New Jersey: College of St. Elizabeth; Douglass University; Drew University; Fairleigh-Dickinson College; Jersey City Junior College; Jersey City State College; Monmouth College; Rutgers University; Rutgers Graduate Council; Rutgers South Jersey; Montclair State College; Trenton State College; Seton Hall University; St. Peter's College; Newark State College; Upsala College; Newark College of Engineering.

New York State: Alfred Agricultural & Technical Institute (of State University); Alfred University; Bard College; Canisius College; Clarkson Institute; College of St. Rose; Cornell University; D'Youville College; Erie County Technical Institute; Harpur College; Hartwick College; LeMoyne College; Niagara University; Oneonta State Teachers College; Orange County Community College; Rochester Institute of Technology; Rosary Hill College; State Teachers College, Buffalo; State Teachers College, Cortland; State Teachers College, Fredonia; State Teachers College, New Paltz; State Teachers College, Plattsburgh; State Teachers College, Potsdam; Union College; University of Buffalo; University of Rochester; University of Rochester, School of Nursing; Vassar College; Ithaca College.

Ohio-Indiana: Antioch College; Ashland College; College of Wooster; Defiance College; Denison University; DePauw University; Fenn College; Fenn College, evening session; Indiana University; John Carrol University; Muskinggum College; Oberlin College; Ohio State University; Otterbein College; St. Mary's College; Taylor University; University of Notre Dame; Ursuline College; Western College for Women; Wilberforce University; Wilmington College; Youngstown University.

Pennsylvania-West Virginia: Alderson-Broaddus College; Allegheny College; Alliance College; Beaver College; Bethany College; Bryn Mawr College; Cedar Crest College; Chatham College; Chestnut Hill College; Dickinson College; Drexel Institute of Technology; Gannon College; Grove City College; Hershey Junior College; Immaculata College; Juniata College; Lincoln University; Lycoming College; Mercyhurst Colledge; Mount Mercy College; Philadelphia Textile Institute; Rosemont College; St. Francis College; Seton Hill College; Sheppard College; Swarthmore College; Temple University; University of Pennsylvania, Woman's Student Government; West Virginia University; West Virginia Wesleyan College; Villa Maria College; Harcum Junior College; Waynesburg College; St. Joseph's College; Moravian College; Muhlenberg College.

Rocky Mountain: Colorado State College (of Education); Colorado Women's College; Loretto Heights College; Regis College; University of Colorado; University of New Mexico.

Utah: Brigham Young University; College of Southern Utah (of Utah State University); University of Utah; Utah State University; Weber College.

SENATE

MONDAY, AUGUST 24, 1959

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of the Ages, whose help we seek for today's duties, it undergirds us with confidence to know that through every scene life brings, Thou seekest us with patient, haunting pursuit.

When in some great hour of fulfillment of heart's desire we have been moved to kneel and pray and offer thanks, or when some fond hope has lain buried and then from the dust an unseen hand has set us upon our feet again, we have found, O Thou God of our salvation, that Thou hast been closer than breathing and that Thy spirit with ours can meet.

At the beginning of another week confront us with the solemn reality that in the last resort everything depends on the faith that our own life with all its difficulties and problems and hard self-denials has a place in the final mosaic of Thy great plan and that even in the experiences that hurt most Love Almighty is in control and there is a hand that guides.

We ask it 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 Friday, August 21, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on August 21, 1959, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 746. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the placing of children in family homes, and for other purposes," approved April 22, 1944, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1371. An act to repeal the act approved March 3, 1897, and to amend the act approved December 20, 1944, relating to fees for transcripts of certain records in the District of Columbia;

S. 1407. An act for the relief of Mrs. John M. Cica;

S. 1442. An act for the relief of Kim Fukata and her minor child, Michael (Chaney);

S. 1500. An act for the relief of Yee You Gee;

S. 1533. An act for the relief of Ho Rim Yoon Holsman;

S. 1558. An act for the relief of Theopi Englezos;

S. 1601. An act for the relief of Mrs. Erika Elfriede Ida Ward;

S. 1611. An act for the relief of Adeodato Francesco Piazza Nicolai;

S. 1669. An act for the relief of Evagelia Elliopulos;

S. 1705. An act for the relief of Ivan (John) Persic;

S. 1719. An act for the relief of Lushmon S. Grewal, Jeat S. Grewal, Gurmale S. Grewal, and Tahil S. Grewal;

S. 1773. An act for the relief of Alan Alfred Coleman; and

S. 1829. An act for the relief of Herman Luchner.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

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

S. 900. An act to amend section 204(b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend the authority of the Administrator of General Services to pay direct expenses in connection with the utilization of excess real property and related personalty, and for other purposes;

H.R. 271. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide a further period for presuming service connection in the case of veterans suffering from Hansen's disease (leprosy);

H.R. 4329. An act to provide for the conveyance to any public or private organization of the State of Virginia of certain dwellings acquired in connection with the Chantilly Airport site, Virginia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6288. An act to establish a National Medal of Science to provide recognition for individuals who make outstanding contributions in the physical, biological, mathematical, and engineering sciences;

H.R. 7106. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, with respect to forfeiture of benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration;

H.R. 7978. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 115. Joint resolution to reserve a site in the District of Columbia for the erection of a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to provide for a competition for the design of such memorial, and to provide additional funds for holding the competition.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

TRANSACTION OF CONGRESSIONAL BUSINESS AND THE CONGRESSIONAL ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am not overly concerned about the question when the Congress is going to adjourn, although that seems to occupy the attention of so many commentators. The Members of Congress will go home, I think, when they have completed the work which has to be done.

Congress does not assemble in Washington just to make plans for going home. We assemble to transact the pub-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

lic business; and there is no reason for us to go home until we have finished our job.

I think there has been much too much speculation about the factors that are supposed to send us home. I do not believe that the mere fact that the President of the United States has invited a guest to visit him is any reason for Members of Congress to pack their bags and leave the Capital.

Yesterday I saw a Gallup poll which demonstrated that the country has a deep and abiding confidence in the ability and the good will of the majority party in the Congress. According to the poll figures, the Democratic Congress enjoys the confidence of the country.

The Democratic Congress enjoys the confidence of the country because we have applied ourselves to the tasks before us, and I believe we shall continue to do so.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the Gallup poll, as published in the New York Herald Tribune of August 23.

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

DEMOCRATS STILL LEADING IN BASIC PARTY STRENGTH

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N.J., August 22.—Largely because of an argument that they first drove home to voters more than 20 years ago, the Democrats today continue to run well ahead of the Republicans in terms of basic party strength.

The latest reading on the Gallup poll's regular congressional barometer shows the Democrats with the following lead:

Congressional barometer, August 1959

	Percent
Democrats	59
Republicans	41

It is one of the ironies of modern politics that, with personal incomes at a record high, and the forthcoming Khrushchev visit generally viewed as easing cold war tension, the Republicans find themselves in about as weak a position with the Nation's voters as they have ever been.

VOTE OF 1936 RECALLED

Even in 1936, when President Roosevelt swept to a landslide victory, the Republican share of the congressional vote was no lower than it is today.

The present confidence in the Democrats stems from a belief, heard time and time again by Gallup poll reporters working on this assignment, which goes back to those early New Deal days:

"The Democrats are more for the common people."

If today's political situation is unprecedented, it should be remembered that it occurs in virtually unprecedented times.

Since he first took office in 1953, President Eisenhower has enjoyed a high degree of personal popularity with voters. On the average, his standing with the electorate has been considerably above the average recorded by the Gallup poll for his predecessor, President Truman.

ONE VICTORY IN 30 YEARS

Yet since 1954 the Republicans have failed to win control of Congress—not even in 1956 when Eisenhower scored a major personal triumph.

In point of fact, the Republican Party has scored only one convincing party victory in the last 30 years. That was in 1946, when Republican congressional candidates won 54.3 percent of the vote and controlled the House of Representatives by a 58-seat margin.

(In 1952, Republicans won a slim eight-seat margin in the House while polling less than a majority of the popular vote. In 1942, they polled a majority of the popular vote, but failed to gain control of Congress.)

NOT MANY CONVERTS

The reasons for the current situation are twofold.

1. On the one hand, the Republican Party has failed to make many new converts to Republicanism over the last three decades. Their current showing in the solidly Democratic South, for example, is about what it was in 1930 and 1932.

And, as indicated in Gallup poll surveys, they trail the Democrats on a self-interest barometer among such groups as manual workers, Negroes, and Catholics—all groups which voted heavily Democratic for Congress in the early 1930's and were still doing so in last fall's election.

2. Accompanying this lack of conversion to Republicanism have been sharp inroads by the Democrats in areas and groups which have been traditionally Republican and thus key to Republican victories in the past.

In the Midwest, for example, the Republican Party's current strength is at an all-time low point. A heavy Republican majority in this 12-State area has traditionally offset the Democrats' Southern advantage.

ALLEGIANCES LOST

In addition, studies of voter confidence show that the Republicans are losing the allegiance of such historically Republican groups as the business and professional people and white-collar workers.

A third factor is also at work today—one dealing more specifically with the political situation over the last few years.

With a President of one party and Congress controlled by another since 1954, the voters have, in a sense, deprived themselves of the inalienable political right to throw the rascals out.

This type of sentiment was clearly at work, surveys show, in the Republicans' 1946 congressional election—with the voters wanting the Democratic rascals out of office.

In sum, it is important to remember that the one convincing Republican victory in the past three decades came primarily because of a negative voter reaction to the "ins," and not because of voters being sold on basic Republican philosophies.

THE 50TH STATE—WELCOME TO THE SENATORS FROM HAWAII

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is a deep pleasure to welcome two new Senators to the U.S. Senate. It is an occasion of great historic significance. Today, we are doing more than merely adding a new star to the flag and a new State to the Union. We are reaching out to build a bridge of friendship spanning the Pacific. The people of Hawaii have more than demonstrated their right to assume their new responsibilities. They have served America in war and in peace. They have contributed both to our defense and to our prosperity. I know that when we shall have completed a quorum call this morning, all my colleagues in the Senate will join me in extending a warm greeting to the two gentlemen whom the people of Hawaii have sent here to represent them in the U.S. Senate, and, through them, to the people who have placed the 50th star in our flag.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I join the majority leader in extending the hand of welcome to our distinguished new colleagues who are about to take the oath. I am glad they will grace this body, representing a State not contiguous to the mainland, but far distant.

I suppose in earlier days, and perhaps in the days of the Founding Fathers, they never thought particularly of a State that was not contiguous to the mainland, to the continental area of this country. We live in a new age. Time moves swiftly. There are new problems, new challenges, in the world. And so we extend our domain, and are delighted, then, that a new State is born, and that the 50th star has been added to the flag.

I shall be proud to present our distinguished Republican Senator-elect from Hawaii as soon as we are ready for the swearing-in ceremony.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is a great pleasure for me to join in welcoming our two new colleagues from Hawaii.

During the Easter recess this year, it was my honor to make a series of addresses in our newest State, then in its last days as a Territory. From Kaui to the Big Island, on Oahu and on Maui, I found a population tremendously alive to the new responsibilities which come with statehood, tremendously interested in public affairs, and joyous in its new status as a full-fledged partner in American democracy.

Hawaii, as we all know, is a beautiful and exotic place, and I would certainly urge my colleagues, most earnestly, to include it in their vacation plans whenever they are able to do so.

Even more important, however, is Hawaii's role as the American bridge to the Far East, and as an example—for each one of us to ponder well—of harmonious life together on the part of peoples with an almost infinite variety of backgrounds.

So if a malihini may use that Hawaiian word which means so much, and so many things, may I in the sense of welcome say "aloha" to Senators LONG and FONG, and extend to them the warmest greetings of the State of New York.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these remarks may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN].

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader in welcoming our two new Senators, Senator FONG and Senator LONG. I think this is a historic occasion, because we will have in the Senate for the first time an American of Chinese ancestry; we will have in the House an American of Japanese ancestry; we have in the islands themselves a Lieutenant Governor of Hawaiian ancestry.

I am sure that every Member of this body is delighted that the long overdue admission of Hawaii is finally to be culminated in the swearing in today of the

two Senators from that beautiful new State.

I believe that the Union has now been rounded. I think no better place could have been selected for this unique and historic event than the islands which comprise the State of Hawaii.

We are delighted and proud to have these new Members, and we look forward to working with both of them closely in the years ahead.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, at long last beautiful, romantic Hawaii joins the American Union, and commitments honorably made over the years by both national political parties now have been happily fulfilled. But that, after all, is the way of progress. Lasting progress is always slow but always sure.

Like you, Mr. President, I call California my home.

More than a century ago California found herself faced and plagued with almost precisely the same arguments in opposition to her request for admission to the Union that the people of the Territory of Hawaii have seen over the years lodged against them. Noncontiguity, quite a mouthful of a word, was registered in the 1840's against our State, as subsequently it was to be argued against the admission of Hawaii. California, it was loudly asseverated, had too few people, too little wealth, too many gamblers, and wild Indians.

All those arguments were overcome, and now I am glad that they have been overcome also in the case of Hawaii and that every other Member of the Senate may now welcome OREN LONG and HIRAM FONG as our colleagues and brethren in this great free parliamentary institution, the Senate of the United States.

The strength of America, her people and her Government, springs in great part on the heterogeneous character of Americans. From almost every nation and race all around the globe have come immigrants to America to seek the freedom our Constitution guarantees.

It is in the interest of the strength of the U.S. Senate that we now welcome a new Senator on the minority side of the aisle who is concrete proof that the heterogeneous Republic of ours practices what its Constitution preaches and that our sisterhood of 50 States is living proof of the dynamics of America.

I speak today as the ranking Republican Member of the Senate Territorial Subcommittee which in this Congress, and in the last Congress, fashioned the legislation by which Hawaii was brought into the Union of States. But I speak also as an American, grateful for all that American citizenship means to my family and to me, and perfectly convinced that Hawaii's statehood, like that of Alaska earlier this year, gives infinite assurance that our country will ever remain strong and free.

The name Hiram Fong is an honorable name, Mr. President. In Biblical times, King Solomon sought out Hiram of Tyre for the assistance of a worthy master craftsman to build his temple. It was another Hiram, Hiram Abif, sent there by King Hiram to use his unique and singular talents to build that magnificent temple of antiquity. Here, indeed, was an early Hiram, fashioning an edifice of unbelievable beauty, a builder in the days thousands of years ago. He helped to set the standard for later Hirams to follow. My late, great predecessor, Hiram W. Johnson, was a great American statesman during most of his lifetime.

My grandfather came to the United States, Mr. President, in the 1830's, to seek his freedom, and to live out his life in the new golden California. My late, beloved father was born in San Francisco over a century ago. As I say, Fong is an honorable name, and I think I can say that if one peruses the pages of the telephone directory in the city of San Francisco, he will find listed far more Americans named Fong than Americans named Kuchel.

So, Mr. President, I am delighted, as each of my colleagues is delighted, not only to welcome Mr. LONG from the far side of the aisle, but to welcome on this side of the aisle Mr. FONG each of whom I know will help demonstrate that the self-government we preach we also practice, that the two-party system will continue in America to be vigorous and strong, and that all of us on both sides of the aisle and in both parties are grateful for free government in the United States, as we see it practiced in these ceremonies today, and that we, all of us, rededicate ourselves to the cause of free America in a world of peace, of honor, and of justice. Welcome, my colleagues.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe this is one of the most historic incidents that has occurred in the Senate of the United States in this century. I doubt if any of us here on the floor or any of those in the gallery will live to see two Senators take their seats in this body as the representatives of a new 51st State.

Aside from that fact, Mr. President, it seems to me that this Congress should have a peculiar pride, in a bipartisan way, in having done in the field of civil rights, which is mentioned so frequently and with so many differing connotations, something that is greater and finer and more lasting than that which has been done by Congress at any earlier time in this century.

Mr. President, the bringing in of the States of Alaska and Hawaii in this year as a result of action during the last 2 years by the Congress of the United States and the Executive is something of which every person who has had a part in bringing about this wonderful moment has just cause to be proud. In a completely bipartisan way Congress, controlled by one party, has cooperated—both Houses and both sides of the aisle in each House—working together with an Executive of the other party, to admit these two new States to statehood. There is no step in the field of civil rights quite so meaningful as that of admitting to statehood great groups of new Americans, new in the sense that for the first time they can now exercise the full duties and responsibilities and privileges of citizenship in the United States of America.

Mr. President, different Senators, different people, have different understandings of what we mean by civil rights, but in my humble judgment there is nothing that we could do or could have done which compares in dignity and in lasting effect in the profound field of civil rights than the granting of statehood to these two new States whom we welcome.

Mr. President, although I have not known Senator FONG I welcome him joyously. We have all known Senator LONG, who has visited us as the Governor of Hawaii, and later as one of the chief citizens of the then Territory, in the effort to bring about statehood year after year, and we all respect and love him. We warmly welcome both the new Senators.

Mr. President, may I say as to the new State of Alaska, now our largest, replacing even the imperial State of Texas which had always been the largest theretofore, no one was warmer in welcoming Alaska to statehood than the majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas, and the junior Senator from Texas. In passing upon the statehood claims of that new and great State we were passing upon a State which confronts the Soviet Union, only a few miles—3, I believe—separating the nearest bodies of land, one a small island belonging to the State of Alaska, the other an island that forms a part of the Soviet Union.

Under no other conditions could we make a more impressive showing, Mr. President, of our deep conviction and belief in liberty and freedom, just as under no other conditions could we make a stronger showing that we practice what we preach, and that we show to our potential enemy and our greatest rival the fact that we hesitate not at all to grant fullest statehood to Alaska, notwithstanding its closeness to the Union of Soviet Republics.

In admitting Hawaii we have created a show window, where all the Orient, with its teeming millions, can see, and will see, that we practice there our belief in liberty, freedom, and democracy and in the dignity of the individual, which is so fundamental to our whole American system.

This is a joyous day for me. It is a joyous day for our Florida people. Even though we have been replaced as the southernmost State of the United States by the admission of Hawaii, it is a happy day for us, and we welcome this newest sister State.

While I speak for both Senators from Florida in welcoming Hawaii to the family of States, I have the honor to present again to the Senate of the United States our illustrious Governor, recently chairman of the national Governors' conference, and recently chairman of the southern Governors' conference, as a friend of statehood of both Alaska and Hawaii. He shares with the Senator from Florida the view that our convictions as to freedom and liberty of the individual, the greatest value we have in this Nation, should have long ago resulted in the extension of statehood to those two former Territories. Our Governor is here to take a bow for our State in welcoming the State which has just replaced us as the southernmost State

in the Union. I am proud to present Governor Collins, of Florida. [Applause.]

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I heartily applaud and share the eloquently expressed views on this occasion of the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], both of whom were such stanch and effective advocates of our statehood causes and I rise with a deep sense that we are participating in a great historic event in saluting our two colleagues from Hawaii who have just been sworn in, raising to a round and conclusive 100 the number of Senators.

I welcome my old friend, OREN LONG, whom I have known for many years—first as superintendent of public instruction of the Territory of Hawaii, then as secretary of Hawaii, and then as Governor—as well as our new colleague on the other side of the aisle, HIRAM FONG, whose reputation of having achieved an Horatio Alger type of success has preceded him. He likewise is a fellow alumnus of a distinguished university which has other graduates in this body. As one who supported the cause of Hawaiian statehood ever since my entry into the Federal service 25 years ago, when I became the first Director of the Division of Territories and Island Possessions of the Department of the Interior, I feel that this is a day of great fulfillment, not merely for the intensely patriotic Americans of Hawaii, but for our entire Nation. Hawaii has much, much to give our Nation, and through our Nation to the world.

Over 60 years ago, Hawaii came under the American flag, with every hope and desire that its Territorial status would not last long. While it has been longer than many of us hoped, all is well that ends well.

The admission of Hawaii to statehood means a great deal to the United States. It demonstrates that the United States is still young, still progressing, still dynamic, still growing both materially and spiritually, and still as deeply steeped as ever in the principles of the Founding Fathers.

As the junior Senator from Alaska—until today our youngest State—it gives me great satisfaction to relinquish my "juniority"—if I may coin this word—and to welcome warmly the two Senators from the 50th State. I wish our two colleagues every success in their new responsibilities.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the past hour has been a dramatic and historic one in the life of this great Republic. I thought the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] expressed so eloquently my own views, as I wish I were able to express them, that I shall be content to associate myself with the remarks he made with regard to the admission of Alaska and Hawaii.

The admission of these two States and the seating of the two Senators from each State constitute freedom's answer to Russian propaganda. I believe that the seating of these four Senators and their counterparts in the House of Representatives will have a great effect on American relations all over Asia, as well as in other parts of the world. By our action today, and through the action we took earlier with respect to Alaska, we have demonstrated convincingly that our people have put America's ideals of freedom into practice. As the Senator from Florida said so eloquently, I believe that by these proceedings we have given unanswerable proof that we put into practice our ideals of nondiscrimination in the administration of our free Government.

I think it is a thrilling thing that the opportunity has been ours today to participate in these ceremonies because, as the Senator from Florida pointed out in conversation with me, we probably shall never again in our lifetime see such an event. Possibly no like event will occur again in the history of the Nation itself. It has been our privilege to participate in a great symbolic occasion.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, this is indeed an occasion of vast historical importance for our Nation.

I am privileged to add my words of welcome to our new colleagues from the 50th State. I was a strong advocate of Hawaiian statehood and followed the course set by an illustrious predecessor, the late Senator Francis G. Newlands, of Nevada, who in 1898 introduced a resolution which provided for the annexation to the United States of the Hawaiian Islands.

As I said on the floor at the time Hawaii's case for statehood was being debated, I say again today: Here we have a dramatic demonstration of true and undiluted democracy.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as was so ably said by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the admission of Hawaii as a State is the fulfillment of a historic agreement. More than 100 years ago some American statesmen negotiated with the Kingdom of Hawaii, seeking to admit it as a State in the American Union. After a delay of some 40 years, the Kingdom of Hawaii had become the Republic of Hawaii. Then it took voluntary action to join the Union as a Territory, with special Territorial status.

Now, a little more than 60 years later, Hawaii has come into the Union as a full-fledged member of this sisterhood of States.

We in Texas have a peculiar feeling for Hawaii, because Texas and Hawaii are the only two States to have maintained a separate, independent existence as nations, showing that they had the power, the ability, and the know-how to maintain their independencies.

Each nation had its separate monetary system, postal system, and diplomatic corps scattered throughout the world. These two nations, by their separate existence as nations, understood their obligations as States when they entered the Union.

I think the Senator from Florida has eloquently stated the values of admitting Hawaii to statehood. But I think there are other values. Many people today say that the greatest unexplored territory lies not out among the stars, but may lie in that part of the earth which is covered by water. The science of oceanography is one of the fastest growing sciences. The mild climate of Hawaii makes it a peculiarly attractive place for study in this field. Scientists believe that in about a hundred years much of the food for man will come from the water. It is believed that it will be possible to plant crops in shallow water and harvest them as crops are harvested on the land, and that the currents and the storms will not be as severe on the crops grown in water as they are on the food grown on land.

So Hawaii is in a position to lead in the progress of the studies which are being made now in this great work. I believe Hawaii will make useful and peculiar contributions to the materials necessary for civilization because of her scientific knowledge. I am happy to be one of the representatives of her sister States to welcome Hawaii as a State in the Union.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I wish all Americans everywhere could have heard the very eloquent remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] with respect to the admission of Hawaii and Alaska as States of the Union. I wish, too, that they could have heard what the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] had to say about this. No person, either in or out of Congress, ever strived harder to bring statehood to those Territories of the West than the Senator from California or the Senator from Florida.

I observe in the Chamber now the distinguished ranking minority member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania. Mr. SAYLOR likewise is among those to be counted as a stanch supporter, advocate, and worker for statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii. Other Members of the House who come to mind as having provided great assistance are the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, and Representative LEO W. O'BRIEN, chairman of the Subcommittee on Territories of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, who did so much over the years to further this great cause.

The number of supporters has been legion. Obviously, Mr. President, that is the case, or else statehood would not now be the legal status of either Alaska or Hawaii. As the Senator from Florida has stated, this movement was carried through on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. President, I wish that the late Joe Farrington, who for so many years was the able Delegate from Hawaii, could be here to witness this great day; and I wish that the Delegate who was in the Congress at the time when statehood for Hawaii was achieved, John Burns, were now to play a more immediate active role in the government life of that island community. He did very much, indeed, to bring statehood to Hawaii; and I know that he will return to the field of government, to make the great contribution of which he is capable.

Mr. President, from the standpoint of my seniority in this great body, I would raise my voice to add to the statements already made by the other Senators who

have spoken in welcome to Mr. FONG and Mr. LONG. It is true that my seniority has been very recently attained—as a matter of fact, within the hour; but my colleague, ERNEST GRUENING, and I, gladly move aside to make room for the baby Senators.

Mr. President, speaking for myself, for many, many years, I have believed that Hawaii would be a State. I came to that belief because of testimony presented before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee when I was a member of that committee; and that belief was only strengthened when I visited the island Territory in 1954.

In Alaska and in Hawaii there is demonstrable evidence that democracy works, and works supremely well, among people of diverse racial origins.

The people of Hawaii have ever so much to give to this Union of States; and I know that their contributions will be great and magnificent. They are sterling Americans, these residents of the paradise islands of the Pacific.

Mr. President, I heard with particular interest the statement, made earlier in the day by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], that the Union is now rounded out with 50 States. My personal opinion is that that is a literal fact, and that the Union will remain at 50 States, and that the last two organized Territories have been admitted to the Union as full and equal States.

Over the years, when the struggle for statehood for the two equal Territories went on, it often was said that their admission to the Union as States would result in breaking down the barrier, and in making it possible to admit to the Union all the islands of the seas, or even countries in Europe, as States of our Union. I never took any stock in that fear, Mr. President. But, in any case, the Congress of the United States will be the judge; and no State will be admitted to the Union unless the Congress approves, and the Congress will never approve unless the Nation so demands.

Mr. President, I am indeed happy that so shortly after the Alaska Senators had the honor and the privilege of taking their oaths in this great Chamber, Mr. FONG and Mr. LONG have become the newest Members of the U.S. Senate. This is a historic day.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I would not undertake to embellish or enlarge upon the most meaningful, sincere, and eloquent expressions by the Senator from Florida, the Senator from Texas, the Senator from Oregon, and the Senators from Alaska—both Senator GRUENING and Senator BARTLETT. Of course the statements made by the two Senators from Alaska were among the best and the most impressive. They spoke with great feeling, because they know what a struggle it was for Alaska to be admitted to the Union.

I am very happy to say that, during my service in the Senate I have always supported legislation to grant statehood to Hawaii and Alaska.

So I express my own personal satisfaction, and I extend to Hawaii's representatives in the Senate and to the Hawaii Member of the House of Representatives warmest congratulations and expressions of good will and cordial hospitality.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues who have expressed pleasure over the admission of the 50th State and the swearing in of the Senators from Hawaii today. I have known of Senator FONG and of his remarkable career for a long time, but I had not known him personally. I have known Senator LONG, of Hawaii, for a long time, and it is a special privilege and pleasure to welcome him as a Senator from Hawaii. Senator LONG, of Hawaii, was superintendent of schools at Knoxville, Tenn., for many, many years, and he was highly regarded by all the citizens of that State who had the privilege of working with him. We are very proud of the fact that he has now become a Senator from Hawaii. I know that he will bring to this body much valuable experience in the administration of education and school problems, which experience he has had both in Tennessee and in Hawaii.

Mr. President, this has been a great year for the people of Alaska and Hawaii. This is not only a great day for the people of the beautiful islands of Hawaii, who had sought statehood for so long, but I think it gives all our American people a new interest. It gives us new ideas and new opportunity for growth and expansion. It is a demonstration that our democracy can grow and can enlarge its opportunities by the admission of new States.

During the more than 20 years that I have been a Member of Congress, first in the House of Representatives and then in the Senate, I have always fought for and joined in sponsoring bills for the admission of both Alaska and Hawaii as States. On one occasion I had the privilege of being chief sponsor here in the U.S. Senate of a bill for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. Back in those days there was a substantial amount of opposition to statehood for Alaska and Hawaii both in the Congress and among our people, but now former critics of statehood fortunately have joined in extending a welcome to the people of those new States, and they have obtained an appreciation of the value that is to come to our Nation and to the world by their admission.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I join all my colleagues in paying tribute, in regard to the swearing in of the two Senators from Hawaii today, to them personally, for the historic role which they are fulfilling, and to the great action of the U.S. Congress, of the President, and of all who have worked so hard for Hawaiian statehood over the years.

Mr. President, this is a great victory in the foreign policy of the United States, and should be recorded as such. It represents the entry of the United States in an authoritative way into the Pacific, taking unto itself of its own and making it a part of the family. It represents also acknowledgment by us that there is complete equality among us in terms of statehood; as desired by those of us, like the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and other Senators, who fight for equality in terms of citizenship without regard for race, creed or color.

So we honor this equality in our States, and wish to honor it among our citizens.

Mr. President, while we speak of this historic occasion I have the honor to bring to the attention of the Senate the role played by former Senator Guy Cordon, of Oregon, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the 83d Congress, which committee reported the bill and led the floor fight for Hawaiian statehood. The Senate passed the bill, but no action was taken in the House of Representatives.

It was former Senator Cordon who led the fight which resulted in the very first passage of a Hawaiian statehood bill by the Senate.

Mr. President, this is the kind of day we wish to honor men such as former Senator Cordon, who is no longer with us.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I should like to join with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in extending a cordial welcome to the newly elected Senators from our 50th State of Hawaii.

In our time, Mr. President, we have witnessed the dissolution of the great empires which dominated the affairs of men in the 19th century. These empires have broken up in our time, like large icebergs in a thaw. Out of the wreckage, Mr. President, has emerged the United States of America, at the summit of its power and its glory, the strongest of the free nations of the world.

What accounts for this astonishing American success story, Mr. President? I think, more than any other fact, it is due to the unique contribution which we have made to the science of government, in not attempting the building of an empire, but rather the building of one nation. Statehood has been the mortar of its construction.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I will be happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator mentioned the mortar used in the construction of statehood for Hawaii. I want to say for the record that no man in this body has worked harder or with greater enthusiasm for statehood for Hawaii than the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH].

I would, of course, have to include in that category such men as our distinguished minority whip, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the chairman of the subcommittee in the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, who reported the bill for statehood originally, Senator JACKSON, of Washington; also the chairman of the full committee, my distinguished senior colleague, Senator JAMES E. MURRAY. But I would say that all the individuals in this Chamber who have worked long and hard for statehood for Hawaii, no one is entitled to greater consideration for the unflagging interest he has consistently shown than our distinguished junior colleague from the State of Idaho, Senator CHURCH, who is now addressing this body.

Mr. CHURCH. I appreciate very much the generous remarks of our as-

sistant majority leader. May I say of him that he was always a determined leader in the fight to win statehood both for Alaska and for Hawaii, and a strong ally to all of us who were interested in both causes.

Mr. President, this morning as we witnessed the swearing in ceremonies of the two Senators from Hawaii, I think all of us were impressed with the solemn significance of the occasion. It may well be that with the admission of Hawaii, the last great State has been added to this Republic and its edifice may now be completed. History alone will tell.

In any case, Mr. President, this is a joyous day in the years of our Republic, a day that should live long in the hearts of all who love their country.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I desire to join very briefly in welcoming our distinguished and historic new colleagues from the great new 50th State of Hawaii.

However, I should like to add one word of caution with respect to some of the prophecies I have heard voiced on the floor of the Senate today. If one will read the history of the United States he will discover that prophecies are often dangerous. When Meriwether Lewis and William Clark first set out for the West, it was said by foes of President Jefferson that they would never return. After they had returned, it was claimed that the $2,500 that was spent on their expedition was a waste, because no one would ever live in the area which they had explored, between St. Louis and the mouth of the Columbia River.

When it was first proposed that the Army Engineers make surveys of the passes through the Rocky Mountains, it was contended that it was the wildest folly ever to think of building a railroad across the Continental Divide.

I have heard a number of prophecies today to the effect that the Union has been rounded out by a 50th State, and that no one need ever think of another State being added.

Perhaps such prophecy is perilous. In my opinion no one can tell what the future may hold. As countries like the Soviet Union and Red China emerge from peasantry and medievalism into the industrial age, who can know what pressures may be on the entire Continent of North America, perhaps, to become one country? No one can foresee what dire events may take place when China, with a quarter of the world's population, begins to make use of modern technology and industrial techniques. So the time may come, even within the lifetime of some Members of this body, when areas such as British Columbia or Manitoba may become States of the Union. It may be that men as young as the distinguished junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] who is only 34 years old, may live to sit in this Chamber and rise in applause to welcome the first Senator who takes his oath from British Columbia or from New Brunswick.

So while I, myself, am voicing no prophecies, I caution against the statement that, with 50 States, the Union is rounded out forever. Forever is a long time. It is said that Dr. Albert Einstein told his biographers that the universe would last 3 billion years.

I trust the United States of America will last an equally long time. Anyone who claims that he can see into the future for 3 billion years is claiming, for himself, powers which I would hesitate to arrogate unto myself.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gore	Monroney
Allott	Green	Morse
Anderson	Gruening	Morton
Bartlett	Hart	Moss
Beall	Hartke	Mundt
Bennett	Hayden	Murray
Bible	Hennings	Muskie
Bush	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Butler	Hill	Pastore
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Proxmire
Cannon	Humphrey	Randolph
Capehart	Jackson	Robertson
Carroll	Javits	Russell
Case, N.J.	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S.C.	Scott
Chavez	Jordan	Smathers
Church	Keating	Smith
Clark	Kefauver	Sparkman
Cooper	Kennedy	Stennis
Cotton	Kerr	Symington
Dirksen	Kuchel	Talmadge
Douglas	Langer	Thurmond
Dworshak	Lausche	Wiley
Eastland	Long, La.	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	McCarthy	Williams, Del.
Engle	McClellan	Yarborough
Ervin	McGee	Young, N. Dak.
Frear	McNamara	Young, Ohio
Fulbright	Magnuson	
Goldwater	Mansfield	

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] are absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Kensas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

SENATORS FROM HAWAII

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk the certificate of the election of the Honorable OREN E. LONG.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials of the Senator-elect from the State of Hawaii will be read and placed on file.

The legislative clerk read the credentials of OREN E. LONG, elected Senator from the State of Hawaii, which were ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

STATE OF HAWAII,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS,
Honolulu, Hawaii.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 28th day of July 1959, OREN E. LONG was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the proposed State of Hawaii a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for a term to be determined by the Senate, beginning on the 21st day of August 1959.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, William F. Quinn, and our seal hereto affixed at Iolani Palace, Honolulu, Hawaii, this 21st day of August, in the year of our Lord 1959.

[SEAL] WILLIAM F. QUINN,
Governor of Hawaii.

By the Governor:

JAMES KEALOHA,
Lieutenant Governor of Hawaii.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a message over the signature of the Honorable William F. Quinn, Governor of Hawaii, and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials of the Senator-elect from the State of Hawaii will be read and placed on file.

The legislative clerk read the credentials of HIRAM L. FONG, elected Senator from the State of Hawaii, which were ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

STATE OF HAWAII,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS,
Honolulu, Hawaii.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 28th day of July 1959, HIRAM L. FONG was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the proposed State of Hawaii a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for a term to be determined by the Senate, beginning on the 21st day of August 1959.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, William F. Quinn, and our seal hereto affixed at Iolani Palace, Honolulu, Hawaii, this 21st day of August, in the year of our Lord 1959.

[SEAL] WILLIAM F. QUINN,
Governor of Hawaii.

By the Governor:

JAMES KEALOHA,
Lieutenant Governor of Hawaii.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senators-elect will present themselves at the desk to take the constitutional oath of office.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii, accompanied by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. FONG, accompanied by Mr. DIRKSEN, advanced to the Vice President's desk; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President, and they each subscribed to the oath in the official oath book and took their seats in the Senate.

[Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

TERMS OF NEW SENATORS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution for the classification of the two Senators from Hawaii, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 172) as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate proceed to ascertain the classes to which the Senators from the State of Hawaii shall be assigned, in conformity with the resolution of the 14th of May 1789, and as the Constitution requires.

Resolved, That the Secretary put into a ballot box two papers of equal size, one of which shall be numbered 1 and the other shall be a blank. Each of the Senators from the State of Hawaii shall draw out one paper, and the Senator who shall draw the paper numbered 1 shall be assigned to the class of Senators whose terms of service will expire the 2d day of January 1965. That the Secretary then put into a second ballot box two papers of equal size, one of which shall be numbered 2 and the other shall be numbered 3. The other Senator shall draw out one paper. If the paper drawn be numbered 2, the Senator shall be assigned to the class of Senators whose terms of service will expire the 2d day of January 1961; and if the paper drawn be numbered 3, the Senator shall be assigned to the class of Senators whose terms of service will expire the 2d day of January 1963.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to the resolution, the Secretary will place in the ballot box two papers, one numbered 1 and the other a blank.

The Secretary placed the papers in the ballot box.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The two Senators from Hawaii will now present themselves at the desk.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii and Mr. FONG presented themselves at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG] will draw the first paper.

[Mr. LONG of Hawaii drew a paper from the box.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG] has drawn the paper which is blank.

[Mr. FONG drew a paper from the box.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], having drawn the paper numbered 1, his term of service will expire on January 2, 1965.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to the resolution, the Secretary will place in the ballot box two papers numbered, respectively, 2 and 3.

The Secretary placed the papers in the ballot box.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG] will draw a paper from the ballot box.

[Mr. LONG of Hawaii drew a paper from the box.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG] having drawn the paper numbered 3, his term of service will expire on January 2, 1963.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR O'MAHONEY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, while we are paying tribute to our new colleagues from Hawaii there is one of us who is not present, but were he present he would be heard—and heard unforgettably. His great service in behalf of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska should be recognized by us here and now as history will recognize it. He is JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, the senior Senator from Wyoming. He started the ball rolling both for Alaska and Hawaii statehood early in this decade. He held the first Senate hearings on the statehood bill. He reported the first statehood bills to the Senate for those former Territories. He led the fight for their admission. It is a cause of great regret to us all that Senator O'MAHONEY's illness has kept him from the Senate.

I desire to pay this deserved tribute to him, as the man who carried on this fight in its early and more difficult stages, whose sincerity and eloquence lifted their cause to great heights and laid the foundation upon which others have built until statehood for Alaska and Hawaii was achieved. We all hope that the beloved senior Senator from Wyoming, more than a national figure, will be back with us soon and that his clear and forthright expressions in behalf of the public interest may again be heard in this Chamber.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1960 (S. Doc. No. 47)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1960 in the amount of $19,349,000 for various agencies of the executive branch (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PLANS FOR WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT IN CERTAIN STATES

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement on Blackberry River, and North Branch Park River, Conn., Taylor Creek, Fla., Potato Creek, Ga., Crab Orchard Creek, Ky., East Fork of Clarks River, Ky. and Tenn., SuAsCo, Mass., Bowman-Spring Branch, Nebr., Santa Cruz River, N. Mex., Willakenzie area, Oregon, Green-Dreher, Pa., and Caney Creek, Tex. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION SALES POLICIES, ACTIVITIES, AND DISPOSITIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the General Sales Manager on Commodity Credit Corporation sales policies, activities, and dispositions, for the month of June 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATION OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation "1292539 (33) school lunch program, Agricultural Marketing Service (transfer to Commodity Stabilization Service), 1959"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control, for the second quarter of 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF CONTRACT WITH CONVAIR, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of the pricing of Department of the Air Force contract AF 33(600)-31174 with Convair, a division of General Dynamics Corp., San Diego, Calif., dated August 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF AVIATION WAR-RISK INSURANCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of aviation war-risk insurance, as of June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department during fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

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

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Tom Do Shing from a report relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on June 16, 1958; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PLAN FOR WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT IN OKLAHOMA

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a plan for works of improvement on Caney-Coon Creek, Okla. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

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

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the National Association of Attorneys General, at New Orleans, La., relating to Federal tort claims coverage for members of the National Guard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Detroit, Mich., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1046, to increase the minimum wage, and so forth; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Ashtabula, Ohio, favoring the enactment of the bill (H.R. 7634) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

The petition of Walter R. Horn, of Joplin, Mo., favoring the enactment of the so-called Landrum-Griffin labor-management relations bill; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

S. 2431. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of statehood of the State of Kansas (Rept. No. 801); and

S. 2517. A bill to amend section 7 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended (Rept. No. 804).

By Mr. BENNETT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

S. 2454. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the pony express (Rept. No. 800).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 2725. An act to amend chapter 3 of title 18, United States Code, so as to prohibit the use of aircraft or motor vehicles to hunt certain wild horses or burros on land belonging to the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 802).

PROGRAM OF ASSISTANCE TO CORRECT INEQUITIES IN CONSTRUCTION OF FISHING VESSELS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 2578) to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels and to enable the fishing industry of the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 803) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report may be printed, with individual views of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from California.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. CHURCH (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 2586. A bill to provide for the conservation of anadromous fish spawning areas in the Salmon River, Idaho; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 2587. A bill to require an act of Congress for public land withdrawals in excess of 5,000 acres in the aggregate for any project or facility of any department or agency of the Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. GORE:

S. 2588. A bill to amend the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 so as to transfer to the highway trust fund a portion of the receipts from the excise tax on passenger automobiles collected during the 1960 fiscal year; to rescind 1 percent of certain appropriations made for the 1960 fiscal year; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 2589. A bill for the relief of Agatha Eccleston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 2590. A bill to authorize the Starr-Camargo Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

PLAN TO HOLD INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES TO STRENGTHEN RULE OF LAW AMONG NATIONS

Mr. JAVITS (for himself and 36 other Senators, submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 74) favoring a plan to hold international conferences in order to strengthen the rule of law among nations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JAVITS, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT FROM THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM AND COMMITTEE'S FINAL REPORT

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 171); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That a "letter to the President of the United States from the President's Committee To Study the United States Military Assistance Program and the Committee's Final Report," and the President's letter of transmittal of that report, dated August 20, 1959, be printed with illustrations as a Senate document.

TERMS OF SENATORS FROM HAWAII

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas submitted a resolution (S. Res. 172), relating to the terms of the Senators from Hawaii, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, which appears under a separate heading.)

COMMENDATION OF NATIONAL JAYCEE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Mr. HARTKE submitted a resolution (S. Res. 173) commending the National Jaycee Community Development Program, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. HARTKE, which appears under a separate heading.)

CONSERVATION OF ANADROMOUS FISH SPAWNING AREAS IN SALMON RIVER, IDAHO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would provide for the conservation of anadromous fish spawning areas in the Salmon River of Idaho.

Mr. President, the Salmon River begins and ends in Idaho; it contributes 8,100,000 acre-feet of the average annual runoff of the Columbia Basin; it is the main spawning stream—besides the Columbia itself above the Snake River—for anadromous fish, accounting for approximately 30 percent of the total which passes McNary Dam, and more than half of the total of spring and summer Chinook.

Migrating salmon must pass, both upstream and downstream, existing dam structures at Bonneville, the Dalles, McNary, and Ice Harbor—under construction—en route to the confluence of the Snake and the Salmon. None of these have provisions for downstream passage of fingerlings. Methods for passing adult fish upstream over dams up to 100 feet have been operated for many years, and solutions are being sought to passage over higher structures. Solutions for the problem of passing the young downstream migrants over high dams are not as advanced. Losses from passage through turbines of the lower structures have been about 11 percent, but the pressures preclude this for the higher structures.

Evidence indicates that projected development of the Upper Columbia will reduce the spawning there as the reservoir areas and slack water encroach upon spawning grounds. The Salmon River's importance as the principal spawning stream will proportionately increase.

Mr. President, I am introducing this bill in the last days of this session for a special reason. Although I have talked this matter over with a number of people in my State and have received assurances from many of them that this is a sound approach, I recognize that an attempt to inhibit an agency like the Federal Power Commission from licensing structures on any navigable

stream is a serious and restrictive step, and one which should be taken only if there is strong evidence that such step is in the public interest and in accordance with sound public policy.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is my hope that the committee to which this bill is referred, will utilize the recess period to give the bill careful study. Perhaps it will be decided that public hearings in the area would be desirable. In such case I would hope to be able to sit with the committee and to listen to the points of view expressed by those people in the Northwest who have a lifelong and vital interest in the Columbia River and the Salmon River, one of its principal tributaries.

I call particular attention, Mr. President, to the fact that this bill is limited by a provision which recognizes that there already are dams below the mouth of the Salmon River which the salmon must overcome, and therefore it does not prohibit the licensing of new dams on the Salmon River itself which are no more restrictive to the passage of fish to their spawning grounds than similar structures downstream.

I call further attention, Mr. President, to the fact that the bill as I have drafted it, will require the Secretary of the Interior to report to the Congress any developments in fish conservation or in the construction of dams or reservoirs that in his opinion would justify the removal of the restrictions which this bill contains.

In summary, Mr. President, let me make these three points concerning the bill which I am introducing:

First. It is a "study" bill—intended to call for a review of the important problem of maintaining the Salmon River as a spawning area for anadromous fish;

Second. It is a limited bill—it does not foreclose all developments on the Salmon River, but only those which would block salmon runs;

Third. It calls for affirmative action on the part of the Secretary of the Interior to keep the Congress informed as to the continuing need for this kind of restriction, so that the law may be modified or repealed, when new methods for successful fish passage are devised and proven.

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

The bill (S. 2586) to provide for the conservation of anadromous fish spawning areas in the Salmon River, Idaho, introduced by Mr. CHURCH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have not studied the Senator's bill, but I presume it will be referred to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

We have several bills in the committee now, and I think this is a good time to say something about this for the RECORD.

We have four or five bills. One of the bills would include a comprehensive study, and that was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Oregon, and there is another bill introduced by myself which calls for a sort of look-see or a moratorium in the middle Snake until the Army Engineers can make their report.

All these bills have been the subject of a great deal of interest in the committee, but because of their comprehensive nature such as this bill, which is very important, the committee has informally decided that they would hold some hearings out in the field this fall, and I have prevailed upon the very distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], to come into the area sometime in the fall.

I hope that this bill will be included in the field hearings along with the other bills.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I would like to express my gratitude to the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It will be the intention, of course, of the committee to invite the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Oregon and those of us in the Pacific Northwest who are so deeply interested in these various matters.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I merely want to say this is, as the chairman of the committee noted, a very important bill, upon which hearings ought to be held as promptly as possible and to which full consideration should be given.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I want to say, too, there are a lot of problems. We have this so-called upstream-downstream benefit bill, and all of these bills sort of overlap the whole problem, and I am very hopeful and I am very appreciative to the Senator from Alaska, who can look at it more objectively than some of us who are right in the middle of it all the time, and he has agreed to do that.

Mr. BARTLETT. I want right now to extend a very cordial invitation to my friend from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] to be at the hearings.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank both the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Alaska for their interest. I am happy to know that hearings are to be held. I am hopeful a hearing will be held in Idaho. Certainly I will attend the hearing and participate in it.

I think the bill I have introduced this morning ought to be considered in conjunction with the resolution that was introduced by the senior Senator from Washington, and with other related bills, so that we can find a just and equitable solution.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I suggested to the Senator from Alaska that we could start at Lewiston, which is sort of the hub of these problems.

Mr. NEUBERGER. If this hearing is to be held in the State of Oregon, it should take place at Astoria. Astoria at the mouth of the Columbia River is the leading salmon canning community in the entire Pacific Northwest.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Astoria or some place like that, a site right in the area.

Mr. CHURCH. Lewiston certainly would be an appropriate city. I appreciate the cooperation of the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Alaska, who will conduct the hearings.

Mr. CHURCH subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today, I introduced Senate bill 2586. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my introductory statement, and following the colloquy which followed that statement.

Let me also say that I have been advised that the junior Senator from Oregan [Mr. NEUBERGER] would like to be listed as one of the cosponsors of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that will be done; and, without objection, the bill will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2586) to provide for the conservation of anadromous fish spawning areas in the Salmon River, Idaho, introduced by Mr. CHURCH (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER), is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in recognition of the fact that the Salmon River and its tributaries constitute one of the principal spawning areas of anadromous fish from the Pacific Ocean, and since the size and structure of the flood control and power dams and reservoirs, and other structures used in connection therewith, now in existence on the Columbia and Snake Rivers between the Salmon River and the Pacific Ocean presently allow the passage of such fish to their spawning areas, it is the purpose of this Act to prohibit, unless or until future developments justify a change in this policy, the authorization of any such dams and reservoirs or structures on the Salmon River that would be any more restrictive on the passage of such fish than similar structures which such fish must now pass to reach the spawning areas or which would flood established spawning grounds.

SEC. 2. The Federal Power Commission shall not issue any permit, license, lease, or other authorization under the provisions of the Federal Power Act for any dam, reservoir, conduit, powerhouse, or other works for the storage or collection of water on the development of power on the Salmon River in Idaho in any case in which any such proposed works would have a more restrictive effect on the passage of anadromous fish than any similar works already in existence on such river or on the Columbia or Snake River between the Salmon River and the Pacific Ocean, or which would flood established spawning grounds.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior shall report to the Congress any developments in fish conservation or in the construction of dams and reservoirs that in his opinion justify amending the provisions of this Act.

BILL TO AMEND PUBLIC LAW 85–337—WITHDRAWALS OR RESERVATIONS FROM PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act of February 28, 1958, Public Law 85–337.

The Senate will recall that Public Law 85–337 was enacted after extended hearings and prolonged consideration. It provided that all withdrawals or reser-

vations from the public lands of the United States by the Department of Defense would require congressional approval when such withdrawals or reservations, in the aggregate, included an area in excess of 5,000 acres devoted to a single defense use or facility. The distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE]—then a Member of the House of Representatives, where I was privileged to serve with him as the Delegate from Alaska—played a principal role as chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, in the enactment of Public Law 85–337. Largely through his efforts, Congress restored to itself a constitutional function in a field of growing concern to an increasingly crowded America.

The bill which I introduce today would extend the principles of Public Law 85–337 to withdrawals or reservations by any executive department or independent agency. In the light of our experience under Public Law 85–33, it is apparent that that law works no hardship on the Department of Defense and provides closer scrutiny by the people's representatives of proposed withdrawals and reservations. It is my view, therefore, that the Department of Defense should not be singled out for unique treatment in the matter of withdrawals and reservations, and that passage of this bill would provide a desirable uniformity and congressional supervision over withdrawals and reservations proposed by any branch of the executive department.

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

The bill (S. 2587) to require an act of Congress for public land withdrawal in excess of 5,000 acres in the aggregate for any project or facility of any department or agency of the Government, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. GRUENING subsequently said: Mr. President, I am in hearty accord with the purposes of the amendment of Public Law 85–337 which my colleague the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] has introduced in behalf of both of us, to apply the provision which provides that withdrawals of more than 5,000 acres from the public domain for military purposes shall have the prior consent of Congress to all forms of reservations and withdrawls.

The withdrawal of an area larger than 5,000 acres may be of such momentous consequence, that it seems advisable to have the legislative branch participate in the decision, and not have it merely made by action of one of the executive departments.

In Alaska, we already have a total of 14,744,676 acres withdrawn as national parks and wildlife ranges or refuges. This is a tremendous area, larger than the combined areas of several of our smaller States. It is an area almost the size of the State of West Virginia. It is more than four times the land area of the State of Connecticut, and nearly three times that of Massachusetts.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point, a list of the national parks and monuments, moose ranges, wildlife refuges, and other withdrawals and reservations in Alaska, which make up this formidable total.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

WILDLIFE PRESERVATION AND RELATED AREAS UNDER FEDERAL JURISDICTION IN ALASKA

	Acres
National parks and monuments:	
Mt. McKinley National Park	1,939,334
Glacier Bay National Monument	2,274,595
Katmai National Monument	2,697,590
Subtotal	6,911,519
Kenai National Moose Range	2,057,197
Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge	1,815,000
Nunivak National Wildlife Refuge	1,109,000
Aleutian National Wildlife Refuge	2,720,235
Bering Sea National Wildlife Refuge	41,113
Bogoslof National Wildlife Refuge	390
Chammisso National Wildlife Refuge	641
Hazy Island National Wildlife Refuge	42
Forrester Island Bird Refuge	2,832
Pribilof Islands Reservations in Tongass National Forest	50,163
Simeonof National Wildlife Refuge	10,442
St. Lazaria National Wildlife Refuge	65
Semidi National Wildlife Refuge	8,422
Tuxedni National Wildlife Refuge	6,439
Hazen Bay National Wildlife Refuge	6,800
Reindeer Experiment Station	1,520
4 Fishery research stations	2,565
22 administrative sites	289
Subtotal	7,833,155
Total national parks and wildlife preservation areas	14,744,674

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, many of these were made in an earlier period, when Alaska was a virtually uninhabited wilderness. Most of these are excellent in purpose and desirable. They render a valuable service for recreation and conservation. As a conservationist, I am glad that they are there. Some may be too large. But before any more withdrawals of this magnitude are made, and it should be noted that of these, 4 exceed 2 million acres, and 3 exceed 1 million—both my colleague and I feel that the legislative branch of the Government should be taken into consultation. By this legislation it is sought henceforth to make such mammoth withdrawals a joint arrangement between the executive and legislative branches. I think this would be in the interest of good government, and desirable in its restoration of some of the legislative authority which has been forfeited through custom in recent years.

On behalf of my colleague, Senator BARTLETT, and myself, I request that this bill be allowed to lie on the table for 1 week, until the end of business on August 31, so that other Members who may desire to do so may cosponsor this proposed legislation.

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

PLAN TO HOLD INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES TO STRENGTHEN RULE OF LAW AMONG NATIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and 36 other Senators, I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution as a first step toward bringing about the rule of law among nations through the greater use of the International Court of Justice, through the establishment of regional courts to deal with international legal disputes and through other means; it embodies the proposal for regional and world legal conferences for the purpose of promoting world law which is now being developed by the American Bar Association.

The resolution declares that it is the sense of the Congress that the proposal to hold privately sponsored international conferences of lawyers from many countries in order to strengthen the rule of law among nations, as advocated by the American Bar Association, can make a substantial contribution to international peace and security and merits the full support of the U.S. Government and the American public.

Those Senators who have joined in cosponsorship of the resolution include: GORDON ALLOTT, Republican, of Colorado; J. GLENN BEALL, Republican, of Maryland; ALAN BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada; PRESCOTT BUSH, Republican, of Connecticut; ROBERT C. BYRD, Democrat, of West Virginia; HOWARD CANNON, Democrat, of Nevada; JOHN A. CARROLL, Democrat, of Colorado; CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican, of New Jersey; Dennis CHAVEZ, Democrat, of New Mexico; FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho; JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, Republican, of Kentucky, THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut; PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois; CLAIR ENGLE, Democrat, of California; PHILIP A. HART, Democrat, of Michigan; THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., Democrat, of Missouri; HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota; KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York; ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee; THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Republican, of California; FRANK J. LAUSCHE, Democrat, of Ohio; WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington; WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon; FRANK E. Moss, Democrat, of Utah; JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana; RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon; WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin; LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts; HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania; GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida; STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri; ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin; HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey; STEPHEN M. YOUNG, Democrat, of Ohio; and E. L. BARTLETT, Democrat, of Alaska.

The submission of this resolution coincides with the official presentation to

the American Bar Association's annual meeting today on Monday, August 24, in Miami, Fla., of a report and recommendations on the desirability of holding conferences of lawyers with the objective of furthering world peace through more extensive reliance on the rule of law in international disputes. The report was prepared by the ABA Special Committee on World Peace Through Law and advance copies were recently sent to every Member of the Congress. The concurrent resolution I am submitting today was prepared in cooperation with Charles S. Rhyne, chairman of that special committee and a past president of the American Bar Association.

As we have learned once again with the stalemate of the Geneva talks among the Big Four Foreign Ministers, there is no single, smoothly paved road down which we can travel to arrive at a secure world peace. Instead, we must search out and pioneer new approaches.

I think we should all acknowledge our indebtedness to the chairman of the special subcommittee and past president of the American Bar Association for leading the way in this whole field.

In this regard, I know of no proposal which is potentially more challenging nor more promising than the one put forward by the special committee of the American Bar Association that jurists, practicing lawyers, and teachers of the law from all over the world—including those from behind the Iron Curtain—meet together in a series of legal summit conferences with the objective of replacing the rule of force with the rule of law.

Of special significance today in the struggle to achieve the peaceful settlement of legal disputes between nations in international courts of law is the fresh vitality and leadership being supplied by the American Bar Association, which represents more than 90,000 lawyers in the United States. A concurrent resolution passed by the Congress praising its efforts and simultaneously rallying the vibrant support of the general public for such international legal conferences lends great prestige to the cause of world law and to our deep-rooted determination as a nation and a people to advance the cause of world peace.

Finally, there is an additional reason for congressional recognition of this outstanding report prepared by the ABA special committee. The study which produced it was undertaken with the assistance of a planning grant from the International Cooperation Administration whose primary interest was in the development of legal institutions and standards facilitating the expansion of international investment and trade.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the ABA special committee report, and of the concurrent resolution I am submitting be printed in the RECORD at this point and that the concurrent resolution may lie on the table until Friday for additional cosponsors.

Mr. President, I am very proud to number 36 other Senators already among the sponsors of this concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution and report will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 74) favoring a plan to hold international conferences in order to strengthen the rule of law among nations, submitted by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the American Bar Association, after a detailed study by its Special Committee on World Peace Through Law made at the request of the International Cooperation Administration, has submitted to the said Administration a comprehensive plan for a series of conferences of lawyers from many nations to consider and recommend action on matters within the special competence of the legal profession with a view to the strengthening of the rule of law among nations; and

Whereas according to the said plan, the agenda of the proposed conferences might include the means of increasing use of the International Court of Justice, the establishment of regional courts of international law outside the judicial system of the United Nations, the extension of the jurisdiction of international courts to disputes between governments and individuals and between private parties, the extension and improvement of institutions and procedures for arbitration of disputes between governments and of disputes growing out of concession contracts and international business transactions between governments and individuals and between private parties, the removal of the legal uncertainties and fears which now block the economic advancement of nations, and the establishment or improvement of agencies and procedures for adaptation of existing rules of international law to changing conditions, with a view to furthering the growth of a body of international law acceptable to all nations by drawing upon all legal systems of the world; and

Whereas the report submitted with the said plan provides a substantial basis for the hope that members of the legal profession throughout the world meeting in conferences for the purpose stated in the said plan might be able to break through the barriers of mutual distrust that have prevented agreement among governments on topics such as those hereinbefore mentioned, to achieve mutual understanding of their diverse systems of law, and to agree upon recommendations of concrete steps looking toward the establishment of the rule of law among nations; and

Whereas the report submitted with the said plan emphasizes the fact that it would be most advantageous to the success of the proposed conferences that they be held under private sponsorship and that all political issues be avoided, but it is nevertheless clear that the governments of all countries should welcome and encourage the search by members of the legal profession throughout the world for means of stimulating and coordinating their efforts to strengthen the rule of law among nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the plan submitted by the American Bar Association for a series of conferences of lawyers from many nations with a view to the strengthening of the rule of law among nations offers possibilities of a substantial contribution to international peace and security and should be encouraged by the Government and people of the United States in every appropriate way.

The report presented by Mr. JAVITS is as follows:

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW TO THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION—RECOMMENDATION: THAT THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW BE CONTINUED

THE COMMITTEE'S ASSIGNMENT

This committee was created to explore and report upon what lawyers can do of a practical, concrete character to advance the rule of law among nations. Its assignment also includes activities for the increase of interest among lawyers and laymen in the advancement of the world peace through extension and expansion of the rule of law.

THE ICA CONTRACT

On November 7, 1958, the American Bar Association accepted a planning grant from the International Cooperation Administration for study of the feasibility of a conference of lawyers from many nations "to consider and recommend means of developing and strengthening, within and among nations, legal concepts, standards, and institutions which will contribute, through facilitating the expansion of the flow of international investment and trade and otherwise, to the economic growth of such nations and which will facilitate peaceful settlement of disputes within and among nations".

Under the terms of the grant the American Bar Association was to report to ICA on or before June 6, 1959, whether such a conference is feasible. If the conference was found to be feasible, the association was to include in its report "a statement of specific objectives of the conference, an agenda of matters to be considered by the conference, a working procedure for preparations for and conduct of the conference, proposals as to the participants in the conference or the basis and procedure for selection of participants, and a budget setting forth estimated costs of the conference".

The committee on world peace through law was designated to make the necessary studies for the association under the ICA contract.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK UNDER THE CONTRACT

The committee decided to seek the cooperation of lawyers, professors of international law, and associations of lawyers in this country and abroad and the cooperation of legal organizations each as the International Bar Association, the Inter-American Bar Association, and the International Law Association; to study the efforts of the United Nations and other official agencies in the field of world law; to arrange a number of regional conferences of leading lawyers of the United States for discussion of tentative ideas, suggestions, plans and proposals; and to employ a staff to assist the committee in its work. It decided to give special attention to the compilation and analysis of ideas and information as to how a conference of lawyers from the United States and other nations might advance the use of the rule of law in world affairs, promote the use of the judicial concept in the settlement of disputes between nations, extend international judicial institutions to disputes of individuals growing out of international transactions and increase the sense of responsibility and the influence of members of the legal profession in the field of international relations.

Presidents of 1,400 State and local bar associations in the United States and 182 professors of international law were requested to send the committee comments, suggestions, and ideas as to what a world conference on the rule of law should do and can do.

Similar letters, accompanied by a partial list of topics which had been suggested for discussion at a world conference of lawyers, were sent to 1,300 members of the section of international and comparative law, 2,400 members of the American Society of International Law, and the presidents of 74 bar associations in foreign countries.

The responses to the above-mentioned letters were almost uniformly favorable to the idea of the proposed conference. Many of them contained extremely helpful suggestions as to the questions to be discussed and as to the practical arrangements required for successful conduct of such a conference. These communications provided substantial evidence that lawyers assembled from many nations may be able to achieve concrete advancement of carefully stated programs looking toward the establishment of international relations on the basis of respect for law and the observance of its orderly procedures. Many ideas were stated as to how the rule of law could be strengthened in the world community and a wealth of material in support of these ideas was submitted.

Equally encouraging indications were received from specially qualified persons whose views were sought in private conversations and at conventions and conferences of lawyers in the United States and abroad. Interest in the rule of law as an instrument to achieve and maintain order internationally is at an alltime high among lawyers and laymen.

REGIONAL CONFERENCES IN THE UNITED STATES

On March 28 and 29, 1959, the first of five regional conferences in the United States was held at Boston, Mass., for the purpose of consultation on what lawyers assembled from many nations could do toward the achievement and maintenance of world peace. Similar conferences were held at Charlotte, N.C., on April 10 and 11; Chicago, Ill., on April 17 and 18; San Francisco, Calif., on April 24 and 25; and Dallas, Tex., on April 28 and 29. The participants in each of these conferences included the presidents of state bar associations in the several regions (comprising from 7 to 11 States) and four or more leading lawyers of each State invited by these presidents or by the committee. The participants in each of the conferences were provided, in advance of the conference, with extensive working papers, prepared by the committee's staff with the assistance of experts in the fields of international law, which contained the background information required for intelligent discussion of the important questions raised in the conferences.

CONSENSUS OF THE PARTICIPANTS

The consensus of the participants in the five regional conferences, with specific reference to the feasibility of conferences of lawyers on a continental or global scale, may be fairly summarized as follows:

1. A world conference of lawyers should be held. To make it a true world conference, lawyers from behind the Iron Curtain should be invited.

2. The groundwork for the world conference should be laid by international regional conferences in Latin America, Asia, Africa, and Europe.

3. The conferences will serve a very useful purpose even though Iron Curtain lawyers and their governments may not yet be willing or able to seek to extend the rule of law. It is important meanwhile, for the other countries of the world to create a constructive program whereby they may gain more experience in the settlement of international disputes among themselves by judicial means.

4. The world conference and the international regional conferences which precede it should concentrate chiefly on the improvement and increased use of existing international institutions and the creation of the new international institutions and conventions that will be required if the rule of law is to be utilized more and more in the future to achieve internationally the degree of order and stability which it has achieved within nations.

5. As a first step in this direction, the conferences should consider means of encouraging the submission of more international disputes to the existing International Court of Justice and the creation of new circuit or regional courts of international law. They might appropriately urge the International Court of Justice to exercise the authority which it now has to sit outside The Hague and to establish in advance chambers of three or more members of the Court for hearing and decision of particular cases or classes of cases as well as to improve the cumbersome procedures now followed by the Court. Sitting in New York at the headquarters of the United Nations and elsewhere throughout the world, the Court would be more accessible to the parties, and proceedings would be much less expensive. Regional courts of international law could be established by agreements without amendment of the Charter of the United Nations or the Statute of the International Court of Justice. Regional courts would be especially useful in overcoming suspicion and distrust of foreign court proceedings.

6. The world conference and the international regional conferences should give special consideration to ways and means of extending the jurisdiction of international courts to disputes between governments and individuals growing out of international business transactions. Study should be given to the creation of special courts where consideration of limited commercial litigation growing out of international business transactions might take place. Governments might more readily agree to the creation of such courts as significant questions involving their sovereignty would not be likely to arise.

7. The world conference and the international regional conferences should also consider the means of expanding and improving procedures for arbitration of disputes growing out of international business transactions and means of encouraging greater use of legal rules in international commercial arbitration. An increase in agreement upon legal principles is seemingly a prerequisite to such an expansion in use of arbitration under the rule of law.

8. The conferences now contemplated should not attempt agreement on substantive rules of international law. Restatements of present rules and drafts of new rules of international law should be left to existing official and unofficial groups of experts where they are giving adequate attention to particular subjects or fields of law. If further world legal conferences are recommended, committees may be created to review progress in various fields of substantive law and make recommendations to further that progress or to initiate new work on old or new problems. It is recognized that many existing official and unofficial groups of experts do not have the resources or the sustained interest required to draft the many new legal rules required to fill the pressing needs of the ever-growing field of international transactions and relations. Codifications or agreements in specific areas of private international law are badly needed, including such areas as conflicts of law, admiralty and international commercial transactions of all types. Such codifications or agreements would increase the acceptance and certainty of international transactions and relations by increasing resort to law instead of to action by sovereign right.

9. The mere fact of holding international regional conferences and eventually a world conference of lawyers on the rule of law among nations would have tremendous import. Lawyers have never before worked together on this subject on a multinational or global scale. The prospect of worthwhile accomplishments has already stirred and inspired prospective participants in such conferences on a worldwide basis.

10. Participants in the proposed conferences would be jurists, practicing lawyers, and teachers of law.

11. The conferences should consider establishment of permanent clearinghouses of ideas, programs, and experience pertinent to the extension of world peace through the rule of law. There are great gaps in the reference works and legal materials available now even at the institutions which have exerted the greatest effort to collect such materials. The establishment of such centers in various regions around the world could be of great assistance in bringing legal concepts and rules of law into more general worldwide use. In this connection they should consider the possibility of proclamations of a World Law Day and a World Law Year to stimulate and coordinate the efforts of lawyers.

12. One of the U.S. reservations, which presently limit our acceptance of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, was discussed extensively. The consensus was that the unilateral determination clause of this reservation should be eliminated. Under this clause the United States and other nations having similar clauses can determine in each case filed against them whether the World Court has jurisdiction. As one of the greatest users of the rule of law nationally, the United States must prove that we trust the rule of law internationally. Such leadership on our part is essential.

13. A tremendous grassroots educational program is essential in the United States as well as in other countries. This program should spotlight the fact that, for survival, it is essential to develop reasonable restraints upon absolute sovereignty which will allow the building of a system of law into the legal vacuum which now exists internationally. This educational program is especially appropriate for lawyer leadership. As lawyers explain the potential use of law in the world community, the idea should attract strong and widespread support among laymen.

14. World government is impractical and impossible in today's world. The program herein urged is directed toward increasing the use of the rule of law in courts and creating new legal rules which the world community requires to govern the ever-increasing contacts which rapid communications and transportation bring about.

15. This effort to create a lawful world should emphasize its private sponsorship and participation. Governments should not play noticeable roles in this program so as to eliminate political issues and fears of lawyers of other countries. It should be a lawyer-to-lawyer to people-to-people program.

16. We should do all we can to strengthen the United Nations by urging increased application of, and adherence to, the rule of law in the deliberations and actions of all of its organs and agencies, as well as by urging amendments to the Charter to further the ideal of world peace through law.

17. The objectives of this program cannot be accomplished within a short time. A long-range continuous effort must be planned for by the legal profession of the nations of the world.

REPORT TO ICA

Upon consideration of the views summarized above, and of pertinent data obtained from other sources, including books, articles,

correspondence, and memorandums of conversations with specially qualified persons, the committee reached the conclusion that it is feasible to conduct a series of conferences, culminating in a world conference of lawyers from the United States and other nations, to consider and recommend specific measures for the advancement of world peace through law. A report embodying this conclusion and a proposed plan for conferences of lawyers of many nations was approved by the board of governors of the association on May 18, 1959, and presented to the International Cooperation Administration on May 19, 1959.

According to the plan embodied in the report, lawyers from the Americas, Asia, Africa, and Europe would meet first in international regional conferences at cities to be decided upon, possibly Rio de Janeiro, New Delhi, Accra, and Vienna, and eventually in a world conference at a city to be selected after considering the views of participants in the regional conferences.

Each of the international regional conferences would run for 5 days, and the world conference for 3 weeks.

The general objectives of each of the conferences would be to further the basic goal of furthering world peace through a more extensive use of the rule of law and to make international law and international courts a more powerful force in international relations, thereby reducing international tensions. The program to advance these objectives would be formulated with full realization that international relations cannot always be conducted under the rule of law as distinguished from policy and that some international disputes are not amenable to judicial decision. Political questions involving sovereignty must be more clearly distinguished from the nonpolitical questions which are suitable for submission to international courts.

AGENDA FOR THE PROPOSED CONFERENCES

The agenda for the conferences would be determined by committees provided for in the plan, upon consideration of topics which would include:

1. Means of increasing use of the International Court of Justice, including:

(a) Exercise of the Court's existing authority to sit outside The Hague and to form chambers of three or more judges for hearing and final decision of particular cases or classes of cases;

(b) Achievement of acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court by all nations without crippling reservations;

(c) Inclusion in future international agreements of a provision that disputes over their interpretation will be subject to the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court;

(d) Review of existing treaties and agreements and insertion of a provision that future disputes over their interpretation will be subject to the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court;

(e) Improvement in the practice, procedure and administration of the Court.

2. Establishment of regional courts of international law, outside the judicial system of the United Nations, by bilateral and multilateral treaties.

3. Extension of the jurisdiction of international courts, by amendment of the Statute of the International Court of Justice and by bilateral and multilateral treaties, to disputes between governments and individuals and between private parties, either generally or with specific reference to disputes growing out of contracts between governments and individuals or out of international business transactions.

4. Extension and improvement of institutions and procedures for arbitration of disputes between governments and of disputes growing out of concession contracts and international business transactions between governments and individuals and between private parties.

5. Extension and improvement of institutions and procedures for the improvement of the legal framework for the economic advancement of all nations and the removal of the legal uncertainties and fears which now block such advancement.

6. Consideration of means to strengthen the United Nations both by Charter changes and by increased use of existing United Nations machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes under the rule of law.

7. Establishment or improvement of agencies and procedures for clarification of uncertainties of existing international law and for adaptation of existing rules of international law to changing conditions with a view to furthering the growth of a body of international law acceptable to all nations by drawing upon all legal systems of the world.

8. Consideration of methods for compilation, reporting and analysis of legal decisions and other developments in the international field.

STATUS OF THE REPORT TO ICA

It is the belief of the committee that a series of conferences prepared for and conducted in the manner suggested in detail in the plan would result in the marshaling of the resources of the legal profession of all the participating nations for work towards world peace through law and for the education of world opinion which is essential to that end. The world conference, if it is held, would be expected to make appropriate arrangements for continuing pursuit of these objectives.

