years older than the United States itself. It was an old county when George Washington became the first President of the United States.

Charles County and communities of similar age gave birth to the United States.

Charles County produced many of the men who achieved prominence in the affairs of state during the Colonial and Revolutionary periods. Among them were John Hanson, president of the Continental Congress; Thomas Stone, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence; Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer, one of the signers of the Constitution; William Smallwood, a general in the Revolutionary Forces whose Maryland line is credit with saving George Washington's army in the Battle of Long Island; Drs. James Craik and Gustavus Brown, physicians who attended George Washington during his last illness; John Hoskins Stone, colonial governor of the State, and Leonard Neale, second archbishop of Baltimore.

The homes where some of these illustrious patriots resided stand today as living monuments to their memory. These homes are open to visitors. These homes are all located in the vicinity of Port Tobacco, a now deserted village nestled at the foot of commanding hills. From those hills the land gentry of yesteryear looked down upon a thriving seaport through which flowed much of the commerce of the Province; for Port Tobacco was also the county seat of Charles County from 1658 until 1958, when La Plata was selected as a new location for the county seat principally because the gradually silting up of the Port Tobacco River had pushed the town inland from navigable water and La Plata had the advantage of a railroad siding.

A bit of history—not to be proud of but nonetheless interesting—centered around old Port Tobacco in the stormy days following the despicable assassination of Abraham Lincoln by John Wilkes Booth. Charles County was the escape route to Virginia for Booth and his accomplice David Herold. With the aid of local Confederate sympathizers, the two men were concealed in a wooded area several miles distant from Port Tobacco until such time as it was thought they could make their escape across the Potomac River. Tom Jones, who years later wrote a book entitled "J. Wilkes Booth: An Account of His Sojourn in Southern Maryland After the Assassination of Abraham Lincoln, His Passage Across the Potomac, and His Death in Virginia," was the man who carried food and drink to the culprits in their wooded hideout. Union soldiers swarmed the area and it was at a bar in Port Tobacco that Jones, his identity, of course, unknown, heard this tempting offer made by a Union captain:

I will pay \$100,000 to the man who will give me information leading me to John Wilkes Booth.

Jones replied:

That's a lot of money to offer for one man and if money will bring him out, that ought to do it.

The money prospect was not sufficient inducement for Jones to betray his trust and he successfully carried out his mission to put Booth and Herold safely across the Potomac.

Charles County, lying just north of St. Marys which was the cradle of religious freedom in the New World, can boast of many historical places of religious interest.

Just to mention a few: Old Durham Church, the oldest in the county, erected in 1732. George Washington attended services there on occasions with his friend Gen. William Smallwood.

St. Thomas Manor, overlooking beautiful Chapel Point, is one of the oldest Jesuit institutions in North America. The original chapel built prior to 1692 and the present manor house built in 1741 were used in colonial times as headquarters for Jesuit Fathers serving other Colonies as well as Maryland.

Not far up the valley from Old Port Tobacco is Mount Carmel, oldest monastery in the United States, founded in 1790.

From the date of its founding down to the present time the economy of Charles County and the livelihood of its farm population have depended primarily upon its fertile tobacco fields. The soil produces tobacco with an aroma and ready burning quality that makes it the pepper and salt employed by leading cigarette manufacturers in seasoning their product. The annual production ranges from five to eight million pounds, selling at an average of from 40 to 50 cents per pound.

Forestry products, however, make the next highest contribution to the wealth of the county. Approximately 70 percent of the county's 502 square miles of area stands in timber; and the pulpwood, lumber, veneer logs, railroad ties, and piling harvested annually sell for an estimated half-million dollars.

The Late George Harris Collingwood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1958

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George Harris Collingwood, one of the ablest and most faithful servants of the Federal Government, died yesterday at his home here in the Capital City.

Mr. Collingwood at the time of his death was head of the Natural Resources Section, Legislative Service of the Library of Congress. He was a scholar, a historian, and one of the best informed men in the Nation on its natural resources. He was always obliging, cheerful, and helpful to the Members of Congress who

sought information from him. In addition to all this, he was a very courteous, kindly, and lovable American gentleman.

I am certain that many of the beneficial provisions in conservation and natural resources legislation enacted by the Congress in recent years are the result of information Mr. Collingwood supplied to Members of Congress and its committees from the wealth of his experience and his constant research.

The whole country is better and will be better for centuries to come because of his contribution to the legislation of his country.

As one Member of Congress I take this brief time to express my gratitude for the many times Mr. Collingwood has been helpful to me and to express my high esteem of his merits and his character.

America is a better nation because of his having served it.

Mr. Collingwood was born in Fayetteville, Ark. He was educated at Michigan State College and Muenchener Universitaet, where he studied forest practices in Germany, Switzerland, and Austria.

After being stationed for 2 years as a ranger in the Apache National Forest, Ariz., Mr. Collingwood went to Cornell University in 1916 as professor of forestry at the New York State College of Agriculture. As a teacher, he introduced important new procedures for forest demonstration areas in cultivated farm lands, and took a leading part in forest planting programs.

He came to Washington in 1923 to become extension forester in the Agriculture Department, and was an active exponent of forestry education in American colleges.

Mr. Collingwood served as head of the Forest Conservation Division of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association from 1940 to 1946, and was the author of the association's industry program. He later served as an agriculture expert on the Hoover Commission for executive department reorganization, and was a forestry consultant to the United States Chamber of Commerce.

In recent years Mr. Collingwood had devoted his time to research and writing on conservation problems. He was the author of several books in his field, and was a member of the Advisory Council of the National Arboretum, the Society of American Foresters, the American Forestry Association, and a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

More Veterans in California—Less Veterans' Medical and Hospital Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1958

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the veterans' hospital and medical program is confronted with serious problems and

unless immediate action is taken by the administration and the Congress, the Federal Government will no longer be able to fulfill its pledge to veterans to provide medical care second to none. There are several things which can be done immediately by the administration and the Congress which will improve medical services to veterans, both in scope and quality.

As a result of the budgetary policies followed during the past 6 years, there has been a steady curtailment of the bed capacities of Veterans' Administration hospitals. On December 31, 1957, there was a total of 7,308 beds in Veterans' Administration hospitals unavailable for patient care. Of this number, 4,974 were unavailable for the care of veterans because of an administrative decision that these beds are not required to meet current operating plans. It would be more accurate if these beds were placed in a classification "sufficient budget not provided VA to operate these beds." Of the 4,974 beds currently withheld from operation by administrative decision, 1,354 are in TB hospitals, 101 are in mental hospitals, and 3,519 are in general medical and surgical hospitals. These beds were constructed at costs to the Federal Government exceeding an average of \$10,000 per bed.

Laws enacted by Congress state that care will be provided to eligible veterans to the extent that facilities are available to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The intent of these laws enacted by Congress is being circumvented by administrative and budgetary decisions which have closed 4,974 beds. The budget presented by the administration to the Congress for fiscal year 1959 contemplates a further reduction of services to veterans and, if approved, would reduce the average daily patientload in Veterans' Administration hospitals by an additional 1,000 patients per day. In other words, we have approximately 5,000 beds now withdrawn from the program and, if the current budget proposed by the President is accepted by the Congress, this number will exceed 6,000 in another year.