At the moment of the preparation of this report the committee has not been informed of any action by the International Cooperation Administration upon the report submitted to that agency on May 19, 1959.

OTHER ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE

The regional conferences held under the auspices of the committee, the letters addressed by the committee to lawyers throughout the United States before and after those conferences, the coverage of those conferences by press, radio, and television, and the statements by President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, Attorney General Rogers, the late Secretary of State Dulles, and other eminent public figures regarding the imperative necessity for the advancement of the rule of law among nations have resulted in the receipt by the committee of a vast amount of correspondence from lawyers and laymen asking what contributions they can make to furthering the objective of world peace through law. Many editorials in newspapers and magazines have hailed work on world peace through law as a great public service by the organized bar and have urged increased efforts by lawyers and laymen to achieve increased progress on this program.

At the suggestion of the committee, numerous State and local bar associations have established special committees on world peace through law for the purposes of studying relevant questions of international and constitutional law, cooperating with civic organizations in the arrangement of public meetings on Law Day—U.S.A. and other occasions; increasing personal contacts with lawyers in other countries; collecting law books to be sent to foreign libraries, law schools and law centers; and carrying out other plans and programs related to reliance upon the rule of law in world affairs. Also at the suggestion of the committee, the International Bar Association and the Inter-American Bar Association have created committees on world peace through law. Your committee expects to work closely with those committees. Some foreign bar associations have created similar committees. The interest and efforts of lawyers is thus gradually being organized and coordinated throughout the world.

It has become increasingly evident that laymen as well as lawyers are eager for current information on all subjects pertinent to the rule of law among nations and particularly on the action that may be taken, with some prospect of success, to facilitate the settlement of international disputes by this peaceful means. The committee has done its best to supply such information as requested. It believes that arrangements should be made for the compilation and regular distribution of information on ideas and developments in this field to those who are specially interested.

CONCLUSION

While the exploratory program this committee has conducted reveals tremendous worldwide interest in law as a replacement for weapons in international decision-making, it is clear that much work is still to be done toward making lawyers and laymen more fully aware of what they can do to advance the gradually evolving program of world peace through law herein outlined. International law as compared to national law is still in its infancy. The search for ways and means to expand the rule of law in the world community requires vision and extensive effort. Quick progress cannot be expected. But already encouraging developments can be noted, especially the many recent statements by leaders of our Nation and leaders of others nations urging increased use of and reliance upon the rule of law in international relations. The spotlight of world public opinion is focusing more and more upon the possibilities and potentialities in this field.

Our task in the months and years ahead must be to encourage increased cooperation among the lawyers of all nations in research, education, exchanges of information and experience, and, above all, leadership in directing the ever-rising tide of interest in the rule of law internationally toward proper and meaningful goals. Years and decades of hard work will be required to achieve tangible progress in this complicated area of expanded international use of the rule of law. But with the knowledge that increased use of the rule of law internationally can only lead toward a peaceful world, no effort should be spared to further interest in, and work upon, every possible subject, procedure or avenue encompassed in this program. No effort by our association can be more meaningful or more important to mankind. We should concentrate all the manpower and resources we can marshal toward the achievement of concrete results from this program.

To act for the association in connection with the arrangement and conduct of the proposed continental and world conferences and to aid in providing leadership in advancing world peace through the rule of law it is recommended that this committee be continued.

Respectfully submitted.

Charles S. Rhyne, Chairman; Homer G. Angelo; Arthur H. Dean, Erwin N. Griswold; Arthur Larson; Philip H. Lewis; Howard C. Petersen; Herman Phleger; Robert H. Reno; Robert G. Storey, Sr.; Lyman M. Tondel, Jr.; Loyd Wright.

AUGUST 24, 1959.

COMMENDATION OF NATIONAL JAYCEE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President I submit for appropriate reference a resolution recognizing as a fitting and patriotic endeavor the "build to beat communism"

campaign of community development sponsored by the National Junior Chamber of Commerce.

The Jaycee community development program is designed to provide leadership training through community improvement. This means that members of these local organizations will adequately inform themselves concerning the problems existing within their community and then to take appropriate action toward solving one or more of these problems.

This program will benefit our communities. It is typical of the fine work which the Junior Chamber of Commerce is doing. This program will I am sure induce other organizations and individuals to join with Jaycees in their efforts to "build to beat communism through community development."

Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may lie on the table until the close of business Friday, August 28, 1959, to give other interested Senators the opportunity of becoming cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

The resolution (S. Res. 173), was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate hereby recognizes as a fitting and patriotic endeavor the National Jaycee community development program, a program established for the purpose of providing leadership training through community improvement; and the Senate hereby commends and encourages the efforts of those joining in the undertaking of such program.

INCORPORATION OF NATIONAL DISTRICT ATTORNEYS' ASSOCIATION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of August 11, 1959, and August 21, 1959, the names of Mr. MOSS, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. CLARK were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2518) to incorporate the National District Attorneys' Association, introduced by Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER) on August 11, 1959.

FEDERAL ANNUITANTS HEALTH BENEFITS ACT OF 1959—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of August 21, 1959, the names of Senators HUMPHREY, BEALL, CAPEHART, and BUTLER were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2575) to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and other Senators) on August 21, 1959.

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. WILEY:

Text of a broadcast made by him over Wisconsin radio stations relating to the record of the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON ANTI-POLL-TAX AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments will hold a hearing on Senate Joint Resolution 126—the anti-poll-tax amendment—on Thursday, August 27. The hearing will be in room 457 of the Old Senate Office Building at 10:30 a.m. Any persons wishing to testify or file statements for the record should contact the subcommittee's counsel, Mr. Bernard Fensterwald, Jr.—room 252, Old Senate Office Building, telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 5581.

Hearings were begun on August 17 on this resolution to prohibit poll taxes in Federal elections. A hearing scheduled for August 20 was canceled for lack of witnesses.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I was intrigued, rather than disconcerted, by an article which appeared in the Sunday edition of the New York Times. The caption of the article is "GOP for Delay on Civil Rights."

The headline is followed by some rather well-worn phrases, such as "administration aides now prefer to have no civil rights bill reach the floor of either the House or the Senate this session."

So, Mr. President, with that quotation from that anonymous, supposedly authoritative source tucked away in the nose cone of the article, it then zooms off into the space of speculation. According to the article, the administration is supposed to think it can get a stronger civil rights measure next year. We are supposed to fear a filibuster. We are supposed to have a "deal" on, in the House, with a wing of the Democratic Party, to sacrifice civil rights on the altar of labor reform. We are supposed to be content to let the whole matter go over until next January.

But standing in the path of a Machiavellian GOP, the articles sees, and refers to, my very distinguished compatriot, the majority leader, as one who insists on civil rights legislation now, as distinguished from the alleged delaying tactics of the Republican Party.

Mr. President, before this journalistic missile goes into orbit, I should put a little message into the nose cone, just in case anyone finds it 5,000 miles away. I think my colleagues will credit me with being fairly close to the administration. I do go to the White House every week. And, as minority leader, I do have some suggestions about the legislative program.

Furthermore, Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, where I have attended with reasonable regularity, I am pretty close to the civil rights problem which has been before that committee for a long time.

I know of no administration aides who prefer to have no civil rights bill reach the floor of Congress at this session; and I challenge the New York Times journalist to name them. I know of no administration aides who want to postpone a civil rights bill until next January, so that we can play politics with it.

The Republican Party does not play politics with civil rights. We already have one of the finest records of advancing the cause of civil rights, from the very beginning of our party with Abraham Lincoln. I may say I had a good deal to do with writing the civil rights plank in San Francisco in 1956. I introduced five of the administration's seven bills; and on a number of occasions I have sat in the Judiciary Committee all day long, in the hope that before this session spins out, we might have an opportunity to vote on a civil rights bill.

In 1957, it was my predecessor, the then minority leader, Senator Knowland, who took a daring step to bypass the Judiciary Committee and bring the bill to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the remainder of my statement printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

We already have one of the finest records of advancing the cause of civil rights from the very beginning of our party under Abraham Lincoln.

In 1957, the then minority leader, Senator Knowland, took a daring step to bypass the Senate Judiciary Committee which, under Democratic majority chairmen, has been the graveyard of civil rights measures. By a rare motion, he brought the subject direct from the House passage to the Senate Calendar. As a result, we did pass a civil rights measure—the first in over 80 years. And 1957 was not an election year.

The Republican Party is too serious about civil rights to play politics with it anywhere, anytime. It is the firm tradition of our party to take every opportunity to make progress, great or small, in the field of civil rights. We will do this in or out of election years.

We do not fear a filibuster. We do not make deals to sacrifice civil rights for labor reform—we want both and I submit we shall get both.

We are delighted to see the majority leader on his knightly charger ready to do battle for the rescue of civil rights. Although in yeoman garb as befits minority members, we are ready to march with the majority leader in this great cause.

We beseech him to talk to the majority chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee to stop blocking our efforts to bring forth a

bill. We urge him to talk to his colleague in command of the House to let the Rules Committee open the gate over there. We want a civil rights bill now—not next January.

It is not the Republican administration which hopes for delay. It is not the Republican minority in the House and Senate which stands in the way.

The roadblock is the Democratic majority which has the votes and the control. I shall be delighted to have the majority leader break a lance with them in the cause of civil rights. He will have the administration and the Republican minority solidly behind him—notwithstanding this journalistic trial missile which painfully struggles to get off the launching pad in the face of obvious defects.

Coming from the New York Times, which makes the truth and responsible journalism an article of its faith, this item in this morning's paper is flagrantly insupportable:

"GOP FOR DELAY ON CIVIL RIGHTS—ADMINISTRATION NOW SHUNS FLOOR ACTION AS JOHNSON PRESSES FOR MEASURE

"WASHINGTON, August 23.—Administration aides now prefer to have no civil rights bill reach the floor of either the House or the Senate this session.

"They think there would be a better chance for a strong civil rights measure next year.

"At this late date in the present session, they feel, pressure for adjournment would force civil rights backers in the Senate to give up on controversial provisions rather than face extended debate.

"In the House, they point out, the Republican-southern Democratic coalition has just reached a peak of effectiveness in the labor bill fight, and conditions are therefore not good for strong GOP support of a civil rights measure.

"Next year will be a presidential election year, and political pressure for civil rights legislation is expected to be that much greater.

"This theory runs head-on, however, into the hard fact of Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON'S plans. The majority leader has said repeatedly that a civil rights bill will be passed by the Senate before adjournment.

"From Senator JOHNSON'S point of view, it is a political must to get the Senate phase of the issue out of the way at this session. He wants at all costs to avoid a party-splitting civil rights battle just before the 1960 elections.

"Thus the strategic picture at present is one of considerable irony. Senator JOHNSON, who has been accused of lukewarm support for civil rights measures, is pushing for early action. Administration spokesmen, who have called for prompt floor action, are now not at all sure they want it.

"End-of-session tactics

"In the end-of-session situation, the southerners in the Senate will be in a position to talk to death any provisions that they find really offensive.

"They will surely not agree to any limitation of debate unless they have assurances from Senator JOHNSON that he has the votes to kill any such proposals.

Senator JOHNSON is therefore in a commanding position to fix the character of any bill passed at this session. He seems likely to seek agreement on these provisions:

"Extension of the Civil Rights Commission, now scheduled to expire next month.

"A requirement for preservation of State voting records and disclosure of them to Justice Department investigators.

"Some provision against bombing of churches and schools.

"Authority to set up Federal schools for children of military personnel when local schools are closed over the racial issue.

"Other provisions requested by the administration include Federal technical aid for school districts agreeing to desegregate, and a law making it a crime to obstruct school integration orders of Federal courts.

"Chances for House passage of any civil rights bill before adjournment now appear nil. A bill is out of the Judiciary Committee, but it will have an extremely difficult time getting the necessary clearance from the Rules Committee.

If the Senate does pass a bill and the House does not, the final decision would be put over until next January. In that event, there is a chance for simple bill extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission to go through this session."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I just wish to be on record, as affirmatively and as emphatically as I know how, as stating that there is not an iota of fact or truth in the New York Times article, I do not care who wrote it; and we will nail down that fact right now.

WHY TAXES ROSE IN NEW YORK STATE

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, Governor Rockefeller, of New York, delivered an address recently at the annual dinner meeting of the National Association of State Budget Officers, meeting in New York City. He urged the members of this association to project their thinking far enough into the future so that the States would be prepared to meet the responsibilities as well as the opportunities that lie ahead. He said:

I am convinced that our people are ready and willing to assume the responsibilities as well as the privileges of self-government, including the fiscal responsibilities, once the hard facts of the problem are made clear to them.

* * * * *

People recognize that it is cheaper and sounder to pay as we go than to resort to borrowing for current needs at a cost of $1.50 for every dollar borrowed.

A recently published article from the New York Times regarding Governor Rockefeller's address reads in part as follows:

Mr. Rockefeller's advice about meeting fiscal problems head on came at a time when most of the budget directors who heard him were encountering difficulty in getting enough revenue to cover projected spending.

I ask unanimous consent that the news account of Governor Rockefeller's address, to which I have referred, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

GOVERNOR TELLS WHY TAXES ROSE—STATE FACED FISCAL CRISIS WHEN HE TOOK OFFICE, HE SAYS IN SPEECH HERE

Governor Rockefeller said last night that the State would have plunged over "an economic Niagara Falls" without even a barrel for protection if taxes had not been raised this year.

His defense of his controversial tax increase program was made in a speech at the annual dinner meeting of the National Association of State Budget Officers at the Barbizon Plaza Hotel.

He urged the members to project their thinking far enough into the future so the States would be prepared to meet the responsibilities as well as the opportunities that lay ahead.

"If we are going to have a future worth working for, we must have some idea of its contours and content," he said. "The alternative is government by fits-and-starts, government by improvisation and, in the end, government by crisis."

Recounting his own experience with his first State budget, Mr. Rockefeller continued:

"On assuming office, I found to my dismay how really unprepared the previous administration had been in relation to its fiscal responsibilities.

LIVING BEYOND MEANS

"It had been living way beyond its means and was heading blissfully for an economic Niagara Falls. If we had continued on such a course, we wouldn't even have a barrel to go over the falls in."

But, he said, thanks to courageous action by the legislature, the outlook has changed.

"I am convinced," he went on, "that our people are ready and willing to assume the responsibilities as well as the privileges of self-government, including the fiscal responsibilities, once the hard facts about the problems are made clear to them."

Renewing his support of a pay-as-you-build policy with respect to major construction, Mr. Rockefeller explained:

"People recognize that it is cheaper and sounder to pay as we go than to resort to borrowing for current needs at a cost of $1.50 for every $1 borrowed."

SPENDING RISE FORESEEN

Mr. Rockefeller's advice about meeting fiscal problems headon came at a time when most of the budget directors who heard him were encountering difficulty in getting enough revenue to cover projected spending.

One recent expert study led to a prediction that State and local government spending for the country as a whole would increase by a minimum of 5 percent a year for the next 5 years. This rate, it was said, is likely to be substantially greater than the probable rise in national income.

Between 1946 and 1956 State and local spending rose from $14 billion to $43 billion, or 209 percent. In the same period national income (gross national product) increased only 99 percent.

The difference between the growth rates of State and local spending and national income account for the increases in tax rates and the rise in the number of governmental bond issues during this period. It likewise accounts for the mounting resistance to further tax-rate increases that most of the State budget officials at the meeting are reporting.

ARE THE PEOPLE AHEAD OF THEIR LEADERS?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, strangely enough, in yesterday's New York Times magazine section there was published a very brilliant article on a subject closely related to that discussed by Governor Rockefeller in his recent address before the National Association of State Budget Officers. The article is entitled "Are the People Ahead of Their Leaders?" and was written by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

In this article, the Senator from Oregon asserts that in today's world, Americans are ready to face reality and more ready to make sacrifices than many of their representatives believe. I was so impressed with the common sense of this article and with the general philosophy of it, which I think is so important to us here today, that I ask unanimous

consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

ARE THE PEOPLE AHEAD OF THEIR LEADERS?
(By Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon)

WASHINGTON.—Many Members of Congress admit candidly to a belief that practical politics requires them to be extremely wary about acquainting their constituents with the stern realities that face the United States in a troubled world.

In the minds of these Senators and Representatives exists a stereotype of the average voter which adds up to a fellow who, given the choice, will invariably follow the path of least resistance. They fear the people are not prepared for further sacrifices in order to advance America's interests and prestige abroad. They are convinced the public is oblivious to the magnitude of the perils in the present world situation, particularly with respect to the industrial and technological emergence of Russia and, to a lesser degree, of Communist China. Nor do they feel that gratitude will accrue to the political leader who endeavors to alert the public to such dangers.

One reason for this rather unflattering concept of the folks back home is the notion, widely held on Capitol Hill, that much of the electorate is more interested in a new hard-surfaced road to the county seat than in what happens to Burma or Iraq. If there is any one maxim which seems to prevail among many Members of our National Legislature, it is that local matters must come first and global problems a poor second—that is, if the Member of Congress is to survive politically. Berlin or Cyprus may be important, but it is at the courthouse and precinct level that votes are won. And I have heard more than one colleague declare that a lot of his constituents would rather have their taxes reduced than land a space rocket on the far side of the moon.

The results of such beliefs may be discerned in many aspects of governmental policy. Despite the fact that even the President's shaky $77 billion budget is not balanced by existing revenues, in neither the Senate nor the House is strong sentiment apparent to increase taxes so that this generation can take care of its own obligations. The fiscal year just ended saw some $13 billion added to the national debt. The interstate highway trust fund is running in the red, but Congress has moved slowly and with great reluctance on the matter, although at last the House Ways and Means Committee has taken partial measures to put the program on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Nor is such political timidity confined to Capitol Hill. Some 34 Governors of the sovereign States want the Federal Government to continue providing 90 percent of the $39.2 billion cost of these interstate roads, but they have petitioned against raising the Federal share of the gasoline tax.

Postal revenues still lag behind expenditures, yet bills to boost postage rates languish in congressional committees. There is much oratory against special privilege in general, but little is done specifically. Tax loopholes are not closed, despite the obvious discrimination and injustice which they typify. And despite all the fanfare about political reform, bills to control or regulate campaign spending still have gotten nowhere on congressional calendars.

The glut of agricultural products continues to mount in warehouses and silos, but the sponsors of the administration's much-heralded program to cut down on wheat price supports did not even seek a Senate rollcall on their own proposal. Key Senators from farm States were reluctant to be forced into taking a stand. The reciprocal-trade structure wobbles when lower bids on electrical equipment from friendly neighboring nations are deliberately set aside by the Government, under heavy political pressure, in favor of paying higher prices to domestic firms.

In the political world there is apprehension over the presidential elections of 1960. An unwillingness exists to offend blocs of votes. This attitude rests mainly on the thesis that the American public is not ready for sacrifice, that the presidential hopeful who dared advocate higher taxes or more expensive postage stamps or an end to discriminatory benefits favoring powerful political groups would be out of the running.

In my opinion, such concepts are wrong. I believe that the national leader who promised the public sacrifice rather than subsidies would soon rally a dedicated and informed following in every State. I think he could speak in terms of increased Federal revenues to defend ourselves and the rest of the free nations, and I feel he could challenge many special interest organizations to relinquish their favored treatment at the expense of the public purse. He would have to be fair, and he would have to voice his advocacies without fear or favor.

Let me make plain what I mean. He could not ask the rural electric farm cooperatives to give up their special 2 percent interest rate on loans from the Treasury, unless he also challenged the private power companies to abandon their accelerated tax writeoffs. But if he did both, I am convinced he would not only get away with it but increase his popularity.

I am aware that my authority for such statements is sharply limited. I am only 1 of 98 Members of the Senate, and I come from a Pacific seaboard State of only 1,800,000 residents. Yet it is not an untypical State, and many national elections have demonstrated that geography rarely influences broad political attitudes in the United States. From the contacts which I have with my constituents—in person and by mail—I think the people are fully prepared for more sacrifices. In fact, it is my view that they are becoming highly suspicious of politicians who imply that the rough trail ahead can be traveled successfully without more sacrifices being undertaken.

A few months ago I decided to put this matter to the test. I introduced four bills to increase Federal revenues by a total of some $3.3 billion. The proposals were (1) a restoration of the excess-profits tax in effect during the Korean war, (2) a reduction in the special depletion allowance for oil companies from 27.5 to 15 percent, (3) permitting the Post Office Department to set its own rates based on sound cost-accounting methods, and (4) increasing the Federal tax on gasoline and other motor fuels from 3 cents to 4½ cents a gallon.

I suppose it may be said that because the first two of these bills would levy only on corporations they involved no political risks. But the proposals to increase postage rates and gas taxes definitely would affect the public, and can be regarded as some measure of whether or not the people are prepared psychologically for additional sacrifices to bear the necessary burdens of government.

During a 10-day trip across the continent to Oregon, I spoke a dozen times before various organizations. The theme of each speech was the same—that if we expected more benefits and a higher level of services from the U.S. Government, then we should be prepared to pay for them in the form of increased taxes.

On no occasion did I encounter a reaction which could be regarded as hostile. Indeed, it seemed to me that exactly the opposite was the case. I remember particularly addressing the annual luncheon of the Western Forest Industries Association. This is an organization of prominent lumbermen, who seek additional funds for the Forest Service in order that larger stands of national forest stumpage may be offered for sale.

In effect, I told these constituents that, while they constantly pressured me to secure more appropriations from the Treasury, I never once had heard from any of them in behalf of augmenting Treasury revenues. Then I offered my belief that this generation should take care of its own needs and obligations, rather than shoving them off onto the Americans of the future, who will have plenty of problems of their own.

I had spoken to the Western Forest Association in the past, but this was the only time I ever received what might be called an ovation. Many members came to the dais and said they were glad to be told the truth rather than being fed "political pap." And my mail still contains letters of approbation from these hardheaded sawmill operators.

This has been the predominant reaction which I have encountered to my tax-increase proposals. For every letter from Oregon criticizing the proposals to boost motor-fuel levies or to authorize higher postage rates, there are at least two letters approving both ideas.

I actually had submitted myself and my political fate to something of this same test last year, when my vote decided the question of higher postage rates on a special five-member Senate subcommittee appointed to consider the issue. The first general rate increase in all categories since 1932 was the result. Political attacks on me in Oregon took place almost immediately. I was accused of putting a tax on the mother writing her GI son in military service, or on the maiden sending a love letter to her boy friend overseas. Among the critics was my senior colleague in the Senate, WAYNE MORSE, one of the most tireless and effective orators in American public life.

My answer was short and direct. I pointed out that the Post Office Department had been operating at a deficit of $700 million, while paying its clerks and letter carriers wages as low as $4,000 a year. Should this deficit be narrowed by the people and businesses who were using the mails or should it be heaped on the entire body of taxpayers, now and in the future? I doubt if a dozen citizens came to me all during the autumn with any criticism of my decisive vote to institute higher postal rates.

This is consistent with our whole national past. The American people have never flinched from burdens and sacrifices, despite the frequent effort of demagogs to discourage them from doing so.

During the terrible ordeal of the Civil War, it became necessary for the Federal Government to enact the first general conscription law Americans ever had experienced. The law declared all able-bodied male citizens between the ages of 20 and 45 eligible for military service in the Union Army. Foes of President Lincoln and his administration spared no effort, fair or foul, to inflame the public against what then seemed an extraordinary demand upon the lives and careers of the Nation's young men. Lincoln even had political antagonists in his own Cabinet who administered the law as oppressively as possible, in order to arouse popular indignation, especially among wives and mothers.

Yet, in spite of these appeals to selfishness and cowardice, the people supported the Union war effort and the President who headed it. The so-called Peace Democrats, who felt the public was unequal to heroic sacrifices, suffered constant repudiation at the polls. President Lincoln won the electoral vote of all except three Union States in 1864.

The lessons of our history point dramatically to a national capacity for sacrifice and

great deeds. Yet neither Congress nor the administration seems disposed to draw on these lessons for guidance in the present crisis of relations between East and West, with the Soviet Union steadily drawing nearer to parity or even supremacy over us in many important realms of technology and production.

The $13 billion added to the national debt in the last fiscal year might have been even greater if some leading Democrats had achieved their wish for across-the-board tax reductions in the spring of 1958.

I would recommend a careful review of an episode which occurred in 1947 when the Republican 80th Congress enacted a generous tax reduction, despite the huge national debt left over from World War II and the drastic inflation already setting in after the abrupt removal of price control. President Truman vetoed the tax-reduction bill and made the veto stick by a narrow margin. "This is the wrong time to provide for tax reduction," he told Congress.

In the elections of 1948 the Republicans seized on this veto as a major issue. Harry Truman not only retained the Presidency, in one of the great political upsets of our era, but the Democrats wrested dominanace in the Senate and House from the Republicans, many of whom had assumed that tax reduction would be an issue of overwhelming popularity with the American public.

A new look at public opinion might well be undertaken by the current 86th Congress. Predicated on my own mail and on personal contacts with the voters. I would unhesitatingly declare that the public prefers additional sacrifices to either an abandonment of our obvious national needs or to a piling up of further financial deficits. I believe the Members of the Senate and the House must be able to separate the clamor of special interests from the legitimate voice of the people.

This sifting is not too difficult. On many issues, the public may be quiescent while a few lobbyists with mimeograph machines and funds for telegrams may seem to take over. Yet this does not mean that the public agrees with the pleadings of the special interests—far from it. And on election day the Jeffersonian axiom of "one man, one vote" generally prevails. Special interests and pressure groups may be able to buy unlimited wires and letterheads, but ballots are not thus readily procured.

Of course, public opinion is never suspended between heaven and earth like Mohammed's coffin. It does not exist in a vacuum. It frequently must be mobilized, cultivated and informed. This is where the executive and the Congress both have an obligation to make every effort to help educate the voters to the realities which confront us all. People rarely can know on their own the specific facts regarding military might of the Soviet Union or the industrial emergence of Red China. These must be disseminated by political leaders who are not afraid to tell their constituents the cold, hard truth, grim and unpleasant though it may be.

This educational process can take many forms—in speeches, direct personal contacts, through the vast torrent of mail which flows out from Capitol Hill and the White House, in press releases and in news letters.

The President possesses the greatest forum in the land, because each word spoken at the White House is magnified countless times. Every Member of Congress also has innumerable avenues to his constituents. Thus, public opinion can be created and led, if those in Government have the courage to keep the sugar-coating off the prescriptions which they prepare for the American electorate. Indeed, this educational process may be one of the most important duties of those who serve in high national offices. Could Jefferson have acquired the West or Lincoln have held together the Union if they had disregarded the formation of public opinion, even with the relatively crude methods for reaching the people which were available in the periods in which they played their epoc roles?

Speaking of a complex and potentially unpopular issue like foreign aid, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said that only the President could prepare the whole public to accept such a program as this. I agree substantially with the Fulbright thesis, although I would add the one cautionary note that Congress likewise has a duty to spread vital information in support of essential undertakings which may be politically unpopular or unpalatable. And Senator FULBRIGHT recently told his colleagues that he believes the American people "would prefer to pay more taxes, if necessary, than to default to the Soviet Union."

So I hope our colleagues in both Chambers of Congress will take a fresh look at the willingness of the average American to face up to realities. I doubt if our people want to be told that they can enjoy increased governmental benefits without paying higher taxes. I doubt if they want to be assured that the Soviet Union can be kept from world domination without many of our young men experiencing rigorous service in their country's uniform. I doubt if they want special privilege, whether it goes to labor unions or to big business.

This same challenge goes, too, to the military hero now serving his final term in the White House. In the last analysis, his is the one national voice in the land—the only voice not anchored to the sectional interests of a single State or region. Harry S. Truman, who has a deep reverence for the high office he occupied for 7 years, has written, "It is through the use of these great powers (of the Presidency) that leadership arises, events are molded and administrations take on character."

I think this is sound advice to Dwight D. Eisenhower. If he should seek further sacrifices and national duty of his continent-wide constituency, I have no doubt whatever that the American people will respond with firmness and with courage—as they have to all similar appeals from their leaders since this country was founded under great travail in 1789.

DISASTER AT ROSEBURG, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on August, 19 I discussed in the Senate a number of the details concerning the disaster which struck Roseburg, Oreg., in the early morning hours of August 7. A tremendous explosion of a dynamite- and ammonium-nitrate-laden truck caused at least 16 deaths, resulted in more than 52 cases of severe injury, and brought about millions of dollars of property damage losses.

The reports I received concerning this terrible emergency left me with lasting and deep impressions of the wonderful and heroic responses of the people of Roseburg and the entire State of Oregon.

Again and again there came to my attention glowing reports of the speed and efficiency with which the Oregon National Guard acted in this instance. Within an almost incredibly short period of time members of the National Guard were on duty in the disaster area protecting lives and property and bringing order to what otherwise might have been chaos.

Today I received a letter from Brig. Gen. Alfred E. Hintz, the adjutant general of the State of Oregon. His report concerning the mobilization of the Oregon National Guard and the work of the National Guardsmen during this emergency so impressed me that I believe it should be brought to the attention of the entire Congress. For that reason, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that General Hintz' letter of August 19 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATE OF OREGON,
MILITARY DEPARTMENT,
Salem, Oreg., August 19, 1959

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Regarding our recent tragedy in Roseburg, I thought you would be interested to know briefly the role the Oregon National Guard played in assisting the citizens and city of Roseburg.

On Friday morning, August 7, following the early hour explosion at 0115 hours (1:15 a.m.), the first unit of the Oregon National Guard was called out. The unit was Company D, 2d Battle Group, 186th Infantry, stationed in Roseburg. Approximately 50 percent of the unit was mobilized by 0145 hours (1:45 a.m.) which is less than 1 hour after the time of the explosion. This indicates the degree of organization and readiness that exists in our National Guard units without further enlarging upon the matter. The balance of this unit was present by 0600 hours (6 a. m.). The first elements of the unit stationed in Cottage Grove, Company B, 2d Battle Group, 186th Infantry, arrived in Roseburg about 0700 hours (7 a.m.), August 7, with the balance of the unit present by 1200 hours (noon) on August 7. These were the only two units initially called out by the adjutant general's office as directed by the Governor's office. At 1130 (11:30 a.m.) on August 7, additional help was requested by officials in Roseburg. The Grants Pass unit, Company C, 2d Battle Group, 186th Infantry, was then mobilized. This unit was present in Roseburg by 1730 hours (5:30 p.m.). The total strength of these three units which were present in Roseburg was as follows: 20 officers, 1 warrant officer, 191 enlisted men.

The above units constituted the units of the Oregon National Guard that were utilized in the disaster area. The total strength was gradually reduced throughout the period August 7 through August 15 with the last National Guard personnel released from Roseburg at 2000 hours (8 p.m.) August 15. The total cost to the Mililtary Department, State of Oregon, for the entire period was $10,833.53.

The primary duty of these units was to protect life and property in the Roseburg area in the initial days of the disaster until businesses were secured to protect against looting. After this had been accomplished, the National Guardsmen were used to isolate dangerous areas and buildings from all but authorized persons.

These National Guardsmen gave freely and willingly of their time. In many instances, the pay they received from being on military duty was much less than the wages from their civilian jobs. However, this was of no major concern to the men as they knew the people of Roseburg had lost a great deal more. It is a glowing spirit and joint effort by our National Guard units in times of need such as this, that makes us all justly proud of the Oregon National Guard.

The merit and conduct of the National Guardsmen during the Roseburg disaster have been further endorsed by most appreciative and praiseworthy comments from civic and State officials who worked closely

with the stricken city. I feel such words of praise are most deserving.

With best personal regards and I look forward to the pleasure of seeing you again soon.

Sincerely,

ALFRED E. HINTZ,
Brigadier General,
The Adjutant General.

REV. DR. FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS, CHAPLAIN OF THE SENATE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on August 16, 1959, the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Chaplain of the Senate, the Reverend Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, participated in a broadcast into the State of Texas. In the broadcast, the Senator from Texas very beautifully and eloquently expressed his views about the spiritual leadership of the Chaplain of the Senate. I associate myself with the remarks which the Senator from Texas made about the Chaplain, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the radio broadcast be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WASHINGTON RADIO REPORT FROM LYNDON B. JOHNSON, U.S. SENATOR

Senator JOHNSON. Today I have in the Senate radio studio with me, in the Capitol of the United States, one of the best men and one of the wisest men with whom I am associated. He is Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain to the U.S. Senate.

Dr. Harris was ordained in 1912. He has served as Chaplain continuously since 1949, when I came to the Senate, and was Chaplain prior to that from 1942 to 1946.

Dr. Harris is the author of five books, as well as a weekly syndicated column "Spires of the Spirit."

Dr. Harris tells me that Benjamin Franklin was the man responsible for bringing the Chaplain into the Continental Congress.

I think, Dr. Harris, my first question will be to ask you to give the people of Texas something of the history of the chaplaincy in the U.S. Senate.

Dr. HARRIS. May I say first to the good people of Texas that I count it a privilege to have a little part in this program with my good friend, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, whom I very greatly admire. He is, indeed, an able leader.

Now, as the Senator said, the custom of having a Chaplain goes back really to Carpenters Hall in Philadelphia. They had been meeting day after day without any recognition of spiritual verities, when Benjamin Franklin arose one morning and called attention to the fact that they had gone on with all their perplexing problems without any recognition of the Almighty.

He suggested that they call a minister from some distance in for the next day. They did, and continued to do that every day during their discussions following.

That was really the beginning of the chaplaincy. It was not a recognition, of course, of church, but of religion—which is a very different thing.

Senator JOHNSON. Dr. Harris, there's nothing as important to me as your daily prayer or as the variety of prayers that are given in the Senate by visiting ministers that come from time to time. I know it's that important to me and how important it is to other Members of the Senate.

I wonder if you would tell me—if you think it's appropriate—about your daily work and the visits that you have with people from all over the United States as well as with Members of the Senate.

Dr. HARRIS. Well, of course, it's a very great inspiration to meet so many people, constantly, from all parts of the country and, through the Senators, to have the opportunity for contact with them.

As far as the prayer is concerned, it's a deep satisfaction to know that it isn't just a pious gesture.

For instance, as far as the Senators are concerned—if, because of committee meetings or other pressures, they cannot be there at the opening of the Senate, they tell me again and again that the prayer means a great deal in their lives, that they always read it whether they happen to be there when it's offered or not. A number of them have lately said to me that they read it aloud in their families.

Senator JOHNSON. I would remind my listeners that the prayer is reproduced each day on the front page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Senate proceedings.

I think that results in considerable mail coming to you, doesn't it, Dr. Harris?

Dr. HARRIS. Yes; that's one of the great compensations of this wonderful relationship to the Senate. Letters come from folks all over the United States saying that they use the prayers in their own devotional life.

Senator JOHNSON. Thank you, Dr. Harris. We have enjoyed having you as our guest today.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call attention to two matters relative to the Chaplain which I shall raise in due course of time when it is appropriate to raise them in connection with proposed legislation on the floor of the Senate.

First, I think we ought to correct the unfair policy which we are following in respect to the salary of the Chaplain. I think we should end the inequality which exists between his salary and that of the Chaplain of the House. That statement is no reflection on either Chaplain. I simply think the salaries ought to be equalized. I shall initiate at the appropriate time the necessary legislative action which will accomplish that purpose.

Second, in the past I have been the author of resolutions which have provided for the printing of the beautiful and inspiring prayers of the Chaplain. I am advised that the supply of copies of the Chaplain's prayers is almost depleted.

I make great use of these prayers in response to mail which I receive asking for copies of them, as I know other Senators do. I think it is well in America that we disseminate as widely as possible the great spiritual lessons which the Chaplain teaches us morning after morning as he prays over us and asks for divine guidance of our work in the Senate.

I simply serve notice now that at the appropriate time I shall not only sponsor a proposal which will make it possible to replenish the copies of the prayers which have been printed heretofore, but shall also ask authorization that the new supply contain the prayers which have been offered since the last previous printing, and that they be published in individual volumes, because I think in such form they are the most serviceable.

I have heard from many, many ministers throughout the country urging this course of action. I consider it a privilege and an honor to continue my sponsorship of these printings. I feel certain that the Senate will support me in my recommendation.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, this is Monday morning, the day the Committee on the Judiciary regularly and habitually meets. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that late on Friday afternoon, there was delivered to my office a notice that on this day there would be no meeting of the Committee on the Judiciary. No reason was assigned, and I do not wish to ascribe unworthy motives to anyone. I only wish to state facts.

The facts are these, among others: that the pending business before the Judiciary Committee is my amendment in the nature of a substitute for Senate bill 2391, commonly known as the civil rights bill, which was the legislation favorably reported by the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee; it was being considered when the committee last discussed the matter of civil rights.

Earlier this month, I became convinced that a number of members of the Judiciary Committee—I may say no more than 4 or 5, out of the committee of 15—were intransigent in their determination that no civil-rights measure of any kind or character would be reported from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Many of us undertook to obtain from our worthy colleagues expressions on this subject; and I went so far as to ask the question, "Are any of the gentlemen who have been opposing this proposed legislation in toto, willing to accept any part of it?"

I have yet to hear any affirmative answer from any of those gentlemen. I wish to emphasize that it is certainly their right to follow the dictates of their own consciences and their own beliefs.

Accordingly, because of the conviction that no civil-rights measure would be reported from the Judiciary Committee, because the majority of the committee would not be permitted to vote to report to the Senate any civil rights bill—a week ago today I undertook to bring the matter to the floor of the Senate.

I should like to say—without any argument ad personam—that what has happened today simply bears out the fact, which I stated before the Senate a week ago, that I had no hope that any proposed civil rights legislation would be reported from the Judiciary Committee.

Accordingly, we proceeded—and I may say that I did so most reluctantly—to bypass the Judiciary Committee. Today's failure of the committee to hold any meeting whatsoever, with its pending business being the civil rights bill, as reported to the full Judiciary Committee by its Constitutional Rights Subcommittee—together with the substitute I offered—demonstrates that there is no willingness on the part of a minority of the Judiciary Committee to report to the Senate any civil rights measure. In fact, there is a very determined effort by a minority of the Judiciary Committee to

prevent the reporting of any civil rights measure to protect the rights and freedoms of all our people. Therefore I think it must be done by an amendment to a bill already on the calendar or otherwise before the Senate, as I have indicated. That is why, Mr. President, I submitted last Monday my eight-point civil rights package, which is presently an amendment to S. 1617 on the Senate Calendar. I might say that I stand ready to offer that, or some portions of it, either in toto or separately, as an amendment or individual amendments to proposed legislation, as it may in due course seem most expeditious and proper to do so.

PROPOSED FILMING OF "THE UGLY AMERICAN"

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "'Ugly American' Embroils Capital," written by E. W. Kenworthy, and published in the New York Times of August 24, 1959. The article deals with the proposed filming of the book "The Ugly American," by Eugene Burdick and William J. Lederer, in the Embassy at Bangkok, Thailand, and the effort to enlist the good offices of the State Department in making the film. The State Department is being urged to facilitate the filming of this book.

I wish only to raise the question as to the wisdom of the Department itself, or the Government, lending its approval and imprimatur to such a film. I assume that in our country of free enterprise we cannot prevent the filming of any kind of book, no matter how scandalous it may be or how misrepresented our Government may be in such a film.

On the other hand, it seems to me unwise to lend the name and support of the Government to the filming of what I consider to be a vastly exaggerated and libelous account of how our Government is conducted.

I do not deny that there is inefficiency in government. There is often good reason for the existence of inefficiency. I believe that our Government ought to do everything it can to improve. However, it might well be a serious mistake to lend our approval to this enterprise, especially by having the film made in the Embassy in Bangkok, and giving the producers the right to say that the book was filmed under such conditions.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. JORDAN. In other words, the Senator does not want to publicize our inefficiency any more than necessary?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct. I feel the same way about some of our domestic affairs, even in the Senate. We can talk about them, but I do not wish to make a film of them. I am always hopeful that we may be able to improve the situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

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

"UGLY AMERICAN" EMBROILS CAPITAL—STATE DEPARTMENT PRESSED TO BACK FILMING OF BOOK IT DIDN'T LIKE

(By E. W. KENWORTHY)

WASHINGTON, August 23.—For some weeks, a backstage drama has been enacted here involving a script writer, assorted Congressmen and high State Department officials, Marlon Brando, Ambassador Gilbert MacWhite, and a beautiful Eurasian girl, named Ruth Jyoto.

In this cast of characters, it should be noted, Ambassador MacWhite and the beautiful Eurasian girl are strictly figments of the imagination. Even so, they are all too real for the State Department.

In the filming of "The Ugly American," Eugene Burdick and William J. Lederer made Gilbert MacWhite one of the few "good guys" in a parcel of incompetents, mediocrities and political sinecurists, who were making a hash out of the foreign aid program.

The book was published last fall by W. W. Norton & Co., New York.

BRANDO HAS LEAD

In the film of "The Ugly American," which will be made by Universal-International Pictures, Inc., Ambassador MacWhite will be the bachelor-hero who resigns his post when Washington insists on building a big, modern road that the natives do not want and insist they do not need. Marlon Brando will have the part.

Unfortunately for film purposes, Messrs. Burdick and Lederer did not supply any love interest. This deficiency has been remedied by the script writer with the creation of Ruth Jyoto.

State Department officials, who have seen the first script, variously describe scenes between the Ambassador and the Eurasian beauty as "quite amorous" and "plenty hot."

The drama here has centered on whether the State Department should lend its good offices in the making of the film and, if so, how much.

SUPPORT IN CONGRESS

The producers and a number of Senators and Representatives have argued that the State Department should be cooperative. The State Department, whose enthusiasm for "The Ugly American" has been negligible, has had its doubts.

The first act, or, rather, the first round, has ended with Universal the victor.

George Englund, the producer-director, and Stewart Stern, the script writer, will arrive in Bangkok, Thailand, tomorrow to make location surveys and other preparations for shooting the film.

They will have been preceded by a letter from the State Department directing the Embassy to extend them the courtesies and cooperation normally accorded American businessmen.

The story leading to the dispatch of this letter began last March when Messrs. Englund and Stern, accompanied by John Horton, Washington representative for Universal, talked with Edwin M. J. Kretzmann, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, and several other officials.

Messrs. Englund and Stern said they did not want to do a film that would harm U.S. interests, that they were eager to dramatize a positive statement about American foreign policy, and that they would appreciate the help of the State Department.

The State Department officials, it is said, made it plain that the Department could not be put in the position of collaborating on the picture or endorsing it or censoring it.

Messrs. Englund and Stern, according to informants here, said that they would not, of course, submit to any censorship, but they would like Department officials to read the first draft of the script when it was ready and express the Department's views.

On this understanding, the Department officials agreed to read the draft.

A FRIEND IN NEED

During this March trip, Messrs. Englund and Stern also "put an anchor to windward" on Capitol Hill. They called on Representative JOHN BRADEMAS, Democrat, of Indiana, a former Rhodes scholar and a friend of Mr. Burdick. Mr. BRADEMAS set up a luncheon with several Senators and Representatives.

About a month ago, four copies of the first draft of the script were delivered at the State Department. According to Mr. Stern, the readers in the Department were not exactly enthusiastic but they were interested.

The view of Department officials, who do not want to be named, was that the script stank.

WRITERS CHIDED

What was particularly objectionable in the Department's view, it was said, was the basing of the plot on the road project.

The script writer, this official said, had no more understanding than Messrs. Burdick and Lederer of the economic and military importance of a road.

Mr. Englund and Mr. Stern became convinced that the Department would pass the word to Thailand that it was not eager to have the picture made.

Mr. Englund got in touch with several Democratic legislators, including Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota.

Senator HUMPHREY wrote to Christian A. Herter, Secretary of State, that he was convinced Mr. Englund and his associates were attempting to do an honest and responsible job of telling what the State Department and the International Cooperation Administration were doing in Southeast Asia.

He said he thought Mr. Englund should receive every courtesy from the Embassy in Bangkok.

State Department officials are eagerly awaiting the second draft. They are also wondering what to say if Mr. Englund asks to shoot some of his scenes in the U.S. Embassy.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND OBJECTIVES OF NATO—ADDRESS BY EDWARD J. MEEMAN, EDITOR, MEMPHIS PRESS SCIMITAR

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, approximately 130 distinguished citizens from the United States attended the Atlantic Congress in London last June. This was a most important Congress, one in which the political and economic ties of the free world nations further were strengthened. Included among our American delegates was Edward J. Meeman, editor of the Memphis Press Scimitar. Mr. Meeman, in an address before the Knoxville Rotary Club on August 4, listed the accomplishments and objectives of NATO in a forthright and constructive manner.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Meeman's excellent observations be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

LONDON: THE ANSWER TO GENEVA

(Address of Edward J. Meeman, editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar to the Knoxville Rotary Club, Hotel Farragut, August 4, 1959)

In the summer of 1955 I attended the first session of the NATO Parliamentary Con-

ference, composed of representative members of the parliaments—in our case Congress is the parliament—of the 15 nations which are members of the North Atlantic Military Alliance, which assembled in the Palais de Chaillot, the NATO headquarters in Paris. I was there to report and comment on its proceedings for the Scripps-Howard newspapers.

The Paris Conference was held in the same week as the first summit conference at which President Eisenhower met the head of the Soviet Union.

I heard a delegate from the Netherlands say: "What we are doing here in Paris is more important than what they are doing at Geneva."

So it has proved. Little or no permanent good came from the summit meeting, but the NATO Parliamentary Conference was successfully organized and has met every year since. Out of its 1957 meeting came the call for an Atlantic Congress, which was to be held in 1959, on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance, to be attended by 650 delegates, one-third members of parliaments, and two-thirds citizens, of the 15 NATO nations. That Congress, held in London June 5 to 10 of this year, I attended as one of the delegates representing the United States. The Congress, like the first Parliamentary Conference happened to be held simultaneously with a meeting at Geneva, this time of foreign ministers of the Western Powers with Khrushchev's Gromyko. So far the Geneva meeting has been fruitless. But our London meeting bore fruit. It was not a large crop, but a good one, and the fruit contains seeds which, if you and I plant and nurture them, hold rich promise of saving our lives and our prosperity.

Why was what happened in Paris in 1955 and what has just happened in London in 1959 more important than what was happening in Geneva at the same time? Because the Russians do not pay much attention to what the nations of the West say to them. But they do sit up and take notice of what the nations of the West say to each other. They pay attention when we talk about getting closer together, and follow up that talk by actually working closer together. In Geneva in 1955 and again in 1959, the West was talking with the Russians, and nothing has come of it. But in Paris in 1955 and in London in 1959, the free nations of the West talked with each other about getting closer together and did move closer together.

The most striking example of how the Russians are impressed not so much by what we say as by what we do was given at the time of the first Berlin blockade in 1949. They were not impressed by our protests at the illegality of what they were doing. But they were impressed when we successfully supplied Berlin by the airlift. They were even more impressed when the nations of Western Europe and North America got together in the North American Treaty Alliance, which we now call NATO for short, and agreed that an attack on one would be considered an attack on all. They gave up the blockade.

So when the parliamentarians and representative citizens of the NATO nations met on the 10th anniversary of NATO with the purpose of achieving greater unity, the Russians were impressed.

Who were the citizens from 15 countries whom the parliamentarians invited to propose, discuss, and vote with them? They were citizens who are in a position, for one reason or other, to reach their fellow citizens with the information about the state of our defenses, military, economic, and ideological, and the ideas developed at the Congress of what can be done about the present crisis. Some of the citizen delegates were political leaders; some publishers, writers and editors; some business leaders; some lawyers, some educational and religious leaders.

From France came such men as Gen. Pierre Billotte, who was Chief of Staff during World War II, and later minister of defense of France, Henri Faure, the statesman, and Andrew Maurois, the famous writer.

From the Netherlands, Lt. Gen. Calmeyer, who will have no knuckling to communism.

From Belgium, Franz van Cauwelaert, vice president of the NATO Parliamentarian's Conference.

From Norway, Finn Moe, chairman of the committee of foreign affairs of the Storting.

From Denmark, Ole Bjorn Kraft, former foreign minister.

From Greece, Panayotis Pipinelis, former foreign minister, now giving his time to Greece's Conservative Party.

From Britain came such leaders as Earl Attlee, the prime minister under whom India found freedom and independence.

The U.S. delegation was headed by Lewis Douglas, former ambassador to Great Britain as honorary chairman, and Eric Johnston, former president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and now head of the Motion Picture Producers of America, as chairman.

Our delegation included such men as:

Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of Radio Corp. of America.

Gen. James M. Gavin, who resigned from the Armed Forces in order to be free to say what he as a patriot thinks should be done about our national defenses.

Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor and president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Dr. Frank Rose, president of the University of Alabama.

Father Edmund Joyce, executive vice president of Notre Dame University.

Percival F. Brundage, who served President Eisenhower as director of the budget. He says that the U.S. taxpayers could save $10 billion a year thru Atlantic Union, under which defense costs would be shared proportionally by all the 15 nations.

Meyer Kestnbaum, chairman of Hart, Schaffner & Marx, and White House consultant.

Elmo Roper, noted public opinion analyst.

Palmer Hoyt, editor and publisher of the Denver Post.

Philip D. Reed, former chairman of the board of General Electric Co. and president of the International Chamber of Commerce.

Harry Scherman, chairman, Book of the Month Club.

Charles Rhyne, recently president of the American Bar Association, and now head of its Committee on World Peace Through Law.

Our own Mayor Edmond Orgill, of Memphis, did valuable work on the political committee.

Memphis was well represented. Leo Burson, of Memphis, was appointed an alternate delegate, and when a vacancy occurred in the American delegation, he became a full delegate and did valuable work on the Committee on Relations With the Communist Bloc.

The Congress met in the shadow of the Houses of Parliament, that British Parliament that is the mother of all parliaments, parliaments which have brought to men all over the world laws which guarantee the rights of man, laws which say that a policeman may not knock on a man's door in the middle of the night, and take him away without warrant, to be imprisoned or shot without trial, laws which assure that a person may go to school where he pleases and work where he pleases, read what he pleases, say what he pleases, listen to what he pleases, travel where he pleases, and know that the property he accumulates will not be confiscated.

The opening session was held in Westminster Hall, the great assembly room with carved stone walls where much history was made. Here King Charles I was tried and ordered beheaded. Here Warren Hastings was also tried, but saved himself. And that morning of June 1959, as we waited in meditative silence for the opening ceremony we knew that the free world was now on trial. Can free men summon the wisdom and determination to save themselves? We knew that it would be our responsibility in the sessions that would follow to try to do just that.

The solemn yeoman and trumpeters in the brilliant red and gold uniforms of the time of the first Queen Elizabeth, heralded the arrival of the second Queen Elizabeth, who came in with Prince Philip. They were preceded in solemn tread by Premier Macmillan and the officers of the Congress, including our own Senator KEFAUVER. The Queen took her seat on the dais and rose to give us a cordial welcome. She gave us the keynote. She spoke of the Atlantic Community as an existing fact, and all through Congress it was so alluded to. This is of the greatest significance. If the 15 nations on both sides of the North Atlantic are in fact a single Community, with the same history, the same ideals and the same way of life, a community must have unity. The Queen said to us:

"My hope is that when you disperse, the peoples of the Atlantic community will be a step nearer to practical cooperation."

Did the Congress fulfill this hope? Yes. As the result of our deliberations the NATO nations are "a step nearer to practical cooperation." It was only a short step that was taken, but it was a step in the right direction. It was a step that takes us on the road to unity along which we must travel further and faster, if we are indeed to save ourselves.

The Congress went to work. The delegates divided into five committees; on spiritual, moral, and cultural values, on political and governmental organization; on economics, on relations with the rest of the free world, on relations with the Communist bloc.

Each committee met in a different hotel, and was in turn divided into subcommittees. The committee reports were acted on by the whole Congress in plenary session. The plenary sessions were held in a round room in Church House, adjoining Westminister Abbey. In the committees, the delegates from the various nations were all mixed up, but in the plenary sessions the delegates from a particular nation all sat together. The Congress was conducted in English and French. Most of the speeches were in English, but the French, Belgians, and French Canadians spoke in French. Most delegates from the other nations spoke in English, but occasionally one would speak in French.

Every delegate had an earphone, which he could put on at will and hear an instantaneous translation of the speech, if it was in English, into French; and if it was in French, into English. I marvel at the facility of translators who can translate a man's speech as fast as he delivers it, and apparently to the satisfaction of all concerned.

On several nights the delegates had work to do, but on others they were entertained by the hospitable British at brilliant receptions and dinners. There was an unforgettable midnight performance of "My Fair Lady" put on especially for the delegates.

What came out of the conference? What actions were taken?

The Congress adopted this statement of its political committee:

"The pooling of our national resources in the traditional form of international cooperation seems today hopelessly inadequate

and out of date compared with the new danger that is threatening us all in equal measure.

"Of course, one solution would be to bring about some form of political federation of all of our nations. The idea of such a federation at this time should not be ruled out, but we must face up to the possibility that it may be psychologically premature. In any event we must proceed beyond the stage of an alliance. In other words what we must do is to create a genuine community.

"This will not be an easy task. What it requires is an entirely new enterprise for which there is no precedent in history. It is also one which must be built up on empirical lines combining the maximum amount of boldness in design with a sense of realities.

"The traditional concept of the sovereignty of our countries must not be regarded as something unalterable, like Holy Writ. It must also be realized that in our democratic society the rights of the individual, though they remain the general rule of that society, are limited by law in order to preserve the freedom of other individuals, or to insure social progress in accordance with technical progress. Hence, the need for us to accept limitations of the sovereignty of our nations; limitations which are urgently called for by the overriding needs of our defense, our well-being and our unity.

"In practice, this would require the transfer to a common authority of that part of our national authority which we are obviously no longer in a position to insure except in an inefficient and outdated manner. It is clear that we are living in an era when safeguarding of the freedom of man—which is the highest good—will be impossible to insure without far-reaching structural reforms.

"The time has come for this need to be fully understood, for the peril is becoming more serious as well as more general. It is of course a fact that for the last 10 years our immediate security has been insured by the alliance, and we should be duly thankful for this. But is not our future security endangered by the great strides the Communist world has made since 1945, and the deep and ever-spreading roots it is putting down throughout southern Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and now Latin America?

"Is it not endangered also by the methods of economic subversion which the Soviets have perfected but, as yet, made little use of on a large scale?

"We are coming to the decisive moment when the balance of force runs the risk of being upset. NATO must prepare itself to confront simultaneously all these threatening perils.

"But NATO can only do this if it maintains its strategy and military potential in a position to deter aggression directed against any of its members, and if it builds up stronger institutions which will effectively place the whole of its means at the service of a policy of closer union which will lift mankind to the new era made possible by scientific, industrial, political, and moral progress."

The following proposals for strengthening NATO were adopted which the delegates, having returned home, are now seeking to put into effect, through the action of their respective countries:

"NATO nations should have a common military strategy.

"Each nation should fulfill its military obligations so that the European shield is brought up to its minimum strength.

"There should be wider exchange of atomic information.

"Air defense of Europe should be under a single command.

"NATO nations should consult with each other before they adopt any policy that affects other nations and coordinate more fully their policies on all questions of common concern. In other words let's not have another Suez, in which England and France go one way and the United States another.

"Give Secretary General Spaak more authority.

"To improve the settlement of disputes among member nations, study the possible creation of a NATO Court of Justice. This was proposed by Charles Rhyne in behalf of the American Bar Association and warmly supported by Mayor Orgill.

"In order to consider the further development of the alliance our governments be requested to carry out as soon as possible the remainder of the unanimous recommendation of the Third NATO Parliamentarians' Conference (out of which the present Congress arose) by bringing about not later than the spring of 1960 a special conference composed of not more than a hundred leading representative citizens, directed to convene for as long as necessary in order to examine exhaustively, and to recommend as expeditiously as possible, the means by which greater cooperation and unity may best be developed within the Atlantic community.

"Create a studies center for the Atlantic community in which our moral, spiritual, and democratic values and institutions will be studied and appreciated.

"Assistance by the NATO nations in the economic progress of underdeveloped nations through government and private loans and investments."

I have said that the Russians are not impressed by what we say to them. They pay little attention to it. They pay attention to what we say to each other that brings greater unity in the free world, and what we do to bring that unity about. For they know that the more we get together the stronger we will be.

What can you and I do to achieve that unity?

The most important single thing we can do is to get our U.S. Congress to adopt the Atlantic Congress proposal that a conference be brought about of not more than 100 leading representative citizens, directed to convene for as long as necessary to recommend the means by which greater cooperation and unity may best be developed within the Atlantic community.

This proposal is very similar to that in Senate Concurrent Resolution 17, House Concurrent Resolutions 107 to 108 which was introduced by Senators HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota; JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky; CLIFFORD CASE, of New Jersey; and ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee. Its chief sponsors in the House are Representatives A. S. J. CARNAHAN, of Missouri, and CLEMENT ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin.

We can write our Senators and Representatives urging them to support that resolution.

In unity, and only in unity is there strength. We all know the story of the father who demonstrated this to his six sons who were not getting along with each other. He took one stick and quickly broke it in in his two hands. But he put six sticks together and they were as solid and unbreakable as a log. Put the 15 nations solidly together and the Communists can never break them.

We can strengthen the free world by the kind of lives we live. We can watch our daily conduct to see that we are living up to the highest and best that we know.

The outstanding impression I carried away from London was the wealth of intellect and character we have in the free world. We need not avoid closer association with Canada and the nations of Western Europe for fear that those people are not as good as we are, are not as much devoted to democracy and freedom as we are. I do not fear to trust my safety, my property, my freedom to the wisdom and virtue of the man I met in London.

One of the men who impressed me was Panayotis Pipinelis, former Foreign Minister to Greece, who is now working for the Conservative Party in that county. I worked with him on the Free World Committee. I took note of what he said:

"We are to avoid moral isolation in our relations with other peoples and if we are to meet the aspirations of the coming generations, we can do no better than stick to the long-established fundamental values of our morality and civilization: the rule of law; freedom of choice and of thought; the decent comforts of privacy; restraint and justice. I know of no better approach to our problem.

"It is to a certain extent inevitable that, living in a world such as ours where these values are usually taken for granted, the impact they produce on the imagination of other peoples is often underestimated. However, their real pertinence becomes more convincing the moment they are ignored. It is only among peoples who are deprived of any guarantees for the individual, with no freedom of thought, with no privacy in ordinary life, with no possibilities for personal and national expression, that their real importance can be completely understood. That is why, I suggest, the best way of avoiding isolation in our relations with uncommitted nations lies in remaining true to our own ideals and in providing a living example of what life can be in an orderly and civilized society.

"For this, it is not enough merely to pay lipservice to these ideals or to limit our acceptance of them to empty generalities. We have to work out ways and means by which the rules of law and the respect of other peoples' rights can best be safeguarded in international life. The widest possible acceptance of the obligatory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice should be earnestly pursued. The institution of a separate High Court of Justice for the NATO countries has certainly much to commend it. Other areas of international intercourse must be explored with a view to extending to them the rule of law.

"But it is hardly necessary to point out that legal guarantees in the international field, with their more or less conservative implications, cannot suffice as an inspiration for peoples expecting improvement through change or revolution. We have to integrate into our human relations the dynamic force of justice and accept it as an article of faith and as a constant directive of our behavior."

Then there was Ole Bjorn Kraft, former Foreign Minister of Denmark, one of those sturdy Danes who have dared to join and stick to NATO, despite Soviet threats, though they are right under Soviet guns. He was chairman of the committee on which I served and I got to know him well. I admired his democratic spirit—how he went around the table twice, to make sure that every member of the committee had an opportunity to express his views fully. I admired his opposition to the creation of new international agencies which unnecessarily add to the burden of the taxpayer.

And I learned how he has done his part to make the life of the free world one of decency of behavior, as the Greek statesman said it must be if we are to win. For Ole Bjorn Kraft is one of those who practices the principles of moral rearmament. He has adopted absolute standards for his conduct—absolute honesty, absolute purity, absolute unselfishness, and absolute love. He has a quiet time every morning in which he seeks the guidance of God in all that he thinks and does.

If we men of the free world commit ourselves to such wisdom, goodness, and courage, we can win.

DELAY IN ACTION AS TO FEDERAL JUDGESHIPS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to say a word about the fact that the Committee on the Judiciary has not brought about the confirmation of the nominations of many nominees to be judges, notwithstanding the overburdened position of our courts. This presses especially hard in the New York jurisdiction.

Notwithstanding everything that I have been able to do and everything that my distinguished colleague [Mr. KEATING] has been able to do, we have made very little progress in bringing about the confirmation of the nominations of admittedly distinguished lawyers, who have been nominated to fill key vacancies on the Federal district and circuit court benches in the New York area.

This is a grave responsibility for the Senate, and a grave disadvantage to the New York jurisdiction, as adjournment day comes closer. So difficult has been my own role in this matter that I have been blamed in one news story for delaying the hearing on the confirmation of the nomination of our nominee for the second circuit court of appeals. This, Mr. President, is simply untrue and is most unfair to me. Nevertheless, with people looking around for explanations to account for what I am the first to say is an unreasonable delay, which has taken place in the case of this particular nominee, Mr. Henry Friendly, of New York, and with regard to other nominees in the New York area, I can hardly blame the newspaper reporter for picking on some conspiratorial reason, rather than on the very evident one that notwithstanding my best efforts—speaking to my colleagues, speaking on the floor of the Senate, speaking in the Republican conferences and every other place I thought appropriate—the Committee on the Judiciary has simply not taken action.

Tomorrow morning a subcommittee of the Committee of the Judiciary, composed of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], has scheduled hearings on the nomination of Henry J. Friendly to be Federal judge for the second circuit.

That brings up, Mr. President, the question of a "box score." The nomination of Mr. Friendly was made by the President on March 10, 1959; 168 days later, August 25, 1959, the first preliminary step is to be taken by the Judiciary Committee. This delay is genuinely appalling, in view of the fact that the Judicial Conference of the United States reports that as of June 30, 1959, the average number of appeals per judge on the second circuit court bench, to which Mr. Friendly has been nominated, was 85, the highest in the Nation and more than 50 percent higher than the national average of 56.

Mr. President, should the meeting tomorrow be but the prelude to another long delay before action by the full committee and by the Senate, then the 19 million people in the area served by the second circuit—New York, Connecticut, and Vermont—may well feel their judicial needs are being pointedly ignored by the Senate, which is charged with the duty of proceeding on Federal judicial nominations in every section of the country—North as well as South, East as well as West.

In that connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation entitled "Box Score on Judgeships" which relates to how long it is taking to obtain confirmation of the nomination of a man to be a judge, when the man has been nominated—how long it takes to have a hearing and to have action by the full Committee on the Judiciary.

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

Box score on judgeships

DISTRICT JUDGES

No.	Name, State, and date of reference	Office	Subcommittee and date of reference	Committee action	Committee report	Confirmed
1	Henley, J. Smith (Arkansas), Jan. 17.[1]	U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Arkansas.	Public hearing scheduled Aug. 26, 1959.			
2	Robson, Edwin A. (Illinois), Jan. 17, 1959.	U.S. district judge for the northern district of Illinois.	Feb. 21, 1959, Messrs. Eastland, Johnston, and Hruska, Apr. 21, public hearing (recorded).	Apr. 27, approved	Apr. 28 (by Mr. Dirksen).	Apr. 29, 1959.
3	Hart, George L., Jr. (District of Columbia), Jan. 17, 1959.	U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia.	Feb. 18, 1959, Messrs. Eastland, Johnston, and Hruska, June 16, July 1, public hearing (recorded).			
4	Gilmartin, Eugene R. (Rhode Island), Jan. 17, 1959.	U.S. judge for the District Court of Guam.	Feb. 21, 1959, Messrs. Eastland, Johnston, and Hruska, Aug. 19, public hearing.			
5	Gordon, Walter A. (California), Jan. 17, 1959.	Judge of the U.S. District Court for the Virgin Islands.	Feb. 21, 1959, Messrs. O'Mahoney, Hennings, Carroll, Hruska, and Keating, public hearing scheduled Aug. 26.			
6	Tucker, John G. (Texas), Feb. 12, 1959.	U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Texas.	Feb. 21, 1959, Messrs. Eastland, Johnston, and Hruska.			Aug. 3, 1959, nomination withdrawn by the President.
7	Crocker, Myron D. (California), Feb. 16, 1959.	U.S. district judge for the southern district of California.	Feb. 21, 1959, Messrs. Eastland, Johnston, and Hruska, June 18, 1959, public hearing (recorded).			
8	Kunzel, Fred (California), Feb. 16, 1959.	U.S. district judge for the southean district of California	Feb. 21, 1959, Messrs. Eastland, Johnston, and Hruska, June 17, 1959, public hearing (recorded).			
9	Kilkenny, John F. (Oregon), Feb. 19, 1959.	U.S. district judge for the district of Oregon.	Feb. 21, 1959, Messrs. Eastland, Johnston, and Hruska, June 15, 1959, public hearing (recorded).	July 27, 1959, approved.	July 27 (by Mr. Dirksen).	July 28.
10	Julian, Anthony (Massachusetts), Feb. 26, 1959.	U.S. district judge for the district of Massachusetts.	Mar. 2, 1959, Messrs. Eastland, Johnston, and Hruska, May 4, 1959, public hearing (recorded).			
11	Walsh, Leonard P. (District of Columbia), Feb. 26, 1959.	U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia.	Mar. 2, 1959, Messrs. Eastland, Johnston, and Hruska, June 17, 1959, public hearing (recorded).			
12	Wood, Harold K. (Pennsylvania), Mar. 2, 1959.	U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.	Mar. 2, 1959, Messrs. Eastland, Johnston, and Hruska, July 8, 1959, public hearing (recorded).			
13	MacMahon, Lloyd F. (New York), Mar. 10, 1959.	U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York.	Mar. 18, 1959, Messrs. Eastland, Johnston, and Hruska, June 24, 1959, public hearing (recorded).			
14	Metzner, Charles M. (New York), Apr. 15, 1959.	do	May 5, 1959, Messrs. Eastland, Johnston, Hruska, June 16, 1959, public hearing (recorded).			
15	Bartels, John R. (New York), Apr. 20, 1959.	U.S. district judge for the eastern district of New York.	May 5, 1959, Messrs. Eastland, Johnston, Hruska, June 4, 1959, public hearing (recorded).	July 27, 1959, approved.	July 27, 1959 (by Mr. Keating).	July 28, 1959.
16	Sweigert, William T. (California), Apr. 23, 1959.	U.S. district judge for northern district of California.	May 5, 1959, Messrs. Eastland, Johnston, Hruska, public hearing scheduled Aug. 25, 1959.			
17	Field, John A. (West Virginia), May 11, 1959.	U.S. district judge for the southern district of West Virginia.	July 29, 1959, Messrs. Eastland, Johnston, Hruska, Aug. 3, 1959, public hearing (recorded).	Aug. 10, approved	Aug. 11, 1959 (by Mr. Eastland).	Aug. 11, 1959.
18	Powell, Charles L. (Washington), May 26, 1959.	U.S. district judge for eastern district of Washington.	June 3, 1959, Messrs. Eastland, Johnston, Hruska, June 10, 1959, public hearing (recorded).	June 15, 1959, approved.	June 15, 1959 (by Mr. Eastland).	June 16, 1959.

[1] Renominated Aug. 18, for eastern and western districts.

Box score on judgeships—Continued

DISTRICT JUDGES—Continued

No.	Name, State, and date of reference	Office	Subcommittee and date of reference	Committee action	Committee report	Confirmed
19	Dalton, Ted (Virginia), July 21, 1959.	U.S. district judge for western district of Virginia.	July 22, 1959, Messrs. Eastland, Johnston, Hruska, Aug. 3, 1959, public hearing (recorded).	Aug. 10, 1959	Aug. 11, 1959 (by Mr. Eastland).	Aug. 11, 1959.
20	Weinman, Carl A. (Ohio), July 28, 1959.	U.S. district judge for southern district of Ohio.	Aug. 5, 1959, Messrs, Eastland, Johnston, Hruska, public hearing, Aug. 17, 1959.			
21	Butler, Algermon L. (North Carolina), July 28, 1959.	U.S. district judge for eastern district of North Carolina.	Public hearing, Aug. 18, 1959			
22	Paul, Charles F. (West Virginia), Aug. 3, 1959.	U.S. district judge for northern district of West Virginia.	Aug. 5, 1959, Messrs. Eastland, Johnston, Hruska.			
23	Young, Gordon E. (Arkansas), Aug. 18, 1959.	U.S. district judge for eastern district of Arkansas.				
24	Kalbfleish, Gerard E. (Ohio), Aug. 21, 1959.	U.S. district judge for northern district of Ohio.				
25	Henderson, John O. (New York), Aug. 21, 1959.	U.S. district judge for western district of New York.				

CIRCUIT JUDGES

No.	Name, State, and date of reference	Office	Subcommittee and date of reference	Committee action	Committee Report	Confirmed
1	Boremen, Herbert S. (West Virginia), Jan. 20, 1959.	U.S. circuit judge, 4th circuit.	Feb. 21, 1959, Eastland, Johnston, Hruska. June 10, public hearing (recorded).	June 15, 1959, approved.	June 15, 1959 (by Mr. Eastland).	June 16, 1959.
2	Forman, Philip (New Jersey).	U.S. circuit judge for 3d circuit.	Feb. 21, 1959, Eastland, Johnston, Hruska, June 18, 1959, public hearing (recorded).			
3	Cecil, Lester L. (Ohio), Feb. 17, 1959.	U.S. circuit judge for the 6th circuit.	Feb. 21, 1959, Eastland Johnston, Hruska, Apr. 28, 1959, public hearing (recorded).	July 13, 1959, approved.	July 13, 1959 (by Mr. Eastland).	July 15, 1959.
4	Aldrich, Bailey (Massachusetts), Feb. 26, 1959.	U.S. circuit judge for 1st circuit.	Mar. 2, 1959, Eastland, Johnston, Hruska, May 4, 1959, public hearing (recorded).			
5	Castle, Latham (Illinois), Feb. 26, 1959.	U.S. circuit judge for 7th circuit.	Mar. 2, 1959, Eastland, Johnston, Hruska, Apr. 21, 1959, public hearing (recorded).	Apr. 27, 1959, approved.	Apr. 28, 1959 (by Mr. Dirksen).	Apr. 29, 1959.
6	Friendly, Henry J. (New York), Mar. 10, 1959.	U.S. circuit judge for 2d circuit.	Mar. 11, 1959, Dodd, Hennings, Dirksen. Public hearing scheduled Aug. 25.			
7	Weick, Paul C. (Ohio), Aug. 5, 1959.	U.S. circuit judge for 6th circuit.				
8	Black, Harry A. (Minnesota), Aug. 18, 1959.	U.S. circuit judge for 8th circuit.				

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this unofficial "box score on judgeships" which was tabulated by my office, relates to the status of nominees to the Federal district and circuit courts, for nominations made by President Eisenhower since the beginning of the present session of Congress in January. It is of particular interest to New York.

Only one of the four nominations to Federal district judgeships in our area—that of John R. Bartels—has been confirmed by the Senate.

The nomination of Lloyd F. MacMahon, for the southern district of New York, submitted on March 10, 1959, the same day that Mr. Friendly was nominated, still languishes, though there was a hearing for Mr. MacMahon before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on June 24, 1959. There was no opposition to the nomination, but no more action has been taken. Hearings were also held on June 16, 1959, on the nomination of Charles M. Metzner, who was nominated to serve in the southern district of New York, the nomination having been made April 15, 1959. Again there was no opposition, but no further action has been taken.

Once more, the statistics furnish powerful testimony as to the need for action. The administrative office of the U.S. courts reports that in recent years southern and eastern district courts in New York have been vying for the unfortunate distinction of having the longest time lag in the entire Nation for disposition of civil cases settled after trial. Right now, the eastern district has the longest average caseload delay in the United States—44.8 months; the southern district has a backlog of nearly 11,000 cases as of June 30 which averaged out to a caseload of 600 civil cases pending per judge.

We need these judges. They are absolutely indispensable. These delays are absolutely shocking.