This undesirable situation can be rectified by the Congress by adding to the Veterans' Administration medical budget, which is now under consideration, funds for in-patient care. However, it will also be necessary for language to be added in the appropriations bills directing the Administrator to place these vacant beds in use for veterans, thus freeing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs from the administrative control which is now being exercised in this field by the Bureau of the Budget.

During recent weeks official Washington has been preoccupied with growing unemployment and there has been a variety of proposals to expand spending by the government, particularly in the field of public works. A few days ago the President sent a proposal to Congress suggesting acceleration of certain public works programs. The Secretary of Commerce has called for a speedup in the highway building program. It is entirely possible that these acts are justified, but

these recommendations are strange indeed when considered in light of the action of the administration on the Veterans' Administration Hospital Construction Program.

Two years ago a program was devised by the Veterans' Administration, the House Appropriations Committee and the Veterans' Affairs Committee which called for a long-range modernization and replacement program in Veterans' Administration hospitals. Under this program, nine old hospitals were to be completely replaced and major repairs were to be accomplished in fifty other hospitals at a cost exceeding one-half billion dollars over an 8-year period. It was agreed that the minimum level of activity should not be less than \$50 million a year. The Veterans' Administration requested \$43,374,000 for its replacement and modernization program for fiscal year 1959. The President's budget reduced this amount to \$9,145,000, or a reduction of \$34,229,000.

This reduction is not justified. It is not good business to neglect the state of repair of our vast veterans' hospital facilities, valued at more than \$2½ billion, and certainly if the economic needs of the Nation justify increased expenditures for public projects, this category of projects should receive first consideration. Strangely enough, it has not been mentioned at all by the administration in the proposals for expanded public works. Here again action can be taken by the Congress to restore funds cut from the Veterans' Administration budget by the administration. Several California hospitals are involved in this program. Extensive repairs are planned in Veterans' Administration hospitals at San Francisco and Palo Alto, Calif.

The Veterans' Administration has been steadily losing ground in its efforts to recruit doctors, nurses and technical medical personnel. The primary reason has been the inadequate salary structure in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration. As medical salaries rise in private, State and other public hospitals the Veterans' Administration is experiencing greater difficulty in retaining its personnel. There is now pending in the Congress a bill which proposes substantial increases in the salaries for doctors, nurses and technical medical personnel in Veterans' Administration hospitals. This legislation should receive immediate attention by the Congress or irreparable damage will be done to the quality of medical care being provided in Veterans' Administration hospitals.

How To Fight Communists Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 17, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address

I made before the Knights of Columbus in East Chicago, Ind., of November 6, 1957.

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

HOW TO FIGHT COMMUNISTS TODAY

You have asked me to talk to you about communism today. I am delighted to be here, but I wish we had a happier subject.

More than 2 years ago, speaking in New York, I said it was hard for me, as I looked ahead, to say anything hopeful about the fight against communism.

Since that time, our efforts have grown even weaker and more confused.

The final blow, as you know, is the recent series of decisions by the Supreme Court. Our highest court has now torn down one after another of the defenses, erected by Congress and our States, to safeguard this Nation against Communist agents in Government departments, in schools and colleges, in our bar associations and our courts.

Of course, I do not believe the United States lacks the ability to defend itself against subversion. We can protect our country against all the dark power the Communists can bring against us. I am confident, also, that if we do what is necessary to protect America, we shall, by that effort alone, start the great roll-back of Communist tyranny all over the world. Then the Soviet rulers will have to manage without the booty which the Red armies wring from the slave workers of Eastern Europe and China. The Soviet war machine will collapse. In time, the people of Russia, too, will be free.

The Communist leaders have won a great victory by sending up a satellite, to circle the globe every few minutes. This is a victory of Soviet propaganda, not of Soviet science, but let us not underestimate a propaganda skill which keeps the eyes of the people of Europe, Asia, Africa, and the Americas, focused on the little golden symbol of Soviet boldness and persistence. In the war of nerves, in which we are engaged to the uttermost, this is a major victory.

Let me remind you, however, that, in the very same weeks when the Soviet leaders put over their brilliant scheme for dazzling the world, the Communist empire, for the first time in history, lost control of a government it had taken over. The Republic of San Marino, which had been under Red rule since the end of World War II, booted the Communist government out of office.

The spark which ignited this revolt was lit by a schoolmistress, a nun. The Communist government ordered her to turn her school over to state management. She said, "No." Before the dust settled, the people of San Marino had risen up, the Italians on their borders had mobilized to help, and Communist rule of San Marino was over.

It is significant that the Soviet rulers won preeminence in the sky at the same time they showed their inability to control little San Marino. It is, I believe, a symbol of the struggle we are engaged in.

The Soviet Union has committed itself to materialistic power. In its chosen field it is winning spectacular victories. But it could not win a contest with an elderly woman who had no political power, no military power, no economic power, no propaganda apparatus. She was armed only with the strength of the spirit.

We know now, from a book called *The White Nights*, by Dr. Boris Sokoloff, that Lenin went to see Dr. Pavlov, in the early years of the Soviet Revolution. Lenin asked Pavlov how his experiments on dogs might be used to control emotions and energies of human beings. "I want the masses of Russia to follow a pattern of thinking and reacting, along a Communist pattern," said Lenin to Pavlov. "We must abolish individualism." So Pavlov's laboratory became a

sanctuary which even the Cheka could not touch. The Communists manipulate the human heart as Pavlov played with the hunger pangs of his dogs.

Contrast this ignoble aim with our Declaration of Independence, which says, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights."

We owe to Dean Manion, of our own State of Indiana, the clearest statement of what this means in the confusion of today. In his little masterpiece, *The Key to Peace*, Manion points out that the American political system is founded on spiritual faith. Political rights are bestowed on man by his Creator, not by a government. These rights are unalienable because they belong to man as a human soul.

I believe the Soviet leaders can win spectacular success in any field of materialistic skill they select, for purposes of political blackmail. But I believe we can end their reign of terror, and free our globe from their evil spell, as soon as we harness our greater material skills to purposes no Communist could understand.

This belief in the spiritual end of man gives us direction, our North Star, so to speak. But how shall we apply this principle, to guide our ship of state through the stormy waters of today?

Dean Manion points the way. Our Constitution was carefully designed, by the Founders of the Republic, to prevent that centralization of power, which tyrants need, to destroy the liberty of their fellow men. It is, therefore, the best shield we could possibly have devised, to block Communist attempts to enslave our country.

My theme for today is strip for action. It is time we admitted that neither the United States nor the Western World will find any easy way to stop Communist world conquest. We have no certainty, whatever, that we shall win the final battle. We have been losing, not gaining, ground. Khrushchev told us over American TV stations that in a generation America would be Communist.

We should stop kidding ourselves, stop living in a dream world, stop trying to ride four horses in four directions at once.

Congress is going to be pressured, from the day it meets, to insist on all sorts of crash programs, to pour more billions down the drain.

There is nothing to be gained by such nonsense. The Communists sent up their satellite to create just such division in our councils.

The Communist legions of death, from Khrushchev to the newest recruit, know that our Constitution is the hardest barrier they must fight against.

Every member of their conspiratorial armies works without rest to undermine our States, to wipe out the separation of powers between Congress, the executive branch and the courts, and to dilute our national sovereignty through a host of international agencies.

I told you this message was strip for action. We will never safeguard our country in this very troubled and dangerous world, until Congress strips from our executive branch every activity, every bureau and every dollar which diverts it from its true responsibility—the defense of our country.

Let me illustrate.