In reviewing the boxscore I am submitting today, it is apparent that there is no chronological pattern to the progress made so far. Of the eight circuit judges nominations made since last January, the first, the third, and the fifth have been confirmed by the Senate, with no committee action taken on the second, the fourth, the sixth—Mr. Friendly—seventh or eighth. Regarding the 25 nominees to Federal district judgeships, the 19th to be nominated, taking them chronologically as well as, the 18th, 17th, 15th—Mr. Bartels—9th, and 2d have received Senate approval. Committee action has yet to be taken on the other 18, one of whom was recently renominated, the name of another was withdrawn, and the 25th nominee was sent up only last Friday by the President. This last nominee is also of special interest to New Yorkers; he is John O. Henderson, the nominee for the vacancy in New York's western district which brings the list to three nominees to the Federal district bench and one to the Federal circuit bench which are of vital concern to my constitutents.

There perhaps would have been the basis for an explanation of the snail's pace at which the great majority of nominations have been proceeding in the Senate Judiciary Committee if its many hours of deliberation on civil rights legislation had been fruitful.

But that deliberation has not been fruitful. We have had no action on civil rights, and we have had little action regarding judgeships.

Mr. President, I think the conscience of the Senate demands action by the Senate. I express the urgent need for confirming the nominations of men whose nominations have remained on the shelf notwithstanding their distinction as nominees and the urgent need of communities, like my own, for them, as well as the fact that there is no opposition to the nominations.

The committee and the Senate should confirm the nominations promptly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of August 24, 1959, regarding this subject.

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

COMMITTEE ON INACTION

The Senate Judiciary Committee—of which JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi, is the chairman—deserves a black mark for its inexcusable slow motion. Stalled in Mr. EASTLAND'S committee are 10 of President Eisenhower's appointments to important Federal judgeships which have been waiting for its approval for the past 5 months—1 since last January. Nine other judgeship appointments made more recently are also on the committee's docket of inaction.

Delays like this dishonor the distinguished individuals whom the President has honored by appointing them, pile still higher the backlog of unsettled cases in the Federal courts and place an unfair burden of business on the judges now sitting. So serious had the situation become last spring in the eastern district that judges from less burdened courts had to be drafted to help clear the calendar.

Then, too, the delays are professionally embarrassing to the nominees. One of them had to ask the President to withdraw his appointment because of the loss of clients due to his uncertain future.

Among the reasons for the Eastland committee's inaction on the judgeships have been the personal pique of members of the committee over the President's appointments and adverse local political pressures—certainly not in the interests of the public. Then, too, the committee has been so busy in its maneuvers to block consideration of civil-rights legislation that it has had little time for anything else. Such feverish action to bring about inaction has an Alice-in-Wonderland atmosphere about it which would be amusing if it weren't taking place in a world of urgent political realities.

OREGON'S EX-GOV. CHARLES A. SPRAGUE SALUTES VIEWS OF SENATOR JOSEPH S. CLARK OF PENNSYLVANIA ON VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is always a pleasure to see heralded—especially in an eminent source—the political courage of a colleague.

This occurred in the Oregon Daily Statesman of August 21, 1959, when ex-Gov. Charles A. Sprague, of Oregon, a leading Republican who is also a great editor, wrote an editorial entitled "Other 'Crying Needs'," which cites the forthright independence of our friend, the able senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], on the question of veterans' legislation.

I did not vote precisely as did Senator CLARK on the recent veterans' pension bill. I voted for the Kerr amendment equalizing the widows and orphans of World War II and Korea with those of World War I; Senator CLARK did not. I voted against the Morse amendment for a special pension only for veterans of World War I with non-service-connected disabilities, and so did Senator CLARK. I voted for the final version of the veterans' bill; Senator CLARK did not.

But I join one of the country's really distinguished editors, ex-Gov. Charles A. Sprague, in saluting the Senator from Pennsylvania, and I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Statesman of Salem, Oreg., be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

[From the Oregon Daily Statesman, Aug. 21, 1959]

OTHER "CRYING NEEDS"

Those who would be on the receiving end of pensions hope that the bills which have passed House and Senate will be reconciled and that the President will sign the final measure. Some veterans are unhappy because the Morse amendment giving every veteran of World War I a pension failed, as it did by a very wide margin. Others who have concern over the spending of public funds do not like either the House or Senate version of a pension bill. One of the latter is Senator CLARK of Pennsylvania. He's a Democrat, but he took the floor to speak against the amendment offered by Senator KERR, of Oklahoma, to substitute the more generous provisions of the House bill for the reduced schedule recommended by the Senate Finance Committee. In his comments on the subject Senator CLARK presented a viewpoint which deserves more general attention, particularly among veterans.

We quote from Senator CLARK'S remarks as follows:

"Mr. President, I regretfully find myself unable to go along with the sponsors of the amendment. Here is an enormous additional burden placed on the backs of the taxpayers of this and succeeding generations in order to increase payments for non-service-connected disabilities of veterans who in many, many cases never were under shellfire or subjected to danger, in the face of a crying need for billions of dollars for education, for housing, water resources development, for highways, for all the American people.

"I cannot find myself willing to take the position of imposing this heavy additional burden on the taxpayers for what seems to me to be a very low order of priority compared with the needs of all the American people in other fields which I have mentioned, compared with our increasing needs, in my judgment, for national defense, compared with our increasing needs, in my judgment, to assist our allies and to aid the uncommitted areas of the world.

"This is a question of priority, and I regret that I cannot find it in my heart to give a high enough priority to support this amendment, which unquestionably would require additional taxation if we are going to go through with the other programs which in my judgment are so necessary to the health and the well-being of all of the American people over the next generation. I therefore regretfully find myself compelled to support the chairman of the Finance Committee. My regret is not that I am supporting the chairman of the Finance Committee, but that I cannot support my good friends, the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Oklahoma."

OREGON NATIONAL GUARD ACCLAIMED FOR READINESS TO MEET EMERGENCIES, SUCH AS AT ROSEBURG, OREG.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, concern is sometimes expressed about readiness of our Military Establishment to meet emergency conditions. In the atomic age, speed of action will be of utmost importance. An explosion of calamitous proportions in the middle of the night on August 7 at Roseburg, Oreg., provided a test of readiness to meet emergencies. The Oregon National Guard was called and found ready. Within a half-hour after the blast leveled a large section of Roseburg's business district, units of the Oregon National Guard were mobilized in strength.

The National Guard is the citizens' army, and the speed with which they moved into action to protect life and property at Roseburg is ample evidence that the guard is prepared for emergency action. The Oregon National Guard responded to the call for help at Roseburg in the best tradition of its service.

I have received a report from Brig. Gen. Alfred E. Hintz, adjutant general for the military department of the State of Oregon, describing Oregon National Guard participation in meeting the emergency at Roseburg. He reports that units called to duty were from Companies B, C, and D, 2d Battle Group, 186th Infantry, located at Cottage Grove, Roseburg, and at Grants Pass. They deserve commendation for their quick and effective response to the emergency situation.

I ask consent to include with my remarks, in the body of the RECORD, the informative report from General Hintz, which details the effective manner in which the Oregon National Guard met the disaster at Roseburg.

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

STATE OF OREGON
MILITARY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE ADJUTANT GENERAL,
Salem, Oreg., August 19, 1959.

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Regarding our recent tragedy in Roseburg, I thought you would be interested to know briefly the role the Oregon National Guard played in assisting the citizens and city of Roseburg.

On Friday morning, August 7, following the early hour explosion at 0115 hours (1:15 a.m.), the first unit of the Oregon National Guard was called out. The unit was Company D, 2d Battle Group, 186th Infantry, stationed in Roseburg. Approximately 50 percent of the unit was mobilized by 0145 hours (1:45 a.m.) which is less than 1 hour after the time of the explosion. This indicates the degree of organization and readiness that exists in our National Guard units without further enlarging upon the matter. The balance of this unit was present by 0600 hours (6:00 a.m.). The first elements of the unit stationed in Cottage Grove, Company B, 2d Battle Group, 186th Infantry, arrived in Roseburg about 0700 hours (7:00 a.m.), August 7, with the balance of the unit present by 1200 hours (noon) on August 7. These were the only two units initially called out by the Adjutant General's office as directed by the Governor's office. At 1130 hours (11:30 a.m.) on August 7, additional help was requested by officials in Roseburg. The Grants Pass unit, Company C, 2d Battle Group, 186th Infantry, was then mobilized. This unit was present in Roseburg by 1730 hours (5:30 p.m.). The total strength of these three units which were present in Roseburg was as follows: 20 officers, 1 warrant officer, 191 enlisted men.

The above units constituted the units of the Oregon National Guard that were utilized in the disaster area. The total strength was gradually reduced throughout the period August 7 through August 15 with the last National Guard personnel released from Roseburg at 2000 hours (8:00 p.m.) August

15. The total cost to the military department, State of Oregon, for the entire period was $10,833.53.

The primary duty of these units was to protect life and property in the Roseburg area in the initial days of the disaster until businesses were secured to protect against looting. After this had been accomplished, the National Guardsmen were used to isolate dangerous areas and buildings from all but authorized persons.

These National Guardsmen gave freely and willingly of their time. In many instances, the pay they received from being on military duty was much less than the wages from their civilian jobs. However, this was of no major concern to the men as they knew the people of Roseburg had lost a great deal more. It is a glowing spirit and joint effort by our National Guard units in times of need such as this, that makes us all justly proud of the Oregon National Guard.

The merit and conduct of the National Guardsmen during the Roseburg disaster have been further endorsed by most appreciative and praiseworthy comments from civic and State officials who worked closely with the stricken city. I feel such words of praise are most deserving.

With best personal regards and I look forward to the pleasure of seeing you again soon.

Sincerely,

ALFRED E. HEINTZ,
Brigadier General,
The Adjutant General.

BILL ZADICK: FRIEND

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last Monday I received a great shock when I learned of the death of a very close friend, adviser, and one of Montana's most accomplished journalists, William Zadick, city editor of the Great Falls Tribune, Great Falls, Mont.

Bill Zadick had been city editor of the Tribune for 15 years during which he contributed greatly toward making this daily newspaper one of the most widely circulated and read in the entire State. Bill's career in the newspaper business paralleled the growth of the city of Great Falls, Montana's largest city. He was a leader in civic activities, in fact his name became a byword to every organization in the city through his longtime interest in civic activities.

Bill came to the newspaper field right out of school and during the years he became an expert in every field of news operation—reporting, photography, editorial writing, printing and general management.

It is indeed sad that a man of such talents should be taken from us at such early age. Bill Zadick was only 46 and no one would have suspected that he would not be actively engaged as city editor for many more years. I want to express Mrs. Mansfield's and my deepest sympathy to his widow, Anna, his mother, Mrs. Nellie Zadick, his sons Bob and Dick, his brothers and sister, Tom, Jim, and Julia, and other members of the family during their hour of bereavement.

May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a news story from the August 18 issue of the Great Falls Tribune and an editorial from the same issue written by the publisher of the Great Falls Tribune, Alex Warden, a friend from boyhood, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, Aug. 18, 1959]

WILLIAM ZADICK, 46, CITY EDITOR OF TRIBUNE, DIES

A chapter in the history of the Great Falls Tribune came to a close early Monday morning when William M. (Bill) Zadick, 46, city editor for the past 15 years, died at a local hospital.

Funeral services will be at 10:15 a.m., Wednesday, at Chapel of Chimes Funeral Home. Solemn requiem mass will be celebrated at 10:30 a.m. at Our Lady of Lourdes Church. Rosary will be recited at 8 p.m. today at Chapel of Chimes. Burial will be in Mount Olivet Cemetery.

Zadick's attending physician said death resulted from a massive heart attack. He said Zadick was stricken at his home at 1825 First Avenue S., at 1 a.m. He regained consciousness by the time the doctor arrived, and remained conscious until he died 2 hours later at the hospital.

Zadick was named the Tribune's city editor in January 1944, following the resignation of A. H. Raymond.

He graduated from Great Falls High School in 1931. Before finishing school, he worked part time at the Tribune, and in 1934 became a full-time staff member, serving as a reporter and photographer.

In high school he was athletic manager, and his interest in all sports never waned. Before becoming city editor, Zadick was Tribune sports editor.

He was a familiar figure at sporting events of all kinds in all parts of the State throughout his life, and took particular interest in Tribune picture pages portraying sporting events.

He was born in Great Falls July 14, 1913, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Charles A. Zadick. The elder Zadick was in the drygoods business here.

He married Anna Mae George of Great Falls July 6, 1938, in Choteau. Mrs. Zadick's mother, Mrs. Mae George, died Thursday. Funeral services for her were held here Monday.

Zadick served as a member of the press advisory committee of the Montana division of the American Cancer Society, and the Montana State Press Association made him a member of its committee on handling juvenile delinquency stories in recognition of his news judgment.

To the Tribune, Zadick was more than a city editor. He was reporter, photographer, and editor's adviser, and was familiar with all phases of the paper's operation, including the jobs of the printers, engravers, and pressmen.

During his years as head of the city staff, Zadick became thoroughly familiar with every facet of life in Great Falls, keeping his finger on the pulse of the growing city to a degree no other person could equal.

His name became a byword to every organization in the city through his longtime interest in civic activities.

In addition to his attention to local affairs, Zadick took a strong interest in State matters as divergent as athletics and government.

The highest officials in the State were on a first-name basis with the energetic city editor. Gov. J. Hugo Aronson, Attorney General Forrest Anderson and other top leaders of the State frequently called Zadick for assistance and advice.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD regarded him as not only a close friend but as a newsman who knew what the people of the State were thinking. When MANSFIELD came to Great Falls, one of his "must" calls was on the Tribune city editor. When the Senator was busy, rushing from one speaking engagement to another, he liked to ask Zadick to take him to the airport so he could consult with him.

Although Zadick was a devout Catholic (he was a member of Our Lady of Lourdes Parish), ministers of every congregation came to know him and rely on his judgment. He was one of the charter members of the Great Falls chapter of the American Newspaper Guild.

Two years ago he was named winner of the Associated Press Managing Editors Association's annual national contest for excellence in news photography. His winning picture, "Cowpoke's Dilemma," showed a rodeo rider tumbling down from a bucking horse at the North Montana State Fair in August 1956, in Great Falls. In addition to winning a cash award his name was engraved on a permanent plaque in the lobby of the executive offices of AP in New York.

Zadick was initiated into Sigma Delta Chi as a professional member of the third annual Dean Stone banquet at Montana State University, Missoula, May 10, 1959.

Survivors, in addition to the widow, are his mother, Mrs. Nellie Zadick; two sons, Robert, a sophomore at Montana State University, and Richard, a sophomore at GFHS; two brothers, Thomas and James, and a sister, Julia, all of Great Falls, and a number of aunts and uncles.

Another brother, Fred L. Zadick, died following an automobile accident in November 1934.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, Aug. 18, 1959]

SILENT TRIBUTE TO ZADICK OBSERVED BY CITY COUNCIL

The Great Falls City Council during its weekly meeting Monday night paid silent tribute to William M. Zadick, Tribune city editor, who died early Monday morning of a sudden massive heart seizure.

Meanwhile, numerous messages of condolence from leading State and National figures, as well as friends from throughout the State, were received.

Preceding the opening of the regular agenda for the council meeting, Mayor William H. Swanberg asked the aldermen to devote a moment of silence to the memory of the community leader.

Swanberg paid tribute to Zadick, saying the city has lost a valuable citizen. "Every member of the city council and administration has lost a very trusted and valuable aid," the mayor said.

He said Zadick had always been very cooperative, investigating both sides of a question before reporting the facts as he saw them. The mayor concluded, "I am sure it is a severe blow to all of us."

Messages received by the family included those from the entire Montana congressional delegation, Senators MIKE MANSFIELD and JAMES E. MURRAY, and Representatives LEROY ANDERSON and LEE METCALF, and members of their respective staffs. They said, "It is with a deep sense of personal grief that we mark the sudden loss of Bill. * * *"

Other messages received included two from officials of the Great Northern Railway in Minneapolis. Charles W. (Dinty) Moore, director of public relations and executive assistant to the president, said, "Montana and the Tribune have lost a top newspaperman and a valued friend." H. J. Surles, who was formerly a GN division superintendent here, said, "Great Falls and Montana have lost a first-class citizen."

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, Aug. 18, 1959]

WE'VE LOST A GREAT CITY EDITOR

(By Alexander Warden, publisher)

No member of our Tribune family could leave us with a larger void than Bill Zadick.

Bill started with us answering sports scores inquiries on weekend nights more than a quarter of a century back up the time road.

Most highschoolers on this job just touched base with us for a few weeks. But Bill showed so much aptitude that he went on full time in the fall of 1934 as a starting reporter, then broke in on all beats and desks. When the city editor's spot opened a decade later, there wasn't any other choice.

Bill didn't have any fancy school of journalism degrees, but he didn't need any. He was a newspaperman's newspaperman, than which no greater accolade can be given by the fourth estate. And if any newspaper can be called the image of one man, the Tribune was Bill Zadick. More than the owners was he the continuing key to fulfilling that prime obligation of any newspaper worthy of the name—giving the readers all the news. He was fearless, but scrupulously fair. He was sympathetic where sympathy was deserved, but he was gifted in spotting sham or pretense.

The Montana Press Association recognized his judgment in making him a member of its committee on the troublesome problem of handling delinquency stories. His shot of a catapulted rodeo rider at the State Fair was Associated Press picture of the year, reprinted the world over. Recently he was honored by election as a professional member of Sigma Delta Chi, national journalism fraternity.

If there's a newspaper in Valhalla, it will have a new city editor when Bill gets there.

HEALTH INSURANCE FOR RETIRED FEDERAL CIVIL EMPLOYEES

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last week the able and distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] introduced, on behalf of himself and some 15 other Senators, one of whom I am glad to be, a bill making available health coverage for retired Federal civil employees. This is a companion bill to one introduced by the Senator from Oregon earlier, of which I was also a cosponsor, which was passed by the Senate by a vote of 81 to 4, making these health services available on a voluntary basis to Federal career employees.

It is highly desirable legislation, based on the sound principle of cost sharing, the Federal Government contributing one-half and the beneficiaries one-half, and I was more than happy to see the Senate adopt it by so overwhelming a majority. It was clear, however, that the omission of retired civil service employees remained to be rectified. Under S. 2527, which does so, they are entitled to elect, if they so desire, the same benefits. They have served our Government faithfully for many years, often a full lifetime. In one sense, they need this opportunity even more than those in active service, since the aged beyond retirement are far more apt to require these medical services. Moreover, their retirement annuities are obviously less than the pay of those still in active public service.

I want to commend not only the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], who has always shown a great concern, not merely in the field of health, but for the welfare of our workers generally, both in the Federal Government and outside of it, and also to commend the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], who has warmly supported this measure, as well as many other measures helpful to those in the Federal career service.

The proposed legislation would become effective on July 1, 1960, and I am hopeful that both this bill and the one extending the health services to Federal employees in active service will become law before the conclusion of the 86th Congress.

ESKIMO NATIONAL GUARD SCOUTS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on the very frontline of America's defenses are two units, two battalions, of Eskimo National Guard scouts. They are scattered along the Bering and Arctic seacoasts, and are performing an extremely valuable service in behalf of national defense. I organized these units originally during the early days of World War II and enrolled these stalwart Americans of Eskimo blood in the Alaska Territorial guard. Their service, although entirely new to them, proved so valuable, that I felt it imperative, at the close of hostilities, to continue to make it continuously available to our Nation, and so arranged to have them enrolled in Alaska's National Guard.

An excellent article, headlined "Eskimos Bolster Alaska Defense," with a subhead of "One Thousand and Fifty Resourceful Scouts Patrol Vast Coastline for National Guard," was published in the New York Times yesterday. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

[From New York Times, Aug. 23, 1959]

ESKIMOS BOLSTER ALASKA DEFENSES—1,050 RESOURCEFUL SCOUTS PATROL VAST COASTLINE FOR NATIONAL GUARD

(By Bill Becker)

NOME, ALASKA, August 15.—Here, where the United States almost touches the Soviet Union, America's first line of defense is the Eskimo scout.

The 1,050 Eskimo scouts along the Obering, Cukchi, and Arctic Seas help to fill the chinks in the vast Alaskan coast defense network. They also form the backbone of Alaska's National Guard.

These easygoing but eager natives are, in the words of one of their officers, full-time soldiers on part-time pay.

Yet Eskimo enthusiasm is so high that the guard has detachments in 57 villages and towns in western and northern Alaska.

The scouts provide an intelligence force that is unusual in the present continental defense system.

In recent years they have spotted Soviet submarines, picked up radioactive debris to substantiate Soviet nuclear blasts in Siberia, and reported planes that missed radar screens.

The Army is now striving to give the Eskimo the military know-how to go with his native shrewdness. About one-third of the scouts have received active duty training at Fort Richardson, Anchorage, or Fort Ord, Calif.

A group of 150 has just been selected for a 6-month program at Fort Ord, starting in November.

"The Eskimos have been so proficient," says Brig. Gen. Thomas Carroll, Alaska Adjutant General, "that the original training program set up for them is no longer advanced enough to present a challenge."

To step up their training, the Army this week gave scouts of the guard's 1st battalion a part in the 9th Infantry maneuvers at Nome. In a reconnaissance test, the Eskimos succeeded in infiltrating Regular Army lines.

Their spirit impressed their new Army adviser, Capt. Lawrence M. Flanagan, of Dayton, Wash. Their adaptability and disregard of personal comfort, he feels, gives them a head start in guerrilla warfare.

With sharper training techniques, the efficiency of the Eskimo battalions will approach Army combat standards. Captain Flanagan, an infantry ranger, says.

Capt. James E. O'Rourke commands the 1st battalion, which has 540 enlisted men and 15 officers.

A TRUSTED SOLDIER

A World War II company commander, Captain O'Rourke, has lived in Alaska since the war and has high regard for the Eskimo as a soldier.

"As soon as they know what you want done, it'll get done," he says. "I'd like to have had men like them in the Regular Army."

The First Scout Battalion with headquarters in Nome, is responsible for guarding 2,400 miles of coast in an area as big as Texas.

It has detachments as far out as Little Diomede Island in the Bering Strait, two and a half miles from Siberia, and St. Lawrence Island, scene of the Gambell beer bust.

The Second Battalion headquartered at Bethel, covers southwestern Alaska with 510 enlisted Eskimo men and 15 officers.

The guard's battle group, containing fewer Eskimos, is based at Anchorage and has about 1,000 men in all.

Eskimo scouts were first trained when the Army established the Territorial home guards shortly after Pearl Harbor.

Several of the original scouts are still active. Enlistment is for 3 years, but many scouts have steadily reenlisted.

They range in age from 18 to 45 years. The smallest detachment numbers 7 men, the largest 80, at the northern outpost of Barrow.

The Scouts are obligated to take forty-eight 2-hour drills a year. They draw anywhere from $3 to $10 per drill, depending on rank. That, for some, is a primary source of income.

Many of the scouts are community leaders. Sgt. Charles Guest of Kasigluk, a guardsman for 6 years, also holds the distinction of being the first Eskimo priest in the Russian Orthodox Catholic Church in Alaska.

The 44-year-old scout-priest serves 16 parishes in southwestern Alaska, using dog team, walrus-skin boat, and bush plane. He gives services in Eskimo, English, or Russian.

What prompted him to become a scout? Father Guest, who has seven children, puts it simply:

"America is my country. I want my children and their children to be raised the American way; to be free to worship as they please, to speak as they please."

A statistical survey probably would show that this is not an inconsiderable factor in Eskimo recruitment. Eskimo families of nine or more children are almost commonplace.

LABOR REFORM LAW ON ITS WAY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, earlier this year I said that the American people want Congress to eliminate racketeering and corruption in labor, and to eliminate, too, all improper attempts by labor organizations to dominate the economy of our country. After an overlong period of inaction, Congress, finally, is about to approve an effective labor reform statute. I look forward to supporting it.

So far, Senate and House conferees have been able, title by title, to combine the best features of the House-passed Griffin-Landrum bill and the Senate-passed Kennedy-Ervin bill. Now, the people will receive long overdue protection, through Federal law, against corrupt and evil elements in the labor movement. The legislation which shortly we shall approve will not damage honest American labor unions. It will not abuse their constitutional rights of free expression, nor will it interfere with legitimate and reasonable organizing practices.

The new national statute will require complete democracy in labor unions. It will provide for elections to be by secret ballot. It will mandate, under criminal penalties, complete public disclosure of all income and outgo of each labor organization. It will outlaw the vicious so-called sweetheart contracts, heretofore entered into corruptly between some people in management and some in labor, by which the public has suffered, and by which, also, the union members themselves have suffered.

The new labor law will contain a bill of rights for labor union members. I am particularly pleased that the Griffin-Landrum bill adopted substantially the same bill of rights language which earlier this year I successfully authored as an amendment to the Kennedy-Ervin bill. Although the conferees have reduced the criminal penalties which my Senate-approved amendment provided, the penalties for breaching a union member's rights are, nevertheless, forceful. Under this bill of rights title, a union member will be protected, as he should be protected, in his right to participate in all union activities. He will be insulated against discriminatory treatment. His right to be a candidate for union office is preserved. The union member will receive statutory protection for his rights as a member in much the same way that a stockholder in a business corporation is protected by law in his rights as a stockholder.

There remains for the conferees the problem of composing the differences of the two bills, on their amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act, for example, in the fields of regulating peaceful picketing, in closing the loopholes in that law's ban on secondary boycotts and in solving the question of the so-called no man's land. These will be settled by the conferees, or otherwise, along the lines recommended by President Eisenhower which I support. Peaceful picketing, of course, will be preserved but will be more carefully regulated. The Taft-Hartley prohibition against secondary boycott will be amended, as I say, to close its unfortunate and unintended loopholes.

Legislation in the field of peaceful picketing and secondary boycott is extremely difficult to draft with clarity. For example, the Griffin-Landrum bill contains a proviso to exclude, from the secondary boycott provisions, refusals to perform farmed out struck work. The words it uses are different from those used in the Eisenhower proposal. I mention this simply to indicate the urgent need to weigh precisely all the words used in this bill. It would be tragic to pass such a bill in haste to find that it only served to manufacture lawsuits and to open up new loopholes for either labor or management to crawl through.

The no-man's-land problem is most difficult. My frank preference here is to require equal treatment of each labor dispute if it involves interstate commerce under the Constitution. If a dispute is Federal in nature, I believe that Federal rules should govern its adjudication. A labor dispute which by the Constitution is subject to the Taft-Hartley law ought to be settled, as I see it, under the same rules no matter whether its situs is Alaska, California, Mississippi, or Maine. But, I shall abide by what the conferees and the Senate decide on this intricate question. There are, of course, other less publicized, but nevertheless important, problems remaining to be resolved in the two bills. For example, in the building industry, the two bills amend in a different fashion a section of the present Taft-Hartley law dealing with the unique character of employment in the building and construction industry. The late Senator Taft recognized that section as unfair to the building and construction unions and recommended that it be changed. The President has concurred in the need for a change in this section.

The task of writing fair and effective labor reform legislation, difficult at best, has been complicated by the extremes to which some labor leaders and all labor haters have gone. It is the public—the plain people of the Nation—we need to keep constantly in mind. It is their interest which we must protect. In the legislation which I feel confident we are about to approve, we will not reach perfection. Legislation rarely does. But it will represent progress in this important domestic field.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT OF 1950

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2468) to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the morning hour may be extended.

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

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege. Let me say that I do so in the most friendly possible way, with no animus directed toward any other Senator.

Last Friday afternoon, while I was off the floor, and without notice to me, my good friend—and he is my good friend—the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], took the floor to suggest or to imply, if not actually to charge, that I had made or caused to be made, from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, deletions of statements which, if they had remained in the RECORD, would have shown that I was in a state of some confusion as to the facts of committee voting during part of the debate on the FNMA resolution on last Friday.

I should like to say unequivocally, for the RECORD, that I did no such thing; I neither made any changes in, nor did I make any deletions from, the RECORD of the debate; nor was anyone either directly or indirectly authorized by me to make such changes.

In justice to my good friend, the Senator from Utah, I must say that when he discovered his mistake, he—gentleman that he is—returned to the floor and apologized. I thank him for his apology, which I accept in the good grace with which I am sure it was tendered.

Unfortunately, sometimes such things get ahead of us; and the wire services and certain newspaper reporters sent out over the air, and newspapers in Pennsylvania picked it up, the statement of the Senator from Utah, which perhaps is best epitomized by a little summary published on Saturday morning in the Washington Post, as follows:

Heard BENNETT charge CLARK with unauthorized deletions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that the summary entitled "In Congress," published on Saturday in the Washington Post, may be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

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

IN CONGRESS

TODAY

Senate

Not in session.
No committees scheduled.

House

Not in session.
No committees scheduled.

YESTERDAY

Senate

Met at 10 a.m.
Passed and sent to House $1,428,178,700 military construction appropriations bill.
Passed minor bills.
Heard BENNETT charge CLARK with unauthorized deletions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Received Fulbright resolution calling on administration to investigate the possibilities of a World Fair in the United States in 1964.

Received Neuberger bill to provide health insurance for retired Federal workers.

Heard DWORSHAK call for the revaluation of gold.

Heard GOLDWATER describe James Carey's letter as showing the need for a strong labor reform bill.

Heard HUMPHREY complain of invitation to Khrushchev while refusing visa to Danish scientist.

Adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

House

Not in session.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I take the floor now for only three purposes:

First, I wish to correct the RECORD and to express the hope that the newspapers, wire services, and other publications in Pennsylvania will make the proper corrections in that connection.

Second, I wish to state that I believe that fundamentally the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] was correct, in that deletions should not be made from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, other than for the correction of obvious typographical errors and perhaps the correction of some inartistic grammar, which even the best of us sometimes stray into using.

In fact, Mr. President, because of my conviction that the Senator from Utah was correct, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the pages which were deleted without my authority and without my consent.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. It happened to be my resolution, so I am thoroughly familiar with it. The actual vote was 12 to 3—12 Democrats for and 3 Republicans against. However, in justice to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], it must be said that while he voted to report the resolution, he indicated that he might oppose it on the floor. So in reality the vote was 11 to 4.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Twelve Democrats for and three Republicans against?

Mr. CLARK. No.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Where did the 12 Democrats come from?

Mr. CLARK. I am afraid the Senator from Pennsylvania is a little confused. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] tells me that there were 11 Democrats and 1 Republican.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, there are not 11 Democrats on the committee. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. There must have been three or four Republicans.

Mr. CLARK. I regret my confusion. I have just been told by the clerk of the committee that the vote was nine Democrats for, three Republicans for, and three Republicans against.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, there are only five Republicans on the committee. [Laughter.]

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield time to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

I point out that the report itself shows that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] filed minority views. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] filed individual views; and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] filed individual views.

That is what I have been informed. I thought the Senator from Tennessee said the other day, in discussing this matter on the floor, that the vote was 12 to 3.

Mr. CLARK. That is right. It was.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is my information. I have never seen the rollcall, but I note from the report that two Senators filed minority views, and two filed individual views.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] voted to report the bill, but he indicated that he might oppose it on the floor. I shall be glad to call the roll of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. CLARK. I hope Senators who were present will check me.

Those voting in favor were: The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE]. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] voted to report the resolution, with the reservation which I have indicated. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] voted to report the resolution, but reserved the right to object on the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. I voted against it. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] voted my proxy.

Mr. CLARK. So, in effect, the vote was 12 to 3.

Mr. CLARK. Finally, Mr. President, I wish to state that I hope we can proceed on a better basis in the future with respect to making changes in the RECORD. We are a public body, and what we say should be accurately reported. We have a right to demand that it be accurately reported. We have no right to have statements which we make, which we may later regret, stricken from the RECORD; nor do I believe I have any right to keep these particular pages out of the RECORD simply because they clearly show that during a brief period—I hope it was only a brief period—of the debate on last Friday, I found myself in some confusion as to some relatively unimportant facts.

I should like to make the point, that when I came to this body, it was my understanding that it was a long-established tradition that no Senator would take the floor to make any attack on the position of another Senator or to make any comment adverse to another Senator without notifying that Senator and giving him an opportunity to be present. I hope we will return to that sound tradition.

In conclusion, let me say to my good friend, the Senator from Utah, that I hold no resentment of any sort. I honor him for his apology; and I make this statement only in order that the RECORD may be clear.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I appreciate the attitude of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Before he yields the floor, let me suggest that he has just created a situation which requires a correction of the RECORD; he referred to "the debate of last Friday," whereas it actually occurred last Thursday night. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend for his helpful correction.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. As the Senator from Pennsylvania may know, several days ago I submitted on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], a resolution to forbid the making of any substantial changes in the RECORD.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator from Oregon permit me to join in the sponsorship of that resolution?

Mr. NEUBERGER. We shall be very honored, indeed, to have the Senator from Pennsylvania join us in sponsoring it. Certainly, as Benjamin Franklin has said, experience is the greatest teacher of all.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to my friend, the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I have listened intently and with admiration to the remarks made this afternoon by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania on the point of personal privilege. I congratulate him on what he has said. I think he has made a very splendid statement.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend from Connecticut.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I should like to add a little postscript in regard to this particular situation: I have looked over the portions of the book entitled "Senate Procedure" which deal with the revision of the remarks made by Senators. At the end of that particular portion, we find the following:

A Senator in making a revision of his remarks is not supposed to make any substantial changes therein. (He has no rule of the Senate for guidance).

It is that particular part which the proposal of my colleagues would change. But I hope the Senate will seriously consider adopting a procedural rule—and if it is appropriately referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, I shall be very happy to have that committee give it serious consideration—which will state specifically that no Senator may make any change in the remarks of another Senator.

Nothing of that sort now appears in the rules. It is assumed by the rules and in connection with the book on "Senate Procedure" that all Senators know that. So the rules refer to the privilege a Senator has to revise his own remarks. In fact, I think it should be axiomatic that no Senator should have the right to revise the remarks of another Senator; and I assume that my friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania, will agree that that also is an important consideration.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thoroughly agree as to that. In fact, I would go further: I do not think any Senator should have the right to revise his own remarks, so as to change in any way the substance of what he said.

Mr. BENNETT. Of course, the rule is that in revising his remarks, a Senator is not supposed to make any substantive change in any way. That provision is already in the rule.

Mr. CLARK. And I believe my friend is of the opinion that I made no such change.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes; my friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania, made no such change.

However, we are confronted with a peculiar situation, in that an employee of the Senate made the change, in the process of which, statements made by certain Senators, including a statement made by the Senator from Pennsylvania, were stricken from the RECORD.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield further to me?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Utah is equally clear, is he not, in understanding that I did not authorize that to be done?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes; I understand that clearly; that is perfectly true.

The rules and the book on Senate procedure deal with the privilege of a Senator to make revisions. I am sure no one ever thought we would reach the point where we would have to be concerned with revisions made by staff members.

In fairness to the staff member who made the revision, I wish to state that he has made a very complete and gentlemanly and, I believe, completely proper statement to the Senator from Utah and to the other Senators involved, I assume, whose remarks were deleted as a result of his eagerness to do what he thought would improve the RECORD or make it better.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further to me?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to confirm what the Senator from Utah has said. I have received a long and apologetic letter from the staff member in question—who, incidentally, is one of the best staff members the committee has; and what the committee would do without him, I do not know—and I am perfectly certain that he would not do such a thing again.

Mr. BENNETT. Indeed, I, too, am certain of that; and I am equally certain that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] holds no animus toward that staff member of the Banking and Currency Committee.

MIDDLE EAST REFUGEE CAMPS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on Friday morning the Detroit News, in an editorial called attention to what, if anything could be so termed, is certainly human misery. In our concern with highway financing, civil rights, the labor reform bill, and other day-to-day pressing problems, too many of us are apt to forget a matter that cries out for solution. As one who for some years has been concerned with the problem, I feel strongly that attention should be directed to the continuing problem of the refugee camps in the Middle East.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

ARAB GUILT

As was to be expected, delegates from the nine states of the Arab League, meeting in Beirut, have unanimously rejected Secretary General Hammarskjold's plan for a gradual clearing of the Middle East refugee camps.

Hammarskjold had observed what is clear to the eye of anyone who weighs this problem—that the young generation in the camps is potentially skilled at the building trades and other crafts and that Arab communities are hungry for this kind of help. So, if assistance could be provided for training programs and the young people could be moved out to jobs, the refugee problem would gradually shrink. As things stand, the plight of youth within the camps is more hopeless than all others.

But that compassionate argument fell on deaf ears. The Arab States resumed the theme song now 10 years old—that there can be no solution but the restoration of the refugees to the homes stolen from them by Israel.

Thousands of these people never lived in the land now Israel. Other thousands lived there but owned neither home nor land. Few, if any, were driven out. They fled Israel of their own choice when the Arab armies retreated in 1948. The Arabs who stayed put are still there, running their own villages and working their land. But these facts are incidental to the Arab League case.

But there is in Beirut an exhibit which is pertinent to humanity's case against the Arab League, for neglecting its own people to play politics with human misery. Lebanon, uniquely, is the place where the refugee population is smaller now than in the beginning.

More than 30,000 refugees have been rescued from the camps and integrated. They now lead normal, productive lives. The salvage among Christian Arabs was total; it was the work of other Arabs of their own faith. The contrast between those who have been saved and the million who still cry for help shows where much of the willful guilt lies.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I commend the able senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] for his statement of last week that he was tired out by the delaying tactics of the dominant groups on the Senate Judiciary Committee in the matter of civil rights, and that at an appropriate time he would move to attach a series of thoroughgoing civil rights amendments to some other bill which may come before this body. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and other Senators have been waging a brave struggle inside the committee and deserve the thanks and support of all who believe in greater justice between the races. I shall be glad to serve under their leadership when this measure is brought up on the floor. Since we are obviously not far from adjournment, it is important that action be taken soon. It is also obvious that there is a bipartisan combination operating in the other body to tie up civil rights and to pass an excessively tough labor bill. I hope that no such coalition develops here, and if it does that the liberal forces on both sides of the aisle may be strong enough to win.

We are moving into the most critical phase of this Congress. Let us be alert to our responsibilities and pledges and aware of the forces which are at work.

OBSERVATIONS CONCERNING SECRETARY MITCHELL'S REPORT ON THE STEEL DISPUTE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I ask if the morning hour is still in operation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is still in the morning hour. The morning hour was extended by unanimous consent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for not more than 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, last week Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell released a report entitled "Background Statistics Bearing on the Steel Dispute." The statistics contained in the report are from Government and industry sources, and seem to be accurate so far as they go.

The report does not contain an analysis and evaluation of these facts, and hence its value as an agent for general understanding is limited. But it does contain certain facts which can lead to sound conclusions about the economic issues involved in the steel dispute.

The subject of inflation has figured prominently in the steel wage negotiations. The steel companies have said, in support of their position for a wage freeze in steel, that an increase in hourly employment costs would be inflationary. The steel union has argued that productivity growth and the profit position of the industry would permit an increase in hourly employment costs without a steel price increase. Secretary Mitchell's report shows a long-range growth in output per manhour in the steel industry of 74 percent from 1940 to the latest 12-month period, and an even higher level in the first half of 1959.

The increase in productivity per manhour during the first half of 1959 has been sharp and decisive. Unfortunately, the direct figures on this point are covered up, whether inadvertently or by design, by lumping them in together with data for the last half of calendar 1958. But when separated, they seem to indicate a further gain of approximately 20 percent. This is truly remarkable and it has not been given the notice it should have received, although the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] pointed it out last week.

Equally significant are the facts shown by the report concerning the upward movement of steel prices. In the period from 1951 to the year ending June 30, 1959, the average realized price per ton of steel has risen by $48 from $125 to $173 per ton. In the same period total employment costs per ton of steel for all employees, both wage and salaried, rose by $18. Employment costs for wage employees alone rose by $12 or one-fourth of the rise in the price of steel.

Steel prices in the first half of 1959 were found to be 178 percent above 1940, having risen higher and faster than wholesale prices in general, and much more than retail prices or the prices in steel-consuming industries. As the result of higher steel prices and productivity growth, despite higher hourly employment cost and, presumably, higher material and other costs, the steel industry has improved its profit position. Net profits as a percent of sales have moved up in recent years to almost 8 percent in the first half of 1959 as compared with about 5 percent for the average of all manufacturing industries. Net profits as a percent of stockholders' equity in steel, although on a par with, or slightly below, all manufacturing in the postwar years has moved up to more than 14 percent, as compared with about 11 percent in all manufacturing in the first half of 1959. In this period the average for the 20 largest steel companies was 16.1 percent, as compared with 14.1 percent for the 25 leading industrial firms in the Nation. This record of progress does not appear to substantiate the steel industry's claims of inefficiency and wasteful practices.

It would seem to me that these facts on the growth in steel profits, prices, and productivity—achieved, incidentally, on the basis of an operating rate in the first half of 1959 which was approximately the same as the average operating rate of the industry in the entire postwar period—all have a direct bearing on the question of whether the steel industry can afford an increase in hourly employment costs on the basis of the substantial economic progress it has achieved to date. The facts indicate that there is definitely an area which exists for a settlement of this dispute on a completely noninflationary basis. We cannot ignore the great increase in output during the first half of this year, although the casual reader would miss it from the report itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is not necessary to define precisely this area for settlement. The report notes that so far in 1959 millions of workers in a large variety of industries have received wage and benefit increases. These increases have been granted to workers in industries where the hourly earnings level of workers is above steel as in coal mining and building construction, as well as in those where the earnings level is below steel. The report notes that 96 percent of the workers affected by major wage settlements, excluding construction, in the first half of 1959 received wage increases; that half of the workers received wage increases of 8 cents or more; that many recent settlements have provided for wage rate increases of 3 percent or more; that increases of 4 or 4.5 percent have not been unusual; that 7 out of 10 settlements also liberalized fringe benefits. In addition, there were cost-of-living adjustments. Union scales in building construction were raised by an average of 4 percent—14.3 cents—in the first half of 1959.

In the light of the facts set forth in this report, it is my earnest hope that the leaders of the steel industry will be constrained to reconsider their publicly stated position that steel wages and benefits must remain stationary, and thereby help to make possible a beginning of genuine collective bargaining. This would be the surest method of bringing about a voluntary settlement, freely arrived at by the industry and the union. The facts indicate that it could be settled without an increase in prices.

In the absence of such a collectively bargained settlement in the immediate future, it will become apparent to all that Secretary Mitchell's background statistics cannot serve the purpose of a nonpartisan public factfinding procedure which would, through specific recommendations, provide the basis for a just settlement of the steel dispute as on three others occasions in the postwar period. In company with other Senators, I have for weeks advocated the appointment of just such a board by the President. We have already lost precious time by a failure to act. We should not lose any more.

So far as the future is concerned, it is hoped that the great advance in productivity may lead after a brief time to an actual decrease in prices. For neither labor nor the owners nor management should receive the full gains of increased productivity in this industry. Some of it should be passed on to the users and consumers.

I thank Senators for their patience and kindness.

SITE FOR THE 1964 FAIR

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, there now are several U.S. cities actively competing for the privilege of being host to the 1964 World's Fair. I have commented on this competition several times, and it is no secret that I vigorously support New York City—the Nation's largest city and the home of the United Nations—as the site for the 1964 fair. This morning, I should like to invite attention to a New York Herald Tribune editorial endorsing the proposed 1964 New York World Fair, and spelling out the reasons why New York City is the logical and best suited location for this event.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I also want to speak briefly on another aspect of the competition among American cities to be host city to the 1964 World's Fair. Time is getting short. The site for the 1964 fair is to be selected in November of next year. If we cannot agree on an American city, it is more than likely that a foreign city will be chosen. Much needs to be done in the way of planning and preparation once a site is decided upon, in order that it will be able to compete effectively with other cities throughout the world, which are interested in being selected as the host city for this event. It seems to me very important that we get on with the business at hand.

Mr. President, I urge that every effort be made to have Congress agree as soon as possible as to which of our Nation's great cities will be put forward as the American candidate in the competition to be host for the 1964 World's Fair.

In my judgment, Mr. President, we must present a united front in this matter, or else we run the risk of having a city from some other country selected.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Aug. 24, 1959]

LET'S HOLD THE FAIR RIGHT HERE

It is perfectly understandable that, the subject of a 1964 World's Fair in the United States having been raised, other cities should want to get into the act. Washington and Los Angeles have already begun trying to take the fair away from New York, and we can expect to hear the cry raised repeatedly that New York has had its turn and should yield to another city.

But to hold the fair anywhere but New York would be an injustice to the 70 million visitors from all parts of the world who are expected to attend. Los Angeles, to be sure, is the capital of movieland, and Washington the seat of government, but New York remains the tourist's mecca—the Nation's largest city and its most cosmopolitan, its cultural and financial heart, the crowded, rushing skyscraper-and-subway city that never sleeps, for generations the gateway to America for immigrant and visitor alike. And as headquarters of the United Nations, New York has become the world capital, the repository of hope for achieving that "Peace Through Understanding" that is the theme of the fair.

THE NEED FOR A UNITED NATIONS POLICE FORCE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of the most concrete steps which could be taken to promote world peace would be the creation of a United Nations police force. Such an army, drawn largely, if not exclusively, from the world's smaller nations, could serve as a potent moral and political buffer between potential warring countries.

I have long advocated the formation of such a U.N. police force—a view which has been supported very strongly by many newspapers and organizations around the country. Particularly able arguments for such an addition to the U.N. have come from the Rochester Association for the United Nations and the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle. In a fine editorial recently, this paper pointed out the significant role a U.N. army might play in the present troubles in Latin America. This editorial contains much good food for

thought and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

CARIBBEAN NEEDS U.N. POLICEMEN

In Santiago, Chile, the Council of the Organization of American States has closed its nervous sessions with a fairly strong resolution setting forth its determination to forestall invasions designed to overthrown constituted governments. It also called for eradication of all forms of dictatorship, despotism, or tyranny."

So the Council has done some high-minded barking.

But can it bite, if the need comes? There's the question.

The jittery situation in the Caribbean, which largely prompted this Council meeting in Santiago, would do credit to Gilbert and Sullivan if it wasn't so deadly. It has the same zany comic opera flavor Gilbert and Sullivan bequeathed to humanity.

For example, Haiti asked the Council to intervene and protect her from rebels which have landed in Haiti from Cuba. The Cuban minister of state acknowledged that the rebels sailed from Cuba, but denounced the Dominican Republic—by clearest implication—as inspiring the rebels and helping them out. Meanwhile the Dominican Republic charged that a Cuban tale of the capture of an arms-laden plane said to have come from the Dominican Republic was one of the greatest swindles ever perpetrated on public opinion. Now just to salt this stew a little, the Castros of Cuba, boss Fidel and brother Raul, called the Council meeting a farce.

The only constructive point this page can make in a nervous mess like this one is the hope—even if a forlorn one—that all the foreign ministers of all the well-meaning Latin American states, and there are many such good men, will now see the need for a United Nations police force, and work toward establishment of such a force.

The power of a police force representing not only one nation but nearly 100 nations is incalculable in preventing aggression. Its moral force alone is a whopper. A temporary U.N. force, armed only with sidearms, has cooled the Arab-Israeli struggle to the point where those embattled nations may even reach a peace agreement someday * * * and the U.N. troops are but a handful, camped on the boundary lines.

Earlier this year, the Rochester Association by the United Nations in a statement pleaded for new action by the U.N. General Assembly toward formation of a permanent police force. The statement emphasized the deterring effect of the simple existence of such a force, and outlined the Arab-Israeli case as an illustration.

We think that nobody in the Caribbean, neither the dictator in the Dominican Republic nor the Peck's Bad Boy in Cuba, would rashly slam up against solid U.N. opposition, the way they make whipping boys of each other and of the United States whenever they please. Someday the U.N. nations may recognize that while the world is growing up politically, it must have a cop on the beat.

EISENHOWER LEADERSHIP REDUCES THREAT OF INFLATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate an excellent editorial on the fight against inflation which was published in the Rochester (N.Y.) Times-Union.

The editors of the Times-Union applaud the President's success in curtailing domestic inflation during the hectic first 6 months of 1959. Not long ago, a good many Members of Congress bemoaned the recession of 1957–58, as heralding the onset of catastrophic and incurable economic downturn. Fortunately, the prophets of doom were wrong. It was instead the prophets of boom who were correct. Prophets of doom and prophets of boom have appeared at every major juncture in the growth of the American economy. Look at our great Nation today. Its growth and vigor bear witness to the fact that the economy of the United States has consistently borne out the prophesies of those who predict economic strength and continued industrial expansion.

Mr. President, the editors of the Times-Union have for many years been dedicated to the fight against inflationary increases in the price level. I am proud of their stand. The Times-Union deserves credit for its consistent support of a national economic policy based upon fiscal soundness and economic good sense.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the above referred to editorial from the Rochester Times-Union be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AS WE SEE IT: IKE'S LEADERSHIP REDUCES THREAT OF INFLATION

The Cabinet Price Stability Committee's second report records a battle won. In June this anti-inflation committee, headed by Vice President NIXON, said the economy was at a critical juncture with evidence pointing to a renewal of the upward price spiral.

TIDE TURNS

Now it says that the battle against inflation is being won and that economic growth is the primary concern of the Cabinet committee.

Inflation was the big battle of the first half of the year and the success is a triumph for President Eisenhower's leadership. What he rallied the people against is best illustrated by the majority report of the congressional Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

The majority of the committee declared that strenuous governmental measures were required to pull the country out of the nearly forgotten 1957–58 recession. It said the Federal Reserve Board should abandon monetary controls it described as restrictive, that it should resume pumping additional money into the economy, and that it was not necessary to balance the budget in the fiscal year 1960.

The report represented the feeling of the Congress majority as it went into session last January. But now, thanks to the President's carrying the fight to the people, sentiment has changed. The economy recovered by its own resilience. Easy money policies were rejected. The budget will balance as closely as it ever does 18 months before the books are closed.

Furthermore, Congress is expected to give the Federal Reserve another tool for price stability by repealing the interest rate ceiling on long-term Federal bonds. It is also moving toward financial responsibility on the road program by increasing the gasoline tax.

The evidence that the fight against inflation is being won is to be found in this changed attitude of Congress over the last 8 months as well as in the statistics that prices have risen only slightly more than one-half of 1 percent in the last year.

So now the emphasis is upon economic growth. In some quarters economic growth is merely a more acceptable name for inflation. You show growth by merely marking up the price tags and debasing the dollar. That is not the understanding of the Cabinet committee.

SOUND GROWTH

The sound view of economic growth is that of the minority of the once inflation-minded congressional joint committee. The minority's views have been sustained by the recovery this year. They were that that economic growth means capital accumulation, and this requires: (1) the incentive to invest, and, (2) real savings to finance investment.

And to get these, the minority said, stabilized prices are a basic requisite, without violent swings in employment.

This is the kind of growth that is made possible by defeating the drive for more inflation.

THE EARTHQUAKE IN MONTANA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on the subject of the earthquake in Montana, the story of this tragic event is not yet fully written. As is always the case, there is little notice taken of those people, public and private, who must follow along in the mopping-up operation. A great deal remains to be done. A new natural dam is creating a new lake, and the owners of improvements in the area are experiencing great difficulty in salvage work, owing to the destruction of roads. Life and property must be protected. An inventory of the losses, in life and property, must be taken, and the task is a large one.

Montana is fortunate to be represented in Congress, in both Senate and House, by men who not only are responsive to the needs of their State, but have the wisdom and initiative to take the leadership in meeting these needs.

Much of the damage was on public lands, mainly Forest Service lands. The roads damaged were on the forest highway system in some cases. The Corps of Engineers has a responsibility with reference to the newly dammed Madison River. The west Yellowstone entrance to Yellowstone Park is closed, because slides have closed the roads, and repair is a responsibility of the National Park Service. And many other Federal agencies have interlocking and overlapping interests in this matter.

Mr. President, recognizing this, the senior Senator from Montana acted promptly last week to confer with the heads of the various agencies. Working jointly with them and with the Senate and House Interior Committees and the Senate and House Public Works Committees, and with his colleagues, there was arranged an on-the-site inspection over the weekend by these officials, by committee members and staff members.

I am sure that the work of the Montana Senators and Representatives is contributing greatly to the orderly management of the aftermath of this awesome natural disaster.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that the distinguished Senator from Idaho has seen fit to talk

about the quakes and what is being done to alleviate the situation in southwestern Montana at the present time.

I think a great deal of credit is due to the Montana civil defense unit under Mr. Hugh Potter, to the Montana and Idaho highway patrols, to the Yellowstone Park rangers, and to the Forest Service, which have done so much so quickly to bring about a surcease in this stricken area.

It is my understanding that the intensity of this quake was almost as great as that of the San Francisco earthquake, and had it occurred in a thickly populated area, the amount of damage would have been tremendous.

It is also my further understanding, based on telephone conversations and personal talks with people from Montana, that a mountain has been moved. A mountain that is now known as Earthquake Mountain has formed a natural dam 7 miles below Hebgen Dam. The lake which has been formed by the moving of this mountain is known as "The Lord's Lake," because it was formed through an act of providence.

As the Senator from Idaho knows, a distinguished group of our colleagues, headed by Representative METCALF, of Montana, his colleague, Representative ANDERSON, Senator Moss, and others, visited the earthquake area yesterday and came back this morning to furnish us with a report.

As the Senate knows, before an area may be declared a disaster area it is up to the Governor, as the head of a State, to make the initial request. It is the hope of the Montana delegation that the Governor of Montana will take this initial action so that on that basis Federal assistance may be authorized by the President and rendered to the people living in the area of Yellowstone National Park and the Madison Valley, the two areas most affected by the recent quake.

It is my hope that out of this catastrophe will come something in the way of an alleviation of the difficulties which confront our people, and I want to say that it was very encouraging and heartwarming to observe the combined facilities of the States of Idaho, Wyoming, and Montana working together cooperatively and, when put to the test, working together effectively.

I ask permission, Mr. President, in line with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], that there may be incorporated in the RECORD at this point a report from the Yellowstone area in the New York Times for Sunday, August 23, as well as another article which appeared in this morning's New York Times.

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

[From the New York Times, Aug. 23, 1959]

REPORT FROM YELLOWSTONE—QUAKE DISASTER CAUSES CHANGES IN NATIONAL PARK'S ROUTINE

(By Jack Goodman)

CANYON VILLAGE, YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK, WYO.—Despite the earthquake and landslide that brought death and devastation to the western doorstep of Yellowstone Park last Monday night, officials here estimated that two-thirds of the vacationists who were occupying the park's inns, lodges, cabins and campsites at the time slept through the quake, unaware of the disaster. The park is vast, covering 3,472 square miles, and many tourists learned of the tragedy only through radio broadcasts and newspaper accounts.

Of the dozen lodges and tourist facilities within the park, only Old Faithful Inn suffered damage Monday night when guests were jolted from bed and doused with water from broken pipes in the elderly structure. Although telephone calls from anxious relatives swamped lines at park communities and ranger stations, few tourists and campers thought the occurrence severe enough to warrant reassuring calls to the folks back home. As a result, many motorists were surprised later to find emergency calls listed for them at park entrance points where bulletin boards have traditionally been a standard form of communication.

Most vacationists within the park when Monday's quake jolted the countryside stayed on, making the usual round of visits to Old Faithful, the Norris Geyser Basin, Fishing Bridge, the Mount Washburn country, West Thumb, and the Grand Canyon of the Yellowstone.

ROADS BLOCKED

The quake caused five rockslide blockades of varying size on highways within the park, all along the passes carved through the Madison plateau by the Firehold and Madison Rivers.

Because of the slides and pavement fissures in the area, Park Service officials decided to close to traffic the western section of the park's scenic loop load. That is the 75-mile stretch of highway from Mammoth Hot Springs in the north near the Montana border, down through Madison Junction to Old Faithful. This part of the loop road, together with U.S. 20-191 which joins the loop to the park's between western entrance at West Yellowstone, will remain closed for the rest of the season.

However, the north entry from Livingston and Gardiner, Mont., via U.S. 89, the northeast or Silver Gate Cooke City entrance on U.S. 12, the busy east entrance from Cody, Wyo., by way of U.S. 14–20, and the increasingly popular south entrance from Grand Teton National Park, Jackson Hole and Salt Lake City were unaffected by Monday's tragedy and were carrying normal traffic.

Tourist facilities used for the past three decades by railroad travelers heading to Yellowstone over the Union Pacific will be out of commission for the remainder of the season, but railroad officials last week substituted an alternate entry route for their tour parties, package trippers, and other sightseers with remarkable speed.

Rail travel to battered West Yellowstone, Mont., was cut when the earthquake undermined a sizable fill 7 miles north of Ashton and moved tracks out of alinement. The railroad's West Yellowstone dining lodge, a favored spot with generations of tourists, was put out of service by cracked chimneys and broken windows, while the depot was damaged when a toppled chimney caved in its ceiling.

As a result, the Yellowstone Special, the Union Pacific coach and pullman train which provides vacationists to the park with east and west bound main line connections at Salt Lake City now is shunted to Victor, Idaho, daily. Yellowstone passengers, along with tourists destined for the Jackson Hole country, then board park buses for the trip across Teton Pass, roll north through Grand Teton National Park, and reach Yellowstone by the south rather than the westerly entrance.

NEW ROUTING

Railroaders, pointing out that train service to Yellowstone was scheduled to end September 3, do not expect that the West Yellowstone facilities can be entirely serviceable by that date. But they reported that passengers last week were viewing the added 80-mile journey to Ashton, Jackson Hole and points north as a sort of side trip. It was planned to continue routing passengers through the Tetons until the season ends.

As regards man-made structures within the park, only the rambling, somewhat doddering Old Faithful Inn suffered noticeable structural damage from Monday's quake. This in the main consisted of fractured water pipes and buckled plaster. Food and souvenirs in shops at the communities of Canyon Village Lake, Old Faithful, Mammoth Springs and Tower Junction were jarred from shelves.

STAFFS BUSY

Late-roaming "savages," the collegians who staff lodges and hotels in Yellowstone, had a busy night of it Monday pouring coffee for guests who were shaken awake. At Old Faithful, where some drenched guests took hasty leave of rooms set awash by broken pipes, teenaged staff members joshed about "more steam and water in the rooms than at the geyser," but there was more discomfort than danger. Officials of the Yellowstone Park Co. closed the inn, but reopened a wing to accommodate some 350 guests on Wednesday.

John Q. Nichols, president of the Yellowstone Park Co., believes that vacationists can be readily accommodated at facilities which can be made available at Canyon Village and Lake. The damaged portion of Old Faithful Inn cannot be made serviceable speedily.

Park rangers and hostelry workers, not to mention scores of observant park vacationists, expressed quiet satisfaction at the way in which Yellowstone staff workers and most of the tourists met the situation. The shock, which rumbled across the Madison Plateau Monday night, while it failed to awaken a majority of visitors, was nonetheless severe. However, aside from the difficulties at Old Faithful Inn and some damage to park headquarters at Mammoth, both new and old structures in the park withstood the earth shocks admirably.

The admitted hazard in the park's elderly wooden hotels has always been fire, but the quake had no such aftermath. Equally important, despite the character of the terrain in an area underlaid with thermal basins, volcanic structures and considerable faulting all camp grounds and cabin areas proved well chosen. All are situated in comparatively flat open areas well away from any cliffs and mountain slopes, a tribute both to the builders of early Yellowstone installations and to National Park Service planners of recent years.

Last Monday's earthshock had hardly passed before park officials began checking its aftereffects upon Yellowstone's thermal features, which include 200 geysers and countless mud volcanoes, hot springs, pools, and terraces. Old Faithful proved to be spouting with accustomed regularity. Its eruption intervals, as usual, varied between 30 and 90 minutes, while averaging 63 minutes.

No damage has been reported by park scientists as regards thermal features, but they were greatly interested that Giant Geyser, an occasional performer for the past dozen years, has been "reactivated," at least temporarily, and is erupting almost continuously in the upper geyser basin.

PARK SERVICE PLANS

National Park Service officials, asserting early last week that the recreation area under their supervision was safe and accessible, announced that, with the cooperation of the Yellowstone Park Co. staffs, accommodations and meals would be offered in the

Canyon Village area of the park until October 1, and in the Old Faithful area until October 31.

Among other Park Service plans for the future were the following:

At Mammoth the store and service station remain open the year around, with cottage, hotel, and coffeeshop service available until September 21. At Old Faithful, cabins will be open until September 30, with cafeteria and campers' cabins operating until October 31. The lake lodge will close September 1 as originally scheduled, and the hotel September 8, with boats available until September 15. Fishing Bridge cabins and cafeteria will remain open until September 15.

Canyon Village Lodge will close October 11; camp cabins at West Thumb will close September 8, and Roosevelt Lodge shuts down August 30. The fishing season will extend until October 15, and camping will be permitted at all park campgrounds until snow closes the roads. This occurs generally between October 15 and November. But late-season vacationists should remember that in this high-altitude region, winter togs and snow chains are an October must.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 24, 1959]

QUAKE IN MONTANA

Geologists know that earthquakes are caused by the breaking, or faulting, of strata of rock under immense pressure from within the earth. But they are not sure what causes the pressure.

In the United States, the center of earthquake activity is along the west coast, from the foothills of the Rockies to the Pacific. One great source is the St. Andreas fault, whose movement caused the great San Francisco earthquake in 1906 and the lesser series of tremors in 1957. Another center of activity lies in the Rockies themselves.

Last Tuesday night at 11:30 p.m., mountain standard time, an earthquake of majestic proportions (7.5 on the Richter logarithmic scale used by seismologists, compared with 8.25 for the 1906 San Francisco quake) shook the Rocky Mountain area where Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho meet at the edge of Yellowstone National Park. It is an area that teems at this season with campers touring the Continental Divide.

Part of an 8,000-foot peak came crashing down into a camping area along Montana State Highway No. 1, which runs along Hebgen Lake. Part of the road disappeared under the waters of the lake. In other places it was blocked by landslides 200 to 300 feet high. Great fissures appeared in the earth. Hebgen Dam was damaged and villages below it were evacuated because of the fear of floods. Forestry rescue workers parachuted into the area and helicopters were used to bring out the injured. Aftertremors hampered the work.

There were nine known dead, but it was feared that many more might be buried under the landslides.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in connection with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Montana, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD copies of telegrams which have been sent to the Honorable Hugo Aronson, Governor of Montana, and to the President of the United States, urging that a disaster area be declared, bearing the signatures of FRANK MOSS, FRANK CHURCH, JOSEPH O'MAHONEY, U.S. Senators; LEE METCALF, GRACIE PFOST, JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR., HAROLD JOHNSON, and THOMAS G. MORRIS, Members of the House of Representatives; and also copy of another telegram bearing the signature of JAMES E. MURRAY, U.S. Senator, relating to the same general subject, addressed to the Governor of Montana, the Honorable Hugo Aronson, at Helena, Mont.

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

GOV. HUGO ARONSON,
Helena, Mont.:

After viewing terrible earthquake disaster in Montana we urge that you as Governor immediately exercise your responsibility to request President Eisenhower to declare the Madison River Valley and western part of Yellowstone Park as a disaster area. This action will put into operation several types of important Federal assistance essential to restoring vital public facilities, assisting people suffering damage to property and assure restoration of essential Federal forest and park roads and facilities. Your civil defense director, Hugh Potter, should know complete procedure to follow. Immediate action appears imperative and delay will only aggravate suffering from this catastrophic earthquake.

FRANK MOSS, FRANK CHURCH, JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, U.S. Senators; LEE METCALF, GRACIE PFOST, JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR., HAROLD (BIZ) JOHNSON, THOMAS G. MORRIS, Members of Congress.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.
MR. LEO HOEGH,
Director, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D.C.:

At request of Chairman MURRAY, Senate Interior Committee, we visited earthquake area over weekend and found road and property damage high. Montana's Governor pleaded with us for Federal aid, however he has not yet asked you for disaster area designation. Joined by Montana Senators MURRAY and MANSFIELD we have urged him to seek Presidential declaration of disaster area immediately so that Federal programs for clearing roads and small business aid to restore home and business destruction can get underway. We hope that the Governor makes this request today and that you will give it immediate and favorable consideration.

FRANK MOSS,
FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senators.
LEE METCALF,
LEROY ANDERSON,
GRACIE PFOST,
JOHN BALDWIN,
HAROLD JOHNSON,
TOM MORRIS,
Members of Congress.

AUGUST 24, 1959.

HON. HUGO ARONSON,
Governor, Helena, Mont.:

Congressional group which toured earthquake area at my request has reported findings to me. President has clear cut authority to use available Federal funds for clearing road and small business loans to persons whose property was destroyed or damaged. But you must officially request President to make disaster area designation. I am disappointed that you have not yet acted. Senator MANSFIELD and I join congressional group which made inspection in urging you to request Presidential declaration of disaster area immediately.

JAMES E. MURRAY,
U.S. Senator.

MOTIONS TO RECONSIDER SENATE RESOLUTION 162 AND SENATE RESOLUTION 163, LAID ON THE TABLE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on August 21 the Senate passed Senate Resolution 162 and Senate Resolution 163.

At that time, although I had intended to do so, I failed to move that the votes by which these resolutions were agreed to be reconsidered.

After talking with the minority leader and with the permission of the minority leader, I at this time ask unanimous consent to move that the vote by which Senate Resolution 162 was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. AIKEN. I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I make the same motion as to Senate Resolution 163.

Mr. AIKEN. I move that that motion be laid on the table also.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

COMMENT ON FINAL REPORT OF DRAPER COMMITTEE ON MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the four reports of the Draper Committee on the mutual security program constitute another in the series of excellent challenging studies and reports which have been laid on President Eisenhower's desk in recent years. The Draper report is a worthy follower of the Gaither, Rockefeller, and other reports.

This series of reports to the President by able citizens have two things in common. All of them point out to the President the challenge to the United States posed by the threats from the Communist quarter and from the revolutions now in progress in underdeveloped lands. All these reports cry out for Executive leadership, greater effort on the part of the American people, and increased Federal expenditures for urgent needs. The four fields mainly referred to are repeated again in the Draper committee's letter to the President of August 17:

> Economic growth, level of scientific technology and education, military preparedness, and national purpose and morale.

The Draper report presents another opportunity to the President to carry out urgent recommendations. I hope that this time the President does not simply pass the report on to the Congress and the public for study. Some of us in Congress are fully discouraged already. We tried to give the President an adequate Development Loan Fund, the Foreign Relations Committee recommending $1 billion a year for 5 years in borrowing authority for that Fund. The Draper Committee agrees with the Foreign Relations Committee's recommendation. The efforts of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Draper Committee failed because the President, for budgetary reasons alone, did not support an adequate financial structure for the Development Loan Fund. I despair of any further efforts in Congress along these lines without Executive backing. I suspect that the Draper Committee is discouraged, too, because over and over again in the committee's report recurs the phrase, "Proposals will require strong Executive support to become fully effective."

President Eisenhower has two more budgets to submit to the Congress. Only one of these will he have an opportunity to defend and implement. The President has no political gain or loss personally to anticipate since he cannot succeed himself. It is to be hoped that he will do what his advisers on the Draper Committee—and on the other committees whose reports I have referred to—recommend that he do. It is to be hoped that the President will call upon the people of the United States to support him in the programs necessary to stimulate more rapid economic growth in the United States, raise the level of scientific technology and other educational programs generally, provide adequate military preparedness for both big and little conflicts, and revitalize the national purpose and morale. The President should call for additional taxes, if necessary, to meet these needs. I am sure that the country will not fail to respond.

The Draper report shows excellent thought and thorough preparation. I have not had a chance to read the annexes yet, but the list of authors is impressive. Each reader of the Draper report will make his own list of conclusions which seem most significant. My own earmarking of pages is quite lengthy

Time still remains even in this session of the Congress to do something toward the Draper Committee recommendations. I have in mind that an approach can be made toward the Draper Committee recommendation of "lending for economic development should be increased to at least $1 billion per year" by appropriating now the full amount authorized for the Development Loan Fund for the 2 years ahead. I hope that the members of the Appropriations Committee and all other Senators will read the Draper Committee report before action on the fiscal year 1960 mutual security program is completed in Congress.

REA BORROWERS SERVING COMMUNITIES OF OVER 1,500 POPULATION—SUPPLEMENT TO HEARINGS ON AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1960

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, during the hearings on H.R. 7175, the agricultural appropriation bill, 1960, there was a request made for information on the communities having a population in excess of 1,500 directly served by rural electrification electric borrowers. This information was not available in the Rural Electrification Administration.

On March 6 I requested the Secretary of Agriculture to obtain the requested information from the REA electric borrowers and to furnish it to the committee. The information was received subsequent to the hearings and has now been printed as a supplement to the hearings.

A copy of this supplement to the hearings has been mailed to each Member of Congress, to the Governors of each State, to the REA electric cooperatives, and to the available mailing list of private power companies. Additional copies are available for distribution upon request to the Committee on Appropriations.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, is the morning hour business now concluded?

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

Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, commencing with Order No. 733.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 6904) to establish an Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations was announced as next in order.

Mr. KEATING. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H.R. 6888) to amend section 4132 of the Revised Statutes, section 37 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, section 2 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and section 905(c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended was announced as next in order.

Mr. KEATING. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H.R. 8159) to amend the national banking laws to clarify or eliminate ambiguities, to repeal certain laws which have become obsolete, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARTLETT. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H.R. 8160) to amend the lending and borrowing limitations applicable to national banks, to authorize the appointment of an additional Deputy Comptroller of the Currency, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARTLETT. Over, as not being proper calendar business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT OF 1950

The bill (S. 2468) to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, there is on the calendar Order No. 739, House bill 8284, a companion bill, for the same purpose. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the House bill.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8284) to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection Senate bill 2468 will be indefinitely postponed.

EQUITABLE TREATMENT FOR PRODUCERS PARTICIPATING IN THE SOIL BANK PROGRAM

The bill (S. 2457) to provide equitable treatment for producers participating in the soil bank program on the basis of incorrect information furnished by the Government was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Soil Bank Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 128. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may, to the extent he deems it desirable in order to provide fair and equitable treatment, pay a produce compensation under the acreage reserve or conservation reserve program which he otherwise would not be entitled to receive because the contract, application therefor, action, or conduct of the producer is—

"(1) not in conformity with the provisions of the program, or

"(2) less favorable to the producer than would have been the case if it had been based on correct information, or

"(3) based on an understanding that payment would be forthcoming in an amount in excess of that permitted by the program

if it is established to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the contract, application, action, or conduct of the producer was the result of relying in good faith on the erroneous approval of such contract, application, action, or conduct by, or on the erroneous advice, determination, or computation of, an authorized representative of the Secretary."

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS FOR CHILDREN OF SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 2773) to amend section 1701 of title 38, United States Code, to provide the same educational benefits for children of Spanish-American War veterans who died of a service-connected disability as are provided for children of veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment on page 1, after line 6, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. In the case of any individual who is an eligible person within the meaning of section 1701(a)(1) of title 38, United States Code, solely by virtue of the amendments made by this Act, and who has reached his eighteenth birthday but has not reached his twenty-third birthday on the date of enactment of this Act, the period referred to in section 1712 of title 38, United States Code, shall not end with respect to such individual

until the expiration of the five-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this Act.

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.