In looking back over the war years, I noticed a curious thing. While Americans were straining every nerve to win two wars, and carry the Soviet Union on their back, someone was loading down our Federal Government with all kinds of social welfare programs. They were not the business of the Federal Government at any time, but certainly not in the midst of total war. The result was a smokescreen of confusion, which hid—among other things—the curious

political policies we followed in Eastern Europe and China.

I am certain these efforts were masterminded by a few Communists, in or out of our Government, who knew what they wanted.

I also noticed another mysterious trend. The Federal Government, which was grossly overextended by taking on the duties of the States, overextended itself still further, in the middle of the war, by helping set up a multitude of international agencies in every area of American life.

Let me remind you of two points you know well. These international agencies were set up and staffed under the guidance of Alger Hiss, Harry D. White, Frank Coe, and a host of others whose names are familiar to you. Remember these international agencies operate with American funds, but they are completely freed from annoying interference by Congress or the people they represent.

These international bodies are still operating without interruption. They affect every step we take in defense, foreign policy, trade, labor relations, welfare, farm problems, and immigration. Their influence is growing every day.

Note that these international agencies build up the executive branch at the same time they weaken the Congress, the States, and the rights which individuals are guaranteed by the Constitution.

To this we must add the curtain of secrecy which, noiseless and shapeless as fog, hides the story of what our Government is doing with public money, from the knowledge of Congress and the watchful eye of the press.

You will tell me that many good and loyal people have favored this extension of Federal welfare, and this involvement in international government. I fully agree. But the Communists always win their victories with the help of warm-hearted, generous, trusting, patriotic people.

Some of you will say I exaggerate the influence of the Communists in this country. Last February the International Security Subcommittee heard testimony under oath, corroborated by two of the persons involved, that Earl Browder, head of the Communist Party, U. S. A., had a direct pipeline to President Roosevelt for several years in the war period. A woman Communist, from one of our famous colonial families, wrote chatty letters to the President in which she included political and military materials given her by Earl Browder. Whenever he was especially interested, the President sent for her to come to the White House or Hyde Park and enlarge on her ideas.

Among the documents this woman gave to the President was a report from the headquarters of Mao Tse Tung, the Communist leader. Browder had been sent by Moscow to do a tour of duty under the Chinese Communists and knew them well. The report alleged that the Nationalist Chinese were diverting their troops from the fight on Japan to fighting the "agrarian reformers" under Mao.

Members of his official family saw that Roosevelt got all the letters and reports from this correspondent, who was a direct link between Mao Tse Tung in North China and the President of the United States. How many good Americans at that time had a direct link to the President personally, which would carry their recommendations through all the curtains of secrecy, past the many levels of secretaries, to the President himself? At the time Browder was pouring poison in his ear about the Communists, Roosevelt was getting the same information from the State Department, the Treasury, the war agencies, members of the White House staff, and Henry Wallace, who went to China, escorted by John Carter Vincent.

This woman said definitely that President Roosevelt was opposed to the takeover of China by the Communists. He was farsighted enough to know a Communist China

would be disastrous, and yet he could not protect himself against the poisoning of his own mind by his official family. Who can say how far the Communist brain-washing network carries Communist lies and confusion about our defense policy today?

The lesson of sputnik, is this. America can meet any competition, any attack from the Soviet Government, but only if America is true to itself. America cannot be true to itself, or mobilize the vast energies of free men, until it cuts down the Tower of Babel which was built up in place of our executive of limited powers, while Americans were busy winning the war which freed Russia from fear of the Nazis and Japan.

We have the strongest economic reasons to cut down Federal spending and prevent the political and economic collapse that inflation brings.

We have the strongest political reasons for cutting down the size of the Federal Government.

But I say to you, these reasons, overwhelming as they are, are nothing to the fact that Federal Government agencies cannot do their own work of safeguarding our military and diplomatic security, unless they are freed from the burden of supervising our States, our private business, and the links to international agencies.

I am going to pass over the whispering campaign which hints that Congress dare not cut Government spending, or we will have the greatest depression ever known. There is no truth in that argument. The transition from an economy of Government spending to one of private spending must be worked out carefully, but it can be worked out whenever we decide to do it.

We must return to a Federal executive establishment where there are no dark places in which secret Communists can hide, to destroy American security, while Congress, the people and the press are unable to see why our efforts are going wrong.

True Americans want to unite on common objectives. Americans of every faith, of every race and color, of every section, every economic interest, can work together to make our Government lean and strong and ready for any hostile assault.

This brings us back to sputnik.

You will remember that Congress brought out a fantastic body of information about Communist influence over our foreign policy.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities brought out the sordid story of Alger Hiss, Harry D. White, and the rest of the crew of so-called experts in the State Department and the Treasury who gave the Soviet Union their best.

The Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security spelled out the links that bound the Institute of Pacific Relations to high Soviet officials and their military intelligence on one hand, and on the other hand to key points in the State Department, the Treasury, the White House.

The subcommittee also brought out the links between the Communist-directed groups in our Government and the staff of the United Nations. It showed how many of the more dubious Government officials were suddenly transferred to the United Nations agencies—beyond the scrutiny of Congress.

The Russell committee brought out five volumes of the story of our policy in China, the postwar policy of letting Korea fall but not letting it look as if we pushed her, and the incredible handicaps that were put on our military command in Korea, so they could not use the victory our men had won. The American Government was jockeyed into the position of fighting a barbaric war on the territory of its ally. We left the territory of our enemy, Red China, untouched by a single bullet or a single bomb. Imagine the glee with which the Communists spread the word—line up with America and the wars will be fought on your soil, killing

your people, or line up with Communists and watch the slaughter from afar.

I hope Congress will carry on investigations of our military policies as exhaustive as those earlier attempts to trace the influences shaping our foreign policies. The chief study we have of strange forces in our Military Establishment was made by Senator Joe McCarthy at Fort Monmouth. You know how high that trail led, and you know what fantastic efforts were made to stop the disclosure of the rest of the story. Senator Welker, Joe McCarthy's floor manager in the censure debate, was defeated by those who are determined to destroy the political career of any man who dares fight communism.

I have, myself, pointed out again and again, certain curious facts about our foreign military aid. I have shown that this military aid, which is supposed to be critically important for the defense of our country, is entirely under policy control of the State Department. Only the State Department can decide how much help goes to Korea and how much to India or Indonesia.

We will not give the Koreans modern jets and atomic missiles because the Reds promised, in the cease-fire agreement, they would not modernize their weapons. Of course, they ignored their signed commitments, but we go on pretending the signatures mean something. Some of our best divisions, now stationed in Korea, will take the brunt if the brave Korean fighters fall back before superior arms.

There is a similar weak link hidden somewhere in every one of our programs of military aid.

We have kept most of the able-bodied men in Turkey under arms, when present-day military planning favors small units with devastating fire power. The Turkish economy is cruelly restricted, so we send American Government officials over to lecture them—on what? On balancing the budget.

We have given a billion and a half dollars to Yugoslavia, including the jet planes we refuse to Korea.

Our papers are filled with stories of poor Yugoslavs who are desperately working their way out of Yugoslavia by every road. Recently a little motor boat was rescued adrift in the Atlantic, filled with men, women, and children trying to escape from Tito.

Isn't it too bad our State Department cannot persuade Yugoslavs that Yugoslavia is free? Why do those who live under this benevolent government of Tito flee to the West by every means, even at the risk of death itself?