ASSISTANCE IN ACQUIRING SPECIALLY ADAPTED HOUSING TO CERTAIN VETERANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 7373) to amend section 801 of title 38, United States Code, to provide assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing to certain veterans seriously disabled during a period of war, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with an amendment, on page 1, after line 4, to strike out:

The Administrator is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to assist any veteran, who is entitled to compensation under chapter 11 of this title, based on service after April 20, 1898, for permanent and total service connected disability due to the loss, or loss of use, of both lower extremities, such as to preclude locomotion without the aid of braces, crutches, canes, or a wheelchair, in acquiring a suitable housing unit with special fixtures or movable facilities made necessary by the nature of the veterans' disability, and necessary land therefor. If a veteran is entitled to compensation under chapter 11 based on service during a period of war (as defined for the purposes of chapter 11) for permanent and total service connected disability, which includes (1) blindness in both eyes, having only light perception, plus (2) loss or loss of use of one lower extremity, and such permanent and total disability is such as to preclude locomotion without the aid of a wheelchair, the Administrator is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to assist the veteran in acquiring a suitable housing unit with special fixtures or movable facilities made necessary by the nature of the veteran's disability, and necessary land therefor. The regulations of the Administrator shall include, but not be limited to, provisions requiring findings that (1) it is medically feasible for such veteran to reside in the proposed housing unit and in the proposed locality; (2) the proposed housing unit bears a proper relation to the veteran's present and anticipated income and expenses; and (3) the nature and condition of the proposed housing unit are such as to be suitable to the veteran's needs for dwelling purposes.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

§ 801. Veterans eligible for assistance

The Administrator is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to assist any veteran, who is entitled to compensation under chapter 11 of this title, based on service after April 20, 1898, for permanent and total service-connected disability—

(1) due to the loss, or loss of use, of both lower extremities, such as to preclude locomotion without the aid of braces, crutches, canes, or a wheelchair, or

(2) which includes (A) blindness in both eyes, having only light perception, plus (B) loss or loss of use of one lower extremity, and such permanent and total disability is such as to preclude locomotion without the aid of a wheelchair,

in acquiring a suitable housing unit with special fixtures or movable facilities made necessary by the nature of the veteran's disability, and necessary land therefor. The regulations of the Administrator shall include, but not be limited to, provisions requiring findings that (1) it is medically feasible for such veteran to reside in the proposed housing unit and in the proposed locality; (2) the proposed housing unit bears a proper relation to the veteran's present and anticipated income and expenses; and (3) the nature and condition of the proposed housing unit are such as to be suitable to the veteran's needs for dwelling purposes.

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.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend section 801 of title 38, United States Code, to provide assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing to an additional group of severely disabled veterans."

ELWOOD R. QUESADA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2500) to authorize the President to reappoint Elwood R. Quesada, formerly lieutenant general, U.S. Air Force, retired, to the grade of major general and to retire him in the grade of lieutenant general, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding any other law, the President alone is authorized to appoint Elwood R. Quesada, formerly a retired lieutenant general U.S. Air Force, to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list of the Regular Air Force, with the pay, allowances, emoluments, perquisites, rights, privileges, and benefits of an officer of his grade and length of service who was on that retired list on May 31, 1958. No pay, allowances, or other benefits shall become due as a result of the enactment of this act for any period before the effective date of his appointment under this act.

SEC. 2. The effective date of the appointment authorized by this act is the day after Elwood R. Quesada ceases to hold office as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, or the day before the death of Elwood R. Quesada, whichever is earlier.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the appointment of Elwood R. Quesada to the retired list of the Regular Air Force, and for other purposes."

EXTENSION OF APPLICATION OF MOTORBOAT ACT OF 1940

The bill (S. 1712) to extend the application of the Motorboat Act of 1940, to certain possessions of the United States was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (c) of section 6 of the Federal Boating Act of 1958, approved September 2, 1958 (72 Stat. 1754), is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Such Act of April 25, 1940 (46 U.S.C. 526–526t), is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 22. (a) This Act shall apply to every motorboat or vessel on the navigable waters of the United States, Guam, the Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, and every motorboat or vessel owned in a State and using the high seas.

"(b) As used in this Act—

"The term 'State' means a State of the United States, Guam, the Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 5067) to repeal section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KEATING. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

SOUTH FORK OF SOUTH BRANCH OF CHICAGO RIVER

The bill (H.R. 7948) to declare unnavigable a part of the west arm of the South Fork of the South Branch of the Chicago River in the city of Chicago, Ill., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN EVERGLADES CITY, FLA.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2390) to authorize the exchange of certain lands in or in the vicinity of Everglades City, Fla., in furtherance of the administration and use of the Everglades National Park, and to add certain donated lands to such park, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, after line 14, to strike out:

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept for Everglades National Park purposes, title to approximately 1,160 acres of land and submerged land lying within sections 25, 26, and 36 of township 53 south, range 29 east, and section 30, township 53 south, range 30 east, Tallahassee meridian, and being a portion of the land and submerged land donated and conveyed by three Collier deeds in 1951 and 1952 to the trustees of the internal improvement fund of the State of Florida for subsequent inclusion in the Everglades National Park. Such three Collier deeds are dated December 12, 1951, December 26, 1951, and March 21, 1952, and are recorded in deed book 22, page 240, deed book 22, page 244, and deed book 39, page 25, respectively, in Collier County, Fla. The aforesaid land and submerged land shall be subject to the reservations set forth in the aforementioned Collier deeds for public utility easement and rights-of-way of the public with respect to Indian Key Channel, and also to a public right-of-way for the State highway or causeway from Everglades City to Chokoloskee Island.

And, on page 3, at the beginning of line 10, to change the section number from "3" to "2", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to further the administration and use of the Everglades National Park, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States title to the following described parcels of land:

Those parts of tracts "R" and "S" which lie west of the right-of-way of State Road Numbered 29, and lots 1 to 9, inclusive, of block 40, in Everglades City, Florida, comprising 18.98, 1.32, and 3.17 acres, respectively, as shown on N.P.S. Map No. EVE-NP-E-1, dated June 23, 1959, of Everglades City, Florida; and not to exceed 15 acres of submerged lands lying adjacent to said tracts "R" and "S", if such additional lands are considered necessary by the Secretary of the Interior to permit full utilization of the lands above described;

and, in exchange for such parcels of land, to convey to the owner or owners thereof all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following described parcels of land within the Everglades National Park:

Tract "L" and block 34, comprising 9.09 and 1.65 acres, respectively, lying in or in the vicinity of Everglades City, Florida.

SEC. 2. All lands and submerged lands title to which is accepted by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the provisions of this Act shall, upon the acceptance of title thereto, become parts of the Everglades National Park and shall be subject to all laws and regulations applicable thereto.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to explain to the Senate that last year when we passed the bill limiting the Everglades National Park, part of it approved a grant by private owners to the Park Service of a site for a western headquarters building in Everglades City. Since that time the Park Service has decided that it prefers another site, also in Everglades City, a small town. The owners of the second tract, who were also the owners of the first tract, are perfectly willing to convey it, provided the first tract is conveyed back.

The new tract is bigger than the old, and the Park Service thinks it would be more convenient for its use. The bill, as amended, provides solely for the exchange of these two tracts.

This morning I noted in the Miami News an article calling attention to the large number of people who are visiting the Everglades National Park. Last year's total attendance was 443,000 and this year it will go over half a million. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the Miami News, Aug. 20, 1959]

TOURISTS SWAMP EVERGLADES

Attendance at the Everglades National Park may top the half-million mark this year.

More than 350,000 people have visited the famous Florida park so far this year, with July recording the largest increase in attendance yet.

July visitors numbered 34,404—an increase of 3,802 over the previous month, and an increase of 2,162 over July of last year. Last year's total attendance was 443,263.

"It seems to be following a trend," said Clifford Senni, assistant chief ranger. "The attendance increases every year. In 1949 there was only 94,927 visitors."

Senni also noted that the number of campers in the park have increased. "Visitors are pouring in year round now," said Senni, "not just in the winter."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands in or in the vicinity of Everglades City, Fla., in furtherance of the administration and use of the Everglades National Park."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 4576) to suspend for a temporary period the duty on book bindings and covers imported by certain institutions was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARTLETT. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF MINERAL LEASING ACT OF FEBRUARY 25, 1920

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2181) to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, after the enacting clause, to strike out:

That this Act may be cited as the "Mineral Leasing Act Amendments of 1959".

SEC. 2. Section 17 of the Act entitled "An Act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas and sodium on the public domain", approved February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U.S.C. 226), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 17. All lands subject to disposition under this Act which are known or believed to contain oil or gas deposits may be leased by the Secretary of the Interior. When the lands to be leased are within any known geological structure of a producing oil or gas field, they shall be leased to the highest responsible qualified bidder by competitive bidding under general regulations, in units of not exceeding six hundred and forty acres, which shall be as nearly compact in form as possible, upon the payment by the lessee of such bonus as may be accepted by the Secretary and of such royalty as may be fixed in the lease which shall be not less than 12½ per centum in amount or value of the production removed or sold from the lease. When the lands to be leased are not within any known geological structure of a producing oil or gas field, the person first making application for the lease who is qualified to hold a lease under this Act shall be entitled to a lease of such lands without competitive bidding. Such leases shall be conditioned upon the payment by the lessee of a royalty of 12½ per centum in amount or value of the production removed or sold from the lease. Leases issued under this section shall be for a primary term of ten years and shall continue so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities: *Provided,* That a noncompetitive lease issued under this section for land on which drilling operations are being conducted at the end of said primary term of such lease shall be extended for two years and so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities.

"Any lease issued under this Act which is subject to termination by reason of cessation of production shall not terminate if within sixty days after production ceases, reworking or drilling operations are commenced on the land under lease and are thereafter conducted with reasonable diligence during such period of nonproduction. No lease issued under this Act shall expire because operations or production is suspended under any order, or with the consent, of the Secretary of the Interior. No lease issued under this Act covering lands on which there is a well capable of producing oil or gas in paying quantities shall expire because the lessee fails to produce the same, unless the lessee is allowed a reasonable time, but not less than sixty days after notice by registered mail, within which to place such well on a producing status: *Provided,* That after such status is established production shall continue on the leased premises unless and until suspension of production is allowed by the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of this Act.

"All leases issued under this section shall be conditioned upon the payment by the lessee in advance of a rental of not less than 25 cents per acre per annum. A minimum royalty of $1 per acre in lieu of rental shall be payable at the expiration of each lease year beginning or or after a discovery of oil or gas in paying quantities on the lands leased: *Provided,* That in the case of lands not within any known geological structure of a producing oil or gas field, the rentals for the second and third lease years shall be waived unless a valuable deposit of oil or gas be sooner discovered.

"Whenever it appears to the Secretary of the Interior that lands owned by the United States are being drained of oil or gas by wells drilled on adjacent lands, he is hereby authorized and empowered to negotiate agreements whereby the United States, or the United States and its lessee, shall be compensated for such drainage, such agreements to be made with the consent of the lessees affected thereby, and the primary term including any extensions thereof of any lease for which compensatory royalty is being paid shall be extended for the period during which such compensatory royalty is paid and for a period of one year from discontinuance of such payment and so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities: *Provided,* That the Secretary of the Interior shall report to Congress at the beginning of each regular session, all such agreements entered into during the previous year which involve unleased Government lands."

SEC. 3. Section 17(a) of such Act of February 25, 1920 (30 U.S.C. 226(d)), is amended by striking out "primary term of five years" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "primary term of ten years".

SEC. 4. Section 27 of such Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U.S.C. 184) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 27. No person, association, or corporation, except as herein provided, shall take or hold coal leases or permits during the life of such lease in any one State exceeding an aggregate of ten thousand two hundred and forty acres: *Provided,* That a person, association or corporation may apply for coal leases or permits for acreage in addition to said ten thousand two hundred and forty acres, which application or applications shall be in multiples of forty acres, not exceeding a total of five thousand one hundred twenty additional acres in such State, and shall contain a statement that the granting of a lease for such additional lands is necessary to the person, association, or corporation to carry on business economically and is in the public interest. On the filing of said application, the coal deposits

in such lands covered thereby shall be temporarily set aside and withdrawn from all forms of disposal under this Act. The Secretary of the Interior shall, after posting notice of the pending application in the local land office, conduct public hearings on said application or applications for additional acreage. After such public hearings, to such extent as he finds to be in the public interest and necessary for the applicant in order to carry on business economically, the Secretary of the Interior may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, permit such person, association, or corporation to take or hold coal leases or permits for an additional aggregate acreage of not more than five thousand one hundred and twenty acres in such State. The Secretary may, in his own discretion or whenever sufficient public interest is manifested, re-evaluate the lessee's or permittee's need for all or any part of the additional acreage. The Secretary may cancel the lease or leases and permit or permits covering all or any part of the additional acreage, if he finds that such cancellation is in the public interest or that the coal deposits in the additional acreage are no longer necessary for the lessee or permittee to carry on business economically or if the lessee or permittee has divested himself of all or any part of the original ten thousand two hundred and forty acres or no longer has facilities which in the Secretary's opinion enable him to exploit the deposits under lease or permit. No assignment, transfer, or sale of any part of the additional acreage may be made without the approval of the Secretary. No person, association, or corporation, except as herein provided, shall take or hold sodium leases or permits during the life of such lease in any one State, exceeding in the aggregate acreage five thousand one hundred and twenty acres: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion where it is necessary in order to secure the economic mining of sodium compounds leasable under this Act, permit a person, association, or corporation to take or hold sodium leases or permits for up to fifteen thousand three hundred and sixty acres in any one State. No person, association, or corporation, except as herein provided, shall take, hold, own, or control at one time, whether acquired directly from the Secretary of the Interior under this Act or otherwise, oil and gas leases (including options for such leases) on land held under the provisions of this Act exceeding in the aggregate two hundred and forty-six thousand and eighty acres in any one State, except the States of Alaska and Hawaii. No person, association, or corporation shall take or hold at one time phosphate leases exceeding in the aggregate ten thousand two hundred and forty acres in the United States. No person, association, or corporation shall take or hold at one time any interest or interests as a member of an association or associations or as a stockholder of a corporation or corporations holding a lease or leases, permit or permits, under the provisions hereof, which, together with the area embraced in any direct holding of a lease or leases, permit or permits, under this Act, or which, together with any other interest or interests as a member of an association or associations or as a stockholder of a corporation or corporations holding a lease or leases, permit or permits, under the provisions hereof for any kind of minerals hereunder, exceeds in the aggregate an amount equivalent to the maximum number of acres of the respective kinds of minerals allowed to any one lessee or permittee under this Act. For the purpose of this Act, no contract for development and operation of any lands leased hereunder, whether or not coupled with an interest in such lease, nor any lease or leases owned in common by two or more persons, shall be deemed to create a separate association under this section between or among such contracting parties, or the persons owning such lease or leases in common, but the proportionate interest of each such person shall be charged against the total acreage permitted to be held by such person under this Act: *Provided*, That the total acreage so held in common by two or more persons shall not exceed, in the aggregate, an amount equivalent to the maximum number of acres of the respective kind of minerals allowed to any one lessee or permittee under this Act. No option for an oil or gas lease on any lands held under the provisions of this Act shall be entered into for a period of more than three years, without the prior approval of the Secretary of the Interior, and no person, association, or corporation shall hold any such options at one time on more than two hundred thousand acres of land in any one State, except Alaska and Hawaii. No such option shall be valid unless notice thereof, including the number of acres under option, the names of all parties thereto and their respective interests, and obligations undertaken thereunder by the optionee, is filed in the land office of the Bureau of Land Management for the area in which the land under option is located and every option shall until exercised be charged to both optioner and optionee. In addition each holder of any such option shall file with the Secretary within ninety days after the 30th day of June and the 31st day of December in each year a statement under oath showing as of said dates (1) name of optionor and serial number of lease or application for lease, (2) date and expiration date of each option, (3) number of acres covered by each option, and (4) aggregate number of options held in each State and total acreage subject to said options in each State. If any interest in any land is owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by means of stock or otherwise, in violation of any of the provisions of this Act, the interest may be canceled or forfeited, or the person so owning or controlling the interest may be compelled to dispose of the interest, by the Secretary of the Interior in an administrative proceeding, except that any ownership or interest forbidden in this Act which may be acquired by descent, will, judgment, or decree may be held for two years and not longer after its acquisition. In the event that the Secretary has reason to believe that fraud has been committed in the holding of any such interest by any person, he may request the Attorney General to institute appropriate proceedings against such person. Any such proceeding shall be instituted in the United States district court for the district in which the land or some part thereof is located or in which such person may be found, and the court in such proceeding, in addition to any other penalties provided by law, may if fraud is found provide that such person shall be ineligible thereafter, either permanently or for a lesser period, to hold any lease or other interest in land under the provisions of this Act."

And, in lieu thereof, to insert "That section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437, 448), as amended (30 U.S.C., sec. 184), is further amended by the insertion, immediately after the sixteenth sentence, of the following:"; on page 10, line 17, after the word "adversely", to insert "the title or interest of a bona fide purchaser in"; in line 19, after the word "in", where it appears the second time, to strike out "good faith by any qualified person, association, or corporation in"; in line 21, after the word "person", to insert "association or corporation"; in line 23, after the word "or", to strike out "forfeiture" and insert "forfeited"; on page 11, line 1, after the word "of", to strike out "the Mineral Leasing Act Amendments of 1959 and insert "this Act"; in line 2, after the word "person", to insert "association or corporation"; in line 6, after the word "that", to strike out "he" and insert "the person, association or corporation"; in line 7, after the word "a", to strike out "party in good faith" and insert "bona fide purchaser", and in line 9, after the word "Act", to strike out "If during any such proceedings with respect to a violation of any provisions of this Act, or any proceedings with respect to fraud under such provisions, development rights with respect to the interest involved are suspended pending a decision in such proceedings, any person who in such proceedings is found not in violation of such provisions or not guilty of such fraud, or any person, who acquired any part of such interest involved in good faith without violating any provisions of this Act, shall have the right to have his interest extended for a period of time equal to any period during which development rights were so suspended with respect to such interest. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to limit sections 18, 19, and 22 of this Act or to prevent any number of lessees under this Act from combining their several interests so far as may be necessary for the purposes of constructing and carrying on the business of a refinery, or of establishing and constructing as a common carrier a pipeline or lines of railroads to be operated and used by them jointly in the transportation of oil from their several wells, or from the wells of other lessees under this Act, or the transportation of coal or to increase the acreage which may be acquired or held under section 17 of this Act: *Provided*, That any combination for such purpose or purposes shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior on application to him for permission to form the same. Except as in this Act provided, if any of the lands or deposits leased under the provisions of this Act shall be subleased, trusteed, possessed, or controlled by any device permanently, temporarily, directly, indirectly, tacitly, or in any manner whatsoever, so that they form a part of or are in anywise controlled by any combination in the form of an unlawful trust, with the consent of the lessee, or form the subject of any contract or conspiracy in restraint of trade in the mining or selling of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, or sodium entered into by the lessee, or any agreement or understanding, written, verbal, or otherwise, to which such lessee shall be a party, of which his or its output is to be or become the subject, to control the price or prices thereof or of any holding of such lands by any individual, partnership, association, corporation, or control in excess of the amounts of lands provided in this Act, the lease thereof shall be forfeited by appropriate court proceedings" and, in lieu thereof, to insert "If during any such proceedings with respect to a violation of any provisions of

this Act, or any proceedings with respect to fraud under such provisions, a party to those proceedings files with the Secretary of the Interior a waiver of his rights under the lease to drill or to assign his interests thereunder or if such rights are suspended by order of the Secretary pending a decision in such proceedings, he shall, if he is found in such proceedings not in violation of such provisions or not guilty of such fraud, have the right to have his interest extended for a period of time equal to the period between the filing of the waiver or the order of suspension by the Secretary and the final decision, without the payment of rental." "; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437, 448), as amended (30 U.S.C., sec. 184), is further amended by the insertion, immediately after the sixteenth sentence, of the following: "The right of cancellation or forfeiture for violation of the provisions of this Act shall not apply so as to affect adversely the title or interest of a bona fide purchaser in any lease, option for a lease, or interest in a lease acquired in conformity with the acreage limitations of this Act from any other person, association or corporation whose holdings, or the holdings of a predecessor in title, may have been canceled or forfeited, or may be subject to cancellation or forfeiture for any such violation. Effective on the date of enactment of this Act, any person, association or corporation who is a party to any proceedings with respect to a violation of any provision of this Act, whether initiated prior to such date of enactment or thereafter, shall have the right to be dismissed as such a party upon showing that the person, association or corporation acquired the interest involving him as such a bona fide purchaser without violating any provisions of this Act. If during any such proceedings with respect to a violation of any provisions of this Act, or any proceedings with respect to fraud under such provisions, a party to those proceedings files with the Secretary of the Interior a waiver of his rights under the lease to drill or to assign his interests thereunder or if such rights are suspended by order of the Secretary pending a decision in such proceedings, he shall, if he is found in such proceedings not in violation of such provisions or not guilty of such fraud, have the right to have his interest extended for a period of time equal to the period between the filing of the waiver or the order of suspension by the Secretary and the final decision, without the payment of rental."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BASILE IGNATIOS MAVRIDIS

The bill (H.R. 1579) for the relief of Basile Ignatios Mavridis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONTINENTAL HOSIERY MILLS, INC.

The bill (S. 1015) for the relief of Continental Hosiery Mills, Inc., of Henderson, N.C., successor to Continental Hosiery Co., of Henderson, N.C., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $21,670.11 to Continental Hosiery Mills, Incorporated, of Henderson, North Carolina, successor to Continental Hosiery Company, of Henderson, North Carolina, in full settlement of all claims against the United States, representing a refund of income tax erroneously collected from said corporation on April 19, 1947, by the Bureau of Internal Revenue: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this contract shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. KEATING subsequently said: Mr. President, because we have been moving through the calendar pretty fast, I did not register my objection to Calendar No. 768, S. 1015. It was passed due to my inadvertence. I ask unanimous consent that the votes by which the bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was passed be reconsidered and that the bill be restored to the calendar.

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

WABASH VALLEY COMPACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1257) granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Wabash Valley Compact, and for related purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 13, after line 10, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. Any additional function delegated to or imposed upon the Wabash Valley Interstate Commission pursuant to section E of article VI of the compact shall be one within the general authority granted by the compact and may be utilized only in furtherance of the purposes of the compact.

At the beginning of line 16, to change the section number from "3" to "4"; at the beginning of line 20, to change the section number from "4" to "5", and, after line 21, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 6. Nothing herein contained shall be interpreted or construed as approving any act, action, or conduct which is or has been or may be in violation of existing law, nor shall anything herein contained constitute a defense to any action, suit, or proceeding pending or hereafter instituted on account of any prohibited antitrust or monopolistic act, action, or conduct.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Illinois and Indiana to enter into the Wabash Valley Compact in the form as follows:

"THE WABASH VALLEY COMPACT

"Article I

"Findings and Purpose

"The party states find that the Wabash Valley has suffered from a lack of comprehensive planning for the optimal use of its human and natural resources and that underutilization and inadequate benefits from its potential wealth are likely to continue until there is proper organization to encourage and facilitate coordinated development of the Wabash Valley as a region and to relate its agricultural, industrial, commercial, recreational, transportation, development and other problems to the opportunities in the Valley. To this end it is the purpose of the party states to recognize and provide for such development and coordination and to establish an agency of the party states with powers sufficient and appropriate to further regional planning for the Valley.

"Article II

"The Valley

"As used in this compact, the term 'Wabash Valley' shall mean the Wabash River, its tributaries and all land drained by said river and tributaries, to whatever extent they lie within the party states.

"Article III

"The Wabash Valley Interstate Commission

"(a) There is hereby created an agency of the party states to be known as the Wabash Valley Interstate Commission (hereinafter called the Commission). The Commission shall be composed of seven Commissioners from each party state designated or appointed in accordance with the law of the state which they represent and serving and subject to removal in accordance with such law. The federal government may be represented without vote if provision is made by federal law for such representation.

"(b) The Commissioners of the party states shall each be entitled to one vote in the Commission. No action of the Commission shall be binding unless taken at a meeting in which a majority of the members from each party state are present and unless a majority of those from each state concur, provided that any action not binding for such a reason may be ratified within thirty days by the concurrence of a majority of each state. In the absence of any Commissioner, his vote may be cast by another representative or Commissioner of his state provided that said Commissioner or other representative casting said vote shall have a written proxy in proper form as may be required by the Commission.

"(c) The Commission may sue and be sued, and shall have a seal.

"(d) The Commission shall elect annually, from among its members, a chairman, a vice-chairman and a treasurer. The Commission shall appoint an executive director who shall also act as secretary, and who, together with the treasurer, shall be bonded in such amounts as the Commission may require.

"(e) The Commission shall appoint and remove or discharge such personnel as may be necessary for the performance of the Commission's functions irrespective of the civil service, personnel or other merit system laws of any of the party states.

"(f) The Commission may establish and maintain, independently or in conjunction with any one or more of the party states, a suitable retirement system for its employees. Employees of the Commission shall be eligible for social security coverage in respect of old-age and survivors insurance provided that the Commission takes such steps as may be necessary pursuant to federal law to participate in such program

of insurance as a governmental agency or unit. The Commission may establish and maintain or participate in such additional programs of employee benefits as may be appropriate to afford employees of the Commission terms and conditions of employment similar to those enjoyed by employees of the party states generally.

"(g) The Commission may borrow, accept, or contract for the services of personnel from any state or the United States or any subdivision or agency thereof, from any interstate agency, or from any institution, person, firm or corporation.

"(h) The Commission may accept for any of its purposes and functions under this compact any and all donations, and grants of money, equipment, supplies, materials, and services, conditional or otherwise, from any state of the United States or any subdivision or agency thereof, or interstate agency, or from any institution, person, firm or corporation, and may receive, utilize, and dispose of the same.

"(i) The Commission may establish and maintain such facilities as may be necessary for the transacting of its business. The Commission may acquire, hold, and convey real and personal property and any interest therein.

"(j) The Commission may adopt, amend, and rescind bylaws, rules, and regulations for the conduct of its business.

"(k) The Commission annually shall make to the Governor of each party State a report covering the activities of the Commission for the preceding year, and embodying such recommendations as may have been adopted by the Commission, which report shall be transmitted to the legislature of said State. The Commission may issue such additional reports as it may deem desirable.

"Article IV

"Finances

"(a) The Commission shall submit to the executive head or designated officer or officers of each party State a budget of its estimated expenditures for such period as may be required by the laws of that jurisdiction for presentation to the legislature thereof.

"(b) Each of the Commission's budgets of estimated expenditures shall contain specific recommendations of the amount or amounts to be appropriated by each of the party States. Subject to appropriations by the respective legislatures, the Commission shall be provided with such funds by each of the party States as are necessary to provide the means of establishing and maintaining facilities, a staff of personnel, and such activities as may be necessary to fulfill the powers and duties imposed upon and entrusted to the Commission.

"(c) The Commission may meet any of its obligations in whole or in part with funds available to it under article III(h) of this compact, provided that the Commission takes specific action setting aside such funds prior to the incurring of any obligation to be met in whole or in part in this manner. Except where the Commisson makes use of funds available to it under article III(h) hereof, the Commission shall not incur any obligations prior to the allotment of funds by the party jurisdictions adequate to meet the same.

"(d) The expenses and any other costs for each member of the Commission shall be met by the Commission in accordance with such standards and procedures as it may establish under its bylaws.

"(e) The Commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements. The receipts and disbursements of the Commission shall be subject to the audit and accounting procedures established under its bylaws. However, all receipts and disbursements of funds handled by the Commission shall be audited yearly by a qualified public accountant and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the Commission.

"(f) The accounts of the Commission shall be open at any reasonable time for inspection.

"Article V

"Advice and Cooperation

"(a) The Commission shall establish a technical advisory committee which shall be composed of representatives of such departments or agencies of the governments of the party states as have significant interest in the subject matter of the Commission's work: *Provided,* That if pursuant to the laws of a party state a representative of any such department or agency serves as a member of the Commission said department or agency need not be represented on the technical advisory committee. The Commission shall provide under its bylaws for procedures for the reference of questions to such committee.

"(b) The Commission may establish other advisory and technical committees composed of private citizens, expert and lay personnel, representatives of industry, labor, commerce, agriculture, civic associations, and officials of local, state and federal governments, and may cooperate with and use the services of any such committee and the organizations which they represent in furthering any of its activities under this compact. The Commission shall encourage citizen organization and activity for the promotion of the objectives of this compact.

"Article VI

"Functions

"The Commission shall have power to:

"A. Promote the balanced development of the Wabash Valley by

"(1) Correlating and reporting on data significant to such development.

"(2) Recommending the coordination of studies by the agencies of the party States to provide such data.

"(3) Publishing and disseminating materials and studies which will encourage the economic development of the Valley.

"(4) Recommending standards as guides for local and state zoning and other action which will promote balanced development by encouraging the establishment of industrial parks to facilitate industrial development, the reservation of stream bank and lake shore areas for recreation and public access to water, the preservation of marshes and other suitable areas as wildlife preserves, the afforestation and sustained yield forest management of submarginal lands, the protection of scenic values and amenities, and other appropriate measures.

"(5) Preparing in cooperation with appropriate governmental agencies a master plan for the identification and programming of public works.

"(6) Cooperating with all appropriate governmental agencies in the encouragement of tourist traffic and facilities in the Valley.

"B. Recommend integrated plans and programs for the conservation, development and proper utilization of the water, land and related natural resources of the Wabash Valley, including but not limited to:

"(1) Encouraging the classification of Valley lands in terms of appropriate uses.

"(2) Cooperating in the development of appropriate plans for flood protection, including but not limited to the construction of protective works and reservoirs.

"(3) Developing public awareness of the need for flood plain zoning and in cooperation with the appropriate agencies of the party states and their political subdivisions evolving standards for the implementation and application of such zoning in the Valley.

"(4) Reviewing the need for and appropriate sources of suitable water supplies for domestic, municipal, agricultural, power, industrial, recreation and transportation purposes.

"(5) Encouraging a pattern of land use and resource management which will increase the natural wealth of the Valley and promote the welfare of its inhabitants.

"(6) In cooperation with appropriate agencies, analyzing the recreational needs and potential of the Valley and developing a program for the use and maximization of recreational resources.

"C. Secure the necessary research and developmental activities by:

"(1) Correlating such research and developmental activities as are placed within its purview by this compact. The Commission may engage in original investigation and research on its own account or secure the undertaking thereof by a qualified public or private agency.

"(2) Making contracts for studies, investigations and research in any of the fields of its interest.

"(3) Publishing and disseminating reports.

"D. Make recommendations for appropriate action to:

"(1) The legislatures and executive heads of the party states and the federal government.

"(2) The agencies of the party states and the federal government.

"E. Undertake such additional functions as may hereafter be delegated to or imposed upon it from time to time by the action of the legislature of a party state concurred in by the legislature of the other.

"Article VII

"Enactment and Withdrawal

"This compact shall become effective when entered into and enacted into law by the states of Illinois and Indiana. The compact shall continue in force and remain binding upon each party state until renounced by legislative action of either party state.

"Article VIII

"Construction and Severability

"The provisions of this compact shall be severable and if any phrase, clause, sentence or provision of this compact is declared to be unconstitutional or the applicability thereof to any state, agency, person or circumstance is held invalid, the constitutionality of the remainder of this compact and the applicability thereof to any other state, agency, person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby. It is the legislative intent that the provisions of this compact be reasonably and liberally construed."

SEC. 2. A Federal representative to the Wabash Valley Interstate Commission shall be appointed by the President, and he shall report to the President either directly or through such agency or official as the President may specify. Such representative shall have no vote on the commission. His compensation shall be in such amount, not in excess of $100 per diem, as the President shall specify, but the total amount of compensation payable in any one calendar year shall not exceed $10,000: *Provided,* That if the Federal representative be an employee of the United States he shall serve without additional compensation: *Provided further,* That a retired military officer or a retired Federal civilian officer or employee may be appointed as such representative, without prejudice to his retired status, and he shall receive compensation as authorized herein in addition to his retired pay or annuity but the sum of his retired pay or annuity and such additional compensation as may be paid hereunder shall not exeed $12,000 in any one calendar year. The Federal representative shall be entitled to travel expenses, he shall also be provided with office space, stenographic service, and other necessary administrative services. The compensation of the Federal representative shall be paid from available appropriations for the White House

Office or from funds available to the President in connection with special projects. Travel expenses, office space, stenographic, and administrative services shall be paid from any available appropriations selected by the head of such agency or agencies as may be designated by the President to provide such expenses.

SEC. 3. Any additional function delegated to or imposed upon the Wabash Valley Interstate Commission pursuant to section E of article VI of the compact shall be one within the general authority granted by the compact and may be utilized only in furtherance of the purposes of the compact.

SEC. 4. The Wabash Valley Interstate Commission constituted by the compact shall make an annual report to Congress not later than sixty days after the beginning of each regular session thereof.

SEC. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved.

SEC. 6. Nothing herein contained shall be interpreted or construed as approving any act, action, or conduct which is or has been or may be in violation of existing law, nor shall anything herein contained constitute a defense to any action, suit, or proceeding pending or hereafter instituted on account of any prohibited antitrust or monopolistic act, action, or conduct.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Wabash Valley compact, and for related purposes."

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a brief statement on the bill.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARTKE

I am indeed gratified that such swift action has been taken by the Senate in considering S. 1257, which I introduced on March 5, 1959, with my senior colleague from Indiana and the two distinguished Senators from Illinois as cosponsors.

The Legislatures of Indiana and Illinois earlier this year passed the Wabash Valley Compact with only one dissenting vote. We now rely on the Congress to give its consent.

The Wabash River Valley is one of the finest and richest in the country. With the consent of Congress the States of Indiana and Illinois will join in a coordinated development of this valley. This is important to the Nation as well as to these States.

The interstate commission authorized by this compact will coordinate these efforts. We are hopeful and confident that proper planning will lead to a greater development of the agricultural, industrial, commercial and recreational potential of this valley.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 2717) for the relief of Eber Bros. Wine & Liquor Corp. was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARTLETT. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

FEES OF U.S. MARSHALS

The bill (S. 2349) to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to fees of U.S. marshals, 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 by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1921 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1921. United States marshals' fees

"Only the following fees of United States marshals shall be collected and taxed as costs, except as otherwise provided:

"For serving a writ of possession, partition, execution, attachment in rem, or libel in admiralty, warrant, attachment, summons, capias, or any other writ, order, or process in any case or proceeding, except as otherwise provided, $3;

"For serving a subpena or summons for a witness or appraiser, $2;

"Where service is requested to be made on a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday, the fees prescribed in the preceding two paragraphs shall be increased by 100 per centum;

"For forwarding any writ, order, or process to another judicial district for service, in addition to the prescribed fee, $1;

"For the preparation of any notice of sale, proclamation in admiralty, or other public notice or bill of sale, $3;

"For seizing or levying on property (including seizures in admiralty), disposing of the same by sale, setoff, or otherwise, and receiving and paying over money, commissions of 3 per centum on the first $1,000 of the amounts collected and 1½ per centum of sums in excess of $1,000. If not disposed of by marshal's sale, the commission shall be in such amount as may be allowed by the court. In all cases in which the vessel or other property is sold by a public auctioneer, or by some party other than the marshal or his deputy, the commission herein authorized to be paid to the marshal shall be reduced by the amount paid to said auctioneer or other party;

"For the keeping of property attached (including boats, vessels, or other property attached or libeled) actual expenses incurred, such as storage, moving, boat hire, or other special transportation, watchmen's or keepers' fees, insurance, and $3 per hour for each deputy marshal required for special services, such as guarding, inventorying, moving, and so forth. The marshals shall collect, in advance, a deposit to cover the initial expenses for such services and periodically thereafter such amounts as may be necessary to pay such expenses until the litigation is concluded;

"For copies of writs or other papers furnished at the request of any party, 30 cents per folio of one hundred words or fraction thereof;

"For necessary travel in serving or endeavoring to serve any process, writ, or order, 12 cents per mile, or fraction thereof, to be computed from the place where service is returnable to the place of service or endeavor; or, where two or more services or endeavors, or where an endeavor and a service, are made in behalf of the same party in the same case on the same trip, mileage shall be computed to the place of service or endeavor which is most remote from the place where service is returnable, adding thereto any additional mileage traveled in serving or endeavoring to serve in behalf of that party. When two or more writs of any kind, required to be served in behalf of the same party, on the same person, in the same case or proceeding, may be served at the same time, mileage on only one such writ shall be collected;

"No mileage fees shall be collected for services or endeavors to serve in the District of Columbia;

"The marshal may require a deposit to cover all fees and expenses herein prescribed."

SEC. 2. Section 1920 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding thereto, immediately following the paragraph designated "(5)", a new paragraph designated "(6)", as follows:

"(6) Fees for all marshals' services in a criminal case except for the summoning of witnesses, in a sum to be fixed by the court, not exceeding $25 where conviction is for a misdemeanor and not exceeding $100 where conviction is for a felony."

SEC. 3. Section 1112 of the Act of March 3, 1901, entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia" (31 Stat. 1189, 1365; sec. 11–1510, D.C. Code, 1951 edition), as amended, is repealed.

SEC. 4. This Act shall become effective ninety days after enactment.

MARTHA L. HORTOBOGYI

The bill (S. 2187) for the relief of Martha L. Hortobogyi was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Martha L. Hortobogyi may be naturalized upon compliance with all of the requirements of title III of the Immigration and Nationaliay Act, except that—

(a) no period of residence or physical presence within the United States or any State shall be required in addition to her residence and physical presence within the United States since December 20, 1956; and

(b) the petition for naturalization may be filed with any court having naturalization jurisdiction.

MARTA NAGY

The bill (S. 2186) for the relief of Marta Nagy was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Marta Nagy may be naturalized upon compliance with all of the requirements of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, except that—

(a) no period of residence or physical presence within the United States or any State shall be required in addition to her residence and physical presence within the United States since December 24, 1956; and

(b) the petition for naturalization may be filed with any court having naturalization jurisdiction.

ANTE GRGAS PIVAC

The bill (S. 2154) for the relief of Ante Grgas Pivac was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ante Grgas Pivac 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 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.

YADWIGA BOCZAR

The bill (S. 2081) for the relief of Yadwiga Boczar was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Yadwiga Boczar, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Pelczar, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the said Yadwiga Boczar shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT

The bill (S. 2052) to amend the Bankruptcy Act in regard to the closing fee of the trustee and in regard to the fee for the filing of a petition was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the part of subdivision c of section 48 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 76c) up to the first colon is amended to read as follows:

"c. TRUSTEES.—The compensation of trustees for their services, payable after they are rendered, shall be a fee of $10 for each estate, deposited with the clerk at the time the petition is filed in each case, except when a fee is not required from a voluntary bankrupt, and such further sum as the court may allow, as follows:".

SEC. 2. That section 132 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 532) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 132. The filing of a petition under this chapter shall be accompanied by payment to the clerk of a filing fee of $120 if no bankruptcy proceeding is pending, otherwise $70. Where $120 has been paid and an adjudication is entered under this chapter, $50 thereof shall be distributed by the clerk as in the case of bankruptcy proceeding; but, if the proceeding under this chapter is dismissed and no order of adjudication is entered thereunder, such sum of $50 shall be refunded to the person paying it."

CANDACE ELIZABETH LEE JOHNSON (KYUNG HEE LEE)

The bill (S. 2028) for the relief of Candace Elizabeth Lee Johnson (Kyung Hee Lee) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Candace Elizabeth Lee Johnson (Kyung Hee Lee), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Jack H. Johnson, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the said Candace Elizabeth Lee Johnson (Kyung Hee Lee) shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

LILY ANG

The bill (S. 2022) for the relief of Lily Ang was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lily Ang 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 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.

CHUNG CHING WEI

The bill (S. 1915) for the relief of Chung Ching Wei was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chung Ching Wei shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of March 18, 1947.

IVAN CURKO

The bill (S.1624) for the relief of Ivan Curko was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ivan Curko, also known as Ivan Sam Curko or John Curko, 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 fee. Upon 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.

CAPT. THOMAS J. McARDLE

The bill (S. 1149) for the relief of Capt. Thomas J. McArdle was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Captain Thomas J. McArdle, United States Air Force, a sum equal to the amount which he would have received under the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 if he had made timely application under such Act for compensation for unused accrued leave, the said Captain McArdle having failed to make application for such compensation because of the confidential nature of his assignment in the United States Air Force during the period allowed for filing under such Act.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 981) for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co. was announced as next in order.

Mr. KEATING. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

STAMATIS ZERIS

The bill (S. 673) for the relief of Stamatis Zeris was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Stamatis Zeris 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 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.

LIONIE TARPINIAN

The bill (S. 594) for the relief of Lionie Tarpinian was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lionie Tarpinian 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 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.

ALVARO RODRIGUEZ JIMINEZ

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1980) for the relief of Alvaro Rodriguez Jiminez, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "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.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alvaro Rodriguez Jiminez 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 fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1944) to amend the Bankruptcy Act in regard to the verification of pleading, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in line 3, after the numerals "18", to insert "of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 41c)", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subdivision c of section 18 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 41c) is hereby repealed and subsections d, e, f, and g of such section are relettered to read "c", "d", "e", and "f", respectively.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HARVE M. DUGGINS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1862) for the relief of Harve M. Duggins, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "$823.97" and insert "$862", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harve M. Duggins, United States Commissioner, Knoxville, Tennessee, the sum of $862. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of the said Harve M. Duggins for compensation for services rendered by him as United States commissioner and for which he received no pay due to a misunderstanding in entering an order for his reappointment as a United States commissioner: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

YOM TOV YESHAYAHU BRISZK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1583) for the relief of Yom Tov Yeshayahu Briszk, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 1, line 7, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and *"Provided,* 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: *And provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Yom Tov Yeshayahu Briszk may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That 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: *And provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1033) for the relief of certain aliens, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ignacio Eiguren Gabiola, Manuel Lopez Gonzalez, Antonio Iglesias Fernandez, Enrique Izaguirre Iturbe, Sabino Jayo Guisasola, Doroteo Madariaga Otegui, Martin Madarieta Arregui, Eusebio Mendiola Ycaran, Savino Navarro Arriaga, Francisco Uribe Asteinza, Pedro Maria Genaro Urruchurtu Urrutia, and Juan Prada-Ramos shall be held and considerd 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.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MAYBELL KING

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 540) for the relief of Maybell King, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in line 6, after the word "class," to strike out "E" and insert "F," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Maybell King of Mississippi City, Mississippi, is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $918, representing the amount of payments erroneously made to her as a class F allottee for the period February 1, 1945, to March 31, 1946, incident to the service of her former husband, Clarence Benning Gwynn, United States Army (serial number 14015824).

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OURANIA BEN BLIKAS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2101) for the relief of Ourania Ben Blikas, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, in line 5, after the word "the", to insert "natural-born"; in line 7, after the word "That", to strike out "no" and insert "the"; in the same line, after the word "natural", to strike out "parent" and insert "mother"; in line 8, after the word "beneficiary", to insert "shall not", and at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "shall"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ourania Ben Blikas shall be held and considered to be the natural-born minor-alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Ben John Blikas, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural mother of the beneficiary, shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DONALD G. COPLAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1891) for the relief of Donald G. Coplan, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the figure "$500", to strike out "Such sum represents the amount of the judgment and costs for which the said Donald G. Coplan was held liable to Richard Vossen in a civil action in the courts of the State of Minnesota." and, in lieu thereof, to insert "Such sum represents reimbursement in the amount of the judgment and costs for which the said Donald G. Coplan was held liable and has paid as a result of a civil action in the courts of the State of Minnesota."; on page 2, line 6, after the word "service", to strike out the period and "Such sum shall be paid only on condition that Donald G. Coplan shall use such sum or so much thereof as is necessary to pay such judgment and costs in full", and in line 10, after the word "Act", to strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Donald G. Coplan, Minneapolis, Minnesota, the sum of $500. Such sum represents reimbursement in the amount of the judgment and costs for which the said Donald G. Coplan was held liable and has paid as a result of a civil action in the courts of the State of Minnesota. This civil action arose out of an accident which occurred on October 4, 1955, between an automobile owned by the said Richard Vossen and a United States mail truck driven by the said Donald G. Coplan, a motor vehicle operator in the Minneapolis post office motor vehicle service: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid to or received by any agent or attorney on account

of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract, to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN AXEL ARVIDSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1433) for the relief of John Axel Arvidson, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, in line 3, after the word "of", to strike out "sections 315 and 318" and insert "section 315"; and in line 4, after the word "Act", to insert "or the Act of July 9, 1918,"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 315 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, or the Act of July 9, 1918, John Axel Arvidson shall be held and considered eligible to be naturalized as a citizen of the United States: *Provided,* That he is otherwise qualified in accordance with the general requirements as to residence, good moral character, attachment to the principles of the Constitution and favorable disposition to the United States as set forth in section 316 of the said Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GRANTING STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 186) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens was considered and agreed to.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 445) to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 3, after line 12, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 8. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lee Kuhn Wui and Makoto Yabusaki shall be deemed to be nonquota immigrants.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time, and passed.

VICTOR HOFFER

The bill (H.R. 1595) for the relief of Victor Hoffer was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GANNON BOGGS

The bill (H.R. 2078) for the relief of Gannon Boggs was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF SETH E. LIBBY, JR.

The bill (H.R. 2296) for the relief of the estate of Seth E. Libby, Jr. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS INCIDENT TO NONCOMBAT ACTIVITIES OF THE COAST GUARD

The bill (H.R. 2741) to amend section 2734 of title 10, United States Code, so as to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to settle claims arising in foreign countries incident to noncombat activities of the Coast Guard was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE

The bill (H.R. 2979) to amend section 752 of title 28, United States Code was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EVA MARIE LESHER

The bill (H.R. 4111) for the relief of Eva Marie Lesher was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OMER W. GUAY

The bill (H.R. 5911) for the relief of Omer W. Guay was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COLBERT COLGATE HELD AND CHARLES W. SHELLHORN

The bill (H.R. 6490) for the relief of Colbert Colgate Held and Charles W. Shellhorn was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN B. SUTTER

The bill (H.R. 7085) for the relief of John B. Sutter was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF SAKIHARA KOKI

The bill (H.R. 7638) for the relief of the estate of Sakihara Koki was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 444) for the relief of certain aliens which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 3 to strike out:

That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bonds, which may have issued in the cases of Mrs. Serafina Fernandez, Maldonado, Nicola Perretta, Roberto Garcia Marquez, and Salomon Chehebar. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said persons 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: *Provided,* That suitable and proper bonds or undertakings, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act.

On page 2, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "Sec. 2. For" and insert "That, for"; at the beginning of line 17, to change the section number from "3" to "2"; in line 20, after the name "Roden", to strike out "Ohannes Vartanyan, Agavni Vartanyan,"; on page 3, at the beginning of line 4, to change the section number from "4" to "3"; at the beginning of line 15, to change the section number from "5" to "4"; in line 16, after the word "Act", to strike out "Anna Almo,"; in line 20, after the word "fees", to strike out "*Provided,* That suitable and proper bonds or undertakings, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act in the cases of Anna Almo and Primetta Galli" and insert "*Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act in the case of Primetta Galli."; on page 4, at the beginning of line 4, to change the section number from "6" to "5"; at the beginning of line 13, to change the section number from "7" to "6"; in line 14, after the word "Act", to strike out "John C. Flores and"; in line 18, after the word "natural", to strike out "parents" and insert "father"; in the same line, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to strike out "beneficiaries" and insert "beneficiary", and at the beginning of line 22, to strike out "Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this section of this Act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available."

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.

PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2197) to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to authorize the use of suitable color additives in or on foods, drugs, and cosmetics, in accordance with regulations prescribing the

conditions (including maximum tolerances) under which such additives may be safely used, which has been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments on page 6, line 16, in the heading, after the word "Foods,", to strike out "Drugs" and insert "Drugs,"; on page 7, line 7 after "(ii)", to strike out ", has" and insert "has,"; on page 8, line 23, after the word "is", to strike out "used," and insert "used;"; on page 9, after line 2, to strike out:

(4) The Secretary shall not list a color additive under this section for a proposed use unless the data before him established—

(A) that such use, under the condition of use to be specified in the regulations, will be safe;

(B) that practicable methods of analysis exist for determining the quantity of the pure dye and all intermediates and other impurities contained in such color additive; and

(C) that practicable methods exist for determining the identity and quantity (i) of such additive in or on any article of food, drug, or cosmetic, and (ii) of any substance formed in or on such article because of the use of such additive.

(5)(A) In determining, for the purposes of this section, whether a proposed use of a color additive is safe, the Secretary shall consider, among other relevant factors—

(i) the probable consumption of, or other relevant exposure from, the additive and of any substance formed in or on food, drugs, or cosmetics because of the use of the additive,

(ii) the cumulative effect, if any, of such additive in the diet of man or animals, taking into account the same or any chemically or pharmacologically related substance or substances in such diet; and

(iii) safety factors which, in the opinion of experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety of color additives for the use or uses for which the additive is proposed to be listed, are generally recognized as appropriate for the use of animal experimentation data.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

(4) The Secretary shall not list a color additive under this section for a proposed use unless the data before him establish that such use, under the conditions of use specified in the regulations, will be safe: *Provided, however,* That a color additive shall be deemed to be suitable and safe for the purpose of listing under this subsection for use generally in or on food, while there is in effect a published finding of the Secretary declaring such substance exempt from the term "food additive" because of its being generally recognized by qualified experts as safe for its intended use, as provided in section 201(s).

(5) In determining, for the purposes of this section, whether a proposed use of a color additive is safe, the Secretary shall consider, among other relevant factors—

(A) the probable consumption of, or other relevant exposure from, the additive and of any substance formed in or on food, drugs, or cosmetics because of the use of the additive;

(B) the cumulative effect, if any, of such additive in the diet of man or animals, taking into account the same or any chemically or pharmacologically related substance or substances in such diet;

(C) safety factors which, in the opinion of experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety of color additives for the use or uses for which the additive is proposed to be listed, are generally recognized as appropriate for the use of animal experimentation data; and

(D) the availability of any needed practicable methods of analysis for determining the identity and quantity of (i) the pure dye and all intermediates and other impurities contained in such color additive, (ii) such additive in or on any article of food, drug, or cosmetic, and (iii) any substance formed in or on such article because of the use of such additive.

On page 13, line 24, after the word "health", to insert a colon and *"Provided,* That, with respect to any use in or on food for which a listed color additive is deemed to be safe by reason of the proviso to paragraph (4) of subsection (b), the requirement of certification shall be deemed not to be necessary in the interest of public health protection.", and on page 15, line 20, after the word "identification", to strike out "devices," and insert "devices),"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Color Additive Amendments of 1959".

TITLE I—AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

Definitions

SEC. 101. Section 201, as amended, of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is further amended as follows:

(a) Paragraph (s) of such section (defining the term "food additive") is amended by redesignating clause (3) as clause (4), and by inserting immediately before clause (4), as so redesignated, the following new clause:

"(3) a color additive; or".

(b) Paragraph (t) of such section is redesignated and otherwise amended to read as follows:

"(u) The term 'safe', as used in paragraph (s) of this section and in sections 409 and 706, has reference to the health of man or animal."

(c) There is inserted, immediately after paragraph (s) of such section, the following new paragraph:

"(t)(1) The term 'color additive' means a material which—

"(A) is a dye, pigment, or other substance made by a process of synthesis or similar artifice, or extracted, isolated, or otherwise derived, with or without intermediate or final change of identity, from a vegetable, animal, mineral, or other source, and

"(B) when added or applied to a food, drug, or cosmetic, or to the human body or any part thereof, is capable (alone or through reaction with other substance) of imparting color thereto;

except that such term does not include any material which the Secretary, by regulation, determines is used (or intended to be used) solely for a purpose or purposes other than coloring.

"(2) The term 'color' includes black, white, and intermediate grays."

Colors or colored articles—when deemed to be adulterated or misbranded foods, drugs, or cosmetics

Food

SEC. 102. (a)(1) Clause (2)(A) of section 402(a), as amended, of such Act (relating to food deemed adulterated by reason of unsafe additives) is further amended by striking out the matter within the parentheses and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "other than one which is (i) a pesticide chemical in or on a raw agricultural commodity; (ii) a food additive; or (iii) a color additive".

(2) Section 402(c), as amended, of such Act (relating to food deemed adulterated by reason of uncertified coal-tar color) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) If it is, or it bears or contains, a color additive which is unsafe within the meaning of section 706(a)."

(3) Section 403 of such Act (relating to the circumstances under which food is deemed misbranded) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(l) If it is a color additive, unless its packaging and labeling are in conformity with such packaging and labeling requirements, applicable to such color additive, as may be contained in regulations issued under section 706."

Drugs

(b)(1) Clause (4) of section 501(a) of such Act (relating to drugs deemed adulterated by reason of uncertified coal-tar color) is amended to read as follows: "(4) if (A) it is a drug which bears or contains, for purposes of coloring only, a color additive which is unsafe within the meaning of section 706(a), or (B) it is a color additive the intended use of which in or on drugs is for purposes of coloring only and is unsafe within the meaning of section 706(a)."

(2) Section 502 of such Act (relating to the circumstances under which drugs are deemed misbranded) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(m) If it is a color additive the intended use of which in or on drugs is for the purpose of coloring only, unless its packaging and labeling are in conformity with such packaging and labeling requirement, applicable to such color additive, as may be contained in regulations issued under section 706".

Cosmetics

(c)(1) Section 601(e) of such Act (relating to cosmetics, other than hair dyes, deemed adulterated by reason of uncertified coal-tar color) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) If it is not a hair dye and it is, or it bears or contains, a color additive which is unsafe within the meaning of section 706(a)."

(2) Section 602 of such Act (relating to the circumstances under which cosmetics shall be deemed to be misbranded) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(e) If it is a color additive, unless its packaging and labeling are in conformity with such packaging and labeling requirements, applicable to such color additive, as may be contained in regulations issued under section 706. This paragraph shall not apply to packages of color additives which, with respect to their use for cosmetics, are marketed and intended for use only in or on hair dyes (as defined in the last sentence of section 601(a))."

Regulations to assure safety of color additives for foods, drugs, and cosmetics

SEC. 103. (a) Such Act is further amended by—

(1) repealing subsection (b) of section 406 and striking out the subsection designation "(a)" after "SEC. 406." in such section;

(2) repealing section 504;

(3) repealing section 604; and

(4) amending section 701(e) by (A) striking out "406 (a) or (b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "406"; (B) striking out "504, or 604,"; and (C) inserting the word "or" after "501(b),".

(b) Section 706 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Listing and certification of color additives for foods, drugs, and cosmetics

"When Color Additives Deemed Unsafe

"SEC. 706. (a) A color additive shall, with respect to any particular use (for which it is being used or intended to be used or is represented as suitable) in or on food or drugs or

cosmetics, be deemed unsafe for the purposes of the application of section 402(c), section 501(a)(4), or section 601(e), as the case may be, unless—

"(1) (A) there is in effect, and such additive and such use are in conformity with, a regulation issued under subsection (b) of this section listing such additive for such use, including any provision of such regulation prescribing the conditions under which such additive may be safely used, and (B) such additive either (i) is from a batch certified, in accordance with regulations issued pursuant to subsection (c), for such use, or (ii) has, with respect to such use, been exempted by the Secretary from the requirement of certification; or

"(2) such additive and such use thereof conform to the terms of an exemption which is in effect pursuant to subsection (f) of this section.

"While there are in effect regulations under subsections (b) and (c) of this section relating to a color additive or an exemption pursuant to subsection (f) with respect to such additive, an article shall not, by reason of bearing or containing such additive in all respects in accordance with such regulations or such exemption, be considered adulterated within the meaning of clause (1) of section 402(a) if such article is a food, or within the meaning of section 601(a) if such article is a cosmetic other than a hair dye (as defined in the last sentence of section 601(a)).

"Listing of Colors

"(b)(1) The Secretary shall, by regulation, provide for separately listing color additives for use in or on food, color additives for use in or on drugs, and color additives for use in or on cosmetics, if and to the extent that such additives are suitable and safe for any such use when employed in accordance with such regulations.

"(2)(A) Such regulations may list any color additive for use generally in or on food, or in or on drugs, or in or on cosmetics, if the Secretary finds that such additive is suitable and may safely be employed for such general use.

"(B) If the data before the Secretary do not establish that the additive satisfies the requirements for listing such additive on the applicable list pursuant to subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, or if the proposal is for listing such additive for a more limited use or uses, such regulations may list such additive only for any more limited use or uses for which it is suitable and may safely be employed.

"(3) Such regulations shall, to the extent deemed necessary by the Secretary to assure the safety of the use or uses for which a particular color additive is listed, prescribe the conditions under which such additive may be safely employed for such use or uses (including, but not limited to, specifications, hereafter in this section referred to as tolerance limitations, as to the maximum quantity or quantities which may be used or permitted to remain in or on the article or articles in or on which it is used; specifications as to the manner in which such additive may be added to or used in or on such article or articles; and directions or other labeling or packaging requirements for such additive).

"(4) The Secretary shall not list a color additive under this section for a proposed use unless the data before him establish that such use, under the conditions of use specified in the regulations, will be safe: *Provided, however,* That a color additive shall be deemed to be suitable and safe for the purpose of listing under this subsection for use generally in or on food, while there is in effect a published finding of the Secretary declaring such substance exempt from the term 'food additive' because of its being generally recognized by qualified experts as safe for its intended use, as provided in section 201(s).

"(5) In determining, for the purposes of this section, whether a proposed use of a color additive is safe, the Secretary shall consider, among other relevant factors—

"(A) the probable consumption of, or other relevant exposure from, the additive and of any substance formed in or on food, drugs, or cosmetics because of the use of the additive;

"(B) the cumulative effect, if any, of such additive in the diet of man or animals, taking into account the same or any chemically or pharmacologically related substance or substances in such diet;

"(C) safety factors which, in the opinion of experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety of color additives for the use or uses for which the additive is proposed to be listed, are generally recognized as appropriate for the use of animal experimentation data; and

"(D) the availability of any needed practicable methods of analysis for determining the identity and quantity of (i) the pure dye and all intermediates and other impurities contained in such color additive, (ii) such additive in or on any article of food, drug, or cosmetic, and (iii) any substance formed in or on such article because of the use of such additive."

"(6) The Secretary shall not list a color additive under this subsection for a proposed use if the data before him show that such proposed use would promote deception of the consumer in violation of this Act or would otherwise result in misbranding or adulteration within the meaning of this Act.

"(7) If, in the judgment of the Secretary, a tolerance limitation is required in order to assure that a proposed use of a color additive will be safe, the Secretary—

"(A) shall not list the additive for such use if he finds that the data before him do not establish that such additive, if used within a safe tolerance limitation, would achieve the intended physical or other technical effect; and

"(B) shall not fix such tolerance limitation at a level higher than he finds to be reasonably required to accomplish the intended physical or other technical effect.

"(8) If, having regard to the aggregate quantity of color additive likely to be consumed in the diet or to be applied to the human body, the Secretary finds that the data before him fail to show that it would be safe and otherwise permissible to list a color additive (or pharmacologically related color additives) for all the uses proposed therefor and at the levels of concentration proposed, the Secretary shall, in determining for which use or uses such additive (or such related additives) shall be or remain listed, or how the aggregate allowable safe tolerance for such additive or additives shall be allocated by him among the uses under consideration, take into account, among other relevant factors (and subject to the paramount criterion of safety), (A) the relative marketability of the articles involved as affected by the proposed uses of the color additive (or of such related additives) in or on such articles, and the relative dependence of the industries concerned on such uses; (B) the relative aggregate amounts of such color additive which he estimates would be consumed in the diet or applied to the human body by reason of the various uses and levels of concentration proposed; and (C) the availability, if any, of other color additives suitable and safe for one or more of the uses proposed.

"Certification of Colors

"(c) The Secretary shall further, by regulation, provide (1) for the certification, with safe diluents or without diluents, of batches of color additives listed pursuant to subsection (b) and conforming to the requirements for such additives established by regulations under such subsection and this subsection, and (2) for exemption from the requirement of certification in the case of any such additive, or any listing or use thereof, for which he finds such requirement not to be necessary in the interest of the protection of the public health: *Provided,* That, with respect to any use in or on food for which a listed color additive is deemed to be safe by reason of the proviso to paragraph (4) of subsection (b), the requirement of certification shall be deemed not to be necessary in the interest of public health protection.

"Procedure for Issuance, Amendment, or Repeal of Regulations

"(d) The provisions of section 701(e), (f), and (g) of this Act shall apply to and in all respects govern proceedings for the issuance, amendment, or repeal of regulations under subsections (b), (c), or (e) of this section (including judicial review of the Secretary's action in such proceedings) and the admissibility of transcripts of the record of such proceedings in other proceedings, except that—

"(1) the Secretary's order after public hearing (acting upon objections filed to an order made prior to hearing) shall be subject to the requirements of section 409(f)(2); and

"(2) the scope of judicial review of such order shall be in accordance with the third sentence of paragraph (2), and with the provisions of paragraph (3), of section 409(g).

"Fees

"(e) The admitting to listing and certification of color additives, in accordance with regulations prescribed under this Act, shall be performed only upon payment of such fees, which shall be specified in such regulations, as may be necessary to provide, maintain, and equip an adequate service for such purposes.

"Exemptions

"(f) The Secretary shall by regulation (issued without regard to subsection (d)) provide for exempting from the requirements of this section any color additive or any specific type of use thereof, and any article of food, drug, or cosmetic bearing or containing such additive, intended solely for investigational use by qualified experts when in his opinion such exemption is consistent with the public health."

Confidentiality of trade secrets

SEC. 104. Section 301(j), as amended, of such Act, prohibiting disclosure of trade secrets, is amended by striking out "or 704" and inserting in lieu thereof "704, or 706".

Changes in cross-references and terminology

SEC. 105. Such Act is further amended by—

(a) striking out, in section 301(i) thereof (relating to forgery or unauthorized use of certain identification devices), "404, 406(b), 504, 506, 507, or 604", and inserting in lieu thereof "404, 506, 507, or 706";

(b)(1) striking out, in clause (3) of section 303(c) (relating to color manufacturer's guarantee), the word "coal-tar" wherever it appears in such clause, and (2) inserting after the word "color", wherever it appears in such clause, the word "additive"; and

(c) striking out "harmless coloring" in section 402(d) (relating to non-nutritive substances in confectionery) and inserting in lieu thereof "authorized coloring".

TITLE II—EFFECTIVE DATE, TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS, AND EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS

Definitions

SEC. 201. As used in this title, the term "basic Act" means the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; the term "enactment date" means the date of enactment of this Act; and other terms, insofar as also used in the basic Act (whether before or after

enactment of this Act) shall have the same meaning as they have, or had when in effect, under the basic Act.

Effective date

SEC. 202. This Act shall, subject to the provisions of section 203, take effect on the enactment date.

Provisional listings of commercially established colors

SEC. 203. (a)(1) The purpose of this section is to make possible, on an interim basis for a reasonable period, through provisional listings, the use of commercially established color additives to the extent consistent with the public health, pending the completion of the scientific investigations needed as a basis for making determinations as to listing of such additives under the basic Act as amended by this Act. A provisional listing (including a deemed provisional listing) of a color additive under this section for any use shall, unless sooner terminated or expiring under the provisions of this section, expire (A) on the closing date (as defined in paragraph (2) of this subsection) or (B) on the effective date of a listing of such additive for such use under section 706 of the basic Act, whichever date first occurs.

(2) For the purposes of this section, the term "closing date" means (A) the last day of the two and one-half year period beginning on the enactment date or (B), with respect to a particular provisional listing (or deemed provisional listing) of a color additive or use thereof, such later closing date as the Secretary may from time to time establish pursuant to the authority of this paragraph. The Secretary may by regulation, upon application of an interested person or on his own initiative, from time to time postpone the original closing date with respect to a provisional listing (or deemed provisional listing) under this section of a specified color additive, or of a specified use or uses of such additive, for such period or periods as he finds necessary to carry out the purpose of this section, if in the Secretary's judgment such action is consistent with the objective of carrying to completion in good faith, as soon as reasonably practicable, the scientific investigations necessary for making a determination as to listing such additive, or such specified use or uses thereof, under section 706 of the basic Act. The Secretary may terminate a postponement of the closing date at any time if he finds that such postponement should not have been granted, or that by reason of a change in circumstances the basis for such postponement no longer exists, or that there has been a failure to comply with a requirement for submission of progress reports or with other conditions attached to such postponement.

(b) Subject to the other provisions of this section—

(1) any color additive which, on the day preceding the enactment date, was listed and certifiable for any use or uses under section 406(b), 504, or 604, or under the third proviso of section 402(c), of the basic Act, and of which a batch or batches had been certified for such use or uses prior to the enactment date, and

(2) any color additive which was commercially used or sold prior to the enactment date for any use or uses in or on any food, drug, or cosmetic, and which either (A) on the day preceding the enactment date was not a material within the purview of any of the provisions of the basic Act enumerated in paragraph (1) of this subsection, or (B) is the color additive known as synthetic beta-carotene,

shall, beginning on the enactment date, be deemed to be provisionally listed under this section as a color additive for such use or uses.

(c) Upon request of any person, the Secretary, by regulations issued under subsection (d), shall without delay, if on the basis of the data before him he deems such action consistent with the protection of the public health, provisionally list a material as a color additive for any use for which it was listed, and for which a batch or batches of such material had been certified, under section 406(b), 504, or 604 of the basic Act prior to the enactment date, although such color was no longer listed and certifiable for such use under such sections on the day preceding the enactment date. Such provisional listing shall take effect on the date of publication.

(d)(1) The Secretary shall, by regulations issued or amended from time to time under this section—

(A) insofar as practicable promulgate and keep current a list or lists of the color additives, and of the particular uses thereof, which he finds are deemed provisionally listed under subsection (b), and the presence of a color additive on such a list with respect to a particular use shall, in any proceeding under the basic Act, be conclusive evidence that such provisional listing is in effect;

(B) provide for the provisional listing of the color additives and particular uses thereof specified in subsection (c);

(C) provide, with respect to particular uses for which color additives are or are deemed to be provisionally listed, such temporary tolerance limitations (including such limitations at zero level) and other conditions of use and labeling or packaging requirements, if any, as in his judgment are necessary to protect the public health pending listing under section 706 of the basic Act;

(D) provide for the certification of batches of such color additives (with or without diluents) for the uses for which they are so listed or deemed to be listed under this section, except that such an additive which is a color additive deemed provisionally listed under subsection (b)(2) of this section shall be deemed exempt from the requirement of such certification while not subject to a tolerance limitation; and

(E) provide for the termination of a provisional listing (or deemed provisional listing) of a color additive or particular use thereof forthwith whenever in his judgment such action is necessary to protect the public health.

(2)(A) Regulations under this section shall, from time to time, be issued, amended, or repealed by the Secretary without regard to the requirements of the basic act, but for the purposes of the application of section 706(e) of the basic act (relating to fees) and of determining the availability of appropriations of fees (and of advance deposits to cover fees), proceedings, regulations, and certifications under this section shall be deemed to be proceedings, regulations, and certifications under such section 706.

(B) On and after the enactment date, regulations, provisional listings, and certifications (or exemptions from certification) in effect under this section shall, for the purpose of determining whether an article is adulterated or misbranded within the meaning of the basic Act by reason of its being, bearing, or containing a color additive, have the same effect as would regulations, listings, and certifications (or exemptions from certification) under section 706 of the basic Act. A regulation, provisional listing or termination thereof, tolerance limitation, or certification or exemption therefrom, under this section shall not be the basis for any presumption or inference in any proceeding under section 706(b) or (c) of the basic Act.

(3) For the purpose of enabling the Secretary to carry out his functions under paragraph (1) (A) and (C) with respect to color additives deemed provisionally listed, he shall, as soon as practicable after enactment of this Act, afford by public notice a reasonable opportunity to interested persons to submit data relevant thereto. If the data so submitted or otherwise before him do not, in his judgment, establish a reliable basis for including such a color additive or particular use or uses thereof in a list or lists promulgated under paragraph (1)(A), or for determining the prevailing level or levels of use thereof prior to the enactment date with a view to prescribing a temporary tolerance or tolerances for such use or uses under paragraph (1)(C), the Secretary shall establish a temporary tolerance limitation at zero level for such use or uses until such time as he finds that it would not be inconsistent with the protection of the public health to increase or dispense with such temporary tolerance limitation.

Effect on meat inspection and poultry products inspection acts

SEC. 204. Nothing in this act shall be construed to exempt any meat or meat food product or any person from any requirement imposed by or pursuant to the Meat Inspection Act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1260), as amended or extended (21 U.S.C. 71 and the following), or the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 451 and the following).

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I support S. 2197, but because of the concern of some persons in my State, at their request I addressed certain questions to Hon. George P. Larrick, Commissioner of Food and Drugs, in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in a letter dated August 20, 1959. I acquainted the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], with the contents of my letter. I received a written response from Dr. Larrick under the same date, namely August 20, 1959, a copy of which was also furnished to the Senator from Alabama.

I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, who is familiar with both letters, to state whether or not he approves of the positions taken by Dr. Larrick, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, in his letter of August 20, 1959, replying to my earlier letter of the same date.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, my views are in accord with the views expressed by Mr. Larrick in his letter to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] dated August 20, 1959.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is my understanding correct that the bill was reported by the unanimous action of the committee headed by the Senator from Alabama, and that the committee, including the chairman, entertain the same views as are expressed in Dr. Larrick's letter?

Mr. HILL. I have not conversed with every one of the 14 members of the committee, but I think I understand the intent and purpose of the bill. I should say that the intent and purpose as supported by the committee are in accord with the views of Dr. Larrick in his letter to the Senator from Florida dated August 20, 1959.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the reply of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter to Dr. Larrick and his reply to me, both under date of August 20, 1959, be printed at this point in the RECORD, assuming that that course is agreeable to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. It is perfectly agreeable.

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

AUGUST 20, 1959.

Hon. GEORGE P. LARRICK,
Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LARRICK: Several questions have been raised by our citrus industry with reference to certain provisions of S. 2197, the color additive amendments of 1959. I believe these questions can be cleared up by a colloquy on the Senate floor if we can agree upon the intent of these provisions in the bill. Therefore, I would like to ask for your comments on three particular matters with the understanding that this letter and your reply thereto will be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during debate on the bill as part of the legislative history of the act.

First, the question has been raised as to whether the definition of the term "color additive" as contained in S. 2197 includes the ethylene process now used in the coloring of citrus fruit and certain other fruits and vegetables. In view of the fact that this process does not actually add color, and in view of discussions we have had on the subject, I do not believe there is any intention of covering the ethylene method in this definition. I will appreciate your assurance that this is the case.

Second, the term "promote deception of the consumer" used in the bill is extremely broad. As you know, in the coloring of citrus every effort has been made to prevent the use of color for deception and we would like your assurance that the long established practice of using ethylene and the use of the color recently certified for the coloring of sound, mature citrus fruit meeting the maturity standards of the respective States, are not considered as "promoting deception" as the term is used in the bill. In view of the statements made by the Department in its message transmitting this bill, I feel sure that it is not intended to claim that these processes promote deception, but I would appreciate your confirmation of this conclusion.

Third, it is my understanding that citrus red No. 2 listed under the provisions of Public Law 86–2, 86th Congress, approved March 17, 1959, shall be deemed provisionally listed under the provisions of section 203 of the bill. I will appreciate your confirmation of this conclusion, also.

Thanking you in advance for your cooperation and with kind regards, I remain,

Yours faithfully,

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION,
Washington D.C., August 20, 1959.

Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLAND: This replies to your letter of August 20, 1959, asking for our views on three questions that have been raised about S. 2197, the color additives amendment of 1959.

It is our understanding that the treatment of citrus fruit with ethylene after harvest does not add color, that it suppresses the formation of certain coloring materials, such as chlorophyll and thus allows the yellow or orange coloring contributed by other natural components to become more apparent. Therefore we would not regard ethylene used in this way on citrus fruit as a color additive within the meaning of the bill.

The second question is whether the application of ethylene or of citrus red No. 2 to sound, mature oranges that meet the minimum maturity standards established under the laws of the States in which the oranges are grown would be considered as promoting deception as that term is used in S. 2197. We would not consider such use as promoting deception.

The third question is whether citrus red No. 2 as listed under the provisions of Public Law 86–2 would be deemed provisionally listed under the provisions of section 203 under S. 2197. It would be deemed provisionally listed.

Sincerely yours,

GEO. P. LARRICK,
Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INCREASE IN LIMIT FOR ADMINISTRATIVE SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS UNDER THE TORT CLAIMS PROCEDURE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 6000) to amend title 28 of the United States Code to increase the limit of administrative settlement of claims against the United States under the tort claims procedure to $3,000, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 7, after the word "of", to strike out "$2,000" and insert "$2,500"; on page 2, line 2, to strike out "$2,000" and insert "$2,500"; in the line after line 5, after the word "of", to strike out "$2,000" and insert "$2,500", and in line 9, to strike out "$2,000" and insert "$2,500".

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 title 28 of the United States Code to increase the limit for administrative settlement of claims against the United States under the tort claims procedure to $2,500."

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 883) to confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of customs officers and employees to extra compensation for Sunday, holiday, and overtime services performed after August 31, 1931, and not heretofore paid in accordance with existing law was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARTLETT. Over by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED TO FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (H.R. 3240) for the relief of Mrs. Clare M. Ash was announced as next in order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have a request that that bill go over; and pursuant to the request I ask that it go over. But I will not object to its being called up by motion at the end of the call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2467) to authorize the development of plans and arrangements for the provision of emergency assistance, and the provision of such assistance, to repatriated American nations without available resources, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on our side, at least, the report on the bill reached the Calendar Committee only a few minutes before the consideration of the various bills was begun. We have had no time in which to study the report. Therefore, I ask that the bill go over.

The bill will be passed over.

MRS. CLARE M. ASH

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed at this time to the consideration of Calendar No. 810, House bill 3240, for the relief of Mrs. Clare M. Ash. I have spoken to the Senator who earlier today objected to consideration of the bill during the call of the calendar. He stated he would have no objection to having the bill placed at the foot of the calendar.

Therefore, at this time, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H.R. 3240) for the relief of Mrs. Clare M. Ash was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator for his cooperation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the call of the calendar.

PAYMENT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF JAPAN

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 639, Senate bill 2130, to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement of the background of the committee action on the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD; and I wish to add that the bill was reported unanimously by the Foreign Relations Committee.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 631) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACKGROUND AND COMMITTEE ACTION

The Bonin Islands lie about 700 miles due south of Tokyo. During the war, the civilian

population of the islands—about 7,000 Japanese nationals—were evacuated by the Japanese Government to the Japanese home islands. Although 135 persons were allowed to return at one point, the United States, since 1945, has repeatedly held that the Bonins should be closed to other settlement for "security reasons."

Article 3 of the Japanese Peace Treaty gives to the United States "the right to exercise all and any powers of administration, legislation, and jurisdiction over the territory and inhabitants of these islands, including their territorial waters."

Unfortunately, the former residents of the Bonins have not been successfully integrated into the Japanese economy, and it is necessary for the Japanese Government to provide them with assistance. Prime Minister Kishi, during his June 1957 visit to Washington, sought relief for the Bonin Islanders, pleading that the problem constituted a definite irritant in United States-Japanese relations. He favored repatriation and, failing that, indemnification. Subsequently, it was decided that security requirements were such that even limited resettlement was out of the question. The problem then became one of indemnification. The Japanese Government originally requested $12.5 million, but has agreed to accept $6 million.

The Department of State and the Department of Defense agree that the former property holders of the Bonins have legitimate claims. The date from which the claims have been calculated is April 28, 1952, which is when the Japanese Peace Treaty took effect. Since the land has not been in use for many years, there was a problem in determining its value. It was decided to measure the claims by the average value of land in the Ryukyu Islands, another group of Japanese islands under U.S. administration. The figure adopted was $1,060 per acre, and the total value of the land in question was estimated to be $4 million. Interest at 6 percent per annum (standard for the area) was added to this, raising the total sum to about $6 million.

Rather than having the U.S. Government adjudicate individual claims, which both State and Defense regard as unwise, it was recommended that the total amount be turned over to the Japanese Government in full satisfaction of the claims.

On July 27, the committee, sitting in executive session, heard testimony in support of the bill from J. Graham Parsons, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs; and Robert H. Knight, Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense for International and Security Affairs.

The judgment of the U.S. Government is that the overriding consideration in this matter is one of military security. According to Assistant Secretary Knight, "The Department of Defense considers that the unrestricted use of these islands is essential for the security purposes of the United States." The Bonins encompass only 45 square miles, and any resettlement of the area would circumscribe its usefulness as a military site of critical importance.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee agrees that in these special circumstances repatriation of the former residents of the Bonin Islands is not advisable; that in order to avoid a noxious political problem—indeed, a situation that could undermine our position in the Bonin Islands—the proposed $6 million indemnity should be paid to the Japanese Government. Thus, the committee urges the approval of S. 2130 by the Senate.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARTKE in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to say that this measure is a very important one. I have received authentic information regarding the bill, and that information convinces me of the merit of the bill.

I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the bill is a very meritorious one, and its enactment is very much needed at this time. I think it will do much to enhance our good relations with Japan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2130) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to pay to the Government of Japan a sum of $6,000,000. The payment of such sum shall constitute full satisfaction and settlement of all claims of Japanese nationals, formerly resident in the Bonin Islands, arising from the use, benefit, or exercise of property rights or interests in the Bonin Islands by the United States for security purposes, for the period beginning April 28, 1952, and continuing until such time as said use, benefit, or exercise is relinquished by the United States.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $6,000,000 to carry out the purpose of this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which Senate bill 2130 was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL BANKING LAWS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 736, House bill 8159, to amend the national banking laws to clarify or eliminate ambiguities, to repeal certain laws which have become obsolete, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] has two bills. I was talking to him only a moment ago. The bills are noncontroversial, and both of them were passed unanimously by the House of Representatives; and the Senator from Virginia is anxious to have the Senate act on them today.

After our conversation at the door of the Chamber, apparently the Senator from Virginia left the Chamber, under the impression that the bills would not be brought up by motion.

Mr. President, at this time I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. GORE obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Tennessee may yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] without losing his right to the floor.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his courtesy.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, this situation arises from the fact that the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] appears on the list at the Vice President's desk, as I understand. I had been informed that for the remainder of the session such informal arrangements by means of lists of Senators' names would not be adhered to. But inasmuch as the junior Senator from Pennsylvania did not so understand, I certainly wish to yield so that he may speak first.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. I had not been informed of the practice to which he refers. I have been waiting since last Wednesday to have this opportunity, and I have been standing in a position to be recognized by the Chair for the last 10 minutes. So I thank both the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Texas.

Subsequently, during the delivery of Mr. SCOTT's remarks on military strength,

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] may yield for the purpose of bringing up two bills, with the understanding that the colloquy appear in another part of the RECORD, and with the further understanding that he not lose the floor.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 736, H.R. 8159.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8159) to amend the national banking laws to clarify or eliminate ambiguities, to repeal certain laws which have become obsolete, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair may call attention to the fact that that bill is the pending business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Virginia care to make an explanation of the bill?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the two bills which the majority leader is asking to have considered at this time are, so far as we know, noncontroversial banking bills. They have previously

been passed by the Senate, for the most part, in the Financial Institutions Act of 1957. They were unanimously handled this year on the House side. They were unanimously reported by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

We have heard no objection to them.

The first bill to which I refer is H.R. 8159.

H.R. 8159 would repeal a number of obsolete provisions of the national bank laws; it would eliminate a number of ambiguities in those laws; and it would make a number of minor substantive amendments relating to the operations of the Comptroller of the Currency and of the national banks.

H.R. 8159 contains 25 sections. All but two of these sections were contained in the same or substantially the same form in the Financial Institutions Act of 1957, which was passed by the Senate on March 21, 1957. The two new sections are of minor importance—section 19 authorizing the Deputy Comptroller to serve as a member of the Board of Directors of FDIC in the event of the Comptroller's disability, and section 25 requiring inclusion of the word "national" in the name of every national bank.

Among the amendments which would be made by H.R. 8159, and were included in the Financial Institutions Act of 1957, are provisions, first, requiring approval of the Comptroller for a national bank to change the location of its main office; second, giving national banks 10 days instead of 5 to furnish reports of condition pursuant to a call by the Comptroller; third, prohibiting receipt of deposits of corporations not examined or regulated by State or Federal authority; and fourth, imposing restrictions on the payment of dividends.

I have been asked whether the restrictions on dividends imposed by section 21 of H.R. 8159 apply only to the declaration and payment of cash dividends, or whether these restrictions apply also to stock dividends. This inquiry refers to the requirement that the approval of the Comptroller of the Currency must be obtained before dividends may be declared in any year which would exceed that year's net profits plus the retained net profits of the preceding 2 years, over and above required transfers to surplus or funds for retirement of preferred stock.

This provision is intended to apply, and does apply, only to cash dividends. Its purpose, as the report states, is to prevent dissipation of needed capital funds by payment of excessive dividends—to prevent the payment of dividends which would result in a weakened and undercapitalized bank.

The declaration of stock dividends, which would not result in the payment of any funds of the bank to the stockholders, would not be affected by these provisions in H.R. 8159.

In order to complete the story, however, I should add that section 5142 of the Revised Statutes—12 United States Code section 57—specifically requires the consent of the Comptroller, and a two-thirds vote of the stockholders for a stock dividend, and also specifically requires that the surplus of the bank, after the stock dividend, must be at least 20 percent of the increased capital stock.

The committee held hearings on this bill on August 14, 1959. The Comptroller of the Currency and representatives of the American Bankers Association testified in favor of the bill. Favorable recommendations were received from the other banking agencies. No testimony was presented to the committee in opposition to any amendment in H.R. 8159.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 8159) was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I understand correctly that this bill is but a part, and a noncontroversial part, of the Financial Institutions Act which the Senate passed by an overwhelming majority year before last?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. There were two minor differences. All the rest of the 25 changes were included in the bill known as the Financial Institutions Act of 1957. For the first time in the history of our Nation, all the banking and credit laws were put together in one bill.

Passage of the bill was very highly commended not only by the Federal agencies, but by the financial institutions of America; but that bill was put to death on the House side. Now the House is reviving some of the provisions. This particular bill is up for passage. Then there will be another bill involving other parts of the same Financial Institutions Act.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am certainly in accord with what the Senator is doing. I am only sorry other portions of his bill of 2 years ago cannot be passed in the same way.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is very kind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 8159) was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which Calendar No. 736, H.R. 8159, was passed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF LENDING AND BORROWING LIMITATIONS OF NATIONAL BANKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 737, H.R. 8160.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8160) to amend the lending and borrowing limitations applicable to national banks, to authorize the appointment of an additional Deputy Comptroller of the Currency, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment, on page 4, line 6, after the numerals "5200", to strike out "is" and insert "and subsection 11(m) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 248(m) are".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, H.R. 8160 would authorize an additional Deputy Comptroller of the Currency and increase the bonds of the Comptroller and his deputies. It would increase the ceiling on a bank's borrowing authority from 100 percent of capital to 100 percent of capital plus 50 percent of surplus. It would also liberalize a number of the exceptions to the general rule that a bank can lend no more than 10 percent of its capital and surplus to one borrower, and it would liberalize a number of the present restrictions on real estate loans by national banks.

Most of the amendments in H.R. 8160 were included in the Financial Institutions Act of 1957, which was passed by the Senate on March 21, 1957, but did not become law.

The increase in a bank's borrowing authority to 100 percent of capital and 50 percent of surplus is considered a conservative but helpful change, particularly for smaller banks which meet heavy seasonal needs. The Financial Institutions Act would have increased this to 100 percent of capital and 100 percent of surplus. This is the rule for the banks of many States.

Section 5200 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C., sec. 84) limits loans by a national bank to a single borrower to 10 percent of the bank's capital and surplus. There are a number of exceptions to this rule, where experience has shown that larger loans can safely be made to one borrower. H.R. 8160 would make a special provision for loans secured by frozen or refrigerated foods, up to 25 percent of capital and surplus, comparable to, but somewhat more limited than, an existing provision for readily marketable nonperishable staples. It would place a 25-percent limitation on loans secured by dairy cattle comparable to the existing provision for livestock.

The frozen or refrigerated foods industry has become a great industry in the State of Florida. I am sure the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is interested in that. We have not only been getting splendid frozen foods from Florida, but we are now getting the fresh grapefruit, delivered in the cool, chilled form which is fresh, rather than in the frozen form. It is wonderful. It is sold in my hometown, and in many other places, in the same way that milk is sold, in containers.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the cordial and hunger-provoking comments of my distinguished friend from Virginia.

I am glad to back up the Senator's statement that these loans can be safely made, due to the newly discovered processes, whereas the loans would not have been so safe and could not have been made in such large amounts before the knowledge was obtained in the last few years.

Mr. ROBERTSON. We have to admire and sometimes frankly envy the progress made in Florida. Virginia has been very proud in the past of its production of apples, but we envy the production of citrus fruit in the State of Florida.

Mr. President, H.R. 8160 would amend an existing provision which makes the limit on loans to one borrower 25 percent of capital and surplus instead of 10 percent, if the loan is in the form of notes secured by U.S. obligations. The amendment would delete the words "in the form of notes," so that obligations secured in this way would have the benefit of the 25 percent figure, instead of the usual 10 percent.

This was the only point on which the committee amended the bill, and the only point where either the public or an agency raised a question before the committee.

The committee was reminded, even before the bill reached us, as we had been advised in 1957, that there was a comparable restriction on State member banks in section 11(m) of the Federal Reserve Act. In order to keep from creating an unnecessary and undesirable discrimination between national banks and State member banks, the committee amended the bill so as to remove the same phrase—"in the form of notes"—from the Federal Reserve Act.

One witness, a government bond dealer, appeared at the hearing and objected vigorously to a ruling by the Comptroller of the Currency that certain repurchase agreements involving government bonds are lending transactions and subject to the restrictions of section 5200. The dealer objected to this amendment because he thought it might be construed as a ratification of the Comptroller's ruling. The Comptroller took the position that the amendment did not have any bearing on the disputed ruling. The committee made it clear in the report that the amendment was not intended to have, and would not have, any effect on this issue.

Another amendment to section 5200 was the insertion of a new exception, for consumer installment paper, both negotiable and nonnegotiable. The amendment would place the limit on discounts of such paper for one person at 25 percent of capital and surplus. However, where the bank relied on its knowledge of the maker's financial condition for particular paper, and its files showed it, the bank would not have to include this paper in the dealer's limit.

The committee was advised that the laws of many large States now prohibit negotiable paper for consumer installment purchases. In these States, the new provision is expected to be a substantial assistance to many banks. It is recognized, of course, that banks in other States which permit negotiable consumer installment paper and accustomed to handling such paper in the past under the complete exemption for negotiable paper will find this a substantial restriction.

Section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C., sec. 371) contains restrictions on real estate loans by national banks. H.R. 8160 would make five changes in these provisions. Two of these were contained in the Financial Institutions Act—permitting loans—secured by leaseholds which have 10 years to run after the maturity of the loan, and permitting 18-month construction loans on industrial or commercial buildings where there is a takeout commitment for a permanent loan and increasing the aggregate limit on such loans. Another of these amendments was one permitting real estate loans regardless of the relation to the appraised value of the property, where the loan is guaranteed by a State or a State agency backed up by the State's faith and credit. This provision was contained in S. 1173, the bill of the Senators from Maine [Mrs. SMITH and Mr. MUSKIE] which the Senate passed on July 15, 1959.

Another amendment would increase from 66⅔ percent to 75 percent of the approved value the amount which might be loaned on improved real property, where the loan is to be fully amortized within 20 years. This will put national banks in more nearly the same position as State banks.

The last amendment was to exempt from the restrictions on real estate loans, those business loans based on a firm's general credit standing and earnings record, where a lien on real estate is taken as additional security.

The amendments contained in H.R. 8160 will be of substantial help to national banks in meeting the needs of business and the public. While each amendment constitutes a relaxation of a restriction on credit, the committee emphasized in the report that it was not the intent, nor will it be the result, of these amendments to encourage or to permit any general relaxation of credit. The overall credit restrictions are not affected in the least by these individual amendments.

The committee recommended that these amendments be enacted promptly, so that the national banks and their customers can get the resulting benefits as soon as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, 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. 8160) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

FREE IMPORTATION OF TOURIST LITERATURE, UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] has been considerate and courteous to me, as has the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. Both Senators have speeches they desire to make.

I do not want the unanimous-consent agreement which I am about to propose to apply unless and until the Senators have completed the delivery of their speeches. I therefore ask unanimous consent that following the delivery of the speeches and during the further consideration of Calendar No. 672, H.R. 2411, to amend paragraph 1629 of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide for the free importation of tourist literature, there be a limitation of time on the Yarborough amendment to strike the Anderson amendment of 30 minutes on each side, to be controlled by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and by the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am informed this is agreeable to interested Senators, such as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the proponents of the Anderson amendment. My colleague from Texas has informed me it is agreeable to him.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I of course have no objection to the unanimous-consent agreement. I am very much interested in another phase of the bill. So long as the Senator is asking unanimous consent, would he be willing to cover the entire bill and any amendments, so that we can get on with the business of the Senate?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think as soon as the Yarborough amendment is disposed of we can pass the bill without any great delay.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator thinks this will be a proper procedure. I have no objection, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

Ordered, That on August 25, 1959, at the conclusion of routine morning business, the Senate resume the consideration of the bill H.R. 2411 (Calendar No. 672), to amend paragraph 1629 of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide for the free importation of tourist literature, and that debate on the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] to ings strike out section 4, relating to wood mouldings, be limited to 1 hour, one-half thereof to be controlled by him, and one-half by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into not apply until after the morning hour tomorrow.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator from Texas enlighten us in regard to the agreement to which he refers?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Earlier today, there was a unanimous-consent agreement on the Yarborough amendment to strike out the Anderson motion or amendment; and that agreement was to go into effect at the conclusion of the remarks to be made by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. If the agreement were kept, time would have to be allotted to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], who now desires to address the Senate. But neither the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], nor the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], cares about having the vote taken this evening; and I have told the minority leader that we have other arrangements with regard to any voting this evening.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the unanimous-consent agreement apply as I have requested.

Mr. KEATING. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont Mr. [AIKEN] has requested 20 minutes, following the morning hour tomorrow. Is that satisfactory?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator from Texas.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senate will stay in session until a reasonable time this afternoon. There is no assurance that we will reach any votes today. We will see how long the speeches take.

Mr. President, I wish to announce that H.R. 1, reported by the Committee on Public Works, will be taken up tomorrow or the next day. I want all Members of the Senate to be on notice concerning that bill. It is the bill for the Great Lakes water diversion.

U.S. DEFENSE POLICY: OVERALL SUPERIORITY TODAY AND TOMORROW

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, some time ago a pamphlet in a series entitled "Democratic Programs for Action," being pamphlet No. 4, "The Military Forces We Need and How To Get Them," was given some currency. I have been much interested in this pamphlet because I find that in great part I cannot agree with its premises or its conclusions.

While the pamphlet is somewhat confused, and exhibits considerable difficulty in arriving at recommendations, it appears to be arguing the possibility of limited nuclear war as against a war of conventional weapons or an unlimited nuclear war; and certainly it argues for vast increases in the size of our Armed Forces, principally to be distributed in the NATO defenses.

How the authors of this pamphlet arrived at this conclusion is not to be ascertained with any clarity from the pamphlet itself. The apparent argument that the kind of war which Russia plans is a limited nuclear war is disputed by many sources, including Mr. J. M. Mackintosh, who is the leading British authority on Russian military affairs, and who has had firsthand experience with Soviet armed forces and top Soviet leaders. In World War II he served as British liaison officer with the Russian Army for 2 years. At present he is adviser on Soviet military affairs to the Institute of Strategic Studies in London.

In U.S. News & World Report for August 24 the following colloquy occurs, and I submit that this entire interview runs precisely counter to the apparent contentions in the pamphlet I have mentioned:

Question. Do Russian military leaders feel that military expansion in Europe is possible without great risk of a general war?

Answer. The short answer is "No." I think that the Soviet military leaders have convinced themselves by now that the use of Soviet forces in East Germany for military action against West Germany would bring on nuclear war.

Question. Can you envisage any situation in which they would consider that risk worthwhile?

Answer. Speaking again from the point of view of the professional military in the Soviet Union, I can't.

Question. As long as NATO remains a relatively effective military alliance, do you think that the Russians rule out the feasibility of a limited war of any kind in Europe?

Here the Soviet expert is directly in disagreement with the pamphlet. His answer:

Answer. I think so. It is absolutely essential for the peace and defense of the West that NATO should continue to make it clear to the Russians that it is not only the ground forces of NATO in Western Europe which would face the Soviet Union, but the full might of the United States that would be brought to bear should the Soviets use their superiority in ground forces to attempt to achieve a military gain in Western Europe.

Mr. President, I desire to make a further rebuttal of the somewhat cavalier assumptions contained in the pamphlet of the Democratic Advisory Council.

Mr. President, I submit what has been said by Russian military authorities, writing in Russian military publications, for the benefit of all echelons of the Russian military and for the Russian people, ought to be believed, since it is difficult to see what purpose would be served by deceit or evasion, in view of the nature of the article. I should like to quote briefly from the Russian Army Journal, "Military Herald," of June 1958, the writer being Col. I. Baz, a leading Soviet strategist. This is included in a forthcoming book of Raymond L. Garthoff, "The Soviet Image of Future War."

About this naive assumption that perhaps all our problems could be settled by merely adding more Army divisions in Western Europe, and assuming a certain kind of war will take place, Colonel Baz says:

It is necessary to bear in mind that, in our time, peace is indivisible and each local, small war has a tendency to become the prologue to a world war, sooner or later transforming itself into a worldwide military conflagration.

The theory of apologists of militarism advocating so-called small nuclear wars has nothing in common with the truth and is calculated to defraud and demobilize the strength of the peace-loving forces.

I will add parenthetically, that is the Russian description of themselves—

for prevention of a new world war.

The possibility of transforming a small war into a large scale war is as old as wars themselves. It has always existed. But at the present time this possibility is especially great, in particular as a consequence of the mass saturation of the armed forces with various long-range and super-long-range weapons which permit the delivery of powerful blows to distances of hundreds and even thousands of kilometers.

I am very much in favor of the public examination of public policy, particularly in such crucially important fields as the national security. But the observations and conclusions of such discussion ought to be balanced; its recommendations should be positive; its timing ought to be cautious. For instance, I do not feel that a document which blatantly challenges the strategic deterrence adequacy of the United States as well as that Government's willingness to utilize its nuclear retaliatory power came gracefully during the climax of the Geneva Conference.

The authorship of "The Military Forces We Need and How To Get them" is obscure. Who is behind this pamphlet? Who wrote it? Do its "ghosts" include munitions makers? A quick look at the membership of the Advisory Council and its Advisory Committee on Foreign Policy, contained on the inside cover of the pamphlet, fails to reveal any defense experts which, it seems, would be needed to conduct a valuable policy review in this incredibly complicated and constantly changing field.

A NEED FOR EXPERTS AND OBJECTIVITY

Mr. Dean Acheson, Secretary of State during the postwar period of the Marshall plan and the Korean conflict, is listed as the Chairman of the Foreign Policy Committee, and some newspaper reports and usually informed individuals have identified him as the sponsor of the brochure.

I cannot help but find this peculiar. Mr. Acheson is certainly educated, at times through bitter experience, in foreign policy. Military policy, albeit closely interrelated, is nevertheless intensely sophisticated in its own right. Military policy deserves real expertise in its own right. A cattle rancher does not tell his neighbor how to grow potatoes. An advertising executive is not called to advise his firm on labor relations. Nor would we want an optometrist to set a fractured ankle. Also, if there is one

single person who recently has served in high position within the executive branch who should know better than anyone else the degree of difficulty involved in directing international affairs while at the same time having to fend off political snipings, it is Mr. Acheson.

It can be agreed that what we need to aid our thinking are constructive connoisseurs rather than destructive dilettantes.

The pamphlet we are discussing is a strange combination of objective examination and political attack. I have found thought-provoking theories and observations on defense policy which are worthy of attention. I have also found unscientific inconsistency, insinuation, loaded judgments, and outright partisanship. This is a bad mixture.

A critique which attempts to deal with present policies must be founded upon logical objectivity, rather than dark suspicions and ungrounded assumptions of incompetency, ignorance, and blindness.

The American people want the facts, and an expert, unbiased appraisal of them.

The Council either has not read a great deal which has been said or published in this field—by those who are expert in the area—or it expects that its pamphlet's readership will not have done so. For a great deal of essential material has been just plain left out. As one example of a valuable document available on the vital issue of military readiness and the U.S. defense budget, let me mention the prepared statement delivered by Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy before the Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations of the Senate Committee on Appropriations on May 4, 1959.

This is thorough, factual, carefully reasoned, and moderate in tone.

To quote two paragraphs from the McElroy statement:

> In all of this discussion it has been evident that considerable differences of opinion exist on defense policies and programs—sometimes even among members of the Defense Establishment. I know that some of our citizens who are not closely associated with these matters are disconcerted by this lack of unanimity, particularly on the part of Defense spokesmen. These people can't be expected to recognize that in the defense program we are dealing with extremely difficult problems for which there are simply no pat solutions—no simple answers. In many areas—looking into the future—we are dealing largely with assumptions, calculations, estimates, judgments. It is not surprising then, that there are differences of opinion even among experienced, professionally competent men.
>
> Nevertheless, the fact remains that the responsible officials—military and civilian—still have the task of studying these divergent points of view and arriving at a specific program. In accomplishing this, it seems to me, the central problem is one of achieving balance, balance between the offensive and defensive forces; between general war and limited war forces; between numbers of men and numbers of weapons; between new weapons and old; between aircraft and missiles; etc. No one would advocate trying to do everything that every individual would like to see done. This would not only be beyond our resources but would simply dissipate our efforts and weaken rather than strengthen our military power. So, we are faced with the necessity of making decisions among various alternatives—in other words, of exercising judgment, of making "hard choices." In doing so, we make use of the best military and scientific talents in the country. Through this process we have formulated the defense program and budget for fiscal year 1960.

The Secretary of Defense further stated that the Department followed two basic principles in regard to developing the fiscal year 1960 weapons program: (1) the present rate of development is maintained and, if advisable, technologically advanced where a program is unquestionably essential; (2) the level of effort is reduced or the program is eliminated when it appears to be of lesser importance or has been overtaken by events, in view of current technical information. This policy, the Secretary contended, provides the Defense Department with the most efficient defense for the money involved, and allows the greatest overall progress through concentrating on the more advanced and promising weapons systems.

Since the budgetary policy of the President comes under persistent attack—although lessening in recent weeks—this background information is particularly pertinent. It should help refute the "divide and conquer" technique of some of the President's critics, who argue the inadequacy of the defense budget on the basis of separate testimony by the individual Chiefs of Staff, who endorse the over-all adequacy of the defense budget, but request more money for preferred programs in their own baliwicks. Now these requests are perfectly natural, and have been going on for years. No separate military arm ever has enough for itself. It is the duty of the representatives of each to argue, to plead, to harangue for more. When a Chief of Staff speaks individually for his own service, it is not surprising that he is never satisfied with the share allocated to his own service.

What we must not lose sight of, as Secretary McElroy said, is that the officials responsible for the entire defense program must arrive at decisions which bring about a balanced, coordinated, overall proficiency. The fragmentary separated approach can easily result in contradictions, waste and critical gaps. So when the service chiefs speak together, considering the entire multifaceted defense posture, their balanced judgment should be heeded.

As a footnote, it is interesting to observe that if the individual estimates of each of the Joint Chiefs concerning the program needs of each of the other comrade Chiefs were calculated, our overall defense budget for fiscal year 1960 would be considerably less than it is now.

PAMPHLET CHARGES DUAL WEAKNESS

The material in "The Military Forces We Need and How To Get Them" attempts to deal with both strategic and tactical military preparedness.

The pamphlet challenges our defense policies and programs in both areas. Our conventional capability is weaker, it claims, particularly in NATO. A radical shift in the balance of nuclear power is claimed to result in loss to the United States of our "monopoly" and our "nuclear preponderance." We will soon lose, if we have not lost already, a status of "nuclear parity" with the Russians. The tasks before us, therefore, are to "restore" our nuclear striking power and to enlarge and "futurize" forces capable of fighting in a limited engagement.

Here are the basic assertions. There is a great deal of discussion surrounding them, some factual documentation offered, many theories expounded, but the argumentation and evidence offered do not prove the premises or effectively support the conclusions. There is too much wild assumption. There is raw speculation, illogical reasoning, innuendo, and a feeling of urgent necessity to score points for use in political campaigns.

The authors of the brochure assert that the first priority of the United States is to assure nuclear adequacy. One agrees wholeheartedly. The administration agrees also, and when it originally said so, was sneered at by these same critics for its policy of massive power ready for use.

On June 27, in a press conference at Quantico, Va., the Secretary of Defense said:

This says it better than the pamphleteers because, in addition to endorsing the idea of nuclear adequacy, it spells out what nuclear adequacy is. The pamphlet is more vague and less consistent in its definition, and goes on to talk about the "lethargy" of the administration and the "vulnerability of our strategic nuclear power."

> The judgment of our chiefs is that * * * the No. 1 responsibility we should retain * * * is to be in a position always to respond to a nuclear attack by any opponent in such a destructive way that he would know that his country would be destroyed if he would undertake such an attack.

QUANTITATIVE ILLOGIC OF PAMPHLETEERS

Here I cannot agree. In its assertion that the United States is failing as a nuclear power, the Democratic Advisory Council jumps from the fact that Russia has increased her nuclear striking capability strongly over the past 5 years to the conclusion that the United States has less ability for retaliatory destruction. In quantitative terms, it is assumed that as the enemy grows stronger, we must weaken. This is the mentality which later argues for the numerical matching of the Russians in missiles via a crash program, without regard for the overall qualitative potency of the United States. Little emphasis is given the imperative fact that, in order to insure against retaliation which could destroy her, Russia must guarantee that her first nuclear strike to all intents and purposes annihilates our ability to strike back. No basis for that possibility is indicated in this pamphlet; nor is the matter actually dealt with face to face by the pamphleteers.

The pamphlet claims that the Soviet, already strong in conventional forces and improving its limited war capability, has broken the U.S. strategic nuclear monopoly, and therefore U.S. ability to protect Europe with a strategic

nuclear shield diminishes. This intellectual freewheeling awes one. This fragment of illogic completely overlooks the fact that it is plainly foolish to assume that Russia will court outright an initial nuclear air attack from our side by going all out with her ground forces. She will not give us that advantage. With tactical forces in Europe as a limited war buffer, the U.S. huge strategic retaliatory power does supply the Continent with continued protection.

It is ironic that, eventually and inevitably, the pamphlet comes full circle and accuses the administration of depending too much on strategic nuclear forces.

The fact that the United States must depend on her strategic nuclear strength to a major degree because of Russia's overwhelming predominance of manpower-for-land forces is sidestepped by the document under discussion. The administration, moreover, emphatically disputes the claim that the United States has lost her status of nuclear predominance over the Russians, let alone that a situation of nuclear parity is being threatened.

U.S. NUCLEAR PREPONDERANCE MAINTAINED

Secretary of Defense McElroy said in April of this year:

So long as the United States continues to have an overall preponderance of capacity to deliver high potency weapons—on target—we need not fear attack. We have such a preponderance now and no one in this administration—civilian or military—has any intention of allowing this condition to change.

The opinion of our top military advisers is unanimous that we have the power now to discourage any all-out attack on the United States and the free world and we have effective mobile power which can quickly be applied in potential trouble spots around the free world to discourage or to contain military action of a so-called limited scope.

Current U.S. defense policy rests primarily on the manned bomber, since, in the judgment of our military leaders, the manned bomber will remain for ourselves as well as the U.S.S.R., the most effective means of delivering nuclear weapons, in the volume and with the accuracy required to strike a decisive blow, for some time into the future—while the intercontinental ballistic missile is still moving to the operational stage and in adequate numbers. Our Democratic critics seem to overlook this reality; nor do they acknowledge the fact or efficacy of the United States "mix" policy of defense now in practice.

Secretary of Defense McElroy has pointed out that the United States has several times as many heavy jet bombers of the B–52 class, and also more medium bombers, than the U.S.S.R. This, plus our refueling capability and greater training in strategic warfare is surely being taken into account by the U.S.S.R., if not by the D.A.C.

"MIX" POLICY OF U.S. DEFENSE

The "mix" or "double weapons" quality of U.S. preparedness meets the Soviet threat not by matching it numerically missile for missile, but rather by continuing to depend on a widely diversified retaliatory force made up of many different weapons systems, including our long-range strategic bomber force, our intermediate-range nuclear missiles deployed abroad, our atomic-capable tactical aircraft overseas, and our atomic-capable carrier air groups in the Mediterranean and Far Pacific—all of which could strike a devastating blow deep in the U.S.S.R. right now.

By contrast, the U.S.S.R. has no carrier air groups; it has no intermediate-range missiles capable of hitting the United States; it has no tactical aircraft based close enough to strike our country; it has a vastly inferior strategic bomber force. Is this nuclear parity?

In further answer to the "missile gap" charge—more of a slogan than an argument—it should be pointed out again that this gap is largely of our own making. We estimate, in order to have a liberal margin of insurance, the Russians' future missile capability on what they could do ideally, considering the industrial and scientific resources which are calculated to be available to them. Thus we project the Russian buildup of long-range ballistic missile forces into the next few years. When we compare what they could conceivably do, with all their resources, with what we actually plan to do with our defense budgeted for, some gap arises. This protective method of estimation must not be forgotten when cries go up for a "crash" program in missiles.

Why do we not hear something from the experts of the D.A.C. about the Russians' huge bomber gap, or about their perilous nuclear retaliatory gap? These gaps are current and real, and not contrived out of statistical estimates or misestimates for the future.

CRASH-AND-CRISIS THEORY REJECTED

The crash-and-crisis theory of defense preparedness offered by anonymous pamphleteers is not acceptable to the administration. The Department of Defense has mapped out a strategic defense policy to carry us ahead into the early 1960's which is neither complacent nor unalert, but soundly based on a thorough examination of the military capability of the Soviet now and in the future, plus a careful consideration of our own technological capacities.

This policy is a refutation of the superficial missile-for-missile "numbers game" approach. Better to proceed, as we are, by making sure we have what it takes, now and in the future, to promise overwhelming nuclear destruction to the Soviet should she attack us, so as to deter attack, or any serious consideration of it.

This policy puts our primary current strategic dependence on a manned bomber striking system, proven and ready, and a huge variety of other weapons, including missiles, as above noted.

It results in the correct decision to move ahead in research and development of the solid-fuel missiles of the future, rather than in undue construction and reliance upon soon-to-be-obsolete missiles of the earlier stage, even though these are being produced in sufficient quantity to provide a powerful temporary segment of our overall strategic capacity.

It results—and this is the elemental point—in a much greater capacity in the U.S. strategic destructive power than that of her enemies.

If we harkened to the impetuous, amateur, and superficial demands for closing the alleged missile gap, we would be liable, by overlooking the real needs in our defenses, to liken ourselves to the eagle of Aesop's fables who, when shot by an arrow constructed of his own feathers, found he had supplied his enemy with the means for his own destruction.

SOVIET MISSILES AND "ACCEPTABLE RISK"

Nobody has offered evidence to warrant the conclusion that Russian missile capability can or will be such as to achieve a knockout blow to our SAC, missile, and carrier facilities so that our capability to retaliate would be reduced below the level of acceptable risk. This should be made clear. This should be reemphasized, lest the pamphlet's querulous charges of missile inadequacy give the mistaken impression that we are not in fact achieving a posture of balanced defense.

The Ballistic Missile Early Warning System, the dispersal and hardening of SAC bases, and the construction of alert facilities demonstrate current progress in our insurance policy against increased Soviet ICBM attack power in the next few years.

The Secretary of Defense has informed us that a good start has been made on the BMEWS system during the past year, and has stated:

By the time it is anticipated that a full-scale Soviet ICBM attack could be launched against this country the BMEWS system is expected to be able to provide that critical margin of warning which will enable our strategic forces to get off on their retaliatory mission.

The accelerated SAC dispersal and ground alert program should be completed by the end of the present fiscal year, and will frustrate the enemy both by making it more difficult for him to reach our bases and by increasing the speed with which we could retaliate if the need arose. In this connection, our potent retaliatory power from mobile sea bases must also be kept in mind.

To measure our progress in the ballistic missile field, we note that substantial funds were recommended in the present fiscal year's budget for the continued production of the Atlas and for the development of the Titan. Money adequate for pushing forward on the development of the Minuteman solid fuel missile and the Polaris program was also budgeted. We are not wasting time or effort in advanced missilery.

BUDGETING FOR ADVANCED MISSILES

Again, Secretary McElroy's statement supplies documentation. The following budgetary wrapup, taken from his testimony, serves to set the record straight:

Specifically, the fiscal year 1960 budget provides additional funds for such advanced retaliatory weapon systems at Atlas, Titan, Minuteman, and Polaris; for the B–52/Hound Dog combination, the B–58 and for development of the B–70, as well as the supporting tankers for the B–52 and B–58.

A final increment of funds is included in this budget to complete the presently planned production program for Jupiter and Thor.

Now, you will note that there is included in the 1960 budget quite a variety of retaliatory weapons systems. We plan to obligate in 1960 a total of about $5.2 billion for procurement, research, development, test and evaluation, and the construction of facilities for these systems. Roughly $2.4 billion will go for manned aircraft and their related equipment and about $2.8 billion for the ballistic missiles. I want to emphasize that these figures do not include the operating costs for these or any other of the retaliatory systems which will be supported in 1960.

Concerning the pamphlet's charge that Polaris is not being funded highly enough, the Department argues that it must not jump wildly ahead of itself, and insists that the money requested is sufficient for efficient progress. This judgment is supported by information supplied Congress 3 weeks ago stating that the submarine-borne intermediate-range missile weapon would be ready for combat use before the end of 1960, or 3 years ahead of the original goal. Such a schedule factually destroys the charge that the administration is "dragging its feet" on Polaris, although the charge reads well in a political pamphlet.

Proceeding to the pamphlet's treatment of the tactical or "limited" area of our defense, the criticism of present policies and programs continues—shriller, more gloomy, and less consistent than before.

The Democratic tract indulges in a tortured, at times seriously provacative, and certainly confused effort to grasp the intricate character of limited conflict and its relationship to U.S. strategic defense policy.

Let us examine the D.A.C.'s advice in this regard.

D.A.C. CHARGES TACTICAL INADEQUACY

"NATO is pitifully weak," they contend.

Our own contribution to that military alliance is "weaker," it is asserted, and the full complement of 30 NATO Divisions should be honored. Why, they proclaim, the weakness of NATO is so obvious that the enemy may feel he can knock off Europe with a quick, restricted attack. NATO must depend upon falling back immediately on the strategic deterrent of the United States. In turn, however, this will do no good, because the enemy knows that Europe's disaster in the event of nuclear retaliation will be much greater than that which she faces in the event of a "limited war," and therefore it is likely that the West's strategic deterrent is a bluff. "A defense dependent upon the willingness and ability of the NATO governments to employ nuclear weapons in a war of unlimited violence lacks credibility," it is claimed by the pamphleteers. The presence of nuclear weapons in NATO countries is evidently considered to be no more than an act of courtesy on the part of these countries.

At this point the pamphlet has asserted that our limited war capability is nonexistent and that our nuclear deterrents—barely at parity with the Soviet's—probably won't be used anyway.

It is argued, with some effectiveness—even though "all the best authorities" are not "convinced"—that limited war fought with tactical nuclear weapons is not cheaper and does not involve less manpower than limited war fought conventionally, but rather more. The rather extraneous point is made that our tactical forces should be equipped with nuclear weapons, but only to deter the enemy from using his. Their use would not give us a military advantage anyway, the critics claim.

Finally, the topic "Limited Nuclear Warfare or Withdrawal" is discussed in such a way as to imply that these policies have been offered as alternatives by the administration. This is not all true. The administration has rejected both policies. The Advisory Council, after beating around the bush, concurs.

The pamphlet's solution to this dilemma in Europe, and ostensibly elsewhere, in the event of limited engagements, is to "increase the hazards to the Soviet of using its ground forces so that it will be as dangerous as using nuclear forces in the first instance." How is this to be done? Through an increase in our defense forces and through "a vigorous flow of scientific and military invention." Quite a nervous plea is made here for our scientists to "invent something."

Here is one of the most typical examples of naivete to be found in the pamphlet—when the pamphleteers make their entire case depend upon the ability of our country to invent something in the future. Incidentally, Mr. President, I may say that even though the inventions were made, I am sure the Russians would claim they themselves had made the same inventions 50 years before.

Those who have written the pamphlet seem to rely upon having our scientists make some inventions, although the writers of the pamphlet do not specify what the inventions might be. Certainly such an attitude is typical of the schoolboy-writing nature of the pamphlet.

In demanding that the United States increase her manpower complement in Europe, it appeared as if the pamphleteers were advocating that we match the Russians man for man. This is only half an argument, however. Later in the tract, the Democratic Advisory Committee begs its own question, by admitting that our limited forces will inevitably be smaller than those of our Communist adversaries.

"A proper marriage of invention and tactical innovation may greatly increase the effectiveness of the smaller force," the document states. I do not think that anyone would disagree with that statement, although we must admit that the same opportunity for improvement exists for the enemy. In fact, Mr. President, that statement reminds me of boyhood experiences, when one boy would threaten another one, and would say to him, "I am going to do so and so to you," and the boy who was threatened would reply, "Well, while you are doing it, I am going to do so and so to you." So, Mr. President, certainly the pamphleteers should realize that it is quite proper for us to assume that the Russians would be doing something mysterious, too, at the same time.

It is a rather empty "if" to wager the future on, particularly when things are as bad now as the critics indicate. Cannot the pamphleteers come up with a better answer? When real solutions are needed for the problems which the Democratic Advisory Council dilettantes have just finished overexaggerating, they are out to lunch.

CONTRADICTION AND CONFUSION

To sum up, this is the way their argument goes:

If we can strengthen our NATO forces enough, the enemy will have a tougher problem containing any limited conflict of his making and therefore would be less likely to start one. But we are informed that we can never equal his manpower, and that our tactical atomic weapons should be kept only as a deterrent. Furthermore, we are advised that the Russians would not use their own tactical weapons, anyway, again in order to keep the conflict from expanding—so that deterrent is needless. The fog thickens.

I have earlier quoted from the statement made by the Russian expert, who said that certainly the Russians would use all their forces in limited wars. Of course, Mr. President, history shows that usually limited wars expand into worldwide conflagrations.

The Kremlin, being unable to keep a conflict of its making limited, would be in great danger of courting strategic nuclear retaliation. Facing this eventuality, the enemy would be too scared to initiate a limited conflict, in the first place—and we have outfoxed him. This is contradicted when the pamphleteers inform us that Russia thinks our nuclear retaliatory power is only a bluff and would not be used anyhow. The smoke of sophistry has us weeping.

This argument, though noteworthy for its painful effort, simply cannot be held up by the fantastic delusion of an "innovation and invention" advantage which, by a wave of the Democratic wand, will be granted us by our fairy godmother. This mighty exercise in illogic falls of its own weight, crumbles from its own confusion.

NATO: STRONG AND WILLING

I certainly agree that it is advisable to have the NATO forces reach the full complement of 30 divisions. But we cannot forget that NATO is an alliance made up of several sovereign states, over whom we have no control. The United States cannot force its European allies to greater participation, and if we went ahead and increased our own contribution unilaterally—and, incidentally, U.S. combat forces to NATO have not been diminished, but have remained constant, and have been improved qualitatively—it might be largely wasted. Besides, that would create an even larger "political imbalance" and would encourage the Europeans to depend more on us, and do less and less to help themselves.

There is little evidence to indicate that NATO will merely fall back on the strategic nuclear deterrence behind her if attacked in a restricted action. NATO is there to fight, and will fight.

This is the present policy of all NATO governments. If the organization existed only as a "paper tiger," it would not have thrived. NATO not only exists to fight, but is equipped to fight effectively.

Any military move the Communists make will be challenged by force. If necessary, our tactical forces will use nuclear weapons. If necessary, additional men and equipment will converge in the European Continent. This is what our STRAC divisions are for, and the mobility and effectiveness of our conventional forces for restricted conflict situations have already been demonstrated in the Lebanon and Quemoy areas.

If the time comes when our limited forces cannot handle the enemy, when the tactical deterrent has failed, when the United States and her allies have gone to their fullest capacity to contain the enemy on a restricted basis and are unable to do so, then the war has become unlimited, and our strategic striking power will be brought into play. Again, this last-resort deterrent, as massive and as horrible as it is, will fail to deter, will fail to avoid war, unless we are determined to use it when necessary.

If ever the United States and the rest of the free world fail to use their available strength to resist a sustained Communist attack, our destiny will be gravely endangered, for our enemy, ever probing for that single opening, that one sign of critical weakness, seeks for a start to go all the way. Our policy is serious; it is "willing." We are committed to our friends to intervene at once against a common aggressor, and we will. The Russians know all this, even if the Democratic Advisory Committee does not.

THE QUALITY OF U.S. FORCES: CHARGES AND REBUTTAL

The Democratic Advisory Council condemns the size and quality of our forces. The Army is understrength, the pamphlet maintains, and its equipment and weapons are obsolescent.

By June of 1959, it was predicted, our total military forces would be weaker by almost one million men. The charge is leveled that we are reducing our forces to pre-Korean strength. The last Truman defense budget is referred to with admiration.

What are the facts?

In June of 1959, the U.S. total military forces were 1 million less than at the peak of the Korean war. The cold war is not the same as a hot war, despite the contentions in this portrayal of doom. Do the pamphleteers want to draft an extra million young men? If so, for what purpose?

Until the Korean war, defense budgets were progressively lowered by Democratic Congresses. President Truman's original defense budget request for fiscal year 1951, right on the eve of the Korean war, amounted to the staggering sum of something over $13 billion. Also, the pamphlet failed to mention that President Truman anticipated, in his last budget message, that defense budgets in the near future would decline "until they reach the level required to keep our Armed Forces in a state of readiness." The level he mentioned was "in the neighborhod of $35–$40 billion annually." This is actually less than where our defense budget is today.

That makes Mr. Truman a good prophet, if he will take the time to read the statements he made at that time.

In order to evaluate the pamphlet's charges of understrength and outdatedness, let us compare the situation as of June 30, 1959, with that of exactly 9 years earlier—on the eve of the Korean war.

The Army had 593,167 men and 10 divisions. It had no missile commands. It had 48 antiaircraft batallions with guns, and 1,291 aircraft. Today, the Army has 870,000 men and 14 divisions. Its levels of training, equipment and readiness are much higher. It has 82 antiaircraft batallions equipped with missiles. It has 5,300 aircraft.

The Navy had 381,538 men, 598 active ships, 9 carrier air groups, and 7 antisub squadrons. The Navy currently has 630,000 men, 864 active ships, 16 carrier air groups, and 22 antisub squadrons.

The Air Force has moved from 411,277 men to 845,000; from 48 wings to 105, the modernization or qualitative improvement of which is immeasurable; and from 12,500 to over 20,000 active aircraft. Moreover, in 1953 the Air Force had 11 heavy strategic bomb wings of 30 B–36's each. Today, it has the same number of wings with 45 B–52's in each. With additional B–52's funded in recent budgets, including 1960, there eventually will be 14 such wings. Also entering the inventory as a partial replacement for the B–47 is the B–58 mach 2 medium bomber with intercontinental range, and under active development is the B–70 high altitude long-range heavy supersonic bomber.

The Marine Corps moved from 74,279 men to 175,000 in 9 years, and increased their divisions and air wings from two to three each. Both the Marines and the Army announced recently that infantrymen will be equipped with a bazookalike antiaircraft missile equipped with infrared heatseeker, called the Redeye.

The total force level of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps at the outbreak of the Korean War was 1,460,261. The total force goal aimed at by the beginning of the current fiscal year was in the neighborhood of double that figure, 2,525,000.

It is crystal clear that these statistics devastate the contentions of the gloomy members of Dean Acheson's brood.

In our present era of rapid technological advance, the cycle of modernization and replacement is continuous. At any moment, therefore, it is all to easy to term an operational model in some given category "obsolete," while gazing at the prototype of the future. The U.S. forces are greatly modernized, as compared with those which fought in Korea, and they are much more lethal. It would be a mistake to become complacent; it would be unfortunate if we didn't recognize areas needing improvement in the "futurization" of our Armed Forces. Yet great technological advances have been made under the Eisenhower administration, and huge combat power has been incorporated into our Armed Forces in the past 6 years.

Our forces are not being "blindly neglected." This is false.

Two brief paragraphs from Defense Secretary McElroy's testimony before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee quickly document this point:

> Attention is also given in this budget to the continued modernization of our ground force equipment. Funds are included for tanks, trucks, small arms and ammunition, electronics and engineer equipment as well as for a variety of missiles for employment by troops in the field. The Army will also buy two new aircraft—the Mohawk high performance observation aircraft and the Caribou light transport—as well as additional helicopters.
>
> The tactical units of the Air Force, in support of the ground forces, will continue to be modernized with the F–105 supersonic fighter-bomber, the surface-to-surface missile Mace, and the C–130 troop transport.

A STRONG NATIONAL ECONOMY

The overall recommendations made for the revamping and refurbishing of our defense programs in the Democratic pamphlet amount to a cost of $7.5 billion annually.

This $7.5 billion in annual expenditures would be the poorest spent money in the entire defense budget originally programed. After determining an adequate overall effort, one can always add marginal amounts, ad infinitum, which, in consideration of profitable return for the insurance bought, move further and further into the area of diminishing returns. This we cannot afford to do, either militarily or economically—despite the advice of the partisan experts.

Seven and one-half billion dollars annually is a great deal of money, in addition to a $41 billion defense budget which exists at the present. The American taxpayer already supports the largest cold-war budget in history.

Thus it is that the "spendocrats" the people who have no concern or hesitation about the disposition of other people's money, people who have no sense of responsibility for the total cost of the budget, people who believe in spending at any price, regardless of whether the money is needed or not, do not advise us where we shall get the $7.5 billion. They do say that, "There can be no question of the capacity of our economy to support this addition to defense expenditures." That is doubtless in addition to the $10 billion or more welfare proposals espoused by the Democratic Advisory Council members and Democratic Senators and Representatives. Other than these indignantly obscure protestations, however, our friends seem to have run out of advice, again at the most crucial point.

The pamphlet claims that defense policies require "executive leadership with the energy to grapple with the real issues and to make the necessary decisions." The U.S. leadership in the defense field is of the highest caliber—experienced, sound, and mature, as well as energetic—and I may add, infinitely superior to the anonymous kitchen cabinet which put together this curious and nonfactual political pamphlet.

The leadership of the United States, as exemplified by the President, the Department of Defense, and responsible leaders in the Senate and House in both parties, have rejected the "crash and crisis" approach to our national defense. The leadership has refuted the automatic, gloomy, and debilitating assumption that the Soviet is way ahead and that we are way behind, and the belief that the only way to set it all right again is to spend lots more money. It acknowledges the fact that we are in for a long haul, and stresses that our various resources must be utilized accordingly.

The policies and programs set up by our genuine defense experts for the present and future recognize the critical relationship between military preparedness and a strong national economy—our total capacity for survival.

When the authors of the pamphlet arrived at the sum of $7.5 billion annually, they did so, and I quote, "in very general and approximate terms." This is one of the most candid statements in the pamphlet.

I submit that the entire tract was conceived and executed in very general and approximate terms, and that is why I have gone to some lengths to rebut it. Critical examination and review is crucially necessary—especially in this field, as I stated at the outset of this discussion—and to that extent we must be grateful to the members of the Democratic Advisory Council. But in this instance they fell short of the needed standards and the interests of the country were not served.

Mr. President, I will conclude by citing the difference between action in the 86th Congress and the naive recommendations of this Democratic Advisory Council pamphlet.

The pamphlet urges three immediate steps. It was published last month. The steps urged were:

First, an increase in the production of jet tankers, which the Senate and the other body refused to do.

Second, to double the combined Atlas-Titan missile production currently programed, which the Senate and the other body refused to do so far.

Third, to continue the development and production of the airborne cruise missiles, such as the Snark and Regulus II, to be maintained at dispersed locations and made mobile, at relatively low cost. This, to a large extent, this body and the other body of Congress have refused to do.

One of the blessed things about our Government is that those who represent continue to represent, and those who represent themselves as experts are exposed for what they are namely, political pamphleteers.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I want to commend the Senator from Pennsylvania for bringing this pamphlet to our attention. He has performed a very useful service in so doing. I was considerably shocked when I read the report of the Democratic Advisory Council that the United States, over the next 4 years, must spend an extra $30 billion on its national defense above our present defense expenditures—in other words, $7½ billion above the budget recommendations, of which they were very critical, in the coming year.

Of course, I realize that the Democratic Advisory Council was created, according to its charter, to formula and enunciate Democratic policy. I assume that is what they were doing when these armchair people, such as Paul Ziffren, Jacob Arvey, and a few others, promulgated this policy.

Mr. SCOTT. Perhaps, if the Senator will permit me to comment at this point, this policy of this oddly assorted group of established military geniuses conceived of themselves a being created to advise and consent to the Democratic majority here in the Congress. I am very glad the majority in the Congress has so frequently ignored them.

Mr. KEATING. I think it probably has been helpful to our country that they have, in many respects, but it makes one wonder who is formulating the policy of the party. The congressional majority has, as a matter of fact, not only fostered a cut in the budget recommended by the President for natonal defense, amounting to practically $20 million, but it has attempted to take a good deal of credit for the reduction in the defense budget in that regard; whereas we find the council which was set up to formulate and enunciate the policy of the Democratic Party giving us a very disturbing report which would make one practically believe that Russian troops were marching down Pennsylvania Avenue and that our country was in great danger because we are not ready to spend $7½ billion more than the budget recommended by the President.

However, all of the leading military experts, such as Gen. Nathan F. Twining, former head of the Air Force, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, former Chief of Staff of our Army, Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, Gen. Randolph McC. Pate, head of the Marines, and a one-time military figure of considerable consequence, one Dwight D. Eisenhower, have recommended what they consider a fair and adequate budget for our national defense, but which still takes account of the other demands made upon our Federal Treasury.

That budget has been presented to the Congress, and the Congress, under the leadership of the same group who are enunciating this other policy, has seen fit to reduce the amount, not even giving to the President what he says he needs for national defense, to the tune of $20 million.

So that situation puts a person in a good deal of confusion over what the actual situation is as between these two elements, both of them prominent in the party, setting forth what appear to be very conflicting views on the needs of our national defense.

I think the Senator from Pennsylvania has been very helpful to us, and has shown he has studied this problem very thoroughly in presenting these figures to us, to set the record straight in order that we and the country may be well informed on this issue.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from New York has said. The figures which I have cited have been checked for accuracy with the Department of Defense. In my judgment, these figures will stand up against any attempt to counter them.

I will say to the Senator from New York that perhaps the other party ought to adopt the symbol of Janus, the two-faced god of war, instead of the symbol of the jackass or the donkey, since it has now put itself in a position where one wing of the party is saying, "Let us spend $30 billion more" and the other wing of the party is asserting regularly on the floor of this body that they have spent a billion dollars less.

I add, neither figure is accurate, but both figures would be available and useful in a political campaign, since they would be able to say to any person who asks, so that he who runs may read, anything which is most pleasing to him; namely, that the party either sought to increase funds for the preparedness of our country militarily or that it sought to decrease funds. Perhaps our friends think there is not any better place to be than on both sides of an issue.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, that is a very convenient position to be in, but I have a great deal of confidence in the intelligence of the American people and their capacity to realize that one should not with one breath say, "Our funds for national defense are inadequate," and have members of the same group at the other end of the avenue setting forth the proposition that the President has asked for too much and that we must cut the defense budget. The people, in my judgment, are not going to swallow that kind of an argument. The people want a straightforward statement of the needs of our national defense and of what we are doing to meet them.

Mr. SCOTT. I firmly believe it is better for the country to rely upon the judgment of General Eisenhower than upon the judgment of "General" Acheson.

I thank the Senator from New York.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the Senator.

SENATOR MURRAY'S NATURAL RESOURCES AND CONSERVATION BILL

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I rise to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] for the outstanding leadership that he has again manifested in his bill (S. 2549), the proposed Natural Resources and Conservation Act of 1960. I am privileged to be one of the original cosponsors of this bill which, I am confident, will become a keystone of national policy. In the formulation of this proposal, Senator MURRAY evidences the forward-looking confidence in the future of this Nation that he voiced in his remarks at the time he introduced the

measure on August 17, 1959. In discussing the vastly increased requirements for natural resources that will be an inevitable consequence of population growth and rising living standards, Senator MURRAY said:

In the face of this increasing requirement for, and pressure on, natural resources, I am not fearful that we shall fail to meet the Nation's needs. Certainly the United States will have the economic and financial ability for the tasks involved, and we have the skills and competence.

I share Senator MURRAY's confidence in the ability of this Nation to meet its obligations to its citizens, and also to the people of the free world who rely on us until their own economy matures. I agree, too, with Senator MURRAY's farsighted reminder that success in fulfilling these purposes requires actions that are both timely and well considered.

The proposed Natural Resources and Conservation Act effectively implements the views and recommendations of recognized authorities in this area of national policy. A few quotations will demonstrate how well the bill accords with the best thinking on the subject.

Dr. John Kenneth Galbraith, professor of economics at Harvard University, in a recent address, has provided us with a condensation of the Paley Commission findings regarding the "gargantuan and growing appetite" for natural resources. Dr. Galbraith said:

Conservationists are unquestionably useful people. And among the many useful services that they have recently rendered has been that of dramatizing the vast appetite which the United States has developed for materials of all kinds. This increase in requirements we now recognize to be exponential. It is the product of a rapidly increasing population and a high and (normally) a rapidly increasing living standard. The one multiplied by the other gives the huge totals with which our minds must contend. The President's Materials Policy Commission emphasized the point by observing that our consumption of raw materials comes to about half that of the non-Communist lands although we have but 10 percent of the population, and that since World War I our consumption of most materials has exceeded that of all mankind throughout all history before the conflict.

This quotation bears out Senator MURRAY's appraisal of the need for timely action, and the following quotation from testimony before the Finance Committee of the Senate bears out the confidence that the United States has financial ability to meet conservation needs. On April 18, 1958, Dr. Sumner H. Slichter of Harvard University said:

The United States is a growing country, with its population rising by about 3 million a year, and with its output growing at a normal rate of about $14 billion a year or more. Such a growing economy needs more and better schools, roads, recreation areas, and projects for the development of its resources. If the economy were to succeed in achieving full capacity operation by the early fall of 1959, the gross national product should be around $470 billion a year, or about $45 billion above the present (1958) rate. Certainly a substantial part of this increase of $45 billion in the gross national product should go for much needed public works of various sorts.

The United States has, in fact, attained and surpassed the $470 billion rate of gross national product foretold by Dr. Slichter. Regrettably, however, no part of the increase in gross national product is being invested in the much needed public works. Failure to make this investment in America is the blight of the administration policy of no new starts. Sterilizing effects of this blight are evident today, and they will mar the Nation's countryside for decades to come.

Prof. Gilbert F. White, of the University of Chicago, distinguished as a scientist, educator, and natural resources planner, has pointed out that, in the long run, one of the basic deficiencies in natural resources and conservation activies is "lack of understanding of national aims and, consequently, of national means as well." Professor White continues:

So long as this is diffuse, we cannot expect any amount of organizational legerdemain or budgetary management to more than palliate the difficulties. If we seem confused in the field of defense where there at least seems no doubt that we wish to protect and preserve the United States, how much more complex is the case of natural resources where we are not certain as to what we are to conserve? We are not certain that we want to develop all of our waterpower or to save all of our soil, or how much oil, if any, we should keep underground, or whether we should curb our appetite for lead in gas, and iron in tail fins. Having already and of necessity modified the web of nature, we do not know how far is too far in directing our changes in it.

In recent years we have had a generous review of both policies and administration. Raw materials situations have been assessed; water policy has been proposed; a new attack has been made upon problems of recreation. An important element which has been lacking is a general examination of national aims within the range of politically possible means of achieving them, and of the probable impacts of each possible program.

Professor White's conclusion is directed straight at the provisions of S. 2549, the natural resources and conservation bill. Professor White said:

Of the numerous organizational changes that may be in order, none seem more promising of benefits to the whole process of preserving or reforming the American landscape than those which promote a continuing appraisal of the probable results of following the choices which are open.

This is the essence of Senator MURRAY's proposal for a Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers to prepare annually the Resources and Conservation Report of the President, and the joint committee of the Congress that would give continuing attention to resource development, utilization, and conservation.

In conclusion I desire to say that I think it is particularly appropriate that I should be given permission very courteously to make these remarks about conservation by the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania. If I am not mistaken, one of the greatest conservationists in the history of this country came from the State of Pennsylvania and was given to the Nation by the State of Pennsylvania. I refer to the illustrious ex-Governor of Pennsylvania, a man who was the first Chief Forester of the United States, Gifford Pinchot, and I believe and feel that if Gifford Pinchot were with us today, he would support Senator MURRAY's National Resources and Conservation Act.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I am delighted to yield and am much pleased that the Senator has brought in the name of a very famous Governor of our State, a great forester and a famous conservationist.

Mr. NEUBERGER. We are very proud in the Pacific Northwest, that one of the most beautiful national forests in the Cascade Mountains carries the name of Gifford Pinchot and is known as the Gifford Pinchot National Forest.

THE HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in February 1955, the President of the United States submitted to the Congress a report which dramatically called to the attention of the country the inadequacy and dangerous condition of our highways. This report, prepared by a commission headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay, pointed out that one-seventh of all Americans owed their livelihood either directly or indirectly to the highway and highway transportation industries. Particular emphasis was given to the tremendous loss, both economic and in terms of human life and suffering, which was being experienced daily because our highway construction program had not kept pace with expanding needs.

Highway building had been necessarily slowed by the priority demands of a wartime economy. The President recommended that in order to alleviate a critical problem the Federal Government should assume major responsibility for the construction of a new system of interstate and national defense highways, interconnecting our major metropolitan areas. The President gave particular emphasis to the importance of the new system of highways to national defense.

The proposal received intense consideration by the committees of the Congress for almost two complete sessions. There evolved the Federal Highway Act of 1956, of which it was my privilege to be coauthor. This act provided that the Federal Government should pay 90 percet of the cost of constructing this new System of Defense and Interstate Highways with a construction schedule calling for completion of the system by 1972 to design standards adequate to meet estimated traffic needs of 1975. It provided, also, for corresponding improvement of primary, secondary, and urban highways to a corresponding state of adequacy.

Construction progress is now well underway. The State highway departments and the highway construction industry have responded to the challenge. We are now, however, in a critical situation in which, unless appropriate action is taken by the Congress, construc-

tion will stop altogether on the vital Interstate and Defense System or, at best, be so slowed down and stretched out as to make impossible completion of the system on schedule as specified by the act of 1956.

A halt in construction of the Interterstate System will be disastrous. State highway departments have geared their operations to the authorized level. Engineering staffs, recruited with great difficulty and expense, would have to be disbanded only to be recruited again at great loss in money and time, if and when the program is resumed. The highway construction industry, having increased its capacity at the request of Congress, will be severely injured. The entire economy will receive a jolt from which it will not be easy to recover. Substantial increases in unemployment will be inevitable.

Meanwhile, if the program is halted, the gap between highways in being and those required will rapidly increase. Our highways will continue to get worse instead of better, and more people, instead of fewer, will be killed on our inadequate highways. Carnage on the highways and economic loss will go unchecked. Unless we take action to provide better highways, the situation will become much worse. Every year that passes sees the need for better highways become more acute. We cannot afford further delay. Even at the rate of progress authorized in the 1956 act we will barely hold our own between the need for highway improvement and the deterioration of the present system of highways.

The act of 1956 created the highway trust fund, earmarking the revenues from certain highway user taxes for transfer to that fund to be used to defray the Federal Government's portion of the cost. From the beginning, it was recognized that in the early years of the program revenues in the fund would be insufficient to meet annual expenditures. To meet this anticipated problem it was provided that when deficits occurred the trust fund would borrow from the general fund, with the borrowed sums to be repaid in later years when revenues were expected to exceed expenditures for highway improvements. Prior to final congressional action, however, restrictive language was written into the bill which was designed to limit annual apportionments to the States to such amounts as would be available in the trust fund with which to pay the bills when they came due. As a result of this restrictive language, the crisis which we now face was, from the effective date of the act, inevitable. This restrictive language has come to be known as the Byrd amendment; though, in fact, I am informed it was advanced by the former Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. George Humphrey.

All responsible people agree that the Congress must act to prevent a collapse of the highway program. If we are to act properly, however, we must do so on the basis of a clear understanding of the problem.

To begin with, the highway trust fund will be out of money by October 1, 1959—unless this Congress acts the highway trust fund will be bankrupt by the time Representatives and Senators reach their home States.

The States will present during this fiscal year vouchers for reimbursement totaling an estimated $493 million for which funds will not be available for payment. Normally this deficit would be made up by borrowing from the general fund as provided in the Highway Revenue Act. However, the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act recently passed by the Congress limits appropriations to such amounts as "may be available in and derived from the highway trust fund." This amount is expected to be $493 million less than required. Unless we take action, the Federal Government will be forced to default in its obligations to the States. This default will occur in October, next October, October 1959, prior to the reconvening of Congress in January.

Moreover, no apportionments of interstate funds whatever can be made for fiscal year 1961. These apportionments should have been made last month. Unless the States receive this obligational authority they will be compelled to terminate even the planning of additional projects. If the Federal Government defaults on its obligations to the States, the States then will be forced to default in payment of their obligations pursuant to contracts performed and completed, unless they can raise the funds from their own resources.

Already many States have announced that no additional contracts can be awarded. Invitations to bid on contracts which have already been advertised are being withdrawn. In short, we face a complete stoppage of the construction of the new System of National Defense and Interstate Highways which the President declared necessary for national security and which the Congress proclaimed as necessary for national security and to promote a growing economy and safety on the highways.

The problem has two parts which, though related, are separate:

First, we must provide funds to the States in 1960 to meet the obligations that the States have incurred by contract pursuant to Federal commitments in the Highway Acts of 1956 and 1958. Without congressional action, then, the States will be forced into default, or budgetary stringencies, on obligations falling due this fiscal year, and this situation, let me repeat, will occur very soon, unless the Congress acts. Solution of this phase of the problem will have a bearing upon the 1960 budget.

Secondly, we must take action to permit continued apportionments to the States to avert complete stoppage of the interstate program. Authorization of apportionments for fiscal 1961 must be made this year to allow time for proper planning, advertising of contracts, and award of contracts. Such authorization, however, can have no impact whatever on the 1960 budget because under the law the funds could not actually be disbursed until fiscal 1961. Actually, for the most part, fiscal 1961 apportionments would not be disbursed until 1962.

So, Mr. President, solution of this problem which, as I have said, has two parts, will have an effect on the 1960 budget with respect to obligations falling due within 1960, which arise from apportionments already made; but action to permit apportionments for 1961 will not have an effect upon the 1960 budget. Actually for the most part fiscal 1961 apportionments would not be disbursed until fiscal 1962.

Before proceeding to discuss possible solutions, I should like to dispel certain myths about the program and the cause of our present dilemma.

In the first place, the present crisis has not been caused by an increase of construction costs over estimates. On the contrary, contracts are being awarded generally well within or below estimates.

Only today the Bureau of Roads made an announcement that highway construction costs during the April-June quarter dropped by more than 2½ percent.

In the second place, this crisis was not caused by the Highway Act of 1958. As a matter of fact, the Congress was confronted with this same problem last year. The act of 1958 met this problem and averted a slowdown of the program at that time. While that act may properly be said to have postponed the crisis, it cannot be said to have caused it. The delay in resolving the problem and the acceleration provided in the 1958 act have combined to make the problem more acute today.

I think Congress must enact legislation to meet Federal obligations to the States and to permit continued interstate and defense highway apportionments on schedule.

There is no magic way to build highways without money. The only real source of funds for the Federal Government is by way of taxation. This is not to say, however, that there is only one type of tax or only one class of citizens and taxpayers upon whom to levy it.

The administration insists that the only solution to the problem is to impose a further increase in the gasoline tax. This proposal is labeled a pay-as-you-go plan. The implication is plain that users of our highways have not been paying their fair share of taxes and that they should be compelled to do so or else accept responsibility for stoppage of the highway program. Any such implication is highly inaccurate and downright misleading.

In the first place, the theory that highway users should pay the entire cost of the program by direct taxes levied upon them cannot be supported. Good highways benefit everyone and every segment of our economy. We do not levy a special tax on teachers and the parents of students to pay for schools because we realize that education not only benefits everyone but is a responsibility of the general public. The same rule applies, or should apply, I insist, to highways.

But even if we accept the thesis that highway users should pay the entire cost of highways, the administration position, as well as its implications, is unjustified.

Highway users are already paying direct excise taxes far in excess of the amount needed for the highway programs. In addition, of course, the users of our highways pay income taxes and all other taxes, as do all of the people.

What are the facts, Mr. President, about highway user taxes?

In fiscal 1958 highway users paid in direct Federal excise taxes $3.493 billion. Of this amount, only $2.026 billion was transferred to the highway trust fund. In other words, of each highway user dollar collected, 58 cents went for highways while 42 cents went for other purposes, to be diverted from use on highways. On the basis of information now available, approximately the same ratio will be applicable, under the budget, to 1959 collections. I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a table showing actual collections of highway user taxes in fiscal 1958 and indicating the amount of each transferred to the trust fund or kept in the general fund.

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

Revenues collected from increases in highway user taxes imposed by highway act of 1956

[In millions of dollars]

	1957	1958	1959
Gasoline, 1 cent	432	519	535
Diesel, 1 cent	10	17	17
Tires, 3 cents	81	92	93
Tread rubber, 3 cents	11	13	14
Trucks, buses, and trailers, 2 percent (1957) and 5 percent (1958–72)	34	103	107
Truck use	26	33	34
Total	594	777	800
Auto excise, 3 percent	343	351	312
Total (including auto excise)	937	1,128	1,112
Total additional revenues for fiscal years 1957–59 (not including auto excise)	------	------	2,171
Auto excise	------	------	1,006
Grand total	------	------	3,177

Mr. GORE. Throughout the years, highway users have paid larger sums in taxes than were spent for highways. In 1934 the Congress passed the so-called Hayden-Cartwright Act. This act, which is still in effect, provides that any State which diverts to nonhighway uses a larger percentage of highway user taxes than was diverted at the time the act was passed shall forfeit its right to Federal-aid highway funds. Thus we encourage the States, by threat of withholding Federal funds, to use all their revenue from highway taxes for highway purposes. Yet the Federal Government does not follow that example. Indeed, it is now proposed that we levy still additional taxes upon the users of our highways, even though they are now paying more than $1.5 billion a year in excess of the amount actually used for highways. I am advised that, for the current fiscal year, the sum diverted to uses other than construction of highways, will be approximately $1,600 million.

Some appear to have forgotten that highway users taxes were substantially increased by the act of 1956. For the information of the Senate, I list here the taxes that were increased and the amount of the increase in each case:

Gasoline from 2 to 3 cents per gallon.

Diesel fuel from 2 to 3 cents per gallon.

Automoile tires from 5 to 8 cents per pound.

Tread rubber 3 cents per pound—a new tax.

Trucks, buses, and trailers from 8 to 10 percent for 1957 and from 5 to 10 percent from 1958 to 1972.

Truck use tax $1.50 per thousand pounds—a new tax.

Also in 1956, although not in the same act, Congress extended an additional 3 percent excise tax on automobiles which otherwise would have expired. This tax has been extended annually since then. This 3 percent extension, which is also an increase in highway user taxes, has brought in an additional $1,006 billion in the last 3 fiscal years.

All told, Mr. President, highway user tax increases since 1956 have brought into the Treasury $3.177 billion. Total expenditures from the highway trust fund for the interstate program through fiscal 1959 amount to $2.358 billion. Thus the revenues from tax increases alone amount to more than total interstate highway expenditures since the act of 1956 was enacted.

It seems to me that we should keep these figures in mind when considering the possibility of imposing yet an additional increase in the gasoline tax. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, a table showing revenues received from highway user tax increases in the last 3 fiscal years.