We entertain, over here, Soviet scientists working on the Geophysical Year, though they carefully forget to tell us about sputnik which is supposed to be merely a scientific project. Also, just by chance, I suppose, the kindly, benevolent old scientist from Red Russia, who was here conferring with our scientists, is in fact a general of artillery in the Soviet Union. Soviet scientists were taken to conferences at our naval laboratory, so secret that American newspapermen could not be admitted.

Radio commentator, Bob Siegrist of Milwaukee, submitted to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, taped interviews he held with Igor Gouzenko in Canada. Mr. Gouzenko sent a letter to President Eisenhower warning him sputnik was no scientific project, but a pure military operation. The letter probably was sent to the State Department and lies there unanswered. Gouzenko reminded us that some of the people exposed in the famous Canadian report were, even then, top scientists in the Canada National Research Council.

Ask yourself this question: If you were a high Soviet official, studying every day how best to undermine the military strength of the Free World, would you, or would you not, make every possible attempt to penetrate and

misdirect the American Defense Establishment?

We do not need more money to maintain American supremacy.

Soviet scientists do not have, as a body, the capacity of our scientists. Their managers and engineers and technicians do not compare with ours.

We do not need to bring Dr. Oppenheimer back into the missile program any more than we need to bring Alger Hiss back into the State Department.

We have all the talent and all the patriotism we need to safeguard our country if you and I make sure our Government is not hobbled by secret bonds.

We must clear our minds of all the confusion and silliness which grew up in the war years. We must get back on the main track of true American policy, and do it at once.

My friends, you have for years been active in the fight against communism. You, too, have been discouraged by the slow decline in our efforts. It is time to strip for action. Let us strip the Federal Government of every activity except national security. This task cannot be done by Congress alone, but it can and will be done by Congress with the help of determined people who love America and who respect the people of other nations because they are too endowed by their Creator with the unalienable right of life and liberty.

How the Postmaster General Could Help by Making His Position Plain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following recent correspondence between the Postmaster General and me:

FEBRUARY 19, 1958.

HON. ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
Postmaster General of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POSTMASTER GENERAL: You will recall my questions the other day with respect to what White House action could be expected on whatever postal and classified rate bill is enacted by Congress.

I should have asked you this question: Will you recommend a veto if the percentage increase for postal workers is about 6 percent? I ask it now and add the following:

Will you recommend a veto if the percentage is 7½ percent. If the bill contains lump sum payments for the lower grades as in the bill filed by Congressman MORRISON and myself? What percentage do you regard as the maximum for a justifiable increase?

Along with you I am against gestures and cruel hoaxes in connection with pay legislation. It may be that Congress will decide to pass a bill even though the President is on record as being determined to veto it. However, it does seem that Congress is entitled to your explicit views on this important matter and I realize that you did present yourself before our committee for that very purpose, but hope that you will let me know promptly the answers to these vital questions so that I may inform the Post Office and Civil Service Committee at our executive meeting next Monday.

Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES O. PORTER,
Member of Congress.

MARCH 11, 1958.

HON. CHARLES O. POTTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Reference is made to your letter of February 19 in which you request my recommendations to the President concerning the postal pay increase legislation.

I believe I made my position clear when I testified before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee on February 11. It is quite impossible for me to express myself more clearly than I did at that time. I pointed out to you the severe inequities which would result from flat increases by reason of the distortion it would create in the classification structure of the postal field service schedule.

Insofar as my "explicit views" are concerned, I believe my testimony before your committee was quite clear in recommending a permanent straight 6 percent annual pay increase for all postal employees. However, it is impossible for me to state exactly what my position will be until the conferees have agreed on a proposal which has been approved by the Congress.

In my judgment, postal employees are entitled to pay increases as quickly as possible. That is why recommendations were made for a pay adjustment early in January. It is now the second week in March and the House of Representatives has not approved a postal pay increase bill, but the Senate, in its wisdom, approved a pay increase for postal employees which would cost about \$310 million annually, which is almost double the cost of the proposal recommended by the President. This means that the conferees will have an opportunity to approve a fair and reasonable percentage pay increase for postal employees which, if agreed to, by the Congress, I hope I can recommend for approval by the President.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
The Postmaster General.

MARCH 13, 1958.

HON. ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
Postmaster General of the United
States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SUMMERFIELD: I have your reply of March 11 to my letter of February 19 asking you to make your views on a Presidential veto of postal-pay increase legislation more explicit than you did before our committee. At the time I wrote, as I mentioned in my letter, I wanted your views for consideration by the committee at its executive session scheduled for February 24.

It is too late for our committee to profit by such information but still in time for the conferees, on our side, who I understand will be appointed early next week when our chairman returns from the hospital. With this in mind I am undertaking once again to persuade you to make your views explicit.

Your letter of March 11 says it is "impossible for me to state exactly what my position will be until the conferees have agreed on a proposal which has been approved by the Congress." This, with all respect, does not make any sense to me. Don't you, by now, know how far you will go? For example, aren't you ready right now to recommend approval or disapproval for a bill which eliminates the 5-cent stamp but leaves cost of living differential in the lower grades? In short, since you know what you will approve, however reluctantly, why don't you say so and help the conferees frame a bill quickly that can be enacted into law?

It may be that the conferees would decide your limitations were too stringent. This is their decision. They have the job of gauging the possibility of a veto and the chances of overriding a veto in case the President again decided to take that action.

But why leave them up in the air as to your position? Certainly your recommendations of a permanent straight 6-percent annual pay increase for all postal employees does not represent your highest point of toleration. You will recall Senator CARLSON stated on the floor of the Senate that he thought 8½ percent would be acceptable to the President.

You write that postal employees are entitled to pay increases as quickly as possible. Most of Congress thought so last year when you opposed increases. The President will look to you for recommendations. My urgent recommendation is that you inform the conferees as to what, explicitly, your position is so they will not, as now, be forced to speculate about it.

As is true with all legislation the rate and pay bill will represent a compromise. Perhaps there was a time for the contestants to play poker with each other. The time is past. We want the best bill possible as soon as possible. Your position at this time should no longer remain a mystery. I renew the requests made in my letter of February 19 and, with all deference to your office and appreciation of your manifold responsibilities, ask that your reply be made available in time to be of assistance to the conferees.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES O. POTTER,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Nixon: "Action Prime Requisite"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1958

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I recently brought to the attention of the House a splendid article by Fred Digby, the general manager of the New Orleans Midwinter Sports Association, which presents the annual Sugar Bowl classic in New Orleans. The subject of the article was the President's Council on Youth Fitness.

At the time I made the observation that not a single representative of any athletic club in America was named to serve on the committee. The athletic club is, in my opinion, one of the most vital cogs in the whole physical-fitness program yet it had no spokesman on the committee. When the committee was being organized I personally attempted to have the national president of America's Athletic Clubs, Mr. Irwin Poche, the director of the New Orleans Athletic Club, named to the committee. I failed in the endeavor. When I examined the membership of the committee I was amazed at the amount of window dressing through big names. All splendid gentlemen, but certainly much less qualified to pass judgment and make suggestions than a man who has devoted his entire life to the development of physical fitness.

After Mr. Digby's article, which appeared in *Catholic Action*, he was called on the telephone by Dr. Shane McCarthy, the Executive Director of the President's Council. This prompted another article by Mr. Digby, which speaks for itself and which contains some pertinent observations.