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

Highway user excise taxes, disposition—Actual collections, 1958

[Millions of dollars]

	Gasoline	Diesel	Lubricating oil	Auto	Truck and bus	Parts and accessories	Tires	Tread rubber, tubes, truck use	Total
Trust fund	1,558	50	----------	----------	111	----------	244	63	2,026
General fund	----------	----------	35	1,170	95	167	----------	----------	1,467

Mr. GORE. Highway users accepted these new levies without undue protest. They did, however, seek some assurance that the question of equitable distribution of the burden of the cost of highways be subjected to study. Accordingly, section 209(b)(2) of the 1956 act declares it to be the policy of the Congress that "if it hereafter appears that the distribution of the tax burden among the various classes of persons using the Federal-aid highways, or otherwise deriving benefits from such highways, is not equitable," the Congress shall enact legislation in order to bring about such equitable distribution.

The distinguished Presiding Officer of the Senate at the moment was a member of the Public Works Committee when that provision of the law was enacted, thus giving to highway users assurance that if, after careful study, it was determined that they were paying more than an equitable and fair share of the burden of highway costs, the Congress would rectify the mistake.

Section 210 of the same act directed the Secretary of Commerce to make a study and to provide the Congress with information to enable it to determine what taxes should be levied and in what amounts "in order to assure, insofar as practicable, an equitable distribution of the tax burden among the various classes of persons using the Federal-aid highways or otherwise deriving benefits from such highways."

The Secretary of Commerce was directed to submit his final report no later than March 1, 1959. Subsequently, at the administration's request, the date of submission of the report was extended to March 1, 1961.

The new taxes levied by the act of 1956 have brought into the treasury substantial revenues. During fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959, receipts from these increases alone have, as I have said, totaled $3.177 billion, more, I repeat, than has been used for interstate highway improvements since 1956.

Mr. President, we assured the highway users that the question of equitable distribution of the burden of the cost of highway construction would be restudied. The administration requested that submission of the study called for by the law be delayed from 1959 until 1961. If I had known at the time the request was submitted that there was a plan to ask that taxes be further increased on every gallon of gasoline, I would have opposed the extension. I think we should have such a study before we levy more Federal sales taxes on every gallon of gasoline every person puts in his car or his truck.

Yet without even establishing that the additional levies imposed in 1956 are equitable and fair, it is now proposed to increase the gasoline tax once again, while we wait another 2 years for the study to be completed.

Mr. President, a further increase in the gas tax at this time, at the very least, is not in accord with assurances given by the Congress to the highway users in 1956. The facts speak for themselves. A gasoline tax increase is grossly inequitable and completely unfair.

I should like to read at this time two paragraphs from an article appearing in the New York Times of yesterday:

Today the tax on gasoline is at a higher rate than that on any other essential product; even that on many luxury items. If the Federal tax of an additional cent a gallon goes into effect on September 1, as provided in a bill approved recently by the

House Ways and Means Committee, the gasoline levy will exceed 10 cents a gallon and will just about equal the refinery price of the product.

On what other commodity essential to our economic life do we have a 50-percent tax? At retail levels, every time a man drives up to a filling station in my State and has his tank filled or partially filled, one-third of what he pays is taxes. I repeat that a further increase in this tax is unjustifiable. I continue to read from the article:

Some economists are wondering how much tax an essential product can stand before there is an adverse effect on the Nation's economy. With business expanding and wage rates moving upward, it is held that the general economy can sustain the present or a higher level without much difficulty. But if a recession should develop, it is feared the high gasoline tax would aggravate it.

The Ways and Means Committee of the other body, after long study and labor, has apparently approved an increase of 1 cent per gallon in the gasoline tax for fiscal 1960 and 1961. For the reasons I have already given, such an increase is without justification. Moreover, the plan proposed by the Ways and Means Committee is inadequate to meet existing needs. It falls short in the following respects:

First. For the remainder of fiscal year 1960 a 1-cent increase in the gas tax would bring in approximately $380 million. This would fall short by more than $100 million of providing enough funds to reimburse the States the amounts which will be owed. Figures released by the Ways and Means Committee indicate that as of January 1, 1960, under its proposal, the trust fund will still have a deficit of $309 million, and will still be in arrears by $107 million at the end of the fiscal year. On January 1, 1961, the deficit will be $351 million, and the deficit will not be eliminated until July 1, 1961. I cannot believe, Mr. President, that our preoccupation with a balanced budget will let us go so far as to undertake to balance it by simply not paying to the several States the amounts owed to them by the Federal Government. I cannot believe that the Federal Government will default on its commitments to the States. Yet this is what will happen unless additional funds are made available to the trust fund and appropriated for expenditure by the Bureau of Public Roads.

Second. The Ways and Means Committee proposal would permit the apportionment of $1.8 billion this year for fiscal 1961 and only $2 billion next year for fiscal 1962. The 1956 act prescribes an annual level of apportionment of $2.2 billion. These apportionments were based upon the cost estimates submitted in the Clay report. Under more realistic estimates later submitted by the Secretary of Commerce, an annual level of apportionment of $2.5 billion will be required to complete the system by 1975. Even at this rate, there will be a 3-year stretchout of the program. With annual apportionments no higher than those which would be permitted by the Ways and Means Committee proposal, this brand new System of National Defense and Interstate Highways would not be completed until long after 1975. The highways would be obsolete before they were even built.

This proposal destroys the integrity of the interstate highway and defense system as a unified, integrated system of national highways, interconnecting all the principal metropolitan centers, to be completed on schedule and adequate to the needs of 1975.

In any event, a further appropriation act will be required this year if the States are to receive full payment, because the maximum amount appropriated in the bill already passed is insufficient to meet the estimated requirement for funds. Unless such an appropriation bill is passed, we shall have broken faith with the States.

Mr. President, the Congress must come to grips with this problem. In 1955 the President recommended that the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways be built within 10 years. At best this will now be almost doubled. We cannot allow a further stretchout. We cannot accept the proposal of the Committee on Ways and Means of the other body.

I am willing to meet head-on the question of raising additional revenue if the facts require it. This is admittedly difficult to accomplish in the Senate which cannot initiate revenue raising proposals except by way of amendment. There are many areas in our tax structure, however, from which additional revenue might be obtained far more equitably than by extracting yet another pound of flesh from highway users who are already paying sums substantially in excess of the cost of highways.

Earlier this year the Senate adopted an amendment to a tax bill which would have repealed the tax favoritism granted to dividend income by the Revenue Act of 1954. Had we been able to retain this amendment in conference, it would have increased revenue by $335 million in fiscal 1960—almost as much as would be obtained from a 1-cent increase in the gasoline tax. The administration, despite its pleas for additional revenue, was opposed to this amendment, and so were the conferees from the other body.

Mr. President, we have an obligation to implement the interstate highway program which both the President and the Congress have called essential to the national welfare. Pending submission of the study now being undertaken by the administration, and as long as highway user taxes are diverted to other purposes, a further increase in the gasoline tax is unjustified. We can and we should make available an additional portion of these revenues so that the program can go forward.

Why should discrimination be practiced on highway improvement? Why should all other programs, all other expenditures throughout our country and around the world, continue—be the budget balanced or unbalanced—yet stop dead-still our vital interstate and defense highway improvements unless an addtional Federal sales tax is levied on each gallon of gasoline? I reject this injustice, this total lack of reason.

Funds can be provided for continuation of the highway program in any one of three ways, or a combination of the three.

First. A direct appropriation from the general fund to the highway trust fund or dedication of a sufficient amount of revenue from existing highway user taxes to the trust fund, together with the repeal of the so-called Byrd amendment. To the extent that the amounts thus appropriated exceeded the amounts by which Congress has reduced the Presidential budget estimates, a budget deficit would result, assuming the accuracy of the budget estimates of revenue. The administration opposes this method.

Second. The levying of additional taxes with the revenue dedicated to the trust fund. The administration favors this course and has proposed that an additional Federal sales tax 1½ cents be levied on each gallon of gasoline. Congress has declined to approve this recommendation. I think it will continue to decline such approval. I am vigorously opposed to this proposal, as are many others, for reasons already stated.

Third. Congress can make a further reduction in other expenditures by enacting a rescission of appropriations heretofore made by an amount sufficient to permit highway improvement within the total budget estimates. I propose this course as a solution. I introduce a bill to rescind 1 percent of all fiscal 1960 appropriation bills with discretion vested in the President to except fixed statutory requirements such as veteran pensions and other obligations made mandatory by statute, which are spelled out in the bill. My bill would dedicate to the highway trust fund such portion of the revenue from excise taxes on automobiles as may equal the total amount of such recision. It provides for a continuation of our highway improvement programs within the 1960 budget estimates.

This will afford the Senate a clear choice of reducing other expenditures or increasing gasoline taxes. When the highway bill reaches the Committee on Finance I shall offer this bill as an amendment thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be recived and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2588) to amend the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 so as to transfer to the highway trust fund a portion of the receipts from the excise tax on passenger automobiles collected during the 1960 fiscal year; to rescind 1 percent of certain appropriations made for the 1960 fiscal year; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

THE FOOD FOR PEACE ACT WOULD MAKE THE FARMER A KEY FIGURE IN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, we are now in the seventh year of an administration which came to power in a full tide of confident talk about solving the farmers' problems. Ready assurances were freely given. The ills of farming,

we were told, were the Government's fault; streamline the Department of Agriculture, get the Government out of farming, give the farmers freedom to plant as they please, and all would be well; above all, eliminate high and rigid price supports.

Flexibility was the key word in the new magic formula. By means of flexible price supports, we were assured, supply would be brought into balance with demand, surpluses would disappear, the cost of the farm program to the taxpayer would be slashed, and a fair price would be established for the farmer, not by Government subsidy, but by the genuine needs of the marketplace.

THE FAILURE OF FLEXIBLE PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. President, let there be no mistake about it. This administration got its way. Congress acquiesced to Eisenhower's demands for flexibility. Rigid price supports, established at 90 percent of parity when the Democrats left office, were abandoned. Authority was granted the Secretary of Agriculture, within broad limits, to adjust price supports as he saw fit. He has used this authority to move price supports remorselessly downward. The magic formula has been put to the test, and too many years have passed, to blame its failure any longer upon the carryover effects of the last Democratic administration.

Never has a farm program been given such fanfare as this administration's program of flexible price supports. The businessmen were told that it would put an end—not to business subsidies—but to handouts for the farmer. Housewives were told that it would reduce food prices at the grocery store. Farmers were told they need not worry, for flexible price supports would get the Government out of farming, and would return them to the healthy competition of the open market.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

Mr. CHURCH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. To what program does the Senator from Idaho refer? Does he refer to the one which was passed by the Congress, but was vetoed; or does the Senator from Idaho refer to the one which was promised by Mr. Benson, last January, but which he has not yet delivered to Congress?

Mr. CHURCH. I am referring now to the original promotion of the flexible price support program of the Republican administration at the time when it was first urged upon the Congress early in this Republican administration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield further to me?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then the Senator from Idaho has not yet gotten to the point. Six and one-half years after this administration came into power, the agricultural surpluses had increased by 700 percent, and the cost of maintaining those surpluses had increased 7 times, 4 million small farm families had left the land, and 1,400,000 farm families—according to the Commodity Credit Corporation of this administration—are today earning less than $1,000 a year. I am sure the Senator from Idaho will agree that those facts are worth mentioning, in addition to the fact that this "businessman's administration" has increased the personnel of the Department of Agriculture by approximately 22,000 since January 20, 1953.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Montana very much for his observations. I am about to make some of the points he has made so cogently, and I appreciate the figures he has cited, because they fill out the case which I hope to establish in the course of my remarks this afternoon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope the Senator from Idaho will also recall the promise made by Secretary Benson in January of this year; namely, his promise that he would present Congress with an administration program, although to this day no such program has been forthcoming from the administration.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Montana very much. I would only add that I think the failure of the administration to present such a program merely is an indication of its refusal to concede defeat with respect to the much ballyhooed farm program which it has followed to date. The facts demonstrate that is program is a failure, as I hope to point out during the course of my remarks.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator from Idaho does not contend, does he, that at any time the Congress has responded to the program—whether right or wrong—recommended by Secretary Benson?

Mr. CHURCH. I do, indeed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What program?

Mr. CHURCH. I do, indeed, make the point, and I shall make it later in the course of my remarks. It demonstrates the extent to which the flexible-price-support concept was adopted by the Congress, as the result of administration pressures, and the degree to which that program has failed; and I think the statistics will bear out my point.

Mr. KEATING. I agree that part of the program has been enacted by the Congress. But not during my tenure in either the other body or in the Senate has the Congress ever enacted the program sent to it and recommended by Secretary Benson.

Mr. CHURCH. In response to that statement, let me say that we have given a sick patient the administration's dose of medicine by the teaspoonful, but the patient has gotten persistently sicker. I do not think the remedy now comes in the form of giving the patient dosages of the same medicine by the tablespoonful.

Mr. KEATING. That is a matter of opinion. If we had given the patient the proper dosage when we began, we might have avoided a lot of the trouble we have had.

Mr. CHURCH. It is my opinion that it was the wrong medicine to start with, and that the medicine has been making the patient weaker and weaker, and that further doses are very apt to kill the patient.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to repeat that the Congress in the past 6½ years, to my knowledge, has passed two good farm bills, and perhaps three. All of them were vetoed by the President on the advice of the Secretary of Agriculture. This January we asked the Secretary of Agriculture to come up with a program. He promised to do so. We are still waiting.

Mr. CHURCH. That, I think is a very accurate statement of the facts.

With respect to the administration's farm program, the forecasts were so favorable, Mr. President, that many still prefer the fiction to the fact. But the results of the flexible price support program are in. Let us face them:

Has farm production, which was supposed to have been inflated by high price supports, fallen off with their removal? It has not. Farm output in 1958 was 14 percent higher than in 1953, despite a dwindling farm population.

Have the lower prices resulted in larger markets, so that the increased production could be balanced against increased demand? They have not. Per capita food consumption rose only 2 percent from 1952 to 1957. The excess production has gone into storage, not into mouths, and the Government investment in farm surpluses tripled by 1958. We now have a staggering $7 billion worth of surplus food and fibers in storage.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is not the Senator being conservative in his estimate of $7 billion worth of food and fiber in storage?

Mr. CHURCH. I am trying purposely to give the administration the benefit of the doubt with respect to all of these figures, for I do not want to overstate the case. I think, however, there are other figures with respect to surpluses which are considerably above those I have given.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And that applies to the interest rates, of course. Is that correct?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes.

Has the Government gotten out of farming? Hardly, Mr. President. Total appropriations for the Department of Agriculture have risen from less than $3 billion in 1953 to more than $7 billion in 1959. The present administration has spent more money for the Department of Agriculture than the total of all previous administrations combined since the Department was first created.

Has the Department of Agriculture been streamlined? It now employs 97,000 people; in 1953 it employed 78,000.

Have farmers been freed from the burden of Government controls? If so, Mr. President, what do these extra 19,000 people do?

Finally, do farmers enjoy the promised full parity of income? Net farm operators' income has fallen, since 1952, by 21 percent. Farmers' income per person

is about half that of the nonfarm population. The parity ratio, which stood at 100 in 1952, now hovers at around 80.

Let us admit it, Mr. President. The administration's farm program—flexible price supports, expansion of markets, streamlined administration, freedom to plant, soil bank, and all—is a monumental failure.

THE NEED FOR A NEW APPROACH

Seven years would seem long enough to experiment with failure. But the administration stubbornly refuses to concede. Every attempt by Congress to change the program has been vetoed by the President. We desperately need a reappraisal of the whole farm problem, and a new approach to its solution, but there will be none forthcoming until another President occupies the White House. That is the plain truth.

What, then, can Congress do? Is there any way that we can move to help the farmer, and still avoid a veto? I submit there is one course open to us that holds promise. It is the Food for Peace Act, which was introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

I am one of the sponsors of this measure. I voted, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, to report it favorably to the Senate. When I campaigned for office, I urged the application to our farm problem, and to our foreign relations, of the principles embodied in this bill. I believe the farmers of Idaho to favor it, and that they have given me a mandate to speak and vote for it in this Chamber.

Beyond that, Mr. President, I believe this to be a measure which serves well the deepest aspirations of the American people—one on which men of good will, whether here in the Senate or in the White House, can agree.

In form, the measure is an extension and expansion of the Agricultural Trade and Development Act, better known as Public Law 480. In substance, it is much more than that. Its central objective is to move food out of storage and into stomachs. By this means, we can strike a telling blow against the hunger, poverty, despair, and disease on which communism breeds.

Mr. President, this bill will also reduce the appalling rental costs for storing and warehousing our mounting surpluses, now approaching a billion dollars a year. And, by seeking to put the food to better use, the very use for which God intended it—to feed the hungry of the world—rather than to permit it to rot away in sterile storage, this bill moves in the direction of returning our farmers to their natural place, in the forefront of those who labor in joy to serve human need.

The principal authority granted in the original Public Law 480 was for the President to sell our surplus agricultural commodities to friendly nations in exchange for their own currencies. He was directed to see that these sales did not interfere with normal marketing of our farm products through regular commercial channels. The dollar value of foods and fibers to be sold under Public Law 480 was limited to a rate of $1½ billion annually. All of this amount is presently being used, and Public Law 480 will expire, unless extended, at the end of this year.

THE FOOD FOR PEACE ACT

The International Food for Peace Act builds upon the foundations of Public Law 480. Indeed it takes the form of amendments to that law, so that, if enacted, the program will continue to bear the title of Public Law 480. The authority to sell our surplus foods for foreign currencies, under the bill, is extended for 3 years, and the dollar volume of authorized sales is increased by one-third, to a total of $2 billion a year.

As in Public Law 480, the proceeds we receive from the surplus food sales will be deposited in accounts subject to our control within the countries making the purchases. We can then use the money for a wide variety of purposes, all geared to advance our foreign policy objectives.

Up to one-fourth of the proceeds, under the terms of the bill, may be loaned, through the facilities of the Export-Import Bank, to American businesses, for expansion of their trade and business activities abroad. As these loans are repaid, the principal and interest will remain with the Bank, to create a revolving fund from which further loans may be made. Thus our surplus food will be used to generate capital which may be employed over and over again to promote American enterprise abroad, long after we no longer have surplus foods and fibers for export.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to my good friend from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The genesis of a somewhat similar idea for the making of multilateral soft currency loans may be traced to the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma, as the able Senator knows.

This is a fine illustration of the constructive course of action which a legislator can take. All too many people look upon a position of Representative or Senator as a position merely to pass upon the suggestions submitted by the executive branch of the Government. I disagree with that concept.

I think the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is a noble man in our ranks. He is constructive. He is understanding. He is courageous. And he is persuasive. I think this is the fine mark of his service.

Mr. CHURCH. I wish to say to the Senator from Tennessee that it is typical of him to take an occasion of this kind to pay a much deserved tribute to a colleague.

I also add that the Senator from Tennessee has demonstrated once again on the floor of the Senate this afternoon his belief that legislation ought to originate in the Halls of Congress and that we are not bound to accept the recommendations which come to us from the executive branch of the Government. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] speaks with great authority on matters of highway construction. He was one of the original leaders in the great legislative effort to establish the Interstate Highway System, and this afternoon he has exhibited once again his capacity for imaginative thought. In doing so he acts in the best tradition of a U.S. Senator.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the Food for Peace bill also makes these proceeds, realized from the sale of surplus foods abroad, available to meet our Government's own obligations. We can use the foreign money in each respective country—in place of American tax dollars—to pay for the buildings, equipment, facilities, goods, and services required for our diplomatic and military personnel, and to finance the exchange of students, and the translation of such scientific publications as our needs may require.

Other portions of the proceeds may be used to develop new markets for our farm products, and to defray the cost of American participation in trade, agricultural, and horticultural fairs. As under Public Law 480, the proceeds may also be used to help support the military forces of countries threatened by Communist aggression.

Finally, Mr. President, a part of these proceeds may be loaned back to the purchasing country for programs of which we approve, to promote trade, to improve living standards, and to facilitate long-term economic development. To achieve these very objectives in underdeveloped countries, we are now appropriating hundreds of millions of our own tax dollars each year. American taxpayers have already bought our surplus food once. What better use for the food, then, than to replace dollars in carrying on our foreign aid program abroad?

Public Law 480 also permits foreign currency loans back to the country purchasing surplus food, to promote trade and economic development. Normally, these loans have been made through the established banking facilities of the friendly nation from which the currency was obtained. As these loans are repaid, with interest, new funds become available for which no uses are authorized under the existing law.

The Food for Peace Act specifies that these repaid funds may be used for the endowment of nonprofit foundations to foster and promote research, education, health, and public welfare. These foundations will be directed by a board of trustees made up, in equal numbers, of citizens of the United States and of the country in which the foundation is located. They will function very much like the charitable foundations—such as those established by Ford and Rockefeller—with which we are familiar in this country. As the years go by, substantial sums of money, to be used for scholarships, research, and charitable activities, will accrue to their trust accounts. Through the good work of these foundations, the free concepts and humanitarian ideals of the United States will live on in many foreign lands for generations to come.

SURPLUS FOOD DONATIONS

Mr. President, the Food for Peace Act is not limited to the sale of our surpluses alone. Like Public Law 480, this bill provides that surplus food may be donated for the relief of hunger at home and abroad. Surplus food will continue to be available for our own school lunch programs, for use in American hospitals and other charitable institutions, and for distribution to our own needy through agencies of the States. Surplus food for foreign relief, through organizations like CARE, will also be continued.

In addition to these uses for which surplus food could be donated under Public Law 480, the Food for Peace Act would establish a major new purpose, donations to national food reserves in certain friendly countries. Famine relief is already authorized under the Public Law 480 program, but experience has shown that it often arrives too late to do much good. Moreover, conditions short of famine often result in great hardship to the common people living in primitive economies, when local food distribution breaks down as the result of hoarding, panic, or natural disaster. It has been found, also, that construction work stimulated by development programs often results in the bidding up of food prices to the point where severe damage is done to local segments of the economy. The mere existence of national food reserves, strategically located with these hazards in mind, will do much to remove them.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Mr. President, these are the broad outlines of the International Food for Peace Act. Its net effect is that we will export, in place of dollars contributed by American taxpayers, surplus food produced by American farmers. With this food, we will first relieve hunger, and then set in motion programs that will help remove the conditions which produced it: poverty, illiteracy, disease, and ignorance. As a part of this process, our vast hoards of food and fiber, which are taxing our substance in storage charges and demoralizing our farm economy, will be put to work in the service of human need.

I do not mean to suggest that this bill is a panacea for all the ills of our farm program. Far from it. But it has immense significance because of the emphasis it puts on a new approach to their solution.

Heretofore, we have relied on farm programs which sought to avoid surpluses through the curtailment of production. The present Republican administration has tried to reduce production with the soil bank and lower price supports. But production has gone up. The surpluses are bigger than ever. The program has failed.

Earlier Democratic administrations sought to prevent surpluses by imposing acreage limitations on the planting of certain basic crops, coupled with high price supports to preserve farm income and purchasing power. Again, however, it must be observed that surpluses were not avoided.

Mr. President, no other society in all the world has yet been blessed, for any sustained period of time, with a surplus of food. Hunger, scarcity, and famine have been the lot of the billions of human beings who have preceded us on this earth, and they remain the lot of most of those who live outside the island of abundance which is the United States.

What we do with this abundance may well shape the course of history, and determine the kind of world in which our children will live. It is not simply an economic problem; it is a part of the transcendent moral challenge of our time.

I think farmers understand, perhaps better than anyone else, that not one scrap of food or clothing is truly surplus so long as there are in this small world millions of our kind who are hungry or unclothed. Most farmers have understood, I believe, the economic realities which have dictated efforts to prevent the glutting of markets by controlling surplus production. But even when these programs have been intelligently administered, and have proved effective in sustaining farm income, I think they have deeply disturbed the farmer.

I am not a farmer, Mr. President, but I come from a farm State, and I have known and talked with farmers all my life. They are proud of their capacity to produce. When a farmer works hard, and the land is good, he is baffled and angry if there is no market for the product of his labor. No good farmer wants to be driven to a city job in order to buy shoes, medicine, and education for his children. But by the same token, farmers do not enjoy accepting money, in whatever form it takes, for not farming.

It goes against the grain, Mr. President, because there is a nagging reproach in the sight of sun and rain falling unheeded on fields left barren of seed. Farmers know that human beings are hungry, and I think they would not be farmers if they did not sense that there is an intimate connection between the fertile acres entrusted, for a time, to their care, and hungry people, whether they are in India, in Africa, or in the house next door.

There are dozens of communities, in my State, where not one person, through all the years of the depression, ever went on relief. Food was shared. An empty home, or an abandoned factory, is a rebuke to man's folly in wasting that which he has himself created. To waste food, in the face of hunger, rebukes the earth, the water, and the sun. No man who tills the soil can see this done without a deep unease.

Mr. President, this bill seeks not to plow food under or to hoard it away; it seeks not to forestall abundance. Rather its objective is the very opposite. This bill would utilize abundance. It would put our surplus food to wholesome use, and make our farmers key figures in the great American effort to build a world of freedom and peace.

I hope we will approve it.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I commend the Senator on his magnificent speech, and assure him that so far as the Foreign Relations Committee was concerned, as I recall the proposal, the measure had the unanimous approval of that group. I hope that in pushing the food-for-peace proposal, in which the Senator from Idaho, the Senator from Minnesota, and others have been so vitally interested, ways and means can be found to substitute for our foreign aid dollars more in the way of food to peoples in need.

It is my understanding that the peoples of Southeast Asia live on an average of 28 to 30 years, that many of them get by on 1 mill a day. I think what is proposed is one way in which they could be furnished hope, in which they could be given the consideration to which they are entitled, and I hope at the same time that we can use some of our surpluses, which we ought to be thankful for, instead of bemoaning, to take care of our own people, the needy and the aged. There are many in this country who are in need.

There are many ways through which the surpluses given to us by Providence can be used, not only to further our own national interest, but, in my opinion, to further the foreign policy objectives of the United States as well.

Again I commend the Senator, and express the hope that the proposal which he has so eloquently expounded this afternoon will be brought to a vote, will be passed by both Houses, and will be signed by the President of the United States.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KEATING. 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 quorum call be rescinded.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H.R. 303. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property in the District of Columbia to the Association of the Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia; and

H.R. 2318. An act to provide for the regulation of closing-out and fire sales in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2317) to amend section 7 of "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended, so as to provide for the bonding of persons

licensed to engage in a business, trade, profession, or calling involving the collection of money for others.

STUDY BY TAX FOUNDATION, INC.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Tax Foundation, Inc., a private, nonprofit organization engaged in research on expenditures and taxation of Federal, State, and local government, is doing an outstanding job in graphically presenting to the public the story of what happens to their dollars. In their July-August monthly publication, they have created Charlie Green, typical $7,500-a-year American. Charlie is described as follows by Tax Foundation:

Charlie is married, father of two children, owner of a home in a metropolitan suburb. He is not the "average worker" but one of the 27 million unorganized white-collar workers who have been referred to as "the forgotten men" of our time. This group generally suffers more than the average employee from inflation and high taxes. Recent estimates show white-collar workers now outnumber "blue-collar" people for the first time in the Nation's history.

Charlie's annual income of $7,500 is about $600 more than the average U.S. family's and considerably above the $4,900 he had 10 years ago. Total direct taxes and some indirect excises, not counting hidden taxes, take 24 percent of his income now, compared with 14 percent of his smaller income a decade ago.

Inflation also has big holes in his pay increases. Since 1949, the Consumer Price Index has risen 22 percent. For Charlie, $1,014 of his $2,600 increase in income has been wiped out by higher prices.

Since another $1,091 of his increased income has been eliminated by higher taxes he now must pay, his net increase in income after inflation and taxes is not anywhere near $2,600; it is just $495.

In the list of Tax Foundation features a number of interesting facts are brought out:

First. For the first time in U.S. history, cost of government is his largest expense—more than food, clothing, or shelter. In 1949 the Green family spent $1,271 for food while paying $679 as its share of the cost of government. In 1959 Tax Foundation, Inc., estimates the Greens will spend $1,622 for food and for government $1,770.

Second. Charlie's Federal tax burden in 1949 was $447 and in 1959 is $1,081. These dollars were spent as follows:

	1949	1959
Charlie Green's income	$4,900	$7,500
His Federal tax burden	447	1,081
National defense	147	671
Foreign affairs, finance	69	50
Veterans' services, benefits	77	69
Labor and welfare	18	58
Agriculture and agricultural resources	28	90
Natural resources	12	23
Commerce and housing	22	47
General government	12	22
Interest	62	102
Contingencies allowance		3
Total	447	1,081

Third. In addition to direct taxation, the Greens pay a considerable sum annually in hidden taxes. Without trying to find dollar amounts, Tax Foundation spent some time adding up the number of taxes on various items and found there are at least 100 taxes on an egg, 116 taxes on a man's suit, 150 taxes on a woman's hat, 151 taxes on a loaf of bread, and 600 taxes on a house.

Tax Foundation is to be commended for the fine service they are rendering the public in informing them of the dangerous trend in this Nation of more and more Government spending. Our Nation was founded with the idea of having as little Government control as possible. What would our Founding Fathers think—men like George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton—if they were to return and find middle-class families spending more money to keep up the Government than they are to feed their families.

THE TRINITY RIVER PROJECT, CALIFORNIA—KNOCKOUT BLOW TO PARTNERSHIP

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, over a fairly long period of time the government of California, under three Governors, recommended to the Congress that it authorize the Trinity River project as a vast Federal water and power project and as an adjunct of the Central Valley project, our vast federally built multipurpose reclamation undertaking located in the Central Valley of California.

In 1955 my colleague, former Senator William F. Knowland, and I sponsored legislation in the Senate to authorize Trinity as a Federal multipurpose undertaking. Similar legislation was introduced in the House of Representatives by then Representative, now U.S. Senator, CLAIR ENGLE, of California. His bill passed the House and came to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It contained an amendment which did not change the bill in any respect, but which provided for a study by the Secretary of the Interior as to the possibility of recommending subsequently to Congress that a private utility be authorized to enter into a contract with the Government to generate power at the Trinity project.

It was made clear in the legislative history in the Senate that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, in recommending the House-approved bill to the Senate, did not desire any change in the multipurpose character of the Trinity River legislation, which the bill itself envisaged. That was the legislative history on which the Senate passed the Trinity River project legislation, and on which the President signed it into law. When I returned home to California, I was very glad to speak out and point with pride to the Trinity project as an example of the benefits to our California people which flow from Federal reclamation projects in our State. I pointed with pride to Trinity which President Eisenhower had approved. I was proud to have played a part in its enactment which, as I say, our State government had requested.

Subsequent to that time a regrettably and unhappily long argument occurred as to whether the Trinity law should be amended to authorize a so-called partnership contract and to repeal the preference clause which was written in to the Trinity law. Just a few days ago, the House Interior Committee rejected a bill which would have practically repealed that Trinity law and would have authorized a so-called partnership arrangement between the Secretary of the Interior and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

At about the same time, the Senate approved an amendment which I had successfully offered in the Senate Committee on Appropriations, providing for, roughly, $2,500,000, by which the Secretary of Interior would take the first steps toward planning and purchasing the necessary generating equipment at Trinity, in order that the multipurpose character of the dam, which the present law requires, might be carried into effect. Thus, I think, this controversy came to its end.

On August 16, the San Francisco Chronicle, one of the great newspapers of California, published an editorial entitled "Knockout Blow to Partnership."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the editorial be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

KNOCKOUT BLOW TO PARTNERSHIP

Four years ago President Eisenhower signed a $225 million bill for Trinity River development. No waters, but many millions of words, have since spilled over the dam that this legislation provided for. The contest between the President, his Secretary of Interior, and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. on the one hand and, on the other, the opponents of Mr. Eisenhower's private "partnership" idea has been fought with many a ringing metaphor and clashing cliche. Last week it came to an end.

We doubt whether many people were surprised by the outcome: the House Reclamation Subcommittee voted to bury permanently a bill that would have authorized the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to build a $60 million powerplant and sell the developed power through its system. In a Democratic Congress the surrender of the principle of public power development was hardly to be expected. It was particularly unlikely in view of the opposition to partnership of both of California's Senators. Democrat CLAIR ENGLE, who as a Congressman had been one of Trinity project's chief sponsors, has consistently been one of the most unflinching fighters for Federal development. Republican THOMAS H. KUCHEL, rather to the astonishment of many Californians, came out a year and a half ago with the announcement that he firmly opposed the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. plan as unsound and likely to virtually nullify the ability of the Central Valley project to supply power to its preference customers such as municipally owned utilities.

There was much to be said for the Pacific Gas & Electric case in terms of the immediate savings of capital outlays and the millions in tax revenues that would be gained by its development of Trinity power. But the idea of letting a private utility move in on a facility that had been publicly paid for and make a profit out of a benefit supplied by the taxpayers never got very far with Congress.

This issue has not been taken to, and therefore it has not been settled by, the people. Partnership may be more popular than the 13–9 vote of the Reclamation Subcommittee makes it appear to be; the truth is no one really knows what is the majority view on this issue, heavily obscured as it is by clouds of conflicting claims and cost figures.

What is perfectly clear, now that partnership on the Trinity has been laid to rest, is the necessity for authorizing and providing funds for the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation to construct the power generators. Northern Californians expect Congress, which has so long delayed decision on the disputed partnership issues, to take care of this before adjournment.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 24, 1959, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 900) to amend section 204(b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend the authority of the Administrator of General Services to pay direct expenses in connection with the utilization of excess real property and related personalty, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr President, I move that the Senate adjourn until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 25, 1959, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 24, 1959:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade indicated, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1211:

To be major general

John Taylor Lewis, O7000.

The following-named officer for advancement on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

John Taylor Lewis, O7000.

The officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3384:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. William Edwards Blake, O295362, Army National Guard of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Gilbert William Embury, O233743, U.S. Army Reserve.

Brig. Gen. John Simon Gleason, Jr., O398999, U.S. Army Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Edward Foster Griffin, O198652, Army National Guard of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Fernando C. Mencaccy, O278275, U.S. Army Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Clarence Harris Peace, A355161, Army National Guard of the United States.

Brig. Gen. George Weaks Trousdale, O189048, Army National Guard of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Loren Gregory Windom, O275591, Army National Guard of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Col. John Alvin Dunlap, O325757, Artillery, Army National Guard of the United States.

Col. Herbert Barnard Eagon, O266877, Infantry, Army National Guard of the United States.

Col. William Esbitt, O291450, Infantry, U.S. Army Reserve.

Col. Oliver Henry Gibson, O262499, Adjutant, General's Corps, Army National Guard of the United States.

Col. Robert Louis Hughes, O387135, Infantry, U.S. Army Reserve.

Col. James Hugh Kidder, O248043, Medical Corps, U.S. Army Reserve.

Col. Noble Owen Moore, O397127, Artillery, Army National Guard of the United States.

Col. Richard John Quigley, O400101, Infantry, Army National Guard of the United States.

Col. Frederick August Schaefer III, O434728, Infantry, Army National Guard of the United States.

To be brigadier general

Col. Charles Goldsmith Stevenson, O233309, Adjutant General's Corps, Army National Guard of the United States.

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 593(a):

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. George Hilton Butler, O186922, Army National Guard of the United States.

Col. Henry Vance Graham, O398163, Adjutant General's Corps, Army National Guard of the United States.

Col. Edwin Weston Heywood, O384274, Adjutant General's Corps, Army National Guard of the United States.

Col. Daniel Sylvester Tuttle Hinman, O313290, Adjutant General's Corps, Army National Guard of the United States.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be major, USAF (Medical)

LeRoy C. Pierce, AO976006.

To be captains, USAF (Dental)

Frederick D. Birmingham, AO3045855.
Robert E. Bulman, AO3042923.
Wilbur J. Dickman, AO2255768.
Ralph H. Frady, Jr., AO3042189.
Paul J. Johnson, AO2261597.
Dan E. Pickle, AO3000644.
Dale F. P. Rank.
Robert A. Tanquist, AO2260285.
Robert M. Wood, O1110352.

To be captains, USAF (Nurse)

Carol L. Anderson, AN785521.
Georgia M. Thomas, AN2244538.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Dental)

Carl N. Fillinger.
Phillip Kamish, AO3075173.
James W. Wooten, AO3077778.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (medical)

Mervyn L. Elgart, AO3079037.
Richard E. Padrnos.
Roderick H. Turner, AO3088649.
Carl Wolnisty, AO3075145.

To be first lieutenant, USAF (nurse)

Elizabeth T. Fellin, AN2243078.

To be first lieutenant, USAF (medical specialist)

Patricia J. Rooney, AJ101203.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, under section 8284, of title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Distinguished aviation cadet graduates

Byron W. Evans, AO3102191.
Albert W. Kandetzki, Jr., AO3082468.
Ernest T. Laudise, AO3082423.
David C. Lindberg, AO3102204.
John H. Livesay, AO3102115.
Cloyce G. Mindel, AO3082447.
Jon C. Vance, AO3102202.
Ray M. Wallace, AO3082308.
Paul D. Winkler, AO3102089.

Distinguished officer candidate graduates

Nicholas M. Brandjes, AO3101424.
Alexander C. Dwelis, AO3101617.
Arthur C. Evans, AO3101624.
Harry O. Evers, Jr., AO3101625.
Wayne D. Hauth, AO3101650.
Charles L. Hite, AO3101309.
Timothy L. Hogen, AO3101520.
Dale D. Lierman, AO3101711.
Henry R. McMillan, AO3101810.
Peter C. Pintler, AO3101739.
Charles A. Rader, AO3101541.
Gerald J. Varner, AO3101772.
Stephen L. Werner, AO3101530.

Subject to medical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduate, the following distinguished military student of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade of second lieutenant under section 8284, of title 10, United States Code, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

William F. Ring

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, AUGUST 24, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Isaiah 45: 5: *I girded thee, though thou hast not known Me.*

O Thou God of all our days, may the renewal of soul and the rest of body and mind that we received on the Lord's Day inspire us with strength for the duties and responsibilities of this new week.

May Thy spirit come nearer than we have ever known before, dispelling the doubts that assail us and the feelings that Thou dost neither know nor care about, the troubles and trials which we are facing.

We beseech Thee to silence our anxious thoughts and gird us with confidence and courage when we are in danger of becoming weary and sick at heart because of the strife and sadness in the world around us.

Hear us in the name of the Captain of our Salvation. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, August 20, 1959, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4329. An act to provide for the conveyance to any public or private organization of the State of Virginia of certain dwellings acquired in connection with the Chantilly airport site, Virginia, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 115. Joint resolution to reserve a site in the District of Columbia for the erection of a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to provide for a competition for the design of such memorial, and to provide additional funds for holding the competition.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 968. An act to provide for the construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Bully Creek Dam and other facilities, Vale Federal reclamation project, Oregon; and

H.R. 8374. An act to amend Public Law 85–880, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8575. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. STENNIS, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 662. An act to amend section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to provide for administration of farm programs by democratically elected farmer committeemen;

S. 861. An act to provide for the control of noxious plants on land under the control or jurisdiction of the Federal Government;

S. 1136. An act to provide for the transfer of title to irrigation distribution systems constructed under the Federal reclamation laws upon completion of repayment of the costs thereof;

S. 1216. An act to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior adjusting, deferring, and canceling certain irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes;

S. 1221. An act to mend the act authorizing the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon, in order to increase the capacity of certain project features for future irrigation of additional lands;

S. 1282. An act relating to acreage allotments for durum wheat;

S. 1514. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 618);

S. 1735. An act to repeal the honorarium provision in subsection (b) of section 4 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended;

S. 1737. An act to authorize the imposition of forfeitures for certain violations of the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission in the common carrier and safety and special fields;

S. 2291. An act to authorize the erection of a plaque in honor of the late Honorable Sam D. McReynolds on or near the site of the Chickamauga Dam;

S. 2524. An act relating to the power of the States to impose net income taxes on income derived from interstate commerce and establishing a Commission on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce and Interstate and Intergovernmental Taxation Problems;

S.J. Res. 128. Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for a memorial to James Madison;

S. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of hearings on "Fallout from Nuclear Weapons Testing"; and

S. Con. Res. 72. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of hearings on "Biological and Environmental Effects of Nuclear War."

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. 900. An act to amend section 204(b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend the authority of the Administrator of General Services to pay direct expenses in connection with the utilization of excess real property and related personalty, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 60–3.

THE HONORABLE DANIEL K. INOUYE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 24, 1959.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the Governor of the new State of Hawaii I have received a certificate of election, in due form of law, of the Honorable DANIEL K. INOUYE as the Representative-elect to the 86th Congress from that State.

Very truly yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Member-elect will present himself at the bar of the House to be sworn in.

Mr. INOUYE appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

TODAY MARKS THE FIRST TIME IN 160 YEARS THAT THERE HAS BEEN NO TERRITORIAL REPRESENTATIVE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, today marks the first time in 160 years that there has been no Territorial representation in this House.

The first Delegate, James White, served from November 18, 1794, to June 1, 1796, as the Delegate from the Territory south of the river Ohio. This Territory was admitted to the Union on June 1, 1796, and Andrew Jackson became its first Representative.

There were no Delegates to either the First, Second, or Fifth Congresses. But since William Henry Harrison, the famed general of "Tippecanoe," who later became our ninth President, took his seat as a Delegate from the Territory northwest of the river Ohio in the Sixth Congress on March 4, 1799, there has been Territorial representation in this body up until today.

A total of 169 Delegates have sat in the House; they have represented 31 Territories.

During the 38th, the 42d, and the 43d Congresses, as many as 10 Territories were represented. In the 38th Congress, the number of Territories represented by nonvoting Delegates was over one-fourth that of the total number of States—36 at that time. This large proportion decreased as States were admitted and only two Territories were represented by Delegates in this body from 1913 to the beginning of this year when Mr. RIVERS of Alaska became the first Representative from that newly admitted State.

And now, today, with the swearing in of our new colleague, DANIEL K. INOUYE, as the first Representative from the new State of Hawaii—the 50th—Territorial representation in this body comes to a close after 160 years.

Mr. Speaker, this is an occasion worthy of some historical note. Therefore, under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks a table showing the Territories which have been represented and the Delegates who have served in this body since the Third Congress.

Delegates to the U.S. Congress

Congress	Date	
1st	Mar. 4, 1789–Mar. 3, 1791	None.
2d	Mar. 4, 1791–Mar. 3, 1793	None.
3d	Mar. 4, 1793–Mar. 3, 1795	Territory south of the River Ohio (formed from territory ceded to the United States by State of North Carolina), James White (seated Nov. 18, 1794).
4th	Mar. 4, 1795–Mar. 3, 1797	Territory south of the River Ohio, James White (served until June 1, 1796, when Territory granted statehood as Tennessee).
5th	Mar. 4, 1797–Mar. 3, 1799	None.
6th	Mar. 4, 1799–Mar. 3, 1801	Territory northwest of the River Ohio (formed from territory ceded to the United States by the State of Virginia), William H. Harrison (resigned, March 1800), William McMillan (seated Nov. 24, 1800).
7th	Mar. 4, 1801–Mar. 3, 1803	Mississippi Territory (formed by act of Apr. 7, 1798, from lands ceded to United States by States of Georgia and South Carolina), Narsworthy Hunter (died, Mar. 11, 1802), Thomas M. Greene (seated Dec. 6, 1802); Territory northwest of the River Ohio, Paul Fearing.
8th	Mar. 4, 1803–Mar. 3, 1805	Mississippi Territory, William Lattimore.
9th	Mar. 4, 1805–Mar. 3, 1807	Indiana Territory (formed by act of May 7, 1800, from lands originally ceded to the United States by the State of Virginia and later part of the Northwest Territory), Benjamin Parke; Mississippi Territory, William Lattimore; Territory of Orleans (formed from a portion of the lands ceded to the United States by France by the Treaty of Paris of Apr. 30, 1803), Daniel Clark (seated Dec. 1, 1806).
10th	Mar. 4, 1807–Mar. 3, 1809	Indiana Territory, Benjamin Parke (resigned), Jesse B. Thomas; Mississippi Territory, George Poindexter; Territory of Orleans, Daniel Clark.
11th	Mar. 4, 1809–Mar. 3, 1811	Indiana Territory, Jonathan Jennings; Mississippi Territory, George Poindexter; Territory of Orleans, Julien de L. Poydras.
12th	Mar. 4, 1811–Mar. 3, 1813	Illinois Territory (formed by act of Feb. 3, 1809, from a portion of the Indiana Territory and from parts of Northwest Territory), Shadrack Bond; Indiana Territory, Jonathan Jennings; Mississippi Territory, George Poindexter; Territory of Missouri (formed by act of June 4, 1812, from lands deeded to United States as part of Louisiana Purchase); Edward Hempstead; Territory of Orleans (granted statehood as Louisiana, Apr. 30, 1812), vacant.
13th	Mar. 4, 1813–Mar. 3, 1815	Illinois Territory, Shadrack Bond (resigned after 1st term), Benjamin Stephenson; Indiana Territory, Jonathan Jennings; Mississippi Territory, William Lattimore; Territory of Missouri, Edward Hempstead (served through 1st and part of 2d sess.), Rufus Easton (seated Nov. 16, 1814).
14th	Mar. 4, 1815–Mar. 3, 1817	Illinois Territory, Benjamin Stephenson (1st sess.), Nathaniel Pope (seated Dec. 2, 1816); Indiana Territory, Jonathan Jennings (served until Dec. 11, 1816, when Indiana Territory granted statehood); Mississippi Territory, William Lattimore; Territory of Missouri, Rufus Easton (1st sess.), John Scott (seated Dec. 2, 1816; seat declared vacant Jan. 13, 1817).
15th	Mar. 4, 1817–Mar. 3, 1819	Alabama Territory (formed from portion of Mississippi Territory, 1817), John Crowell; Illinois Territory, Nathaniel Pope (served until Dec. 3, 1818, when Territory granted statehood); Mississippi Territory (granted statehood, Dec. 10, 1817), vacant; Territory of Missouri, John Scott (seated Dec. 8, 1817).
16th	Mar. 4, 1819–Mar. 3, 1821	Alabama Territory (granted statehood, Dec. 14, 1819), vacant; Arkansas Territory (formed from portion of Territory of Missouri, 1819), James W. Bates (seated Mar. 2, 1820); Michigan Territory (formed from portion of Indiana Territory not admitted to statehood in 1816), William W. Woodbridge (resigned Aug. 9, 1820), Solomon Sibley (seated Nov. 20, 1820); Territory of Missouri, John Scott.
17th	Mar. 4, 1821–Mar. 3, 1823	Arkansas Territory, James W. Bates; Territory of Florida (formed from lands ceded by Spain to United States in 1819), Joseph M. Hernandez (seated Jan. 3, 1823); Michigan Territory, Solomon Sibley; Territory of Missouri (granted statehood, Aug. 10, 1821), vacant.
18th	Mar. 4, 1823–Mar. 3, 1825	Arkansas Territory, Henry Conway; Territory of Florida, Richard K. Call; Michigan Territory, Gabriel Richard.
19th	Mar. 4, 1825–Mar. 3, 1827	Arkansas Territory, Henry W. Conway; Territory of Florida, Joseph M. White; Michigan Territory, Austin E. Wing.
20th	Mar. 4, 1827–Mar. 3, 1829	Arkansas Territory, Henry W. Conway (died Nov. 9, 1827), Ambrose H. Sevier (seated Feb. 13, 1828); Territory of Florida, Joseph M. White; Michigan Territory, Austin E. Wing.
21st	Mar. 4, 1829–Mar. 3, 1831	Arkansas Territory, Ambrose H. Sevier; Territory of Florida, Joseph M. White; Michigan Territory, John Biddle.
22d	Mar. 4, 1831–Mar. 3, 1833	Arkansas Territory, Ambrose H. Sevier; Territory of Florida, Joseph M. White; Michigan Territory, Austin E. Wing.
23d	Mar. 4, 1833–Mar. 3, 1835	Arkansas Territory, Ambrose H. Sevier; Territory of Florida, Joseph M. White; Michigan Territory, Lucius Lyon.
24th	Mar. 4, 1835–Mar. 3, 1837	Arkansas Territory, Ambrose H. Sevier (served until June 15, 1836, when Arkansas Territory granted statehood); Territory of Florida, Joseph M. White; Michigan Territory (portion granted statehood as State of Michigan, 1837), George W. Jones (served as Delegate from Michigan Territory until Dec. 5, 1836, when he became the Delegate from the new Territory of Wisconsin); Territory of Wisconsin (formed from portion of Michigan Territory, Apr. 20, 1836), George W. Jones.
25th	Mar. 4, 1837–Mar. 3, 1839	Territory of Florida, Charles Downing; Territory of Iowa (formed from portion of Territory of Wisconsin, June 12, 1838), William W. Chapman (seated Dec. 3, 1838); Territory of Wisconsin, George W. Jones (served until Jan. 14, 1839), James D. Doty (seated Jan. 14, 1839).
26th	Mar. 4, 1839–Mar. 3, 1841	Territory of Florida, Charles Downing; Territory of Iowa, William W. Chapman (served until Oct. 27, 1840), Augustus C. Dodge (seated Dec. 8, 1840); Territory of Wisconsin, James D. Doty.
27th	Mar. 4, 1841–Mar. 3, 1843	Territory of Florida, David Levy; Territory of Iowa, Augustus C. Dodge; Territory of Wisconsin, Henry Dodge.
28th	Mar. 4, 1843–Mar. 3, 1845	Territory of Florida (granted statehood, act of Mar. 3, 1845), David Levy; Territory of Iowa, Augustus C. Dodge; Territory of Wisconsin, Henry Dodge.
29th	Mar. 4, 1845–Mar. 3, 1847	Territory of Iowa, Augustus C. Dodge (served until Dec. 28, 1846, when Territory granted statehood); Territory of Wisconsin, Morgan L. Martin.
30th	Mar. 4, 1847–Mar. 3, 1849	Territory of Wisconsin (eastern part of the territory was admitted into Union as State, Mar. 29, 1848; western portion retained its Territorial organization under the same name until reorganized into Territory of Minnesota by act of Mar. 3, 1849), John H. Tweedy (served until May 29, 1848), Henry H. Sibley (seated Jan. 15, 1849).
31st	Mar. 4, 1849–Mar. 3, 1851	Territory of Minnesota (formed Mar. 3, 1849, from Territory of Wisconsin), Henry H. Sibley (seated Dec. 3, 1849); Territory of Oregon (formed Aug. 14, 1848, from territory ceded to United States by France, Spain, and Great Britain), Samuel R. Thurston (seated Dec. 3, 1849).
32d	Mar. 4, 1851–Mar. 3, 1853	Territory of Minnesota, Henry H. Sibley; Territory of New Mexico (formed from portion of territory ceded to United States by Mexico, Feb. 2, 1848), Richard H. Weightman (seated Dec. 1, 1851); Territory of Oregon, Joseph Lane; Territory of Utah (formed from portion of territory ceded to United States by Mexico, Feb. 2, 1848), John M. Bernhisel (seated Dec. 1, 1851).
33d	Mar. 4, 1853–Mar. 3, 1855	Territory of Kansas (formed from territory ceded to United States by France in April 1803 and by the State of Texas, in the settlement of her boundaries in 1850), John W. Whitfield (seated Dec. 20, 1854); Territory of Minnesota, Henry M. Rice; Territory of Nebraska (formed from portion of territory ceded to United States in 1803 by France), Napoleon B. Giddings (seated Jan. 5, 1855); Territory of New Mexico, Jose Manuel Gallegos; Territory of Oregon, Joseph Lane; Territory of Utah, Hohn M. Bernhisel; Territory of Washington (formed from portion of Territory of Oregon, Mar. 2, 1853), Columbia Lancaster (seated Apr. 12, 1854).
34th	Mar. 4, 1855–Mar. 3, 1857	Territory of Kansas, John W. Whitfield; Territory of Minnesota, Henry M. Rice; Territory of Nebraska, Bird B. Chapman; Territory of New Mexico, Jose Manuel Gallegos (served until July 23, 1856), Miguel A. Otero (seated July 23, 1856); Territory of Oregon, Joseph Lane; Territory of Utah, John M. Bernhisel; Territory of Washington, J. Patton Anderson.
35th	Mar. 4, 1857–Mar. 3, 1859	Territory of Kansas, Marcus J. Parrott; Territory of Minnesota, William W. Kingsbury (served until May 11, 1858, when portion of the Territory was granted statehood; remainder not entitled to Delegate in Congress); Territory of Nebraska, Fenner Ferguson; Territory of New Mexico, Miguel A. Otero; Territory of Oregon, Joseph Lane (served until Feb. 14, 1859, when Territory granted statehood); Territory of Utah, John M. Bernhisel; Territory of Washington, Isaac I. Stevens.
36th	Mar. 4, 1859–Mar. 3, 1861	Territory of Kansas, Marcus J. Parrott (served until Jan. 29, 1861, when Territory granted statehood); Territory of Nebraska, Experience Eastabrook (served until May 18, 1860), Samuel G. Daily (seated May 18, 1860); Territory of New Mexico, Miguel A. Otero; Territory of Utah, William H. Hooper; Territory of Washington, Isaac I. Stevens.
37th	Mar. 4, 1861–Mar. 3, 1863	Territory of Colorado (formed from portions of territory ceded to United States by France in 1803 and by Mexico in 1848), Hiram P. Bennet (seated Dec. 2, 1861); Territory of Dakota (formed from territory ceded by France in 1803), John B. S. Todd (seated Dec. 8, 1861); Territory of Nebraska, Samuel G. Daily; Territory of Nevada (formed from portion of territory ceded to United States by Mexico in 1848), John Cradlebaugh (seated Dec. 2, 1861); Territory of New Mexico, John S. Watts; Territory of Utah, John M. Bernhisel; Territory of Washington, William H. Wallace.
38th	Mar. 4, 1863–Mar. 3, 1865	Territory of Arizona (formed from portion of Territory of New Mexico), Charles D. Poston (seated Dec. 5, 1864); Territory of Colorado, Hiram P. Bennet; Territory of Dakota, William Jayne (served until June 17, 1864), John B. S. Todd (seated June 17, 1864); Territory of Idaho (formed from portion of lands ceded by France in 1803), William H. Wallace (seated Feb. 1, 1864); Territory of Montana (formed from portion of land ceded by France in 1803), Samuel McLean (seated Jan. 6, 1865); Territory of Nebraska, Samuel G. Daily; Territory of Nevada, Gordon N. Mott (served until Oct. 31, 1864, when Territory was granted statehood); Territory of New Mexico, Francisco Perea; Territory of Utah, John F. Kinney; Territory of Washington, George E. Cole.
39th	Mar. 4, 1865–Mar. 3, 1867	Territory of Arizona, John N. Goodwin; Territory of Colorado, Allen A. Bradford; Territory of Dakota, Walter A. Burleigh; Territory of Idaho, Edward D. Holbrook; Territory of Montana, Samuel McLean; Territory of Nebraska, Phineas W. Hitchcock (served until Mar. 1, 1867, when Territory was granted statehood); Territory of New Mexico, J. Francisco Chaves; Territory of Utah, William H. Hooper; Territory of Washington, Arthur A. Denny.
40th	Mar. 4, 1867–Mar. 3, 1869	Territory of Arizona, Coles Bashford; Territory of Colorado, George M. Chilcott; Territory of Dakota, Walter A. Burleigh; Territory of Idaho, Edward D. Holbrook; Territory of Montana, James M. Cavanaugh; Territory of New Mexico, Charles P. Clever (served until Feb. 20, 1869), J. Francisco Chaves (seated Feb. 20, 1869); Territory of Utah, William H. Hooper; Territory of Washington, Alvan Flanders.
41st	Mar. 4, 1869–Mar. 3, 1871	Territory of Arizona, Richard C. McCormick; Territory of Colorado, Allen A. Bradford; Territory of Dakota, Solomon L. Spink; Territory of Idaho, Jacob K. Shafer; Territory of Montana, James M. Cavanaugh; Territory of New Mexico, J. Francisco Chaves; Territory of Utah, William H. Hooper; Territory of Washington, Selucius Garfielde; Territory of Wyoming (formed from portion of territory ceded by France in 1803), Stephen F. Nuckolls (seated Dec. 6, 1869).
42d	Mar. 4, 1871–Mar. 3, 1873	Territory of Arizona, Richard C. McCormick; Territory of Colorado, Jerome B. Chaffee; Territory of Dakota, Moses K. Armstrong; District of Columbia (by act of Feb. 21, 1871, a Territorial form of government was provided for the District), Norton P. Chipman (seated Dec. 4, 1871); Territory of Idaho, Samuel A. Merritt; Territory of Montana, William H. Clagett; Territory of New Mexico, Jose Manuel Gallegos; Territory of Utah, William H. Hooper; Territory of Washington, Selucius Garfielde; Territory of Wyoming, William T. Jones.

Delegates to the U.S. Congress—Continued

Congress	Date	
43d	Mar. 4, 1873–Mar. 3, 1875	Territory of Arizona, Richard C. McCormick; Territory of Colorado, Jerome B. Chaffee; Territory of Dakota, Moses K. Armstrong; District of Columbia (Territorial form of government withdrawn by act of June 20, 1874), Norton P. Chipman (served until Mar. 3, 1875); Territory of Idaho, John Hailey; Territory of Montana, Martin Maginnis; Territory of New Mexico, Stephen B. Elkins; Territory of Utah, George Q. Cannon; Territory of Washington, Obadiah B. McFadden; Territory of Wyoming, William R. Steele.
44th	Mar. 4, 1875–Mar. 3, 1877	Territory of Arizona, Hiram S. Stevens; Territory of Colorado, Thomas M. Patterson (served until Aug. 1, 1876, when Territory was granted statehood); Territory of Dakota, Jefferson P. Kidder; Territory of Idaho, Thomas W. Bennett (served until June 23, 1876), Stephen S. Fenn (seated June 23, 1876); Territory of Montana, Martin Maginnis; Territory of New Mexico, Stephen B. Elkins; Territory of Utah, George Q. Cannon; Territory of Washington, Orange Jacobs; Territory of Wyoming, William R. Steele.
45th	Mar. 4, 1877–Mar. 3, 1879	Territory of Arizona, Hiram S. Stevens; Territory of Dakota, Jefferson P. Kidder; Territory of Idaho, Stephen S. Fenn; Territory of Montana, Martin Maginnis; Territory of New Mexico, Trinidad Romero; Territory of Utah, George Q. Cannon; Territory of Washington, Orange Jacobs; Territory of Wyoming, William W. Corlett.
46th	Mar. 4, 1879–Mar. 3, 1881	Territory of Arizona, John G. Campbell; Territory of Dakota, Granville G. Bennett; Territory of Idaho, George Ainslie; Territory of Montana, Martin Maginnis; Territory of New Mexico, Mariano S. Otero; Territory of Utah, George Q. Cannon; Territory of Washington, Thomas H. Brents; Territory of Wyoming, Stephen W. Downey.
47th	Mar. 4, 1881–Mar. 3, 1883	Territory of Arizona, Granville H. Oury; Territory of Dakota, Richard F. Pettigrew; Territory of Idaho, George Ainslie; Territory of Montana, Martin Maginnis; Territory of New Mexico, Tranquilino Luna; Territory of Utah, John T. Caine; Territory of Washington, Thomas H. Brents; Territory of Wyoming, Morton E. Post.
48th	Mar. 4, 1883–Mar. 3, 1885	Territory of Arizona, Granville H. Oury; Territory of Dakota, John B. Raymond; Territory of Idaho, Theodore F. Singiser; Territory of Montana, Martin Maginnis; Territory of New Mexico, Tranquilino Luna (served until Mar. 5, 1884), Francisco A Manzanares (seated Mar. 5, 1884); Territory of Utah, John T. Caine; Territory of Washington, Thomas H. Brents; Territory of Wyoming, Morton E. Post.
49th	Mar. 4, 1885–Mar. 3, 1887	Territory of Arizona, Curtis C. Bean; Territory of Dakota, Oscar S. Gifford; Territory of Idaho, John Hailey; Territory of Montana, Joseph K. Toole; Territory of New Mexico, Antonio Joseph; Territory of Utah, John T. Caine; Territory of Washington, Charles S. Voorhees; Territory of Wyoming, Joseph M. Carey.
50th	Mar. 4, 1887–Mar. 3, 1889	Territory of Arizona, Marcus A. Smith; Territory of Dakota, Oscar S. Gifford; Territory of Idaho, Fred T. Dubois; Territory of Montana, Joseph K. Toole; Territory of New Mexico, Antonio Joseph; Territory of Utah, John T. Caine; Territory of Washington, Charles S. Voorhees; Territory of Wyoming, Joseph M. Carey.
51st	Mar. 4, 1889–Mar. 3, 1891	Territory of Arizona, Marcus A. Smith; Territory of Dakota, George A. Mathews (served until Nov. 2, 1889, when the Territory was divided and granted statehood as the States of North and South Dakota); Territory of Idaho, Fred. T. Dubois (served until July 3, 1890, when Territory was granted statehood); Territory of Montana, Thomas H. Carter (served until Nov. 8, 1889, when Territory was granted statehood); Territory of New Mexico, Antonio Joseph; Territory of Oklahoma (formed from portion of Indian Territory and from that portion of the United States known as the "Public Land Strip"), David M. Harvey (seated Dec. 1, 1890); Territory of Utah, John T. Caine; Territory of Washington, John B. Allen (served until Nov. 11, 1889, when the Territory was granted statehood); Territory of Wyoming, Joseph M. Carey (served until July 10, 1890, when Territory was granted statehood).
52d	Mar. 4, 1891–Mar. 3, 1893	Territory of Arizona, Marcus A. Smith; Territory of New Mexico, Antonio Joseph; Territory of Oklahoma, David A. Harvey; Territory of Utah, John T. Caine.
53d	Mar. 4, 1893–Mar. 3, 1895	Territory of Arizona, Marcus A. Smith; Territory of New Mexico, Antonio Joseph; Territory of Oklahoma, Dennis T. Flynn; Territory of Utah, Joseph L. Rawlins.
54th	Mar. 4, 1895–Mar. 3, 1897	Territory of Arizona, Nathan O. Murphy; Territory of New Mexico, Thomas B. Catron; Territory of Oklahoma, Dennis T. Flynn; Territory of Utah, Frank J. Cannon (served until Jan. 4, 1896, when Territory was granted statehood).
55th	Mar. 4, 1897–Mar. 3, 1899	Territory of Arizona, Marcus A. Smith; Territory of New Mexico, Harvey B. Fergusson; Territory of Oklahoma, James Y. Callahan.
56th	Mar. 4, 1899–Mar. 3, 1901	Territory of Arizona, John F. Wilson; Territory of Hawaii (formed from the territory of the Republic of Hawaii, annexed to the United States by act of July 7, 1898, and granted a Delegate in Congress by act of Apr. 30, 1900), Robert W. Wilcox (seated Dec. 15, 1900); Territory of New Mexico, Pedro Perea; Territory of Oklahoma, Dennis T. Flynn.
57th	Mar. 4, 1901–Mar. 3, 1903	Territory of Arizona, Marcus A. Smith; Territory of Hawaii, Robert W. Wilcox; Territory of New Mexico, Bernard S. Rodey; Territory of Oklahoma, Dennis T. Flynn.
58th	Mar. 4, 1903–Mar. 3, 1905	Territory of Arizona, John F. Wilson; Territory of Hawaii, Jonah K. Kalanianaole; Territory of New Mexico, Bernard S. Rodey; Territory of Oklahoma, Bird S. McGuire.
59th	Mar. 4, 1905–Mar. 3, 1907	Territory of Alaska (formed from territory ceded to United States by Russia by treaty of Mar. 30, 1867; granted Delegate by act of May 8, 1906), Frank H. Waskey (seated Dec. 3, 1906); Territory of Arizona, Marcus A. Smith; Territory of Hawaii, Jonah K. Kalanianaole; Territory of New Mexico, William H. Andrews; Territory of Oklahoma, Bird S. McGuire.
60th	Mar. 4, 1907–Mar. 3, 1909	Territory of Alaska, Thomas Cale; Territory of Arizona, Marcus A. Smith; Territory of Hawaii, Jonah K. Kalanianaole; Territory of New Mexico, William H. Andrews; Territory of Oklahoma (granted statehood Nov. 16, 1907), vacant.
61st	Mar. 4, 1909–Mar. 3, 1911	Territory of Alaska, James Wickersham; Territory of Arizona, Ralph H. Cameron; Territory of Hawaii, Jonah K. Kalanianaole; Territory of New Mexico, William H. Andrews.
62d	Mar. 4, 1911–Mar. 3, 1913	Territory of Alaska, James Wickersham; Territory of Arizona, Ralph H. Cameron (served until Feb. 18, 1912, the Territory of Arizona having been granted statehood by act of June 20, 1910); Territory of Hawaii, J. Kuhio Kalanianaole; Territory of New Mexico, William H. Andrews (served until Jan. 7, 1912, the Territory of New Mexico having been granted statehood by act of June 20, 1910).
63d	Mar. 4, 1913–Mar. 3, 1915	Territory of Alaska, James Wickersham; Territory of Hawaii, J. Kuhio Kalanianaole.
64th	Mar. 4, 1915–Mar. 3, 1917	Do.
65th	Mar. 4, 1917–Mar. 3, 1919	Territory of Alaska, Charles A. Sulzer (served until Jan. 7, 1919), James Wickersham (seated Jan. 7, 1919); Territory of Hawaii, J. Kuhio Kalanianaole.
66th	Mar. 4, 1919–Mar. 3, 1921	Territory of Alaska, Charles A. Sulzer (died Apr. 15, 1919, before Congress assembled), George B. Grigsby (served until Mar. 1, 1921), James Wickersham (seated Mar. 1, 1921); Territory of Hawaii, J. Kuhio Kalanianaole.
67th	Mar. 4, 1921–Mar. 3, 1923	Territory of Alaska, Dan. A. Sutherland; Territory of Hawaii, J. Kuhio Kalanianaole (died Jan. 7, 1922), Henry A. Baldwin (seated Apr. 18, 1922).
68th	Mar. 4, 1923–Mar. 3, 1925	Territory of Alaska, Dan. A. Sutherland; Territory of Hawaii, William P. Jarrett.
69th	Mar. 4, 1925–Mar. 3, 1927	Do.
70th	Mar. 4, 1927–Mar. 3, 1929	Territory of Alaska, Dan. A. Sutherland; Territory of Hawaii, Victor S. K. Houston.
71st	Mar. 4, 1929–Mar. 3, 1931	Do.
72d	Mar. 4, 1931–Mar. 3, 1933	Territory of Alaska, James Wickersham; Territory of Hawaii, Victor S. K. Houston.
73d	Mar. 4, 1933–Mar. 3, 1935	Territory of Alaska, Anthony J. Dimond; Territory of Hawaii, Lincoln L. McCandless.
74th	Jan. 3, 1935–Jan. 3, 1937	Territory of Alaska, Anthony J. Dimond; Territory of Hawaii, Samuel W. King.
75th	Jan. 3, 1937–Jan. 3, 1939	Do.
76th	Jan. 3, 1939–Jan. 3, 1941	Do.
77th	Jan. 3, 1941–Jan. 3, 1943	Do.
78th	Jan. 3, 1943–Jan. 3, 1945	Territory of Alaska, Anthony J. Dimond; Territory of Hawaii, Joseph R. Farrington.
79th	Jan. 3, 1945–Jan. 3, 1947	Territory of Alaska, Edward L. Bartlett; Territory of Hawaii, Joseph R. Farrington.
80th	Jan. 3, 1947–Jan. 3, 1949	Do.
81st	Jan. 3, 1949–Jan. 3, 1951	Do.
82d	Jan. 3, 1951–Jan. 3, 1953	Do.
83d	Jan. 3, 1953–Jan. 3, 1955	Territory of Alaska, Edward L. Bartlett; Territory of Hawaii, Joseph R. Farrington (died, June 19, 1954), Mrs. Joseph R. Farrington (seated Aug. 4, 1954).
84th	Jan. 5, 1955–Jan. 3, 1957	Territory of Alaska, Edward L. Bartlett; Territory of Hawaii, Mrs. Joseph R. Farrington.
85th	Jan. 3, 1957–Jan. 3, 1959	Territory of Alaska (admitted to statehood Jan. 3, 1959, pursuant to act of July 7, 1958), Edward L. Bartlett; Territory of Hawaii, John A. Burns.
86th	Jan. 7, 1959–	Territory of Hawaii (admitted to statehood Aug. 21, 1959, pursuant to act of Mar. 18, 1959), John A. Burns (served until Aug. 21, 1959, when the Territory became a State).

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include tables showing the Territories which have been represented and the Delegates who have served in this body since the Third Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ELECTIONS IN MALAYA

Mr. ZABLOCKI. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, while the news stories carry rather discouraging accounts of events in Laos and a few other parts of south Asia, we should not overlook a more encouraging turn of events that took place last week in Malaya. I refer to the elections in that new state in which the Alliance Party was returned to power. On the basis of the news accounts thus far, it would appear that Tengu Abdul Rahman will be the leader of the new Government. He is an admittedly anti-Communist figure and a strong friend of the West.

Given the complex ethnic composition of Malaya, the victory of the Alliance Party is an encouraging sign that the diverse portions of Malaya's population are grouping around ideas and ideals rather than narrow interests. Actually, the Alliance Party consists of three principal organizations—the United Malayan National Association, the Malayan Chinese Association, and the Malayan Indian Congress.

The Alliance Party has outlined for itself a rather ambitious program that includes efforts toward self-sufficiency and food production, aid to small farmers and rubber growers, improved health and educational services, and assistance to small industries.

Four years ago I was head of a study mission that visited Malaya. At that time the country was still part of the British Empire. It was still suffering from the effects of Communist harassment and there were obvious divisions among the population along ethnic lines. With the achievement of its independence there has come a new expression of Malayan nationalism bringing together these groups and offering encouragement to those who want to develop an independent state. I want to congratulate the people of Malaya on an orderly election and wish the new Government every success.

I believe our Government would do well to give every evidence of encouragement it can to assist this new Government to achieve its objectives.

KHRUSHCHEV VISIT

Mr. DORN. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, many years ago I warned this House of the Communist timetable. I warned of the importance of the Far East in the defense of the free world. Yes, I can believe Lenin said the road to Paris is through Peking. The Communists are making a bold, blatant bid for control of all Southeast Asia today. When they consolidate their ill-gotten gains in Southeast Asia they will be in a position to outflank India, put the pressure on Indonesia and move for the rich Mideast oil. After the Near East falls the road to Africa will be open. With north Africa in Communist hands Western Europe will fall like an overly ripe apple.

Western Europe will simply be outflanked and cut off from oil so essential to its industry and standard of living. Africa with its untapped resources will also be the marshaling area for the invasion of nearby South America and South America is the "soft underbelly" of the United States. The fate of the free world is being decided in Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand. Khrushchev ordered this attack on Laos simultaneously with announcement of his visit to the United States. To proceed with Communist domination of the world Khrushchev must win all of Southeast Asia. To win Southeast Asia he must hoodwink leaders in the United States and talk peace. His plans are working to perfection with the cooperation of the eggheads and soft heads here in Washington. The world spotlight will be on his antics here in the United States while his armies advance in Laos. One word from Khrushchev could stop instantly this cold, inhuman, Communist invasion of little Laos. By this invitation to Washington we are helping him greatly in his ambitions to conquer the world. This is a sad, dark time in the history of freedom. We may be nailing the lid on our own coffin. When we play Russian roulette with Khrushchev we should remember that the pistol to our head is loaded while his is empty. A waltz with him may be a dance into eternity.

ALBERT JOSEPH SMITH, PEACETIME CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR WINNER

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, it appears that peacetime Congressional Medal of Honor winners are so few and far between that frequently they are left off the roster of Congressional Medal of Honor winners. On July 3, 1958, there appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a list of living holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor. Albert Joseph Smith, a constituent of mine, did not appear on this list. I am bringing this to the attention of the House so that all lists can be corrected to include his name. Mr. Smith was awarded his citation for the following reasons:

> At about 7:30 a.m. on the morning of February 11, 1921, Private Smith, while on duty as a sentry, rescued Plen M. Phelps, late machinist's mate, second class, U.S. Navy, from a burning seaplane which had fallen near his post, gate No. 1, Marine Barracks, Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla. Despite the explosion of the gravity gasoline tank, with total disregard of personal safety, he pushed himself to a position where he could reach Phelps, who was pinned beneath the burning wreckage, and rescued him from the burning plane, in the performance of which he sustained painful burns about the head, neck, and both hands.

Such heroism certainly deserves the everlasting gratitude of our country.

COMMUNIST-MADE GOODS FROM GERMANY COMING INTO THIS COUNTRY UNDER FALSE PRETENSES

Mr. STRATTON. 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. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to prohibit the advertising of goods for sale in interstate commerce which have been imported into this country from the Soviet-controlled zone of East Germany unless the fact is clearly included in the advertising that they have been manufactured in the Soviet Zone of Germany rather than merely in Germany alone. For some time I have been disturbed to see that a substantial number of cameras are on sale in American camera shops which have been manufactured in the Soviet Zone of East Germany and yet without any indication on these cameras that they are in fact Soviet imports, in violation of section 1304, title 19 of the United States Code. I have asked the Treasury to make a thorough investigation as to the reason these imports have been permitted to come in in violation of our laws and to give me a complete report on their investigation.

In addition these Soviet-made cameras are being advertised in national photography magazines as "Manufactured in Germany," without any reference to their origin in Soviet Germany. In spite of the misleading nature of this advertising, there is nothing presently in the law to prevent it. Accordingly my legislation would plug the gap.

The threat of cheap foreign goods manufactured by cheap labor entering the United States in competition with our own products manufactured on American standards is bad enough today, without permitting the kind of advertising which would confuse the purchaser and keep him unaware until too late of the fact that some of the foreign goods that he may be buying come from Communist-controlled countries manufactured under the slave labor conditions prevailing there.

SMALL BUSINESS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1959

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 8599) to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask the chairman of the committee to explain to the House what this bill does.

Mr. SPENCE. The Small Business Administration has almost reached its limit to make loans at the present time. The present authorization is $500 million. This bill would increase that amount to $700 million. The increase must be obtained by appropriation. It is provided in the law that the loans shall be of such sound value or so secured as reasonably to assure repayment. They will be loans to small business, which is

in great need of this accommodation and which is unable to get it elsewhere.

The losses that have been sustained by this organization have amounted to 1.8 percent of the agency's share of the loans disbursed. These loans have rendered a most useful service and have stimulated that which has characterized our free governments, the maintenance of small business and its independence.

I hope the bill will pass so these small businesses may have assurance that their applications will soon be considered and that there will be no hiatus because of the adjournment of Congress and the exhaustion of the Administration's present authority.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. There was no change in the loan policy of the Small Business Administration in connection with this expansion of its lending capacity?

Mr. SPENCE. None at all.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I notice also that this provides for the filing of reports each year instead of every 6 months, which is evidently a broadening of their authority. They had to file reports every 6 months. This will make that requirement an annual one.

Mr. SPENCE. As to the reports, SBA now is required to make semiannual reports and this bill requires the Administration to make only annual reports. In addition to the main purpose of the bill to increase the authority of the Small Business Administration to make loans under its regular business loan program, there are two other minor amendments to, first, authorize SBA to make prepayments of rentals on safety deposit boxes; and, second, repeal an unnecessary provision concerning surveys of SBA by the Attorney General.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Small Business Administration has as its necessary function the expansion of small business. The purpose of my reservation of objection was to have the bill explained.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Small Business Act Amendments of 1959".

SEC. 2. As used in this Act, unless otherwise indicated, references to "the Act" are to the Small Business Act, approved July 18, 1958 (72 Stat. 384), as amended by the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, approved August 21, 1958 (72 Stat. 689).

SEC. 3. Subsection 4(c) of the Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "$900,000,000" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,100,000,000"; and

(2) by striking out "$500,000,000" where it appears in the fifth sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "$700,000,000".

SEC. 4. Subsection 5(b) of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (10) to read as follows:

"(10) Section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529) shall not apply to prepayments of rentals made by the Administration on safety deposit boxes used by the Administration for the safeguarding of instruments held as security for loans or for the safeguarding of other documents."

SEC. 5. Section 10 of the Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "every six months" from the first sentence of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof ", on June 30 of each year,";

(2) by striking out "and December 31" from subsection (b);

(3) by striking out subsection (c); and

(4) by respectively redesignating subparagraphs (d), (e) and (f) as (c), (d) and (e).

SEC. 6. If any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of this Act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

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.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] have permission to extend their remarks and that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker this bill, H.R. 8599, in addition to increasing the authorization of the aggregate amount of loans that may be made by the Small Business Administration, also makes several technical amendments to the statute.

I would like to point out to the House that there is no amendment contained in this bill with reference to certificates of competency authorized to be issued by the Small Business Administration, because none of the committees of the House nor the House itself finds it necessary to offer any amendments to that section.

For many years investigations by congressional committees established that many Government contracting and procurement officers were systematically excluding small business concerns from Government procurement by disqualifying them on the ground of incapacity or financial insufficiency.

The Congress accordingly vested the right to review such decisions with the Small Business Administration and directed that its certificate of competency was to be conclusive on all contracting and procurement officers. All Government departments and agencies but one have submitted to and followed the clear dictates of the statute. That one department has continuously resisted the right of the Small Business Administration to make such determinations and has sought to evade them.

The intent of Congress is plainly set forth in the statute and the General Accounting Office has repeatedly properly interpreted it to mean exactly what it says. We expect all Government contracting and procurement officers in every department and agency of Government to abide by it.

When the Small Business Administration issues a certificate of competency that certificate is conclusive upon contracting and procurement officers, both as to the capacity and competency of the small business concern to perform the contract and as to its financial responsibility in connection therewith.

INCREASING SBA'S AUTHORITY TO MAKE LOANS TO SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the state of small business is not good. Many things in our business and financing system, and in our Federal laws, operate against a fair and equal chance for small firms. Small business does not have the opportunity to compete purely on the basis of merit and efficiency, and thus to grow and prosper along with the giant corporations.

LACK OF CREDIT—SMALL BUSINESS HANDICAP

One of the great handicaps lies in the fact that the financial resources of the country—the capital and the bank credit—are, as a general rule, not readily available to small firms. This chronic difficulty is now being increased and compounded by the fact that the Government's monetary authorities are again tightening credit. This means that small-business firms will again bear the brunt of the Government's credit policies, as they have before.

We have an official showing of what happens to small business when the Federal Reserve squeezes bank credit. There was such a period when credit was made increasingly tight, from late 1955 until late 1957. This was a 2-year period of large business growth, that is true, and a period when all kinds of businesses needed more bank credit to carry inventories, meet payrolls, and finance other operations. But the increased credit was not, as a general rule, available to the smaller firms. When the big squeeze was over, the Federal Reserve Board made a survey of its member banks to find out how bank loans had been distributed among different sizes of firms before and after the big squeeze. This report shows that in October 1957, at the peak of the credit squeeze, business firms with less than $50,000 of assets actually had 3 percent less in loans from banks than they had had 2 years earlier, in October of 1955. The giant corporations, on the other hand, those with more than $100 million of assets, had 66 percent more bank credit than they had had 2 years earlier. It is no wonder that many thousands of small firms were forced into bankruptcy, and that other thousands were forced to close their doors, though without loss to their creditors. Those were years of big-business prosperity and small-business disaster. Such times are with us again.

The main purpose of the bill is to increase the amount of loans which the

SBA can have outstanding at any one time under its regular loan program. The bill increases the amount from $500 million to $700 million, thus providing an increase of $200 million. Personally, I wish that more would be effectively used and therefore, that more were being provided.

BILL UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

The bill has been recommended by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration. Hearings were held by a subcommittee of which I am chairman. This is Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I am happy to say that the bill was approved unanimously by the subcommittee, whose membership consists, in addition to myself, of the following: Hon. HENRY S. REUSS, Wisconsin; Hon. CHARLES A. VANIK, Ohio; Hon. JAMES A. BURKE, Massachusetts; Hon. CLEM MILLER, California; Hon. BYRON L. JOHNSON, Colorado; Hon. PERKINS BASS, New Hampshire; Hon. EUGENE SILER, Kentucky; and Hon. WILLIAM H. MILLIKEN, JR., Pennsylvania.

The bill will be helpful to small business. It should be passed. As of last June 30, SBA's outstanding business loans, plus commitments, totaled $425 million, leaving only $75 million of its present authorization still available. Further, SBA has estimated that its net loan approvals in fiscal 1960 will approximate $20 million a month, with repayments averaging $8 million a month, resulting in a net increase of $12 million per month. At this rate the $75 million authorization remaining as of June 30 will be used up shortly before December 31, 1959.

THREE MINOR CHANGES IN LAW

The bill also makes three changes in law of a minor nature: First, it authorizes SBA to make prepayments of rentals of safety deposit boxes; second, it permits SBA to file reports with Congress on its operations annually, instead of every 6 months; third, and finally, the bill repeals an unnecessary provision concerning surveys of SBA operations by the Attorney General to ascertain whether or not SBA's operations may be in violation of the antitrust laws.

It is hardly necessary for me to comment on the deep and sincere interest which Members of the House have, probably every Member of this House has, in helping small business. Most of us, I know, wish that we could do more, that we could turn back the present tide that is sweeping more and more of the Nation's business affairs into the great corporate empires. Many of us wish that we could restore fair opportunity and fairplay to all useful and efficient business enterprises and make the business life of the country less an exclusive preserve of the few business corporations which own or control vast financial power.

I will include herewith the unanimous report of Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Following the report, furthermore, I will include a statistical table which has been prepared by the Federal Reserve System showing the shift in bank loans to business firms of various sizes between the beginning and the end of the tight-money period of 1955–57.

NEW TIGHT-MONEY POLICY WILL SQUEEZE OUT SMALL BUSINESS AGAIN—AS BEFORE

In relating information in this table to the new tight-money policy of today, a policy which promises to make money much tighter in the fall and winter, two considerations should be borne in mind.

First, commercial banks do not auction their available supply of credit. They do not advance credit to the bidders who offer to pay the highest interest rate, the risks being even. On the contrary, the banks set a price, or an interest rate, for the credit and then ration the available supply among the would-be borrowers out of considerations having little to do with the creditors' needs or their ability to repay.

At one time, during the 1955–57 period, a great many statements were issued to the effect that the banks were rationing credit fairly, taking care of their small customers, and not merely extending credit to the big customers who have the power to command the credit. There were then many suggestions that the big firms were getting the lion's share of the bank credit only because those industries which were expanding most happened to be the big business industries. The survey which the Federal Reserve made shows a shift in bank credit, however, by type of business. And it shows that in every type of business—textile manufacturing, retail trade, or what not—it was the biggest firms in the industry that got the credit and the smaller firms in the industry either got less credit than before the squeeze began or got only minor amounts of the increase.

SMALL BUSINESS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1959

[Rept. No. 946]

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 8599) to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF BILL

The main purpose of H.R. 8599 is to increase the authority of the Small Business Administration to make loans under its regular business loan program. Present law limits the amount of SBA business loans outstanding to $500 million. The bill would increase this limit to $700 million.

In addition, H.R. 8599 would make three minor amendments to (1) authorize SBA to make prepayments of rentals on safety deposit boxes, (2) permit SBA to file reports on its operations annually, instead of every 6 months, and (3) repeal an unnecessary provision concerning surveys of SBA operations by the Attorney General.

HISTORY OF BILL

Enactment of this bill was recommended to the Congress by the Small Business Administrator. The bill was introduced by Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Banking and Currency Committee. The subcommittee held hearings on the bill and unanimously reported it to the full committee. Your committee, in turn, unanimously voted to report it favorably to the House.

BUSINESS LOAN AUTHORITY

Section 3 of the bill amends section 4(c) of the Small Business Act to increase from $500 million to $700 million the amount of SBA's revolving fund which may be outstanding at any one time for the purpose of making business loans under section 7(a) of the act. It makes a corresponding increase (from $900 million to $1.1 billion) in the total amount of appropriations authorized to the revolving fund.

As of June 30, 1959, SBA's business loans outstanding, plus commitments, totaled $425 million, leaving $75 million authorization available. SBA estimates that net loan approvals in fiscal 1960 will average $20 million a month, with repayments averaging $8 million a month, resulting in a net use of $12 million in business loan authorization per month. At that rate, the $75 million authorization remaining on June 30 will be used up shortly after December 31, 1959. SBA estimates that through June 30, 1961, loans outstanding and commitments will total $669 million, slightly below the $700 million authorization provided in this bill.

It should be noted that the $700 million figure provided for in this bill does not constitute either an appropriation or obligational authority. It is an overall limit on the amount of business loans SBA may have outstanding at any one time. To obtain funds to make these loans, SBA must still obtain appropriations from the Congress. As of June 30, 1959, SBA had available in its revolving fund for all its programs $89 million. An additional amount of $150 million was appropriated to the revolving fund by Public Law 86–88 on July 13, 1959.

The demand for SBA business loans has increased considerably in the fiscal year 1959. A record number of loan applications, 10,213, were received during the year, compared to 7,898 for the fiscal year 1958. This is a rise of 29 percent. The high level of activity which began in March of 1958 was interrupted in December, but picked up again shortly after the first of the year, and in March 1959 applications totaled 1,083.

SBA through June 30, 1959, has charged off 93 business loans with a resulting principal loss of $945,866, which is about two-tenths of 1 percent of the amount, disbursed. As of the same date, 375 loans were in liquidation with the unpaid principal balance amounting to approximately $11 million. If the same loss experience applies to these loans as has occurred in connection with the loans actually charged off, the collateral to be liquidated will reduce the ultimate loss to the Government to approximately $7.7 million. This, coupled with the losses recorded through June 1959, would amount to about $8.6 million, or about 1.8 percent of the agency's share of the loans disbursed.

RENTAL OF SAFETY DEPOSIT BOXES

Section 4 authorizes SBA to make prepayments of rentals on safety deposit boxes used by it to safeguard instruments and other documents held as security for loans. SBA commonly accepts readily negotiable instruments as collateral on loans. Ordinary care requires that such documents be kept in safety deposit boxes. Such boxes are usually rented on an annual basis and, with few exceptions, banks demand payment in advance. The General Accounting Office has ruled that section 3648 of the Revised Statutes prohibits such prepayments. Consequently SBA's regional offices have been able to use safety deposit boxes only by obtaining the necessary funds from employees who, at the end of the rental period, claim reimbursement from SBA. Section 4 of the bill remedies this situation.

SURVEYS AND REPORTS

Section 5 effects two substantive changes in section 10 of the Small Business Act. First, it places the reports which SBA is required to file, pursuant to subsections 10(a) and 10(b), on an annual basis instead of a semi-

annual basis. Second, it eliminates the surveys and reports which the Attorney General is required to make pursuant to subsection 10(c).

Subsection 10(a) of the act now requires SBA to make a report every 6 months of operations under the act to the President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Subsection 10(b) of the act provides that, on June 30 and December 31 of each year, SBA shall make a report to the President, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Senate and House Small Business Committees, showing the amount of the funds appropriated to SBA that it has expended in the conduct of each of its principal activities. Under existing law, therefore, SBA must submit two reports every 6 months concerning its operations. These requirements were laid down when SBA was initiated as a temporary agency. The principal reason for requiring reports at such short intervals was to furnish information needed to determine whether the program should be continued. With the establishment of SBA as a permanent agency of the Government, such frequent reports are no longer needed. In view of the unnecessary expense involved in preparing and issuing two reports every 6 months, SBA should; like virtually all other permanent agencies, report on an annual basis. Under section 5 of the bill, both reports are to be filed on June 30 of each year.

Subsection 10(c) of the act directs the Attorney General to make, or request the Federal Trade Commission to make for him, surveys to determine any factors which may tend to promote undue concentration of economic power in the course of the administration of the act. He is required to submit to the Congress and the President, at such times as he deems desirable, reports setting forth the results of such surveys and including such recommendations as he may deem desirable. This subsection adds little, if anything, to the authority and responsibilities presently reposed in the Attorney General by the antitrust laws and other statutes. Its presence in the Small Business Act serves no useful purpose. On the other hand the subsection, by the peculiar wording, suggests that the Attorney General must exercise special vigilance over the operations of the Administration to detect and prevent violations of law. This, of course, was not the intent. For these reasons, section 5 of the bill deletes the subsection from the act.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as introduced, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

"SMALL BUSINESS ACT

"SEC. 4. (a) * * *

* * * * *

"(c) The Administration is authorized to obtain money from the Treasury of the United States for use in the performance of the powers and duties granted to or imposed upon it by law, not to exceed a total of [$900,000,000] *$1,100,000,000* outstanding at any one time. For this purpose appropriations not to exceed [$900,000,000] *$1,100,000,000* are hereby authorized to be made to a revolving fund in the Treasury. Advances shall be made to the Administration from the revolving fund when requested by the Administration. This revolving fund shall be used for the purposes enumerated subsequently in sections 7(a), 7(b), and 8(a), and in the exercise of the functions of the Administration under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. Not to exceed an aggregate of [$500,000,000] *$700,000,000* shall be outstanding at any one time for the purposes enumerated in section 7(a). Not to exceed an aggregate of $125,000,000 shall be outstanding at any one time for the purposes enumerated in section 7(b). Not to exceed an aggregate of $25,000,000 shall be outstanding at any one time for the purposes enumerated in section 8(a). Not to exceed an aggregate of $250,000,000 shall be outstanding at any one time for the exercise of the functions of the Administration under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. The Administration shall pay into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury, at the close of each fiscal year, interest on the net amount of the cash disbursement from such advances at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States of comparable maturities.

* * * * *

"SEC. 5. (a) * * *

"(b) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this Act the Administrator may—

"(1) sue and be sued in any court of record of a State having general jurisdiction, or in any United States district court, and jurisdiction is conferred upon such district court to determine such controversies without regard to the amount in controversy; but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Administrator or his property;

"(2) under regulations prescribed by him, assign or sell at public or private sale, or otherwise dispose of for cash or credit, in his discretion and upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as the Administrator shall determine to be reasonable, any evidence of debt, contract, claim, personal property, or security assigned to or held by him in connection with the payment of loans granted under this Act, and to collect or compromise all obligations assigned to or held by him and all legal or equitable rights accruing to him in connection with the payment of such loans until such time as such obligations may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection;

"(3) deal with, complete, renovate, improve, modernize, insure, or rent, or sell for cash or credit upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as the Administrator shall determine to be reasonable, any real property conveyed to or otherwise acquired by him in connection with the payment of loans granted under this Act;

"(4) pursue to final collection, by way of compromise or otherwise, all claims against third parties assigned to the Administrator in connection with loans made by him. This shall include authority to obtain deficiency judgments or otherwise in the case of mortgages assigned to the Administrator. Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C., sec. 5), shall not be construed to apply to any contract of hazard insurance or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of property obtained by the Administrator as a result of loans made under this Act if the premium therefor or the amount thereof does not exceed $1,000. The power to convey and to execute in the name of the Administrator deeds of conveyance, deeds of release, assignments and satisfactions of mortgages, and any other written instrument relating to real property or any interest therein acquired by the Administrator pursuant to the provisions of this Act may be exercised by the Administrator or by any officer or agent appointed by him without the execution of any express delegation of power or power of attorney. Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the Administrator from delegating such power by order or by power of attorney, in his discretion, to any officer or agent he may appoint;

"(5) acquire, in any lawful manner, any property (real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible), whenever deemed necessary or appropriate to the conduct of the activities authorized in sections 7(a) and 7(b);

"(6) make such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the authority vested in him by or pursuant to this Act;

"(7) in addition to any powers, functions, privileges, and immunities otherwise vested in him, take any and all actions, including the procurement of the services of attorneys by contract, determined by him to be necessary or desirable in making, servicing, compromising, modifying, liquidating, or otherwise dealing with or realizing on loans made under the provisions of this Act; but no attorneys' services shall be procured by contract in any office where an attorney or attorneys are or can be economically employed full time to render such services;

"(8) pay the transportation expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses, in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949, for travel of any person employed by the Administration to render temporary services not in excess of six months in connection with any disaster referred to in section 7(b) from place of appointment to, and while at, the disaster area and any other temporary posts of duty and return upon completion of the assignment; and

"(9) accept the services and facilities of Federal, State, and local agencies and groups, both public and private, and utilize such gratuitous services and facilities as may, from time to time, be necessary, to further the objectives of section 7(b).

"*(10) Section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529) shall not apply to prepayments of rentals made by the Administration on safety deposit boxes used by the Administration for the safeguarding of instruments held as security for loans or for the safeguarding of other documents.*

* * * * *

"SEC. 10. (a) The Administration shall make a report [every six months], *on June 30 of each year,* of operations under this Act to the President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Such report shall include the names of the business concerns to whom contracts are let and for whom financing is arranged by the Administration, together with the amounts involved, and such report shall include such other information and such comments and recommendations as the Administration may deem appropriate.

"(b) The Administration shall make a report to the President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, and to the House Select Committee To Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business, on June 30 [and December 31] of each year, showing as accurately as possible for each such period the amount of funds appropriated to it that it has expended in the conduct of each of its principal activities such as lending, procurement, contracting, and providing technical and managerial aids.

"[(c) The Attorney General is directed to make, or request the Federal Trade Commission to make for him, surveys for the purpose of determining any factors which may tend to eliminate competition, create or strengthen monopolies, injure small business, or otherwise promote undue concentration of economic power in the course of the administration of this Act. The Attorney General shall submit to the Congress

and the President, at such times as he deems desirable, reports setting forth the results of such surveys and including such recommendations as he may deem desirable.]

"[d] (c) For the purpose of aiding in carrying out the national policy to insure that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for property and services for the Government be placed with small-business enterprises, and to maintain and strengthen the overall economy of the Nation, the Department of Defense shall make a monthly report to the President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives not less than forty-five days after the close of the month, showing the amount of funds appropriated to the Department of Defense which have been expended, obligated, or contracted to be spent with small-business concerns and the amount of such funds expended, obligated, or contracted to be spent with firms other than small business in the same fields of operation; and such monthly reports shall show separately the funds expended, obligated, or contracted to be spent for basic and applied scientific research and development.

"[e] (d) The Administration shall retain all correspondence, records of inquiries, memoranda, reports, books, and records, including memoranda as to all investigations conducted by or for the Administration, for a period of at least one year from the date of each thereof, and shall at all times keep the same available for inspection and examination by the Senate Select Committee on Small Business and the House Select Committee To Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business, or their duly authorized representatives.

"[f] (e) To the extent deemed necessary by the Administrator to protect and preserve small-business interests, the Administration shall consult and cooperate with other departments and agencies of the Federal Government in the formulation by the Administration of policies affecting small-business concerns. When requested by the Administrator, each department and agency of the Federal Government shall consult and cooperate with the Administration in the formulation by such department or agency of policies affecting small-business concerns, in order to insure that small-business interests will be recognized, protected, and preserved. This subsection shall not require any department or agency to consult or cooperate with the Administration in any case where the head of such department or agency determines that such consultation or cooperation would unduly delay action which must be taken by such department or agency to protect the national interest in an emergency."

Change in amount of business loans of member banks, 1955–57, by business and size of borrower

[Increase, or decrease (—). In percent unless otherwise noted]

Business of borrower	Amount outstanding Oct. 16, 1957 (in millions of dollars)	Size of borrower (total assets, in thousands of dollars)							
		All borrowers [1]	Less than $50	$50 to $250	$250 to $1,000	$1,000 to $5,000	$5,000 to $25,000	$25,000 to $100,000	$100,000 or more
All business	40,618	31.9	−3.0	16.7	24.8	21.3	24.7	51.1	66.4
Manufacturing and mining:									
Food, liquor, and tobacco	2,392	28.0	−33.5	7.1	23.7	5.4	−4.6	8.5	104.5
Textiles, apparel, and leather	1,685	−3.0	−38.7	−20.7	−7.8	−4.0	−9.5	3.6	47.7
Metals and metal products	5,526	70.5	−18.2	20.1	20.2	46.7	35.1	106.1	151.2
Petroleum, coal, chemicals, and rubber	3,750	44.1	−16.2	2.2	40.3	18.3	7.2	20.4	138.1
All other	2,793	47.2	−7.2	8.4	20.1	46.1	76.1	82.7	119.2
Trade:									
Retail trade	4,588	33.2	3.4	28.3	51.4	48.7	32.3	36.6	33.7
Wholesale trade	2,982	24.7	−10.6	21.8	23.7	17.9	31.0	105.2	134.7
Commodity dealers	816	10.7	−18.8	13.4	44.2	−22.1	−2.4	61.2	20.2
Other:									
Sales finance companies	3,096	9.3	−32.5	−24.0	20.2	−6.6	7.5	36.3	5.9
Transportation, communication, and other public utilities	4,168	47.0	31.2	13.0	10.5	44.6	56.1	84.0	40.0
Construction	1,981	17.1	−7.7	9.4	9.3	23.6	−.5	101.2	310.0
Real estate	2,976	22.5	−24.9	9.9	23.3	17.1	27.6	109.3	19.9
Service firms	2,263	28.3	4.6	29.5	36.2	42.1	79.8	29.7	9.3
All other nonfinancial	1,606	20.4	6.0	18.0	26.9	−1.3	25.1	30.4	96.1

[1] Based on data that include a small amount of loans for borrowers whose size was not ascertained.

Note.—Details may not add to totals because of rounding.

Source: "Financing Small Business," Report to the Committees on Banking and Currency and the Select Committees on Small Business, U.S. Congress, by the Federal Reserve System, Apr. 11, 1958.

DEPRESSED DOMESTIC MINING AND MINERAL INDUSTRIES

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 347 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this public and other lands. After general deresolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 177) declaring the sense of Congress on the depressed domestic mining and mineral industries affecting public and other lands. After general debate, which shall be confined to the concurrent resolution, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the concurrent resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]; and at this time yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 347 makes in order the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 177. The resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of House Concurrent Resolution 177 is to declare the sense of Congress on the depressed domestic mining and mineral industries affecting public and other lands.

A healthy and strong mining and minerals industry is requisite to American security in peace or war. Certain branches of our domestic mining industry need help. Even though we require imports of mine products in order to meet the evergrowing requirements of an expanding economy, it is vitally necessary to maintain a vigorous mobilization base which can be expanded quickly whenever emergencies arise.

The great national importance of minerals arises from the fact that they provide the sinews of war and literally the foundation and framework of our industrial structure. Only by guaranteeing the continuing supply of mine products can we hope for full employment of the Nation's workers or for providing the weapons and equipment needed for national defense.

Before and for sometime after World War I the United States was the leading exporter of copper, zinc, petroleum, and various other mineral commodities which we now import. In many cases this change from an export to an import basis merely means that consumption has expanded faster than domestic production. In other cases, however, the expansion of imports of minerals products has injured the domestic industries.

Hearings held by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have led to the conclusion that there exists a state of emergency in important segments of the domestic metal and mineral industry and in many mining communities in the United States. The committee feels that the principal cause of the depressed conditions that presently exist stems from excessive imports. Foreign mining operations have been overexpanded and much of the excess production capacity stems directly or indirectly from U.S. Government action. The constant threat of overproduction abroad is an effective deterrent to recovery of the domestic industries affected.

It has become increasingly clear that the maintenance and development of a sound and stable domestic mining and minerals industry without critical dependence upon foreign sources is essential to national security and the welfare of the consuming public, and that this objective is independent of and cannot be accomplished by the maintenance of national stockpiles for planned defense needs in a single emergency or the existence of productive capacity based upon the importation of foreign materials.

The committee's investigation clearly shows the need for prompt study of possible remedial measures by the executive

branch and the need for adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 177.

I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, section 1 of this concurrent resolution reads as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President is requested—

(a) to have reviews made at once of the existing programs of the departments and agencies of the executive branch with the purpose of using them more effectively to provide for increased production and employment in critically depressed domestic mining and mineral industries;

(b) to advise the Congress at the earliest possible date as to the actions taken or proposed to be taken to this end; and

(c) to submit any reorganization plans or recommendations for legislation that may be necessary to accomplish this objective.

The Subcommittee on Mines and Mining held hearings on this and similar concurrent resolutions in Washington June 25 to July 2, 1959.

The report on this measure is lengthy and comprehensive. The committee recognized the problems involved in carrying out a national mineral policy: "tariffs, quotas, subsidies, incentive price-purchase programs, depletion allowances, accelerated amortization and other tax concessions, technical assistance, and other devices have all been tried, but no set of ground rules has yet been established to afford needed guidance as to when and how suitable remedies should be applied."

The report states that although the purpose of the hearings was to analyze the plight of various segments of the mining industry and the causes for their depressed condition, a number of witnesses proposed possible relief measures and many of them were encouraged by members of the subcommittee to discuss such measures; that it was generally agreed that major segments of the domestic mining industries, including most of the nonferrous metal producers, cannot survive under present conditions without some form of Government assistance, such as subsidies, premium prices, tariff protection, or import quotas, or a revaluation of the American dollar; that the testimony of most witnesses indicated that there is nothing wrong with their industries that adequate tariffs or import taxes would not cure.

The committee concluded—

First. That a state of emergency exists in important segments of the domestic metal and mineral industry and in many mining communities in the United States.

Second. That the principal cause of the depressed conditions that presently exist stems from excessive imports—that foreign mining operations have been overexpanded and much of the excess production capacity stems directly or indirectly from U.S. Government actions.

Third. That the constant threat of overproduction abroad is an effective deterrent to recovery of the domestic industries affected.

Fourth. That authorized administrative remedies, particularly those available under the escape clause provisions of the latest Trade Agreement Extension Act, have not been fully utilized; that the plight of the lead-zinc industry is the direct result of administrative procrastination; that such actions as were taken were too little and too late.

Fifth. That the testimony indicated that the wide dispersion of responsibilities for dealing with problems of the mining industry has contributed to confusion and inaction in the executive branch of the Government.

Sixth. That the committee's investigation clearly shows the need for prompt study of possible remedial measures by the executive branch and the need for adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 177.

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS

On May 25, 1959, the committee sent copies of House Concurrent Resolution 177 to—and requested reports from—the Departments of the Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, General Services Administration, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Tariff Commission, and the Bureau of the Budget.

Department of the Interior: Made no recommendation regarding adoption of the proposal.

Department of Agriculture: No recommendation since legislation would not affect functions of that Department.

Department of Commerce: Does not support enactment of the resolution; lists 5 reasons; states in summary:

Justification for assistance to the mining and minerals industries cited by the resolutions is not conclusive. Furthermore, if direct measures by the Government to increase output are undertaken, as indicated by the resolutions, they would not contribute to the soundness of the industries and they would be inflationary in character or costly to the taxpayer. A review of existing programs for the purpose of bringing about such expansion is therefore not in the national interest.

Department of Defense: Deferred to the views of Department of Interior, since subject matter of the resolution falls primarily within the responsibility of that Department.

Atomic Energy Commission: Knows of no basis for considering the domestic uranium mining industry as "critically depressed," and that it looks to that industry for the bulk of its anticipated future requirements for uranium. The Commission does not feel there is any need for the resolution so far as its programs are concerned.

General Services Administration: Defers to the views of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and the Department of the Interior.

Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization: Stated that from the standpoint of mobilization planning, no need for a special review of programs related to the mining and mineral industries because these industries are examined from time to time in the regular course of their planning. Also stated no need for additional legislation or a reorganization plan to assure a ready supply of materials for defense in a national emergency; that under existing statutes and Executive orders, that agency and others charged with mobilization responsibilities have the authority for actions that might be needed toward sustaining that part of domestic production that is required in case of an emergency; that therefore, from the standpoint of mobilization readiness, the resolution is not necessary.

Tariff Commission: States that it has no program which could be used to provide for increased production and employment in critically depressed domestic mining and mineral industries, and that there are no statutes that impose upon the Commission the responsibility for developing such programs. Further stated that implicit in the proposed resolution is the suggestion that the curtailment of imports may be necessary or desirable in order to accomplish the objective of the resolution; that whether or not the curtailment of imports is a desirable means of accomplishing the objective of the resolution is a question of policy on which the Tariff Commission takes no position.

Bureau of the Budget: Stated that, in separate reports to the committee, the Department of Interior, Department of Commerce, and Atomic Energy Commission presented numerous reasons which indicate that the resolution appears unnecessary; that the Budget Bureau similarly does not see any need for enactment of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time and reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAFETY STANDARDS FOR PASSENGER-CARRYING MOTOR VEHICLES PURCHASED FOR USE BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 342) providing for the consideration of H.R. 1341, a bill to require passenger-carrying motor vehicles purchased for use by the Federal Government to meet certain safety standards, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1341) to require passenger-carrying motor vehicles purchased for use by the Federal Government to meet certain safety standards. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and now yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 342 makes in order the consideration of H.R. 1341 relating to safety standards for Government passenger-carrying motor vehicles. The resolution provides for an open rule and 2 hours of general debate.

The purpose of this bill is to establish reasonable safety standards for passenger-carrying motor vehicles acquired by the Federal Government. The standards would be established by the Secretary of Commerce not later than 1 year after enactment of this legislation and would be effective 1 year and 90 days after publication. Military field training and combat vehicles would be exempt.

During the hearing held by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, leading experts in the field of safety, medicine, public health and engineering endorsed the purposes of this legislation. Spokesmen for the automobile manufacturing industry also approved the objectives of the legislation but opposed enactment of this bill.

The cost per vehicle of the additional safety features needed to meet the requirements of this legislation, of course, cannot be determined or estimated at the present time. No estimates would be possible until the Secretary of Commerce has determined the standards for safety. The committee believes, however, that this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Government in that any additional costs in the purchase of passenger-carrying vehicles will be far more than offset in the reduction of death benefits and compensation payments resulting from traffic accidents. No dollar value, of course, can be placed on the cost in human suffering resulting from preventable highway accidents and injuries.

In the last half century 60 million Americans have been killed or injured in motor vehicle accidents. Putting safer motor vehicles on our streets and highways is one very certain way to reduce this staggering loss due to death and injuries. This legislation, when enacted, will accomplish that, and in addition, will protect employees of the Federal Government and encourage the production of safer motor vehicles for the market, thus further reducing the traffic toll in life and property. If these safety features are provided on Government vehicles, the result may well be that it will hasten the day when such safety features become standard equipment on all passenger-carrying motor vehicles offered for sale to the public.

I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, section 1 provides that no motor vehicle may be acquired for use by the Federal Government unless such vehicle is equipped with such reasonable safety devices as may be required by the Secretary of Commerce.

Section 2 provides that the Secretary must publish in the Federal Register, not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this legislation, commercial standards for the safety devices required.

Section 3, as amended, defines "motor vehicle" and the term "officer or employee of the Federal Government."

Section 4 provides that the first section of the act shall take effect 1 year and 90 days following the date of publication of commercial standards established under section 2. If standards are thereafter changed, the revised standards shall take effect 1 year and 90 days after publication.

Military field training and combat vehicles would be exempt.

DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS

Department of Commerce:

While this Department is in accord with the purpose of the bill, the promotion of highway safety, it would not favor the enactment of the bill.

The General Services Administration, with certain exceptions, presently acquires all passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the Federal Government. It would seem that the purpose of this bill could be accomplished through procurement specifications issued by that agency at the time of advertising for motor vehicles. The imposition of additional standards by the Secretary of Commerce may complicate existing procurement processes unnecessarily, thus resulting in loss of efficiency.

General Services Administration:

Responsibility for safety standards applicable to the purchase or operation of Government motor vehicles is being exercised by General Services Administration, pursuant to sections 201(a) and 206(a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, authorizing the Administrator of General Services respectively to prescribe policies and methods of procurement and supply, and standard purchase specifications. Our Federal Supply Service Standard 122 prescribes the accessory equipment, including safety devices, to be furnished the Federal Government with motor vehicles purchased for its use. Any further requirements for motor vehicle safety devices would normally become a part of this standard.

As an example of General Services Administration action in the field of safety devices for motor equipment, Federal Supply Standard 122 provides an option under which agencies requiring their use may order seat belts. When ordered, the seat belt and the installation technique must conform to specifications established by General Services Administration for the use of Federal agencies.

In view of the above, General Services Administration does not regard the proposal made by H.R. 1341 as necessary, and therefore does not favor enactment of the bill.

Bureau of the Budget:

We are in accord with the objectives of H.R. 1341 but believe that such objectives are being and will continue to be substantially attained through the purchase of commercially produced vehicles and through the efforts of the General Services Administration in specifying such additional safety devices as deemed required through its Federal Standard 122. This Federal standard, which covers both passenger-carrying vehicles and light trucks, was coordinated with all Federal agencies before issuance.

The Department of Commerce and the General Services Administration are reporting on H.R. 1341 and the viewpoints contained in their reports are concurred in by the Bureau of the Budget.

Department of Defense:

At the present time the requirements for safety devices are set out in the various State motor vehicle codes, which for the most part conform to the Uniform Vehicle Code developed by the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances. There is accordingly little variation among the requirements of the various States.

Major manufacturers of commercial motor vehicles adhere to the requirements of the uniform code with respect to safety devices and equip their vehicles accordingly. Since the Department of Defense utilizes standard commercial vehicles for its administrative motor requirements, it is seldom necessary to replace installed safety devices or to install additional equipment in order to meet State requirements. Inasmuch as safety requirements are for the most part uniform, and since compliance can be accomplished locally where variations do exist, there appears to be no justification for the enactment of a law which does not specify minimum safety standards.

In view of the foregoing, the Department of Defense does not favor the enactment of H.R. 1341.

COST

The committee report states:

The cost per vehicle of the additional safety features needed to meet the requirements of this legislation, of course, cannot be determined or estimated at the present time. No estimates would be possible until the Secretary of Commerce has determined the standards for safety.

General Services Administration states:

We are unable to offer any estimate of the probable cost attributable to H.R. 1341.

Department of Defense states:

The fiscal effect of H.R. 1341 cannot be estimated.

NUMBER OF VEHICLES INVOLVED

The subcommittee was told that the Federal Government now has a fleet of about 40,000 sedans and 5,700 station wagons, and that new replacement vehicles are being acquired at the rate of approximately 10,000 a year.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill, H.R. 1341, and the rule for its consideration.

This measure has nothing to do with interstate and foreign commerce. It has to do only with the purchase of vehicles by the U.S. Government. When it was introduced on January 7 of this year, it was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, which has legislative jurisdiction with respect to the General Services Administration and the Federal property and Administrative Services Act. On February 16, by unanimous consent, the Committee on Government Operations was discharged from consideration of that measure and it was re-referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which brings this bill to you today.

This bill does not establish safety standards for automobiles generally sold in interstate commerce. It has nothing to do with that subject. It is confined strictly to the purchase of vehicles by

the Government. Let me say to you, as you will notice from the committee hearings, every agency of the Government, and I believe I am correct in saying this—asked to comment on this measure commented adversely. The General Services Administration, for example, on June 3 of this year said this in its letter to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

> Responsibility for safety standards applicable to the purchase or operation of Government motor vehicles is being exercised by General Services Administration, pursuant to sections 201(a) and 206(a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, authorizing the Administrator of General Services respectively to prescribe policies and methods of procurement and supply and standard purchase specifications. Our Federal Supply Service Standard 122 prescribes the accessory equipment, including safety devices, to be furnished the Federal Government with motor vehicles purchased for its use.

No one knows what this bill will cost. There is some testimony in the committee hearings indicating that there are substantial purchases of motor vehicles. I call your attention to the testimony of the representatives of the General Services Administration, which is on page 48 of the committee hearings:

> Mr. ROBERTS. Can you give total purchases by GSA of vehicles of all kinds, number of units, and total cost during fiscal year 1959?
>
> Mr. HANSON. Number of units, 16,686; cost, $34,693,378.

I want to call your attention to a possible list of safety devices. On pages 38 and 39, Dr. Goddard listed some 45 items that might be conceived as safety devices. If we regard power brakes and power steering as a safety device and required power brakes and power steering to be installed on all Government vehicles you can imagine that would raise the cost very substantially.

This is an item that has not been considered by the committee. No one knows what possible list of safety devices will be brought out by someone in the Department of Commerce. The Secretary of Commerce does not want this authority. As Mr. Leland S. Harris, executive director of the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators, testified as follows on page 93 of the hearings:

> All of the preceding information has been included in this statement to indicate to you gentlemen of the committee that nearly all of what is proposed in H.R. 722 and H.R. 1341 is already being done in a very comprehensive way. Federal intervention at this time would be a costly waste of effort and would probably result in serious injury to the economy of this Nation. I agree with the automobile manufacturers that the prescribing of standards and specifications by the Secretary of Commerce would create stagnation among automotive engineers and designers and eliminate competition to improve vehicles and equipment by the several manufacturers.

Mr. Speaker, everyone is for safety, and I am for safety and in opposing this legislation I am not opposing improving the safety of motor vehicles. It is precisely for the purpose of continuing the progress that is now being made and not freezing it by any set of standards set up by some Government bureaucrat, that this bill should be defeated. I believe this bill will harm research and development into improved motor vehicle safety.

I think the bill should be defeated and that the rule should be defeated.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1341) to require passenger-carrying motor vehicles purchased by the Federal Government to meet certain safety standards.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 143]

Abbitt	Dulski	Mason
Abernethy	Dwyer	Merrow
Addonizio	Elliott	Miller, N.Y.
Alexander	Everett	Minshall
Alford	Evins	Mitchell
Alger	Farbstein	Moorhead
Andersen, Minn.	Fascell	Morrison
Andrews	Fino	Moulder
Anfuso	Flood	Multer
Ashley	Flynn	Nix
Ashmore	Flynt	O'Brien, N.Y.
Bailey	Fogarty	O'Hara, Mich.
Barden	Fountain	O'Neill
Barrett	Frelinghuysen	Osmers
Barry	Gallagher	Passman
Bass, N.H.	Gary	Philbin
Baumhart	Giaimo	Pilcher
Becker	Glenn	Pillion
Bentley	Goodell	Powell
Blitch	Granahan	Preston
Boland, Mass.	Gray	Prokop
Bolton	Green, Oreg.	Quigley
Bonner	Green, Pa.	Rabaut
Bosch	Hall	Reece, Tenn.
Bow	Halleck	Reuss
Bowles	Halpern	Rivers, S.C.
Boykin	Hargis	Rooney
Boyle	Harris	Roosevelt
Brewster	Harrison	Rostenkowski
Burke, Ky.	Hays	St. George
Burke, Mass.	Healey	Santangelo
Byrne, Pa.	Henderson	Selden
Cahill	Hoffman, Ill.	Shelley
Canfield	Hoffman, Mich.	Shipley
Cannon	Holifield	Siler
Carter	Holland	Simpson, Pa.
Cederberg	Holtzman	Slack
Celler	Jackson	Smith, Va.
Chelf	Jennings	Staggers
Coffin	Jensen	Taylor
Collier	Kasem	Teague, Calif.
Colmer	Keith	Teller
Cook	Keogh	Thompson, La.
Corbett	Kilburn	Thomson, Wyo.
Cramer	Kilday	Toll
Curtis, Mass.	Kitchin	Tollefson
Curtis, Mo.	Kluczynski	Tuck
Daniels	Laird	Udall
Davis, Tenn	Lane	Wainwright
Dawson	Lankford	Wallhauser
Delaney	Lennon	Wampler
Dent	Lesinski	Watts
Derounian	Lindsay	Weis
Derwinski	Lipscomb	Whitener
Devine	McCulloch	Whitten
Diggs	McDowell	Williams
Dollinger	McSween	Winstead
Donohue	Macdonald	Yates
Dooley	Magnuson	Zelenko
Dorn, N.Y.	Mailliard	
	Martin	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 255 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1341, with Mr. BASS of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first of all before I discuss this bill, I would like to trace for the members of this committee a little bit of the history of the Special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This subcommittee was authorized by House Resolution 357, 84th Congress. That subcommittee was commissioned to go into this matter of the tremendous death toll, which amounts to about 40,000 deaths a year, and injuries in the neighborhood of 5 million a year, and to check into the tremendous cost of the deaths and injuries on our highways, which has assumed the proportions of a mass epidemic. It has reached the point where it takes away from us in the age group from 15 through 24 such a large number of young people in this country that it ranks as the No. 1 cause of death in this particular group. The special committee went out to the manufacturers, since they are the ones who are under some of the criticism being leveled at different phases of the problem, to see what they were doing in the field of safety.

We held hearings in many parts of the country. We had literally hundreds of witnesses before our committee. We have not spent a great deal of money, but I think you can agree when you see the documents that I have here that we have amassed a large amount of valuable material on this problem which affects every household in America. The work of this subcommittee was continued in the 85th Congress by the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

When we started, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] was one of the members on my side. Another member on our side was the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL], the original sponsor of legislation to study this problem. On the minority side were the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Beamer, a former Member of this body, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK]. In the 85th Congress the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. LOSER] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUSH] were added to the subcommittee.

Then in the present Congress, the work was taken over by the standing subcommittee on legislative matters, known as the Subcommittee on Health and Safety, which continued with the study.

As I said, we have visited many research projects. We saw the work being done by the crash-injury research project of Cornell University; we have been to the Holloman Air Force Base, where considerable work has been done because the services are interested in this problem on account of the heavy losses in automotive crashes. Then we went out to the crossroads of the Nation where we had hearings, Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, and Wisconsin. We went to Chicago where we had hearings with the National Safety Council, the American Bar Association, the American Medical Association, and the American College of Surgeons. We have heard many of the law enforcement people in this field. We have heard from the people who go out and make the arrests; we have heard from the doctors who go to the hospital emergency rooms to clean up the results of these accidents on our highways.

I may say that the bill before the Committee today is certainly not offered as any panacea. All it does is to say that the Federal Government may require reasonable safety devices on Government-purchased cars that are used in Federal Government business, and that those standards shall be arrived at by the Bureau of Standards. As the report points out, the Bureau will not go off into a corner and write these standards, but the Bureau will, as they have in the case of refrigerator safety devices, call in representatives of industry and various engineering groups interested in these problems before they write these standards.

PROVISIONS OF BILL

This bill would establish minimum safety standards for passenger-carrying motor vehicles acquired for use by the Federal Government. Military field training and combat vehicles are not included.

The first section of the bill provides that no motor vehicle may be acquired for use by the Federal Government unless such vehicle is equipped with such reasonable safety devices as may be required by the Secretary of Commerce.

Section 2 provides that the Secretary must publish in the Federal Register, not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this legislation, commercial standards for the safety devices required.

Section 3 defines "motor vehicle" and the term "officer or employee of the Federal Government."

Section 4 provides that the first section of the act shall take effect 1 year and 90 days following the date of publication of commercial standards established under section 2. If standards are thereafter changed, the revised standards shall take effect 1 year and 90 days after publication.

This is more than a bill to protect Government employees. It is legislation that will have far-reaching effects in establishing at least one assured method of controlling and mitigating the terrible toll being taken in traffic accidents on our Nation's streets and highways.

This is not a panacea. There is no one remedy for the traffic accident problem. This bill would enable the Federal Government to take advantage of known and demonstrated scientific knowledge in providing safer passenger-carrying vehicles for use by the Government.

There is ample precedent for Federal legislation in this field. In fact, in some areas the Federal Government has gone much farther than it is proposed to go in this instance.

The Federal Government has accepted responsibility for making safety requirements in all fields of interstate commerce. We regulate the railroads, the bus lines, truck transportation, and air commerce. In fact, in air commerce we require that civil aircraft be manufactured and maintained according to strict Federal standards.

We have established standards for foods and drugs, and for flammable fabrics shipped in interstate commerce. Under legislation which I sponsored in the 84th Congress we have established Federal standards for manufacturing refrigerators to prevent children being trapped in them. That legislation was attacked as unwarranted interference with private enterprise, impossible to put into effect, and a costly burden to the industry. All those dire predictions have proved in error. The industry is building refrigerators with safety devices. There has been no attempt by the Federal Government to enter the manufacturing field in refrigerators. Every refrigerator company in America today advertises the fact that their product is equipped with magnetic safety devices or some other type of mechanical safety device.

This legislation does not apply to any privately owned motor vehicle, whether or not used in part by the employee in connection with his official duties. A clarifying amendment will be offered to spell out more clearly the intent of the bill.

This is not regulation, not domination, just Federal leadership.

Four major categories which must be considered in any study of traffic accidents, which are killing nearly 40,000 people a year in this country, and resulting in injuries to 1,500,000 or more a year, are: (1) the driver; (2) the highway; (3) the vehicle; and (4) density of flow of traffic.

MAGNITUDE OF PROBLEM

To show the magnitude of the problem of traffic safety, let me quote some statistics given the committee by the Public Health Service.

In 1957, 38,702 people killed in motor-vehicle accidents in the United States. There were almost three times as many males as females. Of the male deaths almost one-fourth were in the age group 15 to 24. Female deaths were also highest in this age group with almost 17 percent of the total.

In the age group 15 to 25, motor-vehicle accidents were the leading cause of death in 1957, accounting for more than one-third of the deaths from all causes. This includes all infections, malignancies, and deaths from congential defects, and other causes.

Of all the young men aged 15 to 24 who died in 1957, 40 percent were killed in motor-vehicle accidence. For females in the age group 15 to 19, motor-vehicle accidents caused over one-fourth of the deaths from all causes.

During the 12-month period from July 1957 through June 1958 almost 5 million persons were injured in motor vehicle accidents. The number of males injured was greater than the number of females except in the age groups under 5, and 65 and over. Almost 1 out of every 14 young men aged 15–24 was injured as the result of a motor vehicle accident. This rate was somewhat less among men in the age group 25–44 where 1 in 19 was hurt. The highest injury rate for females also appeared in the 15–24 year age group in which 1 out of every 21 young women in the country was hurt in a motor vehicle accident.

Of the persons who were injured during this period, 890,000 were hospitalized because of motor vehicle accidents.

Of these persons hospitalized because of accidents, 50 percent of them are injured in motor vehicle accidents.

Of the 92 million person-days of restricted activity resulting from injuries suffered in motor vehicle accidents, over 28 million were bed disabling. Over 32 million person-days of work and 2 million person-days of school were lost during the 12 months because of injuries caused by motor vehicle accidents.

The above figures for deaths and injuries are typical for the last four or five years.

The motor vehicle accident death rate exceeds that of any chronic disease except cardiovascular diseases and cancer. The rates—per 100,000 population—are:

Diseases of the heart	369.1
Malignant neoplasms	148.7
Motor-vehicle traffic accidents	22.1
Acute poliomyelitis	.1

I have covered the feature that is most unattractive, and that is this is the most dangerous disease as far as our young people are concerned. It is not too tragic when a man has lived long enough to have made his contribution to society, but when these future doctors, scientists, nurses, engineers, and researchers who have not had the opportunity to make their contributions and upon whom their parents have spent money in educating them, it seems a crime this group should have to lose their lives in this epidemic.

Never before in the history of man has any nation been able to provide so many social and economic benefits for its citizens as has the United States of America. To a large degree the development of this Nation's high standard of living has been the result of the development of the world's greatest concept of transportation. The United States of America has, through its system of surface transportation and air transportation, been able to produce more goods in less time, move those goods to market, sell them for a profit, and move the necessary laboring force to its place of employment and return it to its home with greater efficiency than any people in history. In truth, as a result of the development of this system of transportation has come what we commonly call the American way of life.

IMPORTANCE OF PASSENGER AUTOMOBILE

I believe it beyond the point of argument that at the present time the common denominator of the American citizen is and will continue to be the passenger automobile. We have more automobiles and more licensed drivers than we even have income taxpayers.

In 50 short years the American passenger automobile has changed American life more than any single instrument in our history. It has changed our concepts of dress, it has changed our concepts of vacations, it has changed our concepts of where we may work, it has changed our concepts of where we may live, it has changed the face of our cities; in fact, this device may be truly said to have changed America in such a way that it would have defied the imagination of our grandparents or great-grandparents.

With all the changes and benefits which have been produced by the American passenger automobile and the world's greatest system of roads, the automobile has brought with it a byproduct which can only be called a national epidemic—the byproduct I refer to is injury and death.

While no one will gainsay or contradict the American citizen's dependency on the passenger automobile in recent years, our great leaders in the field of medicine and science have been increasingly deploring the slaughter and misery as a result of the use of this great American tool.

In less than 60 years the American passenger automobile has killed more Americans than have been killed in all the wars we have fought to preserve our way of living. Through the efforts of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service we are now aware that death, as horrible as only death can be, is only a small segment of the price we are paying for this great mobility of ours. We know that the leading cause of death in American society in the ages of 15 to 25 is the American passenger automobile. We have known for years that 42 percent of all of this youthful group occur from a single cause, motor vehicle accidents.

We have heard recently many complaints about America's loss of prestige and leadership in the field of science and engineering, yet here we have a single instrument which causes the loss of more prospective, potential engineers, scientists, physicians, theologians, lawyers, and business leaders than any other single factor. We know from studies conducted by the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service that this essential device of American living is now injuring to a degree that medical or hospital treatment is required 4,200,000 American citizens each year. We know that in 12 months this disease in injury and death in motor vehicle accidents has accounted for 92 million person-days of restricted activity, 20 million person-days of bed disability at hospitals or in homes, 32 million man-days of lost worktime, and 2 million person-days of lost school activity. Mark you well, this is the price of only 1 short year.

As dark as these facts seem there is a great hope that the knowledge which has been recently acquired through medicine and science can be used to an amazing degree to mitigate and control the byproduct of the mobility which is so essential to the American way of life.

Many witnesses have appeared before the Subcommittee on Traffic Safety and the Subcommittee on Health and Safety Legislation in the past 4 years to describe the body of scientific knowledge which can be used by automobile designers, engineers, and manufacturers to control the result of accidents while we search for the knowledge that will enable us to more perfectly achieve a program of prevention of the accident.

To an astonishing degree evidence has been submitted to these committees for the past 4 years that much of this knowledge is not being used. It is my hope that H.R. 1341 will, by its enactment, place the Federal Government in the position of leadership in requiring this knowledge to be used in controlling injury and death in automobiles purchased for use by the Federal Government.

Already several of our States have taken action to require safety devices which have been demonstrated by scientific knowledge to be effective in preventing injury and death to be incorporated in the vehicles owned and operated by the State. Outstanding examples of State leadership have been demonstrated by California, New York, North Carolina, Michigan, and many others. It would be shameful if the National Government failed to take a position of leadership commensurate with the position already taken by several of the States.

At no time during the hearings on the framing of this legislation has there been any intent or thought toward Federal domination or regulation of the great American automobile industry. The complete intent of this bill, H.R. 1341, is to assure that all employees and officials of the Federal Government have available the best of preventive techniques in attempting to protect them against the risk which must be inevitably associated with the use of the passenger-type automobile.

Hearings on five bills relating to automobile safety were held July 7, 8, and 9, 1959, in which leading experts in the field of safety, medicine, public health, and engineering testified and endorsed the purposes of this legislation. Spokesmen for the automobile manuacfturing industry, although approving the objections of the legislation, opposed enactment of H.R. 1341.

The bills considered in the hearings were:

H.R. 722, by Congressman BENNETT of Florida, to require certain safety devices on motor vehicles sold, shipped, or used in interstate commerce;

H.R. 880, by Congressman MULTER, to require certificates of fitness in the sale of automobiles;

H.R. 883, by Congressman MULTER, to amend title 15 of the United States Code with respect to the operation of speedometers on motor vehicles;

H.R. 1341, which I introduced, to require passenger-carrying motor vehicles purchased for use by the Federal Government to meet certain safety standards, and

H.R. 1346, by Congressman SCHENCK, to prohibit the use in commerce of any motor vehicle which discharges substances in amounts which are found by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to be dangerous to human health.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that this bill comes to the floor with the unanimous approval of the Committee on Health and Safety, and with the overwhelming vote of the full Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It has the endorsement, after full hearings and after complete study of this matter for the past 3½ years of the National Safety Council, which has been in the field of industrial, home, and automobile safety for more than 40 years. It has the approval and the endorsement of the American Medical Association and the Michigan delegation at the 1955 meeting of the house of delegates who were the first ones to introduce a resolution asking for Federal legislation on safety standards. This proposal has the endorsement of the American College of Surgeons. It has the endorsement of the American Public Health Association.

With reference to these reports from the departments, I remember quite well that they fought the refrigerator safety bill all the way along the line.

However, the Congress is the policy-making body, and when the Congress said that was good legislation, the Department of Commerce carried out the missions and objectives as set forth in the refrigerator safety bill. And I predict if the House passes this bill and the other body approves it and the President signs it, that same situation will be true in the future.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Do not Government vehicles currently have to comply with the requirements of the various States and the District of Columbia as to the vehicles it operates?

Mr. ROBERTS. I know of no requirement, I may say to the distinguished gentleman, when taking a Federally owned vehicle into another State that vehicle has to be equipped with devices prescribed by the States. All this bill does is to give to the Federal Government the same right that the States are already exercising in prescribing safety standards for State-purchased vehicles.

Mr. TABER. Do they not already have that? Does not the Government do that? Why do we not bring up that kind of a bill instead of an investigating bill or a bill that passes the buck to the Bureau of Standards?

Mr. ROBERTS. Well, as a matter of fact, all this bill does is to give the Federal Government the same right that the States already exercise in requiring safety devices.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. It is true, though, is it not, that the General Services Administrator already has authority under existing law to purchase any safety devices that are presently manufactured and available on automobiles that he purchases for the various agencies of the Government, provided the agency itself requested it, and it is felt that it is a necessary device? Is that not true?

Mr. ROBERTS. Let me say to the gentleman, not evading his question, that as a matter of fact there has been agreement on only one safety device as to standards by the industry at the present time, and that is in the field of safety belts. That is the only one that there has been any agreement on standards on.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to read from the GSA regulations concerning this matter?

Mr. ROBERTS. I think the gentleman is referring to regulation No. 122.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Well, it is a modification of that section which provides: for installation on Government vehicles at the time of purchase of safety accessories which have been proven as justifying the cost thereof: These include outside rearview mirrors, horn rings for deep dish steering wheels (so-called safety wheels), fresh air type heater, windshield defrosters, windshield washers, directional signals, constant safety dual windshield wipers, sun visors, ash trays.

Mr. ROBERTS. The only safety devices that I know of that are now required, other than those you refer to, actually have to do with putting the automobile into operation. I do not know how you could operate without brakes. I do not know how you could operate without, except in a limited way, Tires and rims. The device they do not include, of the ones that you mentioned, is the deep dish or safety type steering wheel. That is not included as standard equipment on all Government automobiles.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. It has been authorized.

Mr. ROBERTS. But it has not been specified. That is the reason for this legislation.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Well, do you want to force the General Services Administrator to put on this type of steering wheel you just referred to? That could be done by a very simple act.

Mr. ROBERTS. I say, if it will save lives, it and other devices ought to be purchased. If they do not put them on, the Congress ought to say to the Department that they should be put on as provided in this bill.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. But this legislation does not say that they have to be put on.

Mr. ROBERTS. This legislation will require just what it says, that the Government will require such reasonable safety devices as the Bureau of Standards may establish after hearings.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. But, there is no assurance——

Mr. ROBERTS. I do not yield further. The gentleman has plenty of time on his side.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I wish to congratulate the committee on this legislation, and I hope you will go forward and extend it to all automobiles in the United States. The committee and its able chairman from Alabama have done a great deal toward saving lives.

Mr. Chairman, I enthusiastically and wholeheartedly support H.R. 1341 as a means of reducing the frightful accident toll on our Nation's highways. This bill comes to us as a result of many years of research and investigation by the subcommittee of which the able gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS], is chairman. He and the other members of his subcommittee have done a magnificent job of enlightening Congress as to the causes of highway accidents, and they deserve the gratitude of the American people for their significant contributions in the field of highway safety.

One cause of traffic accidents which they have stressed is the need for greater safety in the design and construction of automobiles. I have been deeply interested in legislation to require safer automobiles, as shown by my introduction of H.R. 561, the first automobile safety bill in the current series of bills, which was introduced on January 3, 1957. I reintroduced this measure on the first day of the present session as H.R. 722.

To speak of the need for safer automobiles is in no way to cast reflections upon American automobile manufacturers. They are forced by economic realities to build cars as we of the American public dictate by our buying. As a matter fact, some automobile manufacturers have pioneered in the field of automobile safety, as shown most dramatically by 1956 models. Cornell Medical School researchers report that chest injuries were cut in half by the safety steering wheel introduced in that year. Studies by this institution further show that if all cars, new and old, had certain recommended safety features, half a million people would escape injury, and many of those now being killed would escape with only injuries.

The bill before us today represents a practical beginning toward greater safety in motor vehicles used on America's streets and highways. I am convinced that enactment of this measure will encourage safety improvements in American automobiles, and that the result will be to save many of our fellow Americans from death or injury. I urge enactment of the bill.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the gentleman from Florida for his contribution and say that he introduced one of the first bills of this type that was introduced in the Congress. He appeared before our committee and made an outstanding statement in behalf of safety devices.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. I believe that the gentleman from Alabama is to be complimented on the fine statement he has made, and the committee is to be complimented on bringing this bill to the floor of the House for a vote. Would the gentleman yield for just an observation on my part?

Mr. ROBERTS. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHERER. You have given to us some startling statistics on the number of accidents resulting in injury and death on our highways. There is no question that the failure of automobiles to carry modern safety devices is one of the causes for the appalling death and accident rate on our highways. But, one of the other causes is the fact that in this country we have had deteriorated and outmoded highways. In 1956 this Congress recognized that fact and passed a comprehensive Highway Act. I was just reading some statistics today which show that between now and 1975 there will be 700,000 deaths on the highways of the United States. If by some miracle we could complete and have as of this moment the highways envisioned by the 1956 act, that number of deaths could be cut 40 percent. I merely call this to the attention of the House at this time in connection with the gentleman's statement that the highway program which is going to do the job, along with what the gentleman's bill would do, is slowly grinding to a halt. It is absolutely necessary that this Congress act before we adjourn to provide the necessary funds to replenish the trust fund in order that the Highway Act may go forward.

I thank the gentleman for this opportunity.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I certainly agree with him that good highways are an important part of this program. It would be a tragedy, I think, if the program provided for in the Interstate System were to grind to a halt.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BROCK. On Saturday one of the daily papers of Washington succinctly pointed out the problem we have before us today. The headline said: "Mass Attack on Traffic Deaths."

The article reads:

MASS ATTACK ON TRAFFIC DEATHS

Three-way drive to cut auto accident fatalities (now close to 40,000 a year) is starting.

It's being pushed in Congress, by the conference of Governors, and by the American Medical Association.

Next week the House will act on a bill setting safety standards for passenger-carrying vehicles bought by the Government.

AMA wants Congress to bring pressure on auto manufacturers to make safety devices standard equipment in all cars.

Governors' conference discussed what automakers could and should do, and committee headed by Connecticut's Gov. Abraham Ribicoff will go into it further.

AMA wants these made standard equipment: Seat belts, rollover bars (especially

on sports cars), collapsible steering wheel, crash padding on dash and roof, safety door locks, higher backs on front seats to prevent headsnapping. They want to eliminate pointed hood and bumper ornaments, junk-accumulating ledge behind rear seat, dangerous knobs, buttons, sharp edges, and other inside gadgets.

Safety devices could be installed at little extra original cost if manufacturers made chrome, clocks and other expensive gadgets and trim opional items, AMA says.

NOTE.—Doctors are making two other auto safety moves. They're asking all State medical societies to set up special committees to develop better medical standards for driver licensing.

* * * * *

Auto safety is getting attention also from Association of State Motor Vehicles administrators and U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. There is one thing to which the gentleman pointed I would certainly agree with, and that is that most of the devices that would be covered in the bill if the work on the problem by the Bureau of Standards could be provided for, could be taken care of if they did away with a lot of the extra high tail fins and extra chrome and things of that kind which may add to the style and beauty of the design but in many cases may even add to the dangerous features of the vehicle.

The legislation presented here would promote the production of safer vehicles. That approach to cutting down the accident toll is urged by leading medical experts and engineers who have testified before the subcommittee.

As Dr. T. P. Wright, vice president of research at Cornell University, former Administrator of Civil Aeronautics and one of the outstanding experts in the country, told the subcommittee, automobiles are more readily changed than either human behavior or highways or traffic regulations.

Let me quote briefly from Dr. Wright's statement to the subcommittee:

I do not believe that we can effect any appreciable and permanent reduction in the magnitude of the crash injury problem, within the foreseeable future, except by increasing the capacity of the vehicle package to protect the occupants, or contents from damage in transit. Only the vehicle, in the complex of human, mechanical, highway, and environmental factors which compose our transportation system, lends itself readily to a high degree of standardization, in areas affecting human safety, within a relatively short period of time. We cannot expect to enforce or impose standardized human behavior by any presently known means. We cannot create overnight a robot-controlled transportation system which will eliminate the consequences of human error, nor can we curtail the high degree of mobility we have attained without shaking both our economy and our civilization to the roots. Only one choice remains: change the vehicle, or continue to live with an epidemic disease raging unchecked in our midst, a plague which fells the innocent as well as the guilty, the genius as well as the idiot, without discrimination or favor.

The legislation the committee brings you today was not hastily conceived. As stated earlier, this committee has had the subject of highway traffic safety under study since 1956, when the special subcommittee conducted an extensive investigation of the problem and filed a report with the House—House Report No. 2971, 84th Congress, second session—in which we recommended:

All known and tested safety devices, such as crash-padded paneling, padded windshield visor, dish-type steering wheel, safety glass, etc., should be included as standard equipment on all model cars. At several of the plants that the subcommittee visited we were shown many of these safety devices.

WOULD PROMOTE SAFETY

The committee believes that enactment of this bill will have far-reaching effect in promoting the manufacture of safety motor vehicles for the public and in educating the public on the advantages of known safety devices not now in general use.

The committee feels that the Secretary of Commerce should establish standards only after consultation with the automobile manufacturing industry, engineers, medical experts, and others who have expert knowledge of the problem. It is not intended to have the Secretary draw up specifications which might be visionary or impractical. We want a workable program that will contribute to public acceptance of vehicles designed for safety.

The industry has spent a lot of time and money on safety. But in some instances it would appear that styling and horsepower, for example, have received more attention than certain safety features and devices which need to be sold to the public.

In the hearings held last month the subcommittee was given detailed information on the continuing and expanding safety activities of the industry. Progress in various areas was described, including the following six major categories:

First. Driver vision: Better vehicle lighting and larger glass areas have made it easier for drivers to watch road and traffic conditions, both day and night.

Second. Signal devices: Improved turn and stop signal lights facilitate advance warning of changes in speed, position, and direction.

Third. Packaging car occupants: Improved materials and designs provide enhanced safeguards against injury in event of accident.

Fourth. Driving controls: Better design of instruments and controls and refinements in automatic or power-assisted control mechanisms have simplified the physical operations of driving and enabled the driver to devote increased attention to traffic conditions.

Fifth. Car performance: Improved responsiveness of automobiles in accelerating, braking, and turning has facilitated safe, smooth driving.

Sixth. Mechanical realiability: Improved materials and designs give added assurance against the possibility of hazardous parts failure.

OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSAL

Two principal objections are made to this legislation. They are, one, it will increase the cost of motor vehicles bought by the Government; and second, it is not necessary.

No one, of course, knows what the dollar cost will be to the Federal Government. That cannot be determined until the standards are set.

But whatever the cost, it will not be unreasonable. No one can put a dollar value on human life. No one should try to put a dollar value on the cost in suffering and anguish resulting from crippling injuries that could be prevented.

The committee feels that the additional cost of the safety features required to comply with this legislation would be more than offset by savings in death benefits and accident compensation payments to Government employees.

In addition, this legislation, by encouraging the production of safer vehicles for sale to the public will make enormous savings by reducing the toll of life and limb in automobile accidents.

Witnesses who know what they are talking about told the committee that if certain known safety devices and safety features could be made standard equipment on the automobiles sold to the public the appalling toll of death and injuries can be substantially reduced.

The argument that the legislation is not needed takes two tangents. One is to question whether there are any worthwhile safety devices that are not now included on automobiles bought for the Government. The second is that the responsible Government agencies now have authority to specify safety devices and therefore this legislation is not necessary.

The second objection can be disposed of easily if it is shown that there are known safety devices not now generally built into the automobiles offered to the Government and to the public.

DOCTORS URGE ACTION

Safety organizations, engineers, and the medical profession have been studying this problem a number of years. In the forefront of those telling us we can and should have safer vehicles you will find the American College of Surgeons and the American Medical Association. Our doctors know what this problem is. They are the ones called on to take care of injuries which might have been prevented if the victim had been riding in a vehicle designed to protect the occupants from such hazards as broken glass, instrument panel knobs, rear view mirrors, and the like.

Let me quote you the following resolution adopted in 1955 by the committee on trauma of the American College of Surgeons:

Resolved, That the committee on trauma of the American College of Surgeons request that the board of regents of the college recommend to the motorcar manufacturers of America that they stress occupant safety as a basic factor in automobile design, to include (1) doors which will not open on impact; (2) seats and cushions which will not become displaced on impact; (3) energy absorbing interiors; (4) adequate safety belts or other passenger stabilizing devices that will resist impacts of at least 20 G's; and be it further

Resolved, That the American College of Surgeons offer to cooperate with automobile manufacturers to further safety belts as a basic factor in motorcar design by furnishing such professional and technical advice and information as may be available.

Let me quote you a statement submitted to the committee on behalf of the American Medical Association in the subcommittee hearings July 9, 1959, by Dr. F. J. L. Blasingame, executive vice president of the American Medical Association, in which activities of that organization in the field of safety are outlined. In this statement, Dr. Blasingame said:

Another objective is to study and report on the design features of automobiles. Improvement of the design and safety equipment of automobiles promises the greatest possibility for rapid reduction in the automobile injury and death toll. If it is estimated that the average life of an automobile is 10 years, it is apparent that a very considerable reduction in the severity of injuries and a marked reduction in fatalities could be accomplished in that time if more attention were devoted to providing safety rather than to increased horsepower, streamlining, color, and chrome.

The engineers and designers of the automobile—a relative handful of men in the industry—virtually control the destinies of the American public on the highways. They are the men who decide which elements of safety design will be put into or left out of next year's new automobile.

There is presently available an ample body of research data which clearly indicates the definite values of certain safety features of automobile design, construction, and equipment. Yet, these safety features, if available at all, are all too often offered as optional equipment at extra cost. The automobile industry can make a great contribution toward solution of this problem by consulting with physicians, anthropologists, psychologists, related biological scientists, and other scientific professions, and by giving realistic consideration to the wide range of physical characteristics of automobile drivers and riders and what happens to them in a collision.

In the past the automobile industry has made many important contributions to safety. However, in recent years, safety has generally been ignored in favor of other developments. The following suggestions have been repeatedly advanced by physicians, researchers, and safety engineers with but little success:

1. Anchorage for seat belts should be standard equipment. The public also needs education in the value of seat belts. The only evidence so far presented against seat belts is in the number of deaths in sports cars during rollovers. This is not an argument against seat belts but against the design of such cars which do not provide rollover bars. It should be quite simple to incorporate such a bar in the windshield and a second one back of the seat.

2. Crash padding of the dash, roof, and other areas should be provided.

3. An improved steering wheel and recessed post; perhaps a collapsible assembly.

4. Safety door locks should be standard in all cars.

5. Removal of dangerous knobs, buttons, sharp edges, and other gadgets.

6. Seats should be securely anchored to the floor of the car and should be locked into position. They should also be high enough in the center to protect the neck in a rear-end impact and prevent neck-snap injury (also called whiplash).

7. Eliminate the deck behind the rear seat as a storage place for flying missiles or provide it with an effective retaining rail or construct it as a recessed pocket.

8. Eliminate sharp, pointed hood ornaments. These fill no functional need and are potentially lethal to pedestrians.

9. Eliminate other hazardous exterior design features such as sharp, pointed, bumper ornaments.

That list should dispose of any argument that the vehicles we are now driving are the last word from the standpoint of safety and that in calling for safer vehicles we are engaging in wishful thinking in a field where engineering ingenuity has gone as far as possible.