Here it is:

MR. NIXON: "ACTION PRIME REQUISITE"
(By Fred Digby)

Our recent call for action by President Eisenhower's Council on Youth Fitness has brought letters from the Honorable RICHARD NIXON, Vice President, and Mr. Shane McCarthy, Executive Director, and a considerable number of booklets and pamphlets on the subject of physical fitness.

Messrs. NIXON and McCarthy agree it is time for action, if we're to get the youth of the Nation physically fit but both contend the action must be provided by parents and community leaders, not the Federal Government.

One of the pamphlets is titled "A Plan for Action" and sets forth the objective of the Council:

"Our main goal for Council operation is to urge organizations and individuals to take further action to improve fitness of youth, with emphasis on physical activity."

Through this particular pamphlet we learned that not one of the large group of national athletic leaders and physical fitness experts invited to Washington and to West Point to discuss and advise what should be done, is on the Council.

The Fitness Council, as presently constituted, consists of five Cabinet members—the Interior, as Chairman; Secretary of Defense; Secretary of Agriculture; and Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In his letter, Mr. NIXON admits there are "differences of opinion" on whether or not there should be a master Federal program but says the "philosophy adopted by the Council" is in favor of action at the "community level."

Here is Vice President NIXON's letter:

WASHINGTON.

DEAR MR. DIGBY: Your recent column on youth fitness and the work of the President's Council interested me greatly. Although the press of other duties made it necessary for me to turn the chairmanship over to the Secretary of the Interior, I have retained my interest in the program.

As you so clearly saw and pointed out, action is a prime requisite in any fitness program. The question of on what level that action should be taken gives rise to differences of opinion, however. I realize there are those who favor a master Federal program. On the other hand, the philosophy adopted by the Council is that the action should be taken at the community level with parents and local leaders taking the primary role.

Under this concept the Council tries to assist the regional efforts, coordinate conflicting activities where necessary, and encourage and advise as to lines of action which may be most productive. We have also found that the limited budget which suffices for this type of Council action meets with the approval of Congress and the taxpayer, whereas an expensive Federal master plan might not.

With all best wishes,

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

Mr. McCarthy, the Executive Director and the man on whom the Council relies to get across its plan called long distance from Washington and afterward wrote two letters. What follows is a gist of these letters:

WASHINGTON, D. C.

DEAR FRED: Sincerely do I say I enjoyed every moment of our telephone visit a few days ago. . . .

Our main concern is with the fact that too many of our boys and girls are sitting and looking at too few being physically active.

This means a challenge to the adults in our society to provide the opportunity for youth for safe play and recreation, which is just as

important for their development as food and sleep. * * *

Since I spoke to you, I have been to two very important meetings, one in Indianapolis at the 42d annual convention of the National Association of Secondary School Principals and one in Kentucky at a governor's conference on youth fitness.

As the high-school principals are the ones who formulate policies for the use of activity areas in their establishments, I was very pleased with their positive reaction to the suggestion that indoor and outdoor school facilities should be available for community use.

In Kentucky, the Governor is setting up what has taken place in many States already, a State-wide youth fitness committee and on the campus of the University of Kentucky itself a youth fitness committee of the students is being formed. This kind of leadership will have a very salutary effect upon what is done in other schools and localities throughout the State. * * *

It is indeed a tough task to change the pattern of living but that is what will have to be done if we are to stop the trend of human softness, and this kind of fitness must come up from below and not down from above.

Very cordially yours,

SHANE MACCARTHY.

During our long-distance visit, Mr. McCarthy contended that the major athletic organizations in this country, like the Amateur Athletic Union are not doing the complete job on physical fitness.

This prompted a query as to wherein the Council thought these groups had been remiss and if such was the case, wasn't it correct to look to the Council to set up the proper program.

He said the Council wanted to avoid "body cultism" and the "manufacture of little champions." It didn't want anything like the Hitler youth movement or to imitate the Russians in their ambition to win the Olympics.

It is quite evident from these letters and conversation that the Council does not plan to offer to the Nation, (1) a master fitness program, (2) financial assistance to parents or community sponsors.

These were the points we had raised in our column which Congressman F. EDWARD HÉBERT inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. NIXON says "the limited budget of the Council meets with the approval of the Congress and the taxpayer."

Since we have no knowledge of what the budget represents in money, we don't know the cost to the taxpayer. However, we cannot agree with Mr. NIXON that the Congress would not approve a budget sufficient to support a master program. The Congress doesn't appear to have any limit on budgets for projects of less importance.

And whether or not the fitness program is Federal, State, or community financed, the taxpayer will bear the burden.

We doubt the average taxpayer would object to the Government spending some money on his sons and daughters to make them as physically fit as the children in Europe to whom we have given so freely of our bounty.

You will recall it was a report by a group of physical education experts on the comparative fitness of our boys and girls and those of Europe, that prompted President Eisenhower to set up the Fitness Council.

But if the Council's philosophy is against a master Federal program, we fear it will fail in its objective. There actually is little if anything in any of the fitness do-it-yourself pamphlets that hasn't already been written or said, over and again, year in and out.

Mr. McCarthy undoubtedly is a sincere and dedicated man, but he can tour the Nation, and talk and write about physical

fitness hour after hour but without a master Federal program his will be a voice crying in the wilderness.

Tax Revision Is Needed Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 17, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 13, 1958, I had a special order of 1 hour which I utilized to discuss our present economic situation. In replying to one of my colleagues who had asked me to yield to him for a comment and a question, I made the statement that if I had to lay the blame for our present recession on any one thing I would lay it on our Federal tax structure. Indeed, in my opinion, so much is the Federal tax structure at fault that this recession could properly be called a tax recession. It is for this reason that I stressed the importance of analyzing the present recession in economic terms and moving ahead in revising our tax code to remove the impediments to economic stability and growth which lie imbedded in it.

We do not have to have tax reduction to correct this recession but we do have to have tax revision—we have to remove its basic inequities and the impediments to economic growth. To do this it would help if we could have the demagogues agree to a moratorium on their pursuit of their activities in this area because taxes are complicated; they do involve rich people and corporations. Tax revisions in personal income-tax laws which affect all people affect rich people 91 percent and most taxpayers at only 20 percent. Of course, my revision across the board is going to reflect the present graduated rates in our tax laws.

If we do not have tax revision—and basic revision soon—we are going to have to rely more heavily each year on the most inequitable and damaging form of taxation ever devised—the tax of inflation. This will ultimately destroy our economy and the private enterprise system, which is responsible for our society attaining the highest standard of living of any contemporary society or any society in history. Inflation is a tax, let no one ever forget it. It transfers purchasing power from the private sector of the economy to the Government. It takes its toll from every person who buys a loaf of bread, a shirt for his back or hires a room to ward off the weather. It is a general consumers tax. It is a graduated tax, but graduated inversely to the ability to pay. The person who has to use all his dollars for consumer dollars, because he does not have much money is hit 100 percent by the tax. The richer the person is the less he is hit by inflation. The more money he has the more he can put into investment and less proportionately into consumption. The investment dollar avoids the tax of inflation and indeed can be used to gain from

the tax. The tax of inflation, because it is graduated, inversely makes the rich richer and the poor poorer. More tragic, it makes the unscrupulous rich richer and those who are rich through an intelligent social use of their talents poorer.

I was reviewing the supplemental views I have written to the report of the Report of the Joint Economic Committee on the President's Economic Report of the years 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958. I set them out here because they lend emphasis to the points I have been trying to make. I find that little has happened in the ensuing years which alters the basic theme:

1955

I concur in the committee report. However, I feel a supplemental statement is needed to clarify a few points in the report and point up certain additional economic factors which I believe are basic to our present-day economy. Inasmuch as whatever supplemental views have been expressed by my colleagues were neither submitted to the committee nor myself, I have no comments to make on them.

1. The committee report discusses a decline in farm income. The matter of immediate concern to our people is per capita farm income, not total farm income as long as farm production continues to rise and meet the demands of our population. Per capita farm income has increased in the past few months and seems to be rising. Farm population is continuing to decline which lies at the base of the foregoing economic fact. Of course, in a proper appraisal of the economics of our society the ratio of farm income to national income is an important factor. However, the ratio has been declining since pre-Revolutionary days as our society has continued to industrialize. I believe we can expect the ratio to continue to decline. What is of immediate concern, however, is the fact that per capita farm income has not been rising to the same extent that per capita national income has.

2. I believe the overall tax rate in our society has gone beyond the point of diminishing return and even with the recent tax reductions and revisions the normal growth of our economy is being restricted. The statements of governmental witnesses and economists appearing before the joint committee as well as the Ways and Means Committee, seem to indicate an obliviousness to the possibility that the retention of high tax rates is not only causing economic damage but is likewise defeating the professed objective of obtaining necessary revenues.

3. I believe it is important to emphasize that inflation is a form of taxation, indirect and hidden. It is a tax upon the consumer with no exemptions or graduations. Continued deficit financing means a continuation of this form of taxation which I believe proper study will reveal is the form potentially most dangerous and damaging to any society. This form of tax should and can be eliminated at once.

4. Tax take can be increased even though rates are decreased by expanding the tax base. In 1929 the ratio of private capital investment to governmental capital investment was 9 to 1. By 1952 this ratio had declined to less than 5 to 1.¹ Essentially private capital investment is the tax base of a society. By switching human endeavor from Government capitalization to private capitalization the following things are accomplished:

1. Government capitalization (debt) is reduced.
2. The tax base is increased.

¹ Conclusions based upon Facts and Figures on Government Financing, 1953-54, by the Tax Foundation, table 16, estimated national wealth in current 1929 dollars.

3. Competition is substituted for governmental cost accounting and appropriation procedures as a method of controlling efficiency and administration to social needs.

4. The personnel is returned to the free-labor market where the rights to organize and bargain collectively are regained.

5. The personnel operates under a system more suited to efficient production in that it is freed from the restrictive features of civil service made necessary to protect against the greater evils of spoils politics.

6. Federal expenditures are reduced (so substantially that the budget can be balanced).

This indicates that greater efforts should be made to move Government out of, and to keep Government from moving into, all human endeavors except those which by analysis and reappraisal require governmental operation.

5. The rise in the stock market comes directly from our tax structure. For several years corporation expansions have been financed more and more from bank borrowings and bonds and less and less from new stock issues—equity financing. In fact, many corporations have called in capital stock pro rata and refinanced through bonds or bank borrowing. The reason for this action by corporate management is as follows: Earnings on bond or note financing escapes the 52-percent corporate income tax while earnings from equity financing pay the 52-percent tax. The stockholder in the higher income brackets prefers to have equity investment in a corporation that expands through bond and note financing because added to the normal growth of the company is the savings of the 52-percent corporate tax. His equity investment reflects this growth in terms of capital gain which is taxed at only 25 percent instead of a maximum of 87 percent. The higher income bracket taxpayer, furthermore, does not need regular dividends for income to take care of his consuming needs, and prefers the corporation to plow back earnings, thus escaping the maximum 87-percent tax and paying only a 25-percent tax when he takes his capital gain.

Thus corporations have been increasing in wealth while their equity investment base remains the same or has been lessened. So the supply of available equity investment has not kept pace with demand, particularly when threats of further inflation increase the normal demand. (Equity investment along with investment in real and personal property alone escapes the tax of inflation.) The individual stock shares which represent a given percentage of the equity value of the corporate assets have indeed increased in real value. To a large extent the stock market is reflecting an appreciation on the part of the investing public of the real values of the equity shares. But it is the higher income bracket taxpayer who can afford to compete in the market for the limited supply of equity capital.

It was to check this trend that the tax dividend credit was included in the recent tax revision bill. It was the reasoning of the Ways and Means Committee that the tax incentive to corporate management to finance through bonds and notes instead of equity investment had to be lessened. The original thought was to do the equalizing at the corporate level, but in considering the mechanics required, the similarity to the retained earnings tax became apparent and the unhappy experience with the economic effects of this tax suggested applying the equalization at the stockholder level. Certainly corporate management would prefer equity financing to debt financing if the tax treatments were somewhat equalized, because in event of poor business conditions dividend declarations can be passed up, while payment of debt interest could not. From a Federal revenue standpoint, it is ob-

vious if more corporation financing is done through stock issue instead of bonds and notes, the Federal tax take will be greater even after deducting the loss from the tax dividend credit, e. g., \$1 billion 6-percent bond issue yields \$60 million annual earnings, which is deducted from the 52-percent tax. The same \$1 billion financed through stock issue yield \$31.2 million in revenue.

The only question is whether the tax dividend credit has been sufficient incentive to corporate management to finance through new stock issues. Certainly the demagoguery on this complicated and difficult matter has badly hurt an intelligent understanding of it by the people and their representatives in Congress. As is frequently the case, the demagog hurts the most the very people he professes to be helping.

More equity financing produces (1) healthier corporation financial structures, (2) more revenue for the Government, (3) more inflation tax-free investment for more people. (In simple language, the little fellow has a fairer chance to invest in good common stock.)

6. Today very little machinery and equipment—or buildings—wear out. Most are junked because of obsolescence. This is a present day and brandnew economic fact and deserves basic consideration in present-day economic thinking. The subjects of technological improvements and automation are allied subjects but they are old economic forces and not the same as obsolescence. The new provisions in regard to depreciation in the recent tax revision bill reflect some thinking on this matter but more study and understanding are needed. Again demagoguery has badly hurt public understanding of the economic implications of this problem.

1956

Essentially we concur in the report of the committee. There are certain overtones in the report resulting from literary style perhaps, but nonetheless serious in their implications, which we feel must be clarified so that our concurrence in the report will not be misunderstood. Furthermore, there is, in our judgment, a completely inadequate treatment of the farm problem from the standpoint of economics.

The preamble of the report carries with it an assumption that the Employment Act has been accepted and its worth established. However, there still remains a basic disagreement as to just what the purposes of the Employment Act were and are. This involves the very philosophy of government. There are those who feel that the role of the Federal Government in maintaining maximum employment in our economy should be a more active one; there are those who do not believe that the Federal Government or any political government over a long period can maintain an active role without thereby damaging the economy and maximum employment; there are those who take intermediate positions. The Employment Act does not attempt to resolve these differences and remains, as we see it, merely a means of establishing machinery whereby both the executive and the legislative branches of Government may make studies and consider economic advice along certain broad lines.

The President's Economic Report both this year and last year stresses throughout the importance of maintaining a proper balance between private enterprise, the Federal Government, and the State and local governments. The President's Economic Reports clearly state that the primary emphasis must be placed upon private enterprise and that the Federal Government must be essentially in an ancillary role. There are those who disagree in varying degrees in both directions. This matter should be brought out clearly in the committee's report, and sidestepping of this basic issue

should cease. We of the Joint Economic Committee have an obligation to clarify what appears to us to be the apparent intent of Congress in these respects. We believe the history and facts incident to the enactment of the Employment Act of 1946 clearly emphasize the conclusions reached by the President—that the primary emphasis must be placed upon private enterprise, and that the obligation of the Federal Government should be to constantly strive to create economic atmospheres in which private enterprise can accomplish the full purposes of the act.

The committee report, on several occasions, refers to the President's Economic Report and the President's budget as if they were together the basis of this committee's study. The point is raised that some felt the budget and the Economic Report were not consistent. The fact that the two Presidential documents are prepared to do two entirely different things is not mentioned, although that fact was clearly pointed up when the question of consistency was first raised. Naturally, the budget has relation to the Economic Report, but if this committee is maintaining that there is a hard and fast relationship between the two, we think it is incumbent upon this committee to make a thorough study of such a thesis instead of trying to dispose of the matter by presumption. This is an area worthy of study and we hope the committee will undertake it, along with a study of another presumption inserted into the report, to wit:

"An obligation rests upon the Council of Economic Advisers to take the leadership in efforts to coordinate the assumptions underlying the Government's entire economic program, etc."

Frankly, we don't know how the committee arrived at such a feeling; it was never examined or discussed in either public or executive hearings.

We want to call attention to an example of verbiage which carries overtones that may convey meanings beyond what the sentences were intended to convey. Recommendation 3 starts:

"The challenge of the coming year is thus one of adjusting to a more sustainable pattern of balanced growth."

Perhaps the pattern of balanced growth is not sustainable, but this is a matter to be openly posed rather than presented as something already concluded and agreed upon as the insertion of the adverb "more" accomplishes.

THE FARM ECONOMY

More words are expended in recommendation 8 on the farm economy than on any other recommendation. Yet the basic economic factors involved in the farm industry are not even posed, let alone discussed. We list a few which certainly must be considered in an analysis of the farm problem.

1. The ratio of farm income to national income has been declining since the establishment of our Republic in 1789, as our society has continued to industrialize. Looking ahead to the future, we may assume that this ratio will continue to decline if our country continues to industrialize.

2. The ratio of farm population to national population has continued to decline also as the Nation has industrialized. It may be assumed that this ratio will continue to decline, if our country continues to industrialize.

3. Farm production has continued to rise. This is largely the result of mechanization, use of fertilizer, botanical research, etc. It appears that this, too, is a continuing trend.

4. Factories have moved into rural areas. The distributive industries have expanded as the demands of the people for service, packaging treatment, etc., have increased. All this has opened up part-time employment to the farm family. Today about one-third of

the farm family's income comes from non-agricultural pursuits. What about this trend? Will it continue? What is its significance in the farm economy?

5. World War II brought unusual demands upon American agricultural production. The American farmer met those demands by increasing his acreage and acquiring the necessary machinery and increasing other overhead to utilize this increased acreage. The increased demand of World War II disappeared as the rest of the world went back to agricultural production. The American farm production was not geared to this lowered demand. Consequently, surpluses developed.

6. Increased efficiency in manufacture brings with it lower unit cost, which in turn, if the laws of economics are operating, will be reflected in some lower cost per unit to the consumer. The same law operates in some degree in regard to efficiency in farm production resulting from mechanization. This situation is accentuated if supply is already well ahead of demand.

7. Although the per capita farm income (the standard of living of the farmer) has been decreasing since 1951, the great rises experienced during World War II have still left the percentage increase in per capita income of the farmer in 1955 (from 1934, the date figures are first available) considerably above the national per capita income increases.

8. Mechanization and increased overhead place a premium on larger operations at the expense of smaller operations.

9. The prices of farmlands (the basic investment of the farmer) are the highest in history.

10. Farm foreclosures are about the lowest in history.

Now we do have a farm problem, but it is hardly in the area that most recent political discussion has been placing it. It must be within the confines of the economics factors we have set out, plus some others. We believe this committee would serve the farmers much better by taking the farm problem out of politics and placing it back into economics, at least until agreement is reached upon the economic factors. Then it can be referred back to the political area with some possibilities of solution; certainly with greater assurance that it won't be made worse by failing to pay attention to the few reliable economic facts we do have.

1957

We feel impelled to make an addendum to this report. We cannot understand the failure of the President's Economic Report or of this committee's report to analyze the economic features of the tight money situation which lies behind the present cost rise we are experiencing and other economic difficulties alluded to in the two reports. Practically every witness who testified on this matter before the committee agreed that behind the tight-money situation lay the shortage of investment capital for all business, not just small business.

Shortages are created by the play of the forces of supply and demand. The shortage of investment capital comes from an increased demand that is greatly in excess of the increased supply.

Several factors lie behind the increased demand for capital investment: (1) The increasing population; (2) the increasing productivity which requires an increasing amount of capital investment in machinery. Estimates were made before our Tax Policy Subcommittee in its hearings in December 1955 that it required an average of \$14,000 of capital investment to employ one man in the United States today. Undoubtedly that investment figure rises as productivity (automation) increases; (3) the increasing living standards of our people (increased supply of consumer dollars); (4) the effects of inflation on replacement of capital plant

and equipment. Under our tax laws depreciation is limited to the cost of the capital item. Most of the United States production plant is on the books at the 1940 dollar cost. After 10 years of inflation the capital items are being replaced at a growing rate. The replacements even for identical items require twice the dollar reserves set aside for replacement. So, just to stand still, let alone move ahead, in capital plant, we need additional investment dollars; (5) the high level of Federal Government's expenditures.

Several factors lie behind the lower rate of increase of the investment dollars available to meet the higher rate of increase of demand. (1) The high rate of Federal taxation which takes away potential savings; (2) the emphasis in the Federal tax structure on the taxation of the investment dollar as opposed to the consumer dollar; (3) the psychology of the people toward saving, as it is affected by Government fiscal and expenditure policies; (4) the various channels available to the investment dollar as affected by inflation and by our Federal tax structure. To illustrate, inflation, as a form of taxation, cut into savings channeled into investments with the fixed dollar sign such as savings accounts, bonds, notes, etc. Yet these forms of investment are given great preference over equity investment by our tax structure if the equity investor must realize a yearly increment on his investment. But the same tax structure gives a great preference to equity investment over fixed investment if the investor does not need yearly income; and even a greater preference to an investor who is content to pass his wealth on to his heirs. Our tax structure, in fact, encourages this preferred type of investor to desire to limit the availability of equity investment. (In simple words, our tax structure is a great deterrent to savings and capital accumulation and particularly to new equity investment.) (5) Our tax structure is a deterrent upon corporate savings, particularly on small corporations and small businesses not operating under the corporate form of doing business.

We have been disappointed that neither the President's report nor the committee's report spell out the evil economic effects of inflation, although in the appraisal of our economic condition in the President's report many factors are mentioned which upon analysis result largely from the inflation of World War II. We have mentioned the effect of inflation on such things as capital replacement. The difficulty experienced by school districts and other local taxing authorities in obtaining the revenue necessary to meet the needs of its citizenry, is the result largely of inflation. The situation is this: Our school districts and local taxing authorities get the bulk of their revenue from real-estate taxes. Real-estate taxes are based upon assessed valuations of the peoples' homes, buildings, and lands. These valuations are placed upon the assessor's books over a period of time. The bulk of the assessments on the books of our communities was placed there before 1945, before inflation. The result is that the total assessed valuation in most communities is based upon the preinflated dollar, but the costs of materials and labor which these communities must buy is based upon the inflated dollar. The situation cannot be corrected by raising the real-estate tax rate, because then even a more unfair burden (it is pretty unfair as it is) is placed upon the new property coming onto the books after 1945 at the inflated dollar value. The only answer is to go through the mechanics of assessing every piece of real estate all over again. This is not only a difficult mechanical job, but it is an even more difficult political job.

Certain overtones remain in the committee report though we have been gratified to have many that were in the original draft eliminated or muted, which carry the thought

that somehow or other the Federal Government can plan and direct our economy. We are convinced that the best the Federal Government can do today is to preserve the climate under which our private enterprise system can thrive. Perhaps someday men will be wise enough to move into the unknown through a system other than an enlightened trial and error system. But that day has not yet arrived. In essence, the private enterprise system is no more than a trial and error system although many people seem not to appreciate it.

1958

In light of the extensive public and political discussion of the present economic decline it was especially important that this Committee on Economics attempt to define the present economic downturn in economic terms in this report. I regret that this was not done.

No two periods of economic decline are identical, yet much can be learned by comparison. Certainly the specific factors that go to make up a particular decline should be set forth. I suggest a few that seem to underlie the present phenomena: (1) The sudden sharp cutback of inventory in the fourth quarter of 1957, (2) the cutback in certain types of defense expenditure such as was occasioned by the shift of emphasis from airplanes to guided missiles, (3) the decline in expansion and replacement of capital plant expenditures, (4) the continued low level of automobile production, (5) the decline in exports.

And just as important to point up are the features of strength; e. g., (1) the maintenance of the high level of consumer purchasing, (2) the increased expenditures in research and development, (3) the resurgence of defense expenditures, (4) the increase in expenditures for the highway program, (5) the upturn of housing starts, (6) the relative high rate of capital plant replacement in spite of the decline from the high level of 1957, (7) the easing of tight money.

In view of the use of noneconomic terms and the abuse of economic terms in the public discussions describing the present phenomena, which can be called a recession if the overtone of "mildness" was understood by the public, it might be well to make a general comparison with the economic phenomena which occurred in 1949 and 1954. Both of these were recessions. Many competent economists agree that the present recession is probably more severe than that of 1954 and less severe than that of 1949. This knowledge should give us a little more perspective and keep us from rushing into programs which will not help us, but indeed can hurt us. Essentially, it should make us realize that the economy itself will adjust and that, at most, governmental action should be geared to assisting rather than hampering this adjustment.

In concurring in recommendation No. 1 on monetary policy, I want to refer to the warnings we were given by some of the expert witnesses that inflationary forces are still close to the surface and an injudicious use of monetary action may swing things too far.

I concur in recommendation No. 2 but I am disturbed by the implications which may be drawn from it by a careless reading. The report dated January 22, 1958, of the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy based upon the hearings on the subject, Federal Expenditure Policies for Economic Growth and Stability, should be read in order to obtain a better understanding of the limitations that public-works programs have in assisting growth and stability and easing a recession. Only public works already in the advanced planning stage can be of immediate assistance in the present recession. Furthermore, as already stated, Federal expenditures according

to plan were to accelerate in 1958 and this acceleration is coming about.

The suggestion that the Federal Government should extend the public assistance grants and the unemployment compensation

program involves questions of Federal-State relationship, matters of policy, and many technical difficulties which are the proper province of the legislative committees which have jurisdiction over these matters. If a

quick cushion against the decline in income is needed, it will hardly be found in this complicated area. On this basis I disagree with the inclusion of this suggestion in the report.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 18, 1958

(Legislative day of Monday, March 17, 1958)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Gracious Father of our spirits, beyond all the madness of these violent days which devastates the face of our discordant earth, we turn to Thee, who sittest above the floods of hate and misunderstanding, and in whose just balances the nations are weighed. Lift us out of our doubt and pessimism by a great faith to live by and great causes to live for. Teach us once again the everlasting mystery that only as we lose ourselves in some compelling concern that captures all our powers, can we find our highest selves.

In this darkened era, as we face foes who deny spiritual verities and who deal in distortion and falsehood, open our eyes to the conquering truth that the omnipotent forces which fight with us when we keep step with the drumbeat of Thy purpose for all mankind are more—ininitely more—than those arrayed against us. We ask in the Redeemer's name. 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 17, 1958, was dispensed with.

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 and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 7149. An act to provide for the periodic transfer to the Hawaiian home-development fund of certain excess funds in the Hawaiian home administration account;

H. R. 7226. An act to clarify the application of navigation rules for the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9410. An act to authorize and direct the transfer and conveyance of certain property in the Virgin Islands to the government of the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 9502. An act to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended;

H. R. 9543. An act to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act relating to the transfer of the title of ceded land by the President;

H. R. 10009. An act to provide for the reconveyance of certain surplus real property to Newago, Mich.;

H. R. 10347. An act to amend section 73 (q) of the Hawaiian Organic Act; to approve and ratify joint resolution 32, session laws of

Hawaii, 1957, authorizing the issuance of \$14 million in aviation revenue bonds; to authorize certain land exchanges at Honolulu, Oahu, T. H., for the development of the Honolulu airport complex; and for other purposes;

H. R. 10679. An act to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 427. Joint resolution to permit use of certain real property in Kerr County, Tex., for recreational purposes without causing such property to revert to the United States.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

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

S. 2042. An act to authorize the conveyance of a fee simple title to certain lands in the Territory of Alaska underlying war housing project Alaska-50083, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3486. An act to provide that the Uniform Simultaneous Death Act shall apply to the District of Columbia;

H. R. 7696. An act to authorize certain persons to wear the uniform of a Reserve Officers' Training Corps;

H. R. 8250. An act to authorize the establishment of the Petrified Forest National Park in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes;

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. 10242. An act to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Chicago International Fair and Exposition, to be held in July 1959 at Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 439. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Seventh International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

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

H. R. 7149. An act to provide for the periodic transfer to the Hawaiian home-development fund of certain excess funds in the Hawaiian home administration account;

H. R. 9410. An act to authorize and direct the transfer and conveyance of certain property in the Virgin Islands to the government of the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 9502. An act to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended;

H. R. 9543. An act to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act relating to the transfer of the title of ceded land by the President; and

H. R. 10347. An act to amend section 73 (q) of the Hawaiian Organic Act; to approve and ratify joint resolution 32, session laws of Hawaii, 1957, authorizing the issuance of \$14 million in aviation revenue bonds; to authorize certain land exchanges at Honolulu, Oahu, T. H., for the development of the Honolulu airport complex; and for other purposes;

to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10009. An act to provide for the reconveyance of certain surplus real property to Newago, Mich.; and

H. J. Res. 427. Joint resolution to permit use of certain real property in Kerr County, Tex., for recreational purposes without causing such property to revert to the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 10679. An act to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. IVES, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GOLDWATER was excused, because of illness, from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the week.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. AIKEN, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Reclamation and Irrigation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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 REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

One hundred and sixty-four postmaster nominations.

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

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John G. Kissane, of Vermont, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 2, with headquarters at St. Albans, Vt.

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

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Anne A. Mitchell, of Connecticut, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 6, with headquarters at Bridgeport, Conn.