That list should be convincing enough but let me give you another list, submitted to the subcommittee during the hearings by a representative of the Public Health Service, which will be found beginning on page 38 of the printed hearings. That list is as follows:

LIST OF DESIGN FEATURES OF VEHICLES WHICH IMPROVE SAFETY

7. Seat belt attachment holes predrilled in auto frame or floor pan.

2. Padded head rest to prevent whiplash injury.

3. Ensolite or equivalent padding wherever impact is most frequent—visor, dash, header area, etc.

4. Recessing or removal of all projecting knobs or instrument controls which could be a dangerous point of impact.

5. Deep-dish steering wheels with appropriate energy absorbing design.

6. Removal of tinted windshields.

7. Use of only hardened glass, not laminated.

8. Engineering of cars and trucks so that no interference exists in driving actions; e.g., brake and accelerator too close, wheel too close to body, etc.

9. Use of moving rather than blinking directional signals.

10. Standardization of rear lamp location, color, and relative intensity.

11. Use of either a separate brake light or a clearly visible brightness increase during braking.

12. Colored rear light indicator when foot leaves gas.

13. Gas pedal pressure speed control device without forced governing of speed, such as the ones manufactured by Bender and Chrysler.

14. Visual and auditory speed warnings on the speedometer.

15. Air intake to passenger compartment near top of car (carbon monoxide avoidance).

16. Passenger compartment air exhaust near top of car.

17. Brake pedal able to be used by either foot.

18. Rigid bumper backup plate with energy absorbing material between it and the bumper.

19. Complete wraparound bumpers rigidly attached to frame and having energy absorbing padding.

20. Recessed door handles.

21. Inside door locks controllable from front seat (against children's tampering).

22. Multiple door latches, bolt type, to prevent opening on impact.

23. Fuel monitor light to indicate dangerously low fuel level (to guard against stopping on high-speed highway).

24. One hundred and eighty degrees forward visibility area from driver's seat.

25. No headlight shades (to minimize pedestrian injury in accidents).

26. Rounded hood to protect pedestrians.

27. No sharp hood ornaments.

28. Illumination of dash instruments at night by red light of appropriate level of intensity to protect the driver's night vision.

29. Automatic light dimmer switch (similar to autronic eye).

30. Ceiling lights recessed.

31. Light under the car to silhouette at night for easy visibility.

32. Rear windshield wipers and defrosters.

33. Recessed package shelf.

34. Rollover strength in roof.

35. Roof padded on inside to protect against head injuries.

36. Improved attachment of seats to prevent breaking loose in an accident—seat attachments should be able to withstand a minimum force of 20 g.'s or better.

37. Inertia reel seat belts of adequate strength and design.

38. Hydraulic steering.

39. Constant radius of curvature in window glass to avoid distortion.

40. Fuller sweep design of windshield wipers.

41. Automatic carbon-monoxide detector.

42. Securely fastened seat cushions.

43. Reduction of severe low-frequency vibration in trucks and tractors.

44. Design of seats molded to person's natural pressure distribution.

45. Bumpers shaped smoothly.

SAFETY FEATURES INSTALLED

It may be pertinent to point out that the automobile industry has already installed so-called safety packaging features as standard equipment in at least two instances, where the device in question was in replacement of, rather than in addition to, a basic structure of the automobile. I am referring to the newly designed door latches and the modified steering wheel designs on current model automobiles. Since all automobiles must have door latches and steering devices of some description, presumably the selection of designs offering greater safety for the occupants than other designs need not materially increase the cost of the vehicle.

Although there is no guarantee that future cars will be so equipped, the Government can at present, by purchasing current standard automobiles, automatically assure the procurement of vehicles which are equipped with some type of modified steering wheel design featuring a recessed hub, and some type of door latching mechanism made available subsequent to the publication, in August 1954, of a Cornell study demonstrating that previous types of latches in use often failed to keep doors closed under accident conditions. This study also indicated that, when doors did not stay closed, one in three car occupants was thrown out of the car and subjected to a doubled risk of injury and a five-fold increase in risk of fatality or extremely serious injury. The value of a modified steering assembly was suggested by Cornell evidence that drivers were both more frequently and more seriously injured by protruding steering wheel hubs—frequently a cause of crushing chest injuries—than by any other observed feature of automobile design.

Although every major manufacturer has changed—and presumably improved—these two elements of design since 1955, there is no evidence that the results were based on any type of uniform minimal standards or specifications. On the contrary, each company has produced its own versions of these items. Furthermore, in the absence of any pertinent requirements, there is nothing to prevent the elimination of genuine improvements on current cars, by a stroke of the stylist's pen, in the planning of future models.

Still another factor for consideration is the fact that, although we can recognize a recessed steering wheel hub at

sight, we cannot tell whether it was recessed as an afterthought, for appearance's sake, or was actually designed to collapse progressively under impact, absorbing force which would otherwise be transmitted to the driver. Similarly, few if any of us can determine, by mere visual inspection, whether a given type of door latch, however different in appearance from its predecessors, is more likely to hold in an accident than another type.

The improvement of passenger packaging is evidently not to be accomplished, in any permanent and fully effective sense, simply by adding an occasional device from time to time, the way one shifts the chrome trim from year to year. As evidence that the industry has not fully accepted its responsibility to work consistently toward a better passenger package, it may be pointed out that the instrument panel of a certain 1959 model was designed with unusually sharp radius bends in the metal, resulting in a structure far more dangerous to the occupants than the instrument panel of the preceding year's model. Presumably the change was directed by no more substantial motive than the whim of the stylist in question.

I do not believe that changes of this nature can be excused on the grounds that a safer design is a more expensive one. On the contrary, the complexities of the unfavorable design which replaced a superior one must have involved an increase in production cost, if anything.

It is apparent that minimum requirements are needed not only to assure that present cars are designed to exploit available knowledge of how injuries are caused, but also to guarantee that design factors offering increased passenger protection are retained year after year, or are replaced by others offering equal or better protection than their predecessors.

POLICY DECISION BY CONGRESS NEEDED

The General Services Administration, in a report to the committee, said that enactment of H.R. 1341 is not necessary because that agency now has authority to specify necessary safety features. In that letter, the Administrator of the agency says:

Responsibility for safety standards applicable to the purchase or operation of Government motor vehicles is being exercised by General Services Administration, pursuant to sections 201(a) and 206(a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, authorizing the Administrator of General Services respectively to prescribe policies and methods of procurement and supply, and standard purchase specifications. Our Federal Supply Service Standard 122 prescribes the accessory equipment, including safety devices, to be furnished the Federal Government with motor vehicles purchased for its use. Any further requirements for motor vehicle safety devices would normally become a part of this standard.

That is very true, but the cold facts are that the General Services Administration is not now specifying known safety features and devices which leading experts in the field believe should be the very minimum for any passenger carrying vehicle.

The committee takes the position that setting up safety standards for Government vehicles is of the highest importance. It is a policy decision that the Congress, as the policymaking branch of the Government, should make and should make now.

In the July hearings, Mr. Paul C. Ackerman, vice president, engineering, Chrysler Corp., and chairman of the Engineering Advisory Committee of the Automobile Manufacturers Association, speaking for the industry, sounded a note of optimism when he said:

The increasing interest of professional and civic organizations as well as governments has facilitated the accumulation of new knowledge of safety. Research is progressing at an accelerating rate and we have every reason to expect significant additional progress in the years immediately ahead.

Accordingly, we believe that the public interest will best be served by strengthening the cooperation between the automobile industry and public bodies to develop new knowledge in every phase of safety, and by intensifying educational efforts to convince car owners of the value of safety features and practices.

We need to know more about the causes of accidents to reach the best conclusions. The manufacturers, universities and others are attempting to develop these facts.

NEED FOR ADDITIONAL RESEARCH

Later, in his statement, Mr. Ackerman said:

We feel the Federal Government can and should have a major and positive role to play in the safety progress that must lie ahead. There is a recognized void in the field of research, a void that should be filled as fast as possible with information about the human aspects of motor vehicle operation on the highways of the Nation. There is a lesser but still important void in the information we now have about highway design, traffic engineering, and ways to make each most effective.

We believe that the Federal Government should continue to play an even greater part in supporting and coordinating such research, as well as in encouraging sound regulation and enforcement liaison between States and regions in meeting mutual traffic problems.

Even a cursory look at the record will show that we should be spending more money on highway traffic research to meet this appalling national problem. We are spending vast sums on other problems which are significant but no more important.

The Public Health Service is spending about $1 million a year on research projects in the accident prevention field. Accidents of all types are the third leading cause of death in the United States, exceeded only by cancer and heart disease and various diseases of the circulatory system. Compared with what we are doing in other fields, we are only scratching the surface in research into accident prevention.

An estimate made by the National Heart Institute is that in fiscal year 1959 we spent $78,800,000 on research on heart and circulatory diseases. The estimated research expenditure for each death due to heart disease was approximately $87. For each death from cancer, the expenditure on research was approximately $360.

Let us take a look at Federal appropriations for research and education in the field of agriculture. In fiscal year 1959 that figure was $185,633,000. In fiscal year 1958 it was $172,469,000. The budget estimate for fiscal 1960 was $184,486,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I want to remind the gentleman of another factor, and that is the matter of drunken driving on the highways. If we eliminated that we would save a great many lives. One of the Members mentioned the figure of 700,000 deaths between now and 1975 because of automobile accidents. We could reduce that number and avoid a lot of suffering if we eliminate drunken drivers on our highways, as we ought to do. They have been dealt with too leniently, in my opinion.

Mr. ROBERTS. I certainly agree with the gentleman and I appreciate his contribution. Of course, the gentleman knows that that is a State matter into which I think we could not properly go here in the Congress. But it is certainly a problem that needs attention by the various jurisdictions which do have cognizance of that matter.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Kansas for bringing out that point. Dr. Goddard, then the Chief of the Accident Prevention Program, Division of Special Health Services, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, pointed out that "over a 7-year period, all drivers in one-car accidents who died within 4 hours after entrance in the hospital, 45 or 50 percent of them had blood alcohol above the legal limit, which is 1.5."

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, may I at the outset join the many colleagues of the gentleman on both sides of the aisle in congratulating the gentleman from Alabama for the leadership he has given over a period of many years on this very important field of safety in the design and operation of motor vehicles. It is a sad commentary that here we have such a serious problem to which so little attention is devoted. I am especially interested in the experience the gentleman has had in dealing with the auto industry as to why more effort and energy and time is not given to better safety design. It is only a guess on my part, but to me it seems obvious that a great deal of money is spent by the auto industry in the design of superfluous features of an automobile. I am willing to submit as I do here on the floor that the automotive industry has spent a lot more money and time and effort in designing the ridiculous tail ends of automobiles than they have on the safety features in the front end. Let me give you just one aspect of this, and that is the compressibility of

an automobile. On an impact test, we know that the slightest amount of give greatly absorved the impact and the shock, yet we have rigid construction in the auto frame where immediately the slightest impact is carried almost totally to the occupants of the car. Try parking your automobile against a steel bar or a concrete block as you come to a parking lot. Just a slight bump gives you an impact that is transmitted immediately to the occupant. We know there is a space in the front end of these new vehicles of anywhere from 12 to 16 inches which, if it could be used in such a way and if the automobile was so constructed that there would be a sort of collapsibility in the construction so that there would be a give for those 12 to 16 inches, I am sure that many of these head-on collisions and other collisions would result in a reduced impact on the occupants. Would the gentleman feel free to give us some comment on his estimate and what his opinion may be be on the efforts of the auto design people are making to improve the safety features of the automobile in comparison to this nickelodeon type of emphasis on the external, nonfunctional, nonimportant features of an automobile? Does he feel there is a sense of responsibility and awareness such as there ought to be on the part of the auto industry? I do not mean to have the gentleman put himself on the spot in any way at all, but I do know the gentleman has encountered resistance most often perhaps, in the form of lethargy, but I think also a deliberate resistance in some avenues from those who are more interested in promoting the sales of automobiles by glittering gadgets rather than devoting more time and attention to the basic, fundamental safety design of the vehicle itself.

Mr. ROBERTS. I might say to the distinguished gentleman, first of all, I appreciate very much his compliment and appreciate very much the fact that he has been before our subcommittee and has shown an intense interest in this matter. I believe the gentleman sponsored the appropriation which was given to the Department of Commerce under section 117 of the Highway Act of 1956, which provided for a study which was released in March of this year on road and highway safety. In answer to the gentleman's question as to whether or not I think improvement in design could be made, let me say to the gentleman, I certainly am not an expert nor are any of the members, so far as I know, on the subcommittee on which I serve. I do believe, as pointed out in the resolution of the American Medical Association that the American people have been too much at the mercy of those who want to engineer for beauty of design and that there has been insufficient effort on the part of the industry to sell safety to the American people. We feel on the subcommittee we had some part in getting the Automobile Manufacturers Association to finally adopt a resolution saying that they would agree not to unduly stress the speed and horsepower and those things at the expense of safety.

I might say that I think they have done a very good job in living up to the sense of that resolution.

We had testimony before the committee not only by automotive experts but also by experts in the field of mechanical engineering. One of them, by the way, Dr. James Ryan, came from the University of Minnesota, where he was head of the department of engineering. This gentleman has done a tremendous lot of work in this field, especially through the use of hydraulic bumpers, to the extent that he drove his own automobile into a brick wall at a speed of 23 miles an hour; and, although he was held in only by a lap belt, he was not hurt and the car was not severely damaged.

We believe many things can be done. When a car stops in a collision and the passenger keeps on going, the thing that injures him is what he hits. We believe that technical devices such as crash paneling and knobs and door handles which do not protrude, deep-dish steering wheels, so that the steering post does not act as a spear to go through the abdomen or chest, are very important matters in design and are principles that can be built in with very little cost. Actually it takes no more metal, fabric, or plastic to build a steering wheel that is safe than it does the conventional steering wheel; and, by the same token, it takes no more metal to build a safety lock than it does one that protrudes. We think that if emphasis is put at the proper place, the design of cars can be much improved from the safety factor. This bill provides not regulation, not domination, but leadership in the field of safety.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield.

Mr. AVERY. First let me say that although I have some reservations about this bill I certainly recognize the tremendous amount of work that has been done on the bill both by the gentleman from Alabama who now has the floor, and by other members of the subcommittee. I wonder if the gentleman could tell me with respect to page 1 where certain categories are set out whether that would preclude leasing by the Government of Hertz cars unless they were equipped as the bill defines in later sections?

Mr. ROBERTS. I assume the gentleman has reference to a portion of the bill that I shall attempt to clarify with some amendments. Some questions have been raised about that and I will have an amendment which I believe will clear up that section. It will be offered at the proper time.

Mr. AVERY. Along with the amendment which the gentleman says he will submit during the third reading of the bill I presume that covers cars that are provided to the House under a leading arrangement for the leadership of the House.

Mr. ROBERTS. I think the amendments would apply to cars furnished to all purchasers by the Government, both Federal and District of Columbia, except those exempt by the bill.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. MEADER. I want to refer to the colloquy between the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Alabama with reference to deep-dish steering wheels. I believe the question was whether or not that item was included upon vehicles now being purchased by the Government. The gentleman from Alabama raised that question with the vice president of the Chrysler Corp. when he was testifying before his subcommittee with reference to standard equipment furnished on motor vehicles purchased by the Government. I believe the record of the hearings is clear that deep-dish steering wheels and safety locks are standard equipment on all of the Chrysler line, including the Plymouth. I believe that appears in the hearings.

I would like, if the gentleman will yield further, to refer to a statement made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], concerning expenditures of the automotive industry for research and development of safety devices. On page 75 of the committee hearings there is a statement in which some explanation is given of the research done by the automotive companies' own engineers, and in addition to that the industry is granting outside organizations money to investigate traffic safety problems. In the current year I think it runs to $1,750,000.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Chairman, this bill will put the Federal Government in the business of designing and engineering automobiles. That is the plain, obvious meaning of the wording of the bill, and the only effect it is intended to have. I do not think the Federal Government, the Bureau of Standards, or the Secretary of Commerce are qualified either by experience or training, and I do not think the people who are working for them are qualified by experience or training to design and engineer automobiles. Yet this bill would give them that responsibility and that function so far as Government-purchased automobiles are concerned.

What is a safety device? It is almost any conceivable part of an automobile. I do not know of anything connected with the structure of an automobile that could not be regarded as a safety device or as a safety unit. The type and shape of the radiator, the shape of the hood, the size and length of the frame, the thickness of the steel that goes into the top of the car, the thickness of the steel that goes into the frame of the car, the horsepower of the engine, the design of the engine, whether it is as safe as it ought to be or whether a different type engine in an automobile would be safer, are all

safety factors in a way, and it would then be a matter of discretion for the Secretary of Commerce working through the Bureau of Standards.

Everyone favors the Congress doing whatever it can to improve safety in automobile construction, but bear in mind that as long as human beings drive automobiles you are going to have accidents. In fact, most accidents are caused either by human error and judgment or by negligence; or, as the gentleman from Kansas pointed out a few minutes ago, through drunken driving, which involves another category.

You can build almost any type of automobile structure that you want to build and you are not going to stop accidents. True, the thicker the steel is in the top of the car the less liable it would be to dent in the case of an accident. The same thing is true, for example, of bumpers. Many people believe that in addition to having bumpers on the rear of the automobile and on the front of the automobile, we should also have them on the sides, so that with someone coming up a side street the side bumper would help protect the occupants of a car to a greater degree.

Emphasis has been laid on seat belts. That is the device the Government authorizes in the purchase of cars, but what good is a seat belt if it is not used? You have other safety devices in a car, the windshield defroster, rear-view mirrors, and things of that type that must be properly used by the driver of the car. If they are improperly used they are of no use whatsoever. If you should require seat belts in every Government automobile, you would have to send along a policeman or a supervisor for each car to see that people riding in the car had the seat belt fastened. You would do the same as the stewardess of an airline does.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan. There is no question but what the author of this bill has the best of intentions. But these matters of safety cannot be legislated so easily.

As the gentleman has so well pointed out, the automobile industry has invested large sums of money in studying safety. Everything that goes into a car is an item of safety, the tires, the windows, and everything else, and once the Government enters into the business of the construction of automobiles it would be a bad day for the Government and for the automobile industry itself, which is suffering from its own troubles right now.

Therefore, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

As I stated, if the basic device, so called, is not used or is not properly used by the occupant, or by the driver, it does not function and it has served no purpose.

I want to call your attention to another thing. At the present time there are several types of safety devices which are being manufactured, but they are not included in the so-called standard equipment of a car.

Now, to install these devices which are not now commonly installed in a standard equipped car would cost $750. You can see that there is pretty good reason why many of these things are not put on the car by the average person, because you have reached a point of saturation; or, if we have not reached it yet, we soon will. So, if the General Services Administrator exercised the authority he now has, he could spend $750 extra for each car he purchased to put these safety devices on presently manufactured cars.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. I would agree, of course, that it may cost more money. But, what is the additional cost as a new model comes out each year? What has it cost these last 2 or 3 years to put these fancy rear end fins on that look like the rear end of a boat, a hydroplane? What is the contribution of all the cost in the design and manufacture of all that elaborate rear end, either toward safety or toward economy or toward efficiency of operation? It is put there to have a pleasing effect, put there as an appeal just to promote sales, and that costs money. I am not unmindful of the point that the gentleman is making; in fact, I am sympathetic to it. Of course, we do not want to be dictatorially telling the auto people what designs they must offer, but certainly even to the layman you do not have to be an engineer to know that there is a lot of waste of money that goes into the design and manufacture of a lot of these expensive forms and shapes and bends. First you have one taillight signal, then you have a double taillight signal, and then you have a triple taillight signal, vertically, and then you switch them horizontally. But, what purpose does the alteration and design of this tail end serve? What does it contribute by way of operation or safety? We are merely asking and suggesting that those who do know their business in the design and manufacture to place a little more emphasis on the functional and on the safety aspects and less on the frills and designs to stimulate sales.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I think there is something to be said in favor of what the gentleman has pointed out. Perhaps some of the things that are presently put on automobiles, certainly many of the things, are not put on primarily for safety; they are put on for convenience, for beauty, for attractiveness, something that will sell to the public; something that the public wants. This is the basic reason I am opposed to this bill, because I do not think that any Federal bureaucrat, regardless of who he is, ought to be given authority by Congress to design and engineer automobiles. That is what this bill does. I do not think the Secretary of Commerce is any better equipped to design a car than the automobile companies. And, what would be the result? This applies only to cars purchased by the Federal Government, but if this thing is good, this authority on the part of the Secretary of Commerce is good, insofar as the Government-owned cars are concerned, then why should he not have the same authority to fix these safety standards and engineer these cars for the public at large?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Well, with reference to the colloquy with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] they could have fins on the backs of cars, under the terms of this bill, 10 feet high, could they not?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. And they could put on 50 feet of chrome and all of the other gingerbread. This bill does not change that at all.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Not only that, but it gives the authority to the Secretary of Commerce, by presumption or by inference, that he ought to make these cars safer. In other words, the present steel top is not thick enough, so they ought to have it a half inch thicker. The bumpers are not large enough, so they ought to enlarge them and put more of them on. This bill provides for standardization of safety devices on Government cars. Now, if it is carried to its logical and sensible conclusion, the same authority ought to be given over the cars used by the public, and there are between 57 million and 58 million cars on the public highways today. I do not think the average driver wants somebody down here in Washington to engineer and design his car for him. It destroys completely the right of buyer choice.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MEADER. With reference to the colloquy the gentleman had with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] on page 79 of the hearings, Mr. Ackerman, the witness on behalf of the automotive industry, answered Mr. BROCK'S question as follows:

> Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. BROCK, I would not want to leave the impression here that we put ornamentation or chrome on the cars at the expense of any known improvement to safety. Certainly, we put ornamentation on, because we feel that we still have to get the car in the hands of the owners.

Is that not exactly the point? These automobile companies are competing to sell their products to the consumer. The consumer is the one who decides whether he wants tailfins or whether he does not want them. If we were operating as they are in Russia, we could have the Secretary of Commerce design the automobiles and we would all get the same car, but it might not be what we wanted. It would no longer be a free economy or a free market where the desires of the consumer are the ultimate test of a product.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. And it would not necessarily prevent accidents.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I should like to associate myself with my colleague from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT]. I have all the confidence any one man could have in the great engineering ability that has brought the automotive industry up to its present high standard. We do not have to go back too long to recognize the great strides that have been made in safety devices and in all matters of automobile construction, without Federal regimentation. Therefore, I do not believe this legislation is necessary. It would put the Federal Government into the business of determining what safety factors should be incorporated in the building of an automobile that Federal employees use.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I thank my colleague for his contribution.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Michigan what effect this bill would have on the acquisition by the Federal Government of automobiles manufactured in foreign countries. Many of these automobiles are bought by our Government and they have no safety glass, they have speed ratios that do not meet the braking ratios, and so forth. What effect would this sort of legislation have on such cars that are purchased by our Government?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. If it had the effect of our not purchasing any of them, I would be in favor of the bill.

Mr. VANIK. Does the gentleman agree that we ought to insist that any automobile purchased by our Government anywhere in the world ought to have safety glass?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I do. There is at present in the law ample authority for the General Services Administrator to purchase such safety devices as he wishes to purchase, which are presently manufactured, upon the request of the department or agency which is getting the automobile. That is already in the law. He has implemented it by regulations. He has authorized safety belts, for instance. Safety glass is standard equipment in all Government cars; windshield washers, defrosters, and heaters, things of that kind—rear view mirrors.

Mr. VANIK. Can the gentleman tell me whether the automobiles that our Government purchases from foreign manufacturers possess such safety devices?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I cannot answer that question; I assume they do. I do not believe the General Services Administrator would purchase a foreign car without these devices or safety factors. Furthermore I know that in our State of Michigan, for example, a foreign car, in order to be licensed—and I think this is true in most other States—would have to have safety glass and many of these other things that we are talking about. Otherwise they could not drive them.

Mr. VANIK. It is my understanding that automobiles purchased by our Government in foreign countries do not have to meet these standards. A great many of these automobiles operate without safety glass or many of these other safety devices that we think are so important for Federal employees to have in this country.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I think they should be required wherever they are purchased or however they are purchased. Certainly the Administrator has the authority to do that.

Mr. VANIK. It is the gentleman's contention, then, that this is not necessary; this could be done by administrative action rather than legislative action of Congress.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Congress has already given this authority to the General Services Administrator. All this bill would do is give the Secretary of Commerce authority to engineer and design automobiles for the future, for all Government use.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MEADER. Is it not true that the General Services Administrator today has ample authority to incorporate in his specifications for the purchase of motor vehicles any proved safety devices without any action by Congress or by the Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. That is right.

Mr. MEADER. In other words, the authority to meet the problem that this bill is ostensibly aimed at already exists in law.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. That is right. The only authority the General Services Administrator does not have is, he cannot design an automobile himself. He must buy safety equipment that is available through a manufacturer. He, himself, does not go into the automobile designing and engineering business as this bill would put the Secretary of Commerce. I want to call your attention to this significant fact. This bill deals with government owned and operated automobiles. The accident frequency rate of automobiles driven by the government is less than the frequency rate of automobiles driven by the general public. Here are some statistics given to me by the General Services Administrator. According to the National Safety Council, 1,888 commercial fleet operators had an accident frequency rate in 1958 of 1.55 per 100,000 miles. In other words, about an accident and one-half for every 100,000 miles of driving. These are commercial fleet operators. Here are some government agencies and their frequency rate. For example, the Post Office Department which operates vehicles night and day all over the country, every day in the year under the most hazardous kind of driving conditions, had the frequency rate of only 2.05 in 1957, and they brought it down to 1.96 in 1958. The Department of the Air Force had a frequency rate of 0.77; the Department of Commerce 1.01; the General Services Administration 0.65; Atomic Energy Commission 0.92; Treasury 0.73; Veterans' Administration 0.63; Department of the Army, where you might expect the accident frequency would be greater, 0.82; and the Department of the Navy 1.17. I mention this merely to show that the accidents on the part of government owned and operated vehicles is less than the nationwide frequency of automobiles driven by the public.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I am delighted to yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Is it not assumed that the Federal Government, making the demand for certain safety devices, would now, of course, pay the bill? It would pay the bill for the safety devices that it asked for; would it not?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. On the government-owned cars, yes.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. So that it is conceivable that having made the request for the purchase of automobiles with these safety devices that the government could be purchasing the entire sets of jigs and dies and fixtures and tools that make these safety devices which would thus make the automobiles purchased by the government the most expensive automobiles ever purchased; is that not correct?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. That is right. There is no way to estimate what the cost of this bill might be. It certainly would depend solely on the discretion of the Bureau of Standards. They would design it completely. No one knows how much that will increase the cost, except we are certain it will be tremendous.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. So that certain safety devices could be purchased for, let us say, 500 automobiles and the jigs and fixtures be paid for, and when it comes to additional numbers of automobiles, the new fixtures would be paid for; could that not be true?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Yes, it would.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTS. Let me say to the gentlewoman, there is no intent in this bill whatsoever to put the government in the business of designing cars. In the first place, the government has purchased only about 10,000 automobiles a year. We know there are certain devices which the engineers and experts say will improve the chances of survival in case the car is in a crash. The gentleman from Michigan appeared before the Committee on Rules and threw out a figure of the cost of about $40 million. We only buy 10,000 cars a year, and that would mean you are going to pay $4,000 an automobile for safety devices. There is no use cluttering up the RECORD with a lot of things that are not in the bill that are not within the intent of the bill and that never will be.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I must decline to yield further to my colleague. At this point, let me ask the gentleman this question.

How much does he think it is going to cost? Can he give us any precise idea as to what it will cost?

Mr. ROBERTS. According to the testimony before the committee, safety locks are now on cars. We had an estimate from the Cornell study of the Ford Motor Co. that they could equip a car with the necessary crash paneling and seat belts at a cost of $32. We had a further statement that if the holes were predrilled in the manufacturing process that the seat belt metal attachments could be put on for as little as 50 cents a unit.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Of course, Mr. Chairman, there is no way of estimating with any degree of accuracy what it will cost. The cost would depend entirely on the type of automobile.

Actually this bill is giving the Secretary of Commerce authority to practically design and engineer an automobile, so the gentleman's reference to item by item safety devices does not paint a clear picture.

Much is being done in the safety area. Most of the State legislatures have passed laws requiring certain devices they think are minimal to qualify an automobile for license.

There is no need for this type of legislation, and certainly not in the manner in which this bill attempts to do it.

As an example of how ridiculous this thing might work out in the matter of safety standardization for automobiles; ice and snow tires are no doubt necessary safety precautions in driving a car in the wintertime in northern Michigan, but such tires would be absolutely useless on a car driven in Miami, Fla., or in many of the Government installations in the South. An air-conditioning unit, which costs $400 or $500 might very well be a significant safety item in some of the Southern States where temperatures go up to 100 and 110 degrees, to keep a driver cool, to keep him breathing fresh air, to help keep him awake. You can associate very well such a device with safe automobile driving in hot parts of the country, but in the part of the country where I come from an air conditioning unit would certainly not be in the interest of either safety or convenience.

So by requiring that no car could be purchased unless it had all this uniform standard equipment could very well put the Federal Government into the business of telling the automobile manufacturers and the American public what kind of cars they must drive.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I come to the well today with mixed emotions. I do not like to be alined on the opposite side of the fence from my two distinguished colleagues and friends, the gentlemen from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK]. I served with these gentlemen on the Committee on Traffic Safety, the select committee that went into this problem and gathered together all of these facts and statistics that have been published throughout this country, and I think very well. However, I am vigorously opposed to the bill which is before the House today, and I want to make it clear that if this bill were a safety measure designed to correct the highway death toll situation that has developed throughout this country I would be here waving a banner for it. It does not do that.

This bill is at most a promotional scheme in which the Federal Government is placed in the position of a promoter trying to bring about the regimentation of the entire citizenship of this country in the matter of the kind of automobile they can have and the kind they cannot have. It poses many, many different problems. In the first place, let me say to those who fear the loss of our markets to foreign countries, the automobile people have priced themselves out of the market right now. Take the average fellow earning $5,000 or $6,000 a year and the price of an automobile to him at $5,000 or $3,500; it scares him to death. Financing has been extended to 3 years. That is one of the reasons why you have these foreign cars coming in, one of the reasons the sales of foreign cars have increased from around 50,000 to somewhere around 600,000 today, although I may be slightly wrong in those figures. Add a lot of gadgets to these cars, and the cost goes up. In the final analysis that is what this bill is intended to do, it is intended to require that a person who buys an automobile must buy one with seat belts or some other gadgets that the automobile manufacturer can sell the Secretary of Commerce or the man to whom the Secretary delegates the power to determine these standards.

This bill is a hunting license for these dealers and manufacturers who build special gadgets; and, of course, the automobile manufacturers are delighted to sell any gadget that costs an additional $10, $20, or even $50, when they are going to make a profit out of it. For instance, suppose the Secretary of Commerce man should say, "Well, it is safer to have one of these electric eyes on your car that dims the lights." Do you know how much those cost? They cost somewhere around $49 to put them on a car.

What are you going to say to some of your constituents in a year or two when they come to you and say, "Mr. Congressman, why do I have to buy a car with a lot of gadgets on it I do not want? I do not want seat belts, I do not want this electric eye, I do not want a few other things that they put on these cars, but I have to buy them and I cannot afford to pay for them."

What are you going to say to them? You will say, "I was in Congress at that time but I did not realize where it was going." Then there is going to be a demand for the repeal of the whole thing because it is not serving the purpose and will not serve the purpose it was intended to serve in the first instance.

Let us look at the bill as it was originally drawn. The bill as originally drawn created a situation where every Member of Congress would have to meet the standards set up by the Secretary of Commerce for this reason: Every one of you use your own private cars for Federal Government business during some time in the year. You do it in Washington, you do it in your own district. This bill says that any car purchased for the use of the Federal Government or agency for 1 minute—it does not say for the full year—has to have these safety devices. That could very easily be construed to mean if you used your car and you deducted on your income tax the expenses for it, you either have to make it comply with the standards or you have to stop deducting the expenses for the use of it for the Federal Government. That is exactly what we are doing here.

Suppose a man set out on committee business from the Congress or from maybe one of the Departments downtown on an airplane and he has to rent a car to go some place to attend to his business. He cannot do it unless that man can give him a certification that the car has met all of the requirements of the Secretary of Commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, there is a great deal that could be said about this bill in opposition to it that I think most Members of the House will be deeply interested in. There is one point I want to make that I think is of great importance. Not one division of this Government has given a favorable report on this bill—not one. The General Services Administration, the Defense Department, the Secretary of Commerce, the Bureau of the Budget; every one of them have in effect condemned the bill. What is going to happen to that bill when it gets to the White House if the President of the United States follows the advice of the people that he appointed to office? We are standing here wasting our time right now. The President will probably veto it, if it passes.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I heard what the gentleman said about use of the private automobile, if it did not comply with all of the regulations of the Secretary in connection with safety devices. You know, we receive some cents a mile every session. Would the gentleman say we cannot accept that 20 cents a mile if we drive our own private automobile up here? Is that Government business?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I would say we would be on loose ground if you did because you are using it for Federal purposes under the bill as it is written now.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROBERTS. I would like to clear up that point. It was raised in the Rules Committee. The bill was drafted by the Legislative Counsel's office. There is some doubt as to whether it would apply to a purchased car used on Government business. I shall offer a clarifying amendment which will restrict it to Government-purchased cars used on Government business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HARDY. Let us be sure we get this point cleared up. There are some committees in the House that have staff people who use their own private automobiles on committee business. That is certainly Federal governmental business.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. They have expense accounts, and they have to be submitted in order to be reimbursed. If we are going to undertake to have a prohibition against them, it is going to seriously hamper committees.

Mr. ROBERTS. There is no point in going rabbit hunting on this bill. I told the gentleman in clear and unmistakable language this amendment that I shall offer will apply to Government purchased cars used on Government business.

Mr. HARDY. I suppose there is no problem about military vehicles. Is that taken care of in this bill?

Mr. ROBERTS. The bill specifically exempts military vehicles.

Mr. HARDY. Would that include vehicles such as jeeps?

Mr. ROBERTS. Jeeps are not included. It does not include military vehicles.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. It does include passenger vehicles used by the military.

Mr. ROBERTS. It applies to passenger vehicles.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Are they going to amend Members of Congress right out of this bill and turn them over to the ravages of the highways?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Of course that is the situation that has developed. You are not going to be as safe in your automobile as the fellow riding in a Federal car may be, according to their arguments.

There is one other point I want to make. An attempt was made here about a year or a year and a half ago to equip all cars with seat belts. One fellow observed that he was against safety belts because they were too uncomfortable to sit on.

Now, that is the whole thing in a nutshell. You can put safety belts on every car that is manufactured, but you cannot make the people buckle those safety belts around them. Now, this bill, so far as Government purchases are concerned, I presume will have to do with these little carts that the postmen run around in. Now, if safety belts are required by the Secretary of Commerce to go on all passenger vehicles, you are going to use more manpower buckling and unbuckling the safety belts on the postmen than you will delivering the mail. Now, that is just exactly what is going to happen. You are going to be in a situation where you have to have this new safety standard on each particular type of vehicle being used in a particular area or for a particular purpose.

Now, what is that going to do? It is going to create a demand on the part of the Secretary of Commerce to set up an entirely new division with a large bunch of new employees to make more raids on the Federal Treasury to pay their salaries with, to do something that the letters contained in this report from all of the departments say "We have the power and the right to do it right today and we can do it, and we are against the enactment of this bill."

I oppose this legislation because it expands bureaucracy, opens the door for tremendous expenditures of tax money, is starting the trend to complete regimentation of the motorist, and could do much damage to the sale of American-made automobiles.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK].

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I seldom appear in the well of the House and do so today only because of the very great importance that I assess to this particular legislation being considered.

Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege to be a member of the Highway Traffic Safety Committee since its beginning. I want to pay my respects, my very sincere respects and commendation, to our chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS], and to the members of the committee who have served on that committee, both past and present, for their devotion to this job of automobile and highway traffic safety. We have had many fine hearings. The chairman could show you several volumes of books showing these fine and very worthwhile hearings. We have seen many wonderful demonstrations in that they were so clear in what they showed. We have examined into drivers' license laws, we have examined into enforcement of traffic laws, and we have examined into the possibility of encouragement of the adoption of a uniform traffic code for the entire United States, which I personally believe would be very helpful.

Now, I would also like to commend the entire automotive industry, because the entire automotive industry has been working together on these safety questions. They have been conducting their tests together. They have exchanged and pooled engineering information. I understand they have a cross-licensing arrangement on various safety devices. So, the industry itself is well aware of its responsibility in this field.

Now, there has been too much emphasis on horsepower and speed in various advertisements in the past, and this has been changed in large measure by the efforts of this particular Highway Traffic Safety Committee. There have been a good many things said here today which are completely hair splitting in an effort to divert attention from the real purpose of this legislation. As the chairman has said, there has been a good deal of rabbit hunting in this matter, and certainly that is not the intention of this legislation and certainly will not be the purpose of this legislation.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHENCK. I am delighted to yield to my friend from Texas, a former and highly valued member of our subcommittee.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for his dedication to the solution of many of these problems in which I think everyone should be interested. His reference to one matter points up one of the most important developments that we have had. That is the horsepower situation. No bill has been introduced which I think strikes at the root of the trouble. Is it not a fact that a great number of the accidents on our highways are caused by people between the ages of 15 and 24 who are engaged in reckless driving, at high speeds, and who are using horsepower that they probably should not have anyway?

Mr. SCHENCK. I would say to my distinguished friend from Texas that probably a very substantial number of accidents are caused by the improper use of the great horsepower that has been made available.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Will the gentleman answer my question?

Mr. SCHENCK. This bill, of course, does not reach the problem of horsepower. The idea that the Federal Government should enter into the matter of the design and engineering of automobiles is just complete "pish-posh." That has no relationship to this legislation at all.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for one other question?

Mr. SCHENCK. A brief question.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Is it not a fact that the automobile industry itself has been the one that has developed whatever safety devices have been developed; that is, the deep-dish steering wheel, the padded dashboard, the door lock that keeps the door from flying open?

Mr. SCHENCK. I would say to my friend from Texas that the automobile industry, as I have indicated before, has done a great deal of work, but they were not entirely of themselves alone inspired in the development of these features. Many of them came about through studies conducted by the Crash School at Cornell University, and other similar efforts.

Mr. Chairman, certainly everybody agrees that the automobile industry is tremendously important in our national economy. We do not wish to do anything which would reflect harmfully on the industry itself or reflect harmfully on its great impact on our national economy. It has been said that sales are influenced by design, by strips of chrome, by various kinds of paint, by styling, by trying to incorporate comfort into the car, by trying to improve the operation of the car. But the design of the passenger compartment itself, as has been so well said by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] leaves much to be desired. For instance, most automobiles today have low roofs and many of us have difficulty in getting into an automobile today especially when we are

wearing a hat. If the car had a couple of extra inches of roof space, added head room space, there would be fewer fatal accidents.

It should be very simple also to place a strip of padding over the top of the windshield. It would be very simple to recess the knobs on the control panel of the car. It would be very simple to have a standardized type of door lock so that the doors would not fly open if the car were involved in an accident. It would be very simple to do away with projections on the front of the car upon which many pedestrians and others have been impaled.

The deep-dish steering wheel has been mentioned. That was a fine development. But there are other developments it would be fine to have. It would be fine to have seat belts. Personally, as the gentleman from Michigan has said, I would have preferred legislation dealing with the entire sale of automobiles in interstate commerce. But this legislation is a good start.

Certainly, we cannot think for one moment that any Secretary of Commerce and his associates are going to go off halfcocked and make all sorts of absurd types of demands for devices that have no use or excuse, economically or otherwise. And so I feel that this is a good start in the right direction. It permits the Federal Government to assume the leadership that is so necessary in the development of automobiles designed for greater safety in the transportation of people.

Mr. Chairman, I can speak only for myself. I never try to speak for any other Member of this House or tell him how he should vote. I am speaking only for myself, but I personally shall support this bill with everything that I can. I want to be on record as being in favor of the right kind of safety legislation in the interest of the people. I do not want it ever shown that because of some sort of trumped up, hair-splitting type, of question that I am willing to have less safety in automobiles. As we have been discussing this legislation this afternoon, in the 2 hours of general debate on this bill, nine people who were live human beings at 10 minutes to 1 will be statistics at 10 minutes of 3. Two hundred and forty who were well, happy people, who were contributing to the support of themselves and their families and the Government—240 people who were doing that at 10 minutes to 1, according to our clock, will be injured more or less seriously by 10 minutes to 3. Yet, we are here trying to develop all sorts of arguments against this measure and why we think that this and that might occur because we dare to suggest that the Secretary of Commerce set some safety standards for automobiles purchased and used by the Federal Government for passenger-carrying purposes. Certainly, it seems to me that we must take a positive forward step. I can speak only for myself, as I indicated, and I am going to take the most positive step I can at this time in supporting this legislation for safer and better designed automobiles from the standpoint of the passengers and the public in general. Somebody said, why do you not build an automobile like you build a ship with boiler plate all around it? My friends, if you stop an automobile suddenly at 25 miles per hour, the people in the car do not stop, they continue to go at 25 miles per hour and the instant when they stop is when the injuries occur. We have seen picture after picture and evidence after evidence and article after article. It does not strike home until it happens to one of our own, a member of our own family. So my colleagues, I personally am going to be for more safety. Personally, I am going to support this legislation. I personally am going to do everything I can to encourage further legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHENCK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. As to these figures that the gentleman gave of 240 people killed or injured or both—were they Government employees driving Government-owned vehicles?

Mr. SCHENCK. No, but let me tell my friend from Iowa that in the past year there were 673, if I recall the figures correctly, 673 Air Force personnel alone, fatally injured in automobile traffic accidents, more I believe, than were killed in air accidents in the Air Force this past year. It has been said that we spend about $25,000 of taxpayers' funds to train and develop an airman or Air Force officer. Let us cut that in two. We still have lost economically in addition to the 673 lives about $8 million. Yet, the chairman says here that this padding can be put on these cars and a few little changes made for between $25 and $30.

Mr. GROSS. How many of these servicemen were traveling in Government-owned vehicles and how many of them were traveling in their own vehicles when they were killed? This bill deals with Government vehicles, you know.

Mr. SCHENCK. I imagine those figures are available. The point is that they were casualties of the Air Force and their fatal accidents are mourned by their families and friends just the same as if they had been lost in combat and in addition the taxpayers of this Nation had invested tremendous sums of money in them.

First, we can well afford to develop a little safer automobile, not only for the Government employee and those who are going to ride in these Government-owned cars, but from the standpoint of damage they may do to the general public on the highways of this Nation.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHENCK. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTS. I would like to commend the gentleman from Ohio who served on this subcommittee ever since its formation 3½ years ago. He has been devoted and dedicated to his work and I appreciate very much his loyalty in supporting this legislation. I want to say to the gentleman that in pointing out that the Air Force in 1957 lost some 673 men in automotive accidents, it should be compared to the somewhat higher toll from air crashes of 698. At one time in the Korean conflict we were losing more people in automotive vehicle accidents than we were in the frontline of battle.

Mr. SCHENCK. I thank the gentleman and I urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman from Alabama with reference to accidents in Korea, the gentleman's bill exempts all vehicles designed or used for military field training, combat, or tactical purposes. How are you going to save lives in the military service when they are exempted from your own bill?

Mr. ROBERTS. I would say to the gentleman from California that if my bill is adopted then these vehicles that caused these deaths would be equipped with at least minimum survival safety features.

Mr. YOUNGER. Not necessarily during combat. When this was before the committee for a vote I do not recall one word being said or brought to the attention of the committee as to the present authority of the Administrator of GSA over safety devices.

Mr. ROBERTS. If the gentleman will yield, I think that question was raised, but the point is that if they had the authority they did not exercise it. They buy stripped-down models. Do you know what they buy a station wagon for? For around $1,700, one that would cost me $3,400; and they pay $1,490 for a four-door sedan. They are stripped-down models, it is true, but they have safety locks on the doors to keep them from opening on impact. As a matter of fact, many of them have safety-type steering wheels, but none of them have crash paneling or any protection for the head, or sun visors. Some of them make no effort to tie down the seats, either front or rear, to keep them from collapsing on impact.

Mr. YOUNGER. The gentleman from Alabama is correct, but I was not talking about that. I was talking about that authority which now exists for the Administrator to specify everything that he thinks is necessary for safety; and he does have authority now to specify these features.

Those facts were not developed before the committee. There was no discussion of it when we had the full committee there.

Mr. ROBERTS. Was the gentleman present at that meeting when the matter was considered?

Mr. YOUNGER. I certainly was present; yes.

Mr. ROBERTS. The gentleman should have inquired about the bill. As I remember, the gentleman voted for the bill.

Mr. YOUNGER. I did, thinking there was nothing in this legislation that would give this protection. I did not have time to make further inquiry. As a matter of fact the hearings, as I recall, were not printed at the time when we had the vote. They may have been but I do not recall that the hearings

were even printed at that time, and, very frankly, after looking into this since that time I cannot support the measure.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. There are two things I would like to make clear: First, in the matter of this Cornell University study referred to by the gentleman from Ohio, that research was financed through industry contributions. I do not know whether all the automobile companies contributed, but many of them contributed substantially to the program.

Second, a lot of statistics have been quoted here with regard to the number of deaths and injuries, and the implication left that there has been no advance or improvement. That is not true at all, for percentagewise there has been a great deal of headway made. Today there are a great many more automobiles on the highways than there were last year or the year before. We should not use these accident statistics until up-to-the-minute revision can be made. Progress is being made at the present time because the figure has stood around 38,000 to 40,000 deaths each year. Of course we want these measurably reduced. But this bill does not do that.

Mr. YOUNGER. I think the large number of deaths as included in these statistics very clearly indicates it is the intent of those advocating this measure that they now want to put those devices on designs for everybody to have them. Frankly, I am just as interested in the safety of my constituents as I am those who are on the Federal payroll. If you are going to require those on the Federal payroll, and it is essential for safety, then the next step is we will have to require it for our own people in good conscience.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ].

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, next month will mark the 40th year of my membership in the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. I am proud to be a member of this union, one of the many labor organizations which has had a splendid record during its 68 years of existence. Therefore, I am quite dismayed to learn that many persons seem to believe that the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers are one and the same organization.

James B. Carey is president of the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers. He has no connection with the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. Mr. Carey's union's initials are IUERMW and much of this confusion could be avoided if this abbreviation were used in referring to his group.

Gordon M. Freeman is president of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. The brotherhood headed by Mr. Freeman has traditionally been abbreviated as the IBEW.

The IBEW was organized in St. Louis in 1891 and has 750,000 members in every part of the United States and Canada. Its members are employed in electrical construction; in public utilities; in every form of communication—telephone, plant and traffic, as well as telephone manufacturing—radio and television, broadcasting and recording, as well as manufacture, service and repair; on railroads; in every form of electrical appliance and electronics manufacturing; in atomic energy installations; in ship and plane and submarine installations; in Navy yards and other Government installations, on the TVA and in other electrical fields.

IBEW members helped build the *Nautilus*, the Univac and to man the equipment at Cape Canaveral. They also keep the railroads operating and help provide electric energy for the entire Nation.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Being a new member of this Committee, on Health and Public Safety, first of all I want to say that this committee has gone into this problem very thoroughly, that our chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee on the minority side have studied this problem for many, many years. This being my first year on the committee, when this problem came up I looked at this particular matter with a good bit of skepticism because I wondered, too, if this type of legislation would do any good; second, whether it is the proper approach; and, third, whether there really was a problem at all to deal with. I sat in committee and heard the witnesses testify, men who are devoting a great deal of their life to research on this very problem, research which they tell us can bring about he saving of lives, a reduction in the number of injuries, a reduction in loss of property in many instances. I think we ought to listen to that advice if we can properly take it and apply it in this field. I am sure you realize that each year we have almost 40,000 lives lost in automobile accidents, that we have approximately 5 million people injured in automobile accidents, and that the property damage results in a figure of something between $5 and $7 billion a year.

Now, I think that pretty much points up a problem that the Federal Government should take leadership in. The only opposition I have heard to this bill is the fact that if we put some safety devices in Government cars, passenger-carrying cars, the people may not use them; they may not strap the seat belts across them, or they might not shut the door well enough so that the safety lock catches. The other argument is, Why? We already have the authority; that the GSA now can do it. Those are the two arguments used in opposition to this legislation, and the only purpose that this legislation can bring about—and it is so stated—is to exert leadership in this field.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I wonder why it is that after 3½ years of study the committee did not bring in a bill which provided that safety standards should be required. Then we would not be passing the buck, but we would be doing something.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Well, I think the gentleman has made a very fine point; I think that is an excellent point, and I am glad to see that the gentleman from New York feels that we need some legislation of this type. I agree that perhaps we could have gone further and required it on all automobiles. However, we felt that this approach was more of a voluntary approach and that leadership being exerted by the Federal Government would be the most effective first step we could take.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I appreciate the contribution by the distinguished gentleman from New York. But the fact remains that in writing the act on these safety devices the Bureau of Standards has a long and distinguished record of cooperation, not only with agencies of the Federal Government but with State agencies, local and State divisions, and with the industry itself. They will do exactly what they did when we put the refrigeration safety device bill through. They called in NEMA, which is the group which represents the electrical manufacturing association. They called in engineers. They called in the public. They called in other experts, and they held hearings and allowed these people to be heard. In that way you get an expert's viewpoint; you get an expert's problem. They are not going off into some corner and write these standards; they are not going off alone and try to write these standards, because the report which forms a part of the legislative intent says they must write these standards in cooperation with industry and with experts and researchers and the public.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Now, I want to comment that the automotive industry is doing a very fine job to help bring about research in this field. They have made many contributions and they are continuing to. Is it not really a litle ridiculous for us to have these advances in research made and then not take advantage of them? And that is all that this bill is asking. It is showing the intent of the Congress that we want to benefit from some of the research that has been done by the automotive industry. Furthermore, we want to exert a little more leadership in it, and I feel that this is the first step we should take to improve this problem of 40,000 deaths a year and 5 million injuries a year and damage to the extent of $5 billion to $7 billion a year. It is time for us to act.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, let me say this, that in the hearings industry was represented. We had a full hearing. They had all of their vice presidents in charge of engineering to come into our hearings. And, I could tell you as a Member of this body that 4 out of 5 members of the automotive industry were willing to endorse this bill and so communicated that fact. But one objected, and that is the reason there is opposition to this bill today.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very much interested in the gentleman's statement. I would like to ask him and the other members of the committee why they are not willing to consider a bill that I introduced for several years which would limit the speed to 50 miles an hour during the long holiday weekends. That is the period, by far, that the greatest number of deaths and injuries occur. Motorists tell me they can control their cars at 50 miles an hour but they often cannot if they go over that speed. I hope the committee will consider my bill. It at least is a trial, and if it works, it will be a wonderful thing.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will say to the distinguished gentlewoman it has always been the intent of this subcommittee and the full committee to try to stay within the Federal jurisdiction, and we think that would be an invasion of States rights and that the matter of speed limits should be confined to State jurisdiction.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It seems to me it is like a war. We try to prevent death and injuries during war. Certainly this is a very horrible kind of war. We are killing day by day more people than we do in war. I feel so strongly about this, and I know the gentleman does. Let us have a war to save lives on the highways. Our children are being killed and we do not seem to do anything about it at all. I do not mean that the committee has not done a lot, but it is not reaching the problem. If we must wait for the different States to act, we shall lose millions upon millions more lives.

Mr. ROBERTS. I certainly agree that a lot more ought to be done than we have been able to do. The lady can see what a battle it is to pass a simple bill like this.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am with the gentleman. I am going to help all I can.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. There is one thing that should be cleared up in view of what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] said about opposition to this bill. I do not know whom he is talking about when he says that one group out of the automobile industry is opposed to the bill. I want the record to be thoroughly clear that no one has talked to me about opposing this bill, no one from the automotive industry. As a matter of fact, the automotive industry is for the bill, because they will sell many additional appliances, devices that go on these automobiles, and it is going to up the cost of the taxpayer in the final analysis. But I think the record ought to be thoroughly clear as to who this individual is that is supposed to be opposing this bill and bringing about this opposition.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I am sure if the gentleman will speak to the gentleman from Alabama, he will be glad to furnish the information.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I think the record ought to show it.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. If the gentleman will speak to the gentleman from Alabama, I am sure he can get the information. I cannot give the gentleman the name; I do not know. But I do want to say this, the record at all times was very clear that there would be no great cost involved in this bill, that we could have many of these safety features for a very nominal cost, just as they have installed in many instances the safety doors, just as they did with the refrigerators, when they put a lock on them, and which has meant so much to the safety of young people in America. It is time for us to take leadership here. This is one of the great problems facing the country today. We have these deaths occurring year after year and we do not want, it seems, to face the problem. It is time for us to assert leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will support the bill strongly.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNGER. Like my good friend, the gentleman from Texas, I want to make this record very clear that I have never talked to anybody in the automobile industry about this. Nobody has been around my office concerning this bill. My only objection is that this bill has not had adequate attention by the full committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I think the name of the person, whoever it is, who is supposed to be generating this opposition, ought to be put in the RECORD. There has been an open accusation on this floor that the opposition was generated by somebody. I feel in all fairness to those of us who are opposing the bill that we should know, and the people of the country are entitled to know, if someone on the outside is trying to block this bill.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNGER. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Alabama, whom he was referring to.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say to the gentleman that I am under no obligation to tell him the name of the person. The gentleman has known me for many years here. He knows that I do not make reckless statements. The information came to me through Mr. John Moore who is Director of the Crash Injury Research Project at Cornell.

The report shows that the industry put out a press release saying, "We heartily endorse the objectives of H.R. 1341." It is in the report. Then they go on and say, "However, the Department under section 112 has the right to prescribe these specifications." But the fact remains that they are not, and have not prescribed any safety devices to amount to anything.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, on page 71 of the committee hearings occurs the statement to which the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] has just referred. It reads as follows. This is the press release:

> The engineering advisory committee of the Automobile Manufacturers Association presented the industry's position on five bills in a statement to the House Permanent Subcommittee on Health and Safety, headed by KENNETH A. ROBERTS, Democrat, of Alabama.
>
> The industry also endorsed the objectives of the proposal by Congressman ROBERTS (H.R. 1341) to equip the Government's passenger-carrying vehicles with specified safety features, saying:
>
> "We feel that governments should set an example for the public by adopting available safety equipment for use on Government-owned vehicles."
>
> However, it questioned the need for Federal specification of automotive design standards as "an unnecessary duplication of effort and expense."

And then the gentleman from Alabama went on to say:

> That statement looks kind of like a yo-yo to me.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Alabama and his subcommittee for the study it has made of highway safety in the past 3½ years.

The subcommittee visited Michigan and visited the Chrysler proving ground which is located in my congressional district. They graciously invited me to sit with the subcommittee in the briefings by the engineers of the Chrysler Corp. and in the demonstrations that were made of safety devices and experimental safety measures under study by the Chrysler Corp.

I commend the gentleman for the study that is revealed in these hearings. I will say for my part, no one from the automotive industry called me to take an interest in this legislation. I discussed it with my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT], and I read the hearings with a great deal of interest.

The subcommittee included a great deal of information on safety devices that have been developed in recent years voluntarily by the automotive industry

and on research for further improvements on safety. The hearings include pictures of various devices and explanations of them starting on page 134 of the committee hearings.

I do not believe there is a single Member of this House who is in favor of hazard and opposed to safety. I do not believe anyone could attempt to use this bill, H.R. 1341, to say that anybody who opposes the bill is really opposed to safety. That would be a very misleading and unfair oversimplification.

I am just as interested as the subcommittee of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] in studying this very important problem of safety which will become more and more critical as our automobile population and automobile travel rapidly increase.

I do not believe the subcommittee can state what percentage of accidents are due to the design and engineering of motor vehicles. I do not believe there are any statistics to show how many serious injuries result from design and engineering features of a motor vehicle.

We all know there are many factors that enter into automobile accidents such as human negligence and human error, road conditions, weather conditions, the condition of the driver with respect to fatigue and so on. All of these factors enter into automobile accidents. How many accidents are the result of the design of the vehicle, there is nothing in this record to show. As a matter of fact, Dr. Goddard on page 36 of the hearings said a study is now being made in the Greater Boston metropolitan area by the Harvard Medical School attempting to make a study of all the causative factors of accidents.

I believe sufficient power already exists in the General Services Administrator to do everything this bill seeks to accomplish and it would only be confusing to get another department of the Government involved.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, I respect my friend, the gentleman from Alabama, the author of this legislation. I know his motives are the best, and he certainly is acting in good faith. But the effect of his legislation would have a serious impact on the entire automobile driving public throughout the United States. My basic objection to this legislation is the fact that it gives the Secretary of Commerce authority to design automobiles and engineer them. I would have no objection to legislation that made specific categories of safety devices required on automobiles in interstate commerce. I think that would be a fair and honest approach, but why does this not apply to every automobile owner. Let me tell you why. How do you think the motorist would feel if Congress passed legislation requiring everybody to have power steering on his automobile at a cost of $180 per car or a headlight beam changer costing $50. There is no question that these things are safety devices, but would the American public want them forced upon them? If you want to do it that way, why do you not do it directly? Why do you not propose legislation and name these devices that you say are so necessary to be put on an automobile instead of delegating to a bureaucrat who knows nothing about automobile design and manufacturing?

You are starting with 10,000 Government cars. What is next? There are 55 million more cars in the United States. You cannot legislate fairly this way. Those devices that are proven necessary for minimum safety will be required anyway, but this is not the way to provide minimum standards. You cannot tell the American public what kind of automobiles they must drive.

I hope the bill will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no motor vehicle manufactured on or after the effective date of this section shall be acquired, by lease, purchase, or otherwise, by any officer or employee of the Federal Government for use by the Federal Government unless such motor vehicle is equipped with such reasonable safety devices as the Secretary of Commerce shall require which conform with standards prescribed by him in accordance with section 2.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Commerce shall prescribe and publish in the Federal Register commercial standards for such safety devices as he may require under authority of the first section of this Act. The standards first established under this section shall be prescribed and published not later than one year from the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "interstate commerce" includes commerce between one State, Territory, possession, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and another State, Territory, possession, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(2) The term "motor vehicle" means any vehicle, self-propelled or drawn by mechanical power, designed for use on the highways principally for the transportation of passengers except any vehicle designed or used for military field training, combat, or tactical purposes.

(3) The term "officer or employee of the Federal Government" includes an officer or employee in or under the legislative, executive, or judicial branch of the Government of the United States, a Member of or Delegate to Congress, a Resident Commissioner, an officer or employee of the government of the District of Columbia, and a member or former member of the Armed Forces of the United States, including the Regular and Reserve components thereof, the Fleet Reserve, the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service.

SEC. 4. This Act shall take effect on the date of its enactment except that the first section of this Act shall take effect one year and ninety days after the date of publication of commercial standards first established under section 2 of this Act. If such standards as so first established are thereafter changed, such standards, as so changed, shall take effect one year and ninety days after the date of publication of such changed standards.

Mr. ROBERTS (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, be printed in the RECORD and be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 7 through 11, inclusive.

Page 2, line 12, strike out "(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "(1)".

Page 2, line 17, strike out "(3)" and insert in lieu thereof "(2)".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBERTS: Page 1, line 5, strike out "any officer or employee of".

Page 2, strike out line 17 and all that follows down through and including line 2 on page 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) The term "Federal Government" includes the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government of the United States, and the government of the District of Columbia."

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, the reason for the amendment is that in drafting the bill some question arose over the language in line 5 on page 1 with respect to "the lease, purchase, or otherwise by any officer or employee of the Federal Government."

The purpose of the amendment is to eliminate any idea that it applies to private purchases used for Government business. The best example I can think of in this regard is use of a car by a Member of Congress or a rural mail carrier. It would not apply to them. It would apply only to Government purchases that are used for Government business.

This question was raised in the Rules Committee. Another question that will be eliminated by the amendment is that on page 2 we struck all language from line 17 down through and including line 2 on page 3, and substitute as a definition for the term "Federal Government" the following: "The legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government of the United States, and the government of the District of Columbia."

This takes out a good deal of surplus language that was contained in those lines.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. That would still leave Members of Congress under this bill?

Mr. ROBERTS. No, it would not leave Members of Congress in it except for the automobiles furnished to the Speaker and the minority leader.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield.

Mr. AVERY. The gentleman will recall that earlier in the afternoon I asked him about cars leased by employees of the Federal Government. I

understand the gentleman's amendment would exempt them.

Mr. ROBERTS. The gentleman from Kansas is correct, and I will say this to him: I do not think it is the intent of the bill to reach vehicles that are leased, certainly not vehicles that are leased for a very short period of time. I would be glad to take that out in conference on the bill if the bill is approved by the House.

Mr. AVERY. If the gentleman will yield further, why not take it out right now?

Mr. ROBERTS. If the gentleman wants to offer an amendment to strike it out I will be glad to accept it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee what is the incidence of accidents involving Government-operated vehicles as compared with other vehicles?

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROBERTS. Let me say to the gentleman that the idea is erroneous that there is a different incidence of accidents among Government employees compared with other drivers. It is no greater. But we believe that the Federal Government should take leadership in things like pure food and drugs, like we did in safety in refrigerator door construction, and like we did with our airplanes, like we did with the railroads, like we did with the Flammable Fabrics Act, where we set certain standards of flammability. We did not take over that industry; we do not take over this one.

Now, that is a long answer to the gentleman's question. But the point is, we believe the example of the Federal Government will draw the trend away from foreign imported cars which have now reached the half million a year mark. I think it will encourage the public to want these devices on the car, and once that fact is known to the manufacturers they will become standard equipment. If they save lives, if they keep an injury from being a death, they ought to be on everyone's car.

Mr. GROSS. I am opposed to the bill and to the amendment. If the bill is good, why not spread the good things of life to everybody, including Members of Congress. I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment, because I want to be protected against those Members of Congress who are driving foreign cars. This bill, in my opinion, is another foot in the door to the U.S. Treasury. I have not yet heard anyone provide an estimate of what this is going to cost the Federal Government.

Mr. ROBERTS. I can say that according to the report the Department spent $200,000 to make the report, and they say that we are spending in the Department $6½ million on campaigns, safety campaigns, slogans, posters, and things of that sort.

Mr GROSS. The gentleman does not intend to dispense with that by this bill, does he?

Mr. ROBERTS. I suspect we could spend $32 a car, about $322,000 a year, on this, and if we saved the lives of 10, 20, or 30 of our servicemen the bill would be well worth the effort.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman spoke about rabbit hunting in this debate. I think there has been a lot of rabbit hunting done around here on the part of the proponents of this bill.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. There is no possible way of determining what the cost will be.

Mr. GROSS. Of course not, because there are no standards.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. The gentleman refers to $32 a car. This bill gives the Secretary of Commerce the right to design a whole automobile. How in the world can anybody foretell at this point what kind of an automobile he is going to come up with or how much it will cost? We are sure it will cost a lot of money on the part of the taxpayers of the country and the motoring public. They are going to be forced to put these things on they do not want.

Mr. GROSS. It is my understanding that the General Services Administration already has the authority to require safety features on automobiles owned by the Government. Does this bill take anything away from the General Services Administration? Apparently not. I see nothing in the bill that does.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. It will simply set up an additional and duplicating bureaucracy in the Department of Commerce which will feel it has a mandate from the Congress to set up a list of safety devices and to establish standards, to hold hearings and so forth. They will have to have personnel to do that. There will be some additional cost in the way of administrative personnel which is wholly unnecessary because the whole job can be done right now by the General Services Administration.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Michigan is correct. How many high-priced consulting firms will be employed by the Department of Commerce? What will that cost with respect to this legislation?

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS]: This last amendment that he proposes is not a committee amendment, is it?

Mr. ROBERTS. It is simply a clarifying amendment.

Mr. YOUNGER. Was that discussed at our meeting when the bill was approved?

Mr. ROBERTS. No; this amendment was not discussed at the full meeting.

Mr. YOUNGER. Now we are trying to write legislation on the floor which should have been done in the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the gentleman from Alabama a question or two about his amendment. A question was raised earlier in the debate as to whether or not these standards would be applied to automobiles rented by a Federal Government employee or by a Member of Congress or by a committee clerk on official business when they went by air or train and had to rent an automobile. Will the gentleman from Alabama clear that up?

Mr. ROBERTS. I may say to the gentleman from Texas my idea is it would not be in the interest of economy to require safety devices on those automobiles. It does apply to them at the present time.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. And with the gentleman's amendment it would still apply?

Mr. ROBERTS. I understand the gentleman from Kansas may offer an amendment to strike the word "lease".

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. How is the gentleman going to get around the "or otherwise"? Those words are in there. If you acquired the automobile by purchase or otherwise, that would mean any right or color of ownership or right to use it by bailment, lease, or other means.

Mr. ROBERTS. I would assume if it is under the control of the Federal Government for a permanent time it would apply to that automobile as the language is written in the bill at the present time.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Does not the gentleman think it would be better if the bill was confined to what its purpose is. As I understand, it was for the operation of Federal leadership, that it would be confined to those automobiles purchased by the Federal Government and title taken by the Federal Government.

Mr. ROBERTS. I might say to the gentleman that there was no testimony as to any number of vehicles that are leased by the Federal Government. The only testimony we had was as to Government purchases. That was the intent of the legislation.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Now, the other question has to do with the definition of the term "Federal Government." I believe the language includes the legislative, the executive, and the judicial branches of the Government of the United States. So, actually the matter would still be up in the air, more or less, as to whether or not a Member of Congress who was using his car on official business might be covered by this act, would it not?

Mr. ROBERTS. Well, I will say to the gentleman that I think the amendment clarifies that part. It is certainly not the intent that it apply to anything but Government-purchased cars used on Government business.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. What about a committee clerk who was using his car more or less as a bailor to the Federal Government but using his car as bailee agent of the Government. Using it for Federal business and was getting paid a per diem on it?

Mr. ROBERTS. I do not believe it would apply to that particular situation.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Does not the gentleman from Alabama think that this matter ought to be thoroughly clarified before we pass a bill of this kind?

Mr. ROBERTS. I think we have discussed that.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. One of the big troubles about this piece of legislation is that there is too much that is left in suspended animation. No one knows exactly where we are going, and we are fixing to pass a law here having to do with all of the automobiles used by the Federal Government not only in this country but, mind you, in foreign countries, because there is no exception made to it. We are fixing to set up another bureau to spend a lot of the taxpayers' money for something, and I certainly think the people of this country are entitled to know what they are getting if we move into that area.

Does the gentleman desire me to yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I will be happy to.

Mr. ROBERTS. I would think that on automobiles purchased by the Federal Government abroad it would be necessary that they contain such safety devices as are required by the Bureau of Standards.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Would the gentleman answer this question? Do you think under this bill that the Secretary of Commerce would have the right to set up one group of standards for a German make automobile, another for a French make automobile, and another for an American make automobile?

Mr. ROBERTS. I would think this, that the Secretary of Commerce would probably have to require American-made automobiles to be purchased, even if to be used abroad, under the language of this bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Well, suppose the automobiles were purchased over there with counterpart funds. As I understand, they could be purchased by using counterpart funds. Certainly the people of those countries are going to insist that the automobile purchases be made in the country from which the counterpart funds came, and I think rightfully so.

Mr. ROBERTS. I am sorry I cannot answer the gentleman's question as to counterpart funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened very carefully to the debate on this bill, and I have read the bill in full. I approached it with an entirely open mind. I am now convinced, after listening to the argument and consideration of this measure, that it is a good one. It seems to me that we have been rather slow in starting something along this line. The safety of our lives and of our health is one of the most important things that we could consider. The Government requires safety standards in buildings, and so forth. The Government always requires protection against fire hazards, against doors opening toward the inside, and there are other safety standards that are required. And we all know that more people are being killed and injured on the highways than by fire. It seems to me that we should take this step, and it is a moderate step. If the bill becomes law and works well, as I believe it will, if it is properly administered, then the public generally will begin to demand safety standards in automobiles and we will save, over a period of time, thousands upon thousands of lives of our good people and millions of dollars that are now being lost in the destruction of property. So I think that the cost, if there is any extra cost, would be infinitesimal compared to the saving that society would make and that our people would enjoy. As a matter of fact, I do not see why it should cost any more at all.

There are some unnecessary gadgets that are put on automobiles now that could well be left off under the operation of this bill, as I see it. Actually I believe the cars could be sold at a cheaper price, constructed more cheaply than they are now. That is the way it appears to me. But even if it should cost some more, and I think it would not cost a whole lot more, certainly the saving in property and in life would be many, manifold greater than the cost.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WIER. Let us take a specific example. Let us take the last Labor Day weekend which is always a criterion of these catastrophes. Out of the 350 people killed over the weekend and probably four or five thousand injured, what percentage of those were Government employees?

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. I think it was not a very large percentage, but this is just a step in the right direction. If it works well eventually all America, in my judgment, will require these safety devices.

Mr. WIER. As a matter of fact, I would venture the guess that the average Federal employee driving a car, whether his own or a Government car, is a lot more careful than the civilian driver.

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. That may be true and as an average it probably is. May I say this in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that this will not stop all accidents and injuries; of course not. There are many other avenues we must approach. There is the question of drunk driving that has been mentioned, that is a most serious matter. But that has to be handled by the States. I doubt seriously that Congress would be able to take jurisdiction in that field. There is the question of reckless driving and too much speed. I would like to see the time come when they will put governors on these automobiles so that they could not run over a certain reasonable speed. I think we are getting too speedy for our highways. At least, let our highway construction catch up with the modern day automobile.

We are just killing too many people. There will never be a time, of course, when we will be completely safe, human carelessness being what it is. Even when a person is perfectly sober and is a good driver, occasionally he will make an honest mistake and cause destruction to himself and others.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. This is the best place in the world for the gentleman to offer an amendment to put governors on cars, if the gentleman thinks that would be acceptable. That would be the only standard in the bill, if the gentleman would just offer an amendment to put governors on all cars, including the chauffeur-driven Cadillacs around here.

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. I probably would support such an amendment. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment this committee. This is a great committee. They have devoted hours and days and weeks and even years to a study of this matter. I would not like to invade their province, however, by offering an amendment here, without their having studied it. But I will say that if this bill works well, in my judgment the committee probably will come out with such a bill. At least I hope so. But we should make progress in this important matter of safety. Now, I do not believe it would be proper for me to offer such an amendment at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENNETT of Michigan: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary' shall conduct a thorough study for the purpose of—

"(1) determining the extent to which motor vehicles used by the several departments and agencies of the Federal Government, or particular classes or types of such motor vehicles, should be equipped with safety devices, and

"(2) developing recommended commercial standards for those safety devices with which, in his judgment, such motor vehicles or particular classes or types thereof should be equipped.

"SEC. 2. As soon as practicable, but not later than January 31, 1961, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the study conducted pursuant to the first section of this Act, together with such recommendations, if any, based upon the findings made in such study, as he may deem to be necessary for the promotion of safety.

"SEC. 3. As used in this Act the term 'motor vehicles' means vehicles, self-propelled or propelled or drawn by mechanical power, designed for use on the highways principally for the transportation of passengers, except any vehicle designed or used for military field training, combat, or tactical purposes."

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, through the Bureau of Standards, to make a study to determine the extent to which motor vehicles used

by the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government should be equipped with safety devices and then report back to Congress and let Congress take action on his report. We are giving the Secretary of Commerce in this bill, if it is passed, as I said previously, absolute authority to design automobiles and to engineer them. He may require anything relating to safety to be put in an automobile. Why is it necessary to delegate that tremendous authority to any agency of the Federal Government? We should first find out what gadgets and safety devices are necessary to be put on these cars, and if they are so necessary in the public interest and if they are so found to be necessary, then we should legislate to require that they be on every motor vehicle that is sold in interstate commerce. But do we want to legislate blindly and completely in the dark? Here are some of the things that the Secretary of Commerce could do under this and require John Q. Public to put on his automobile under the guise of safety. He could require him to have a constant level riding device, an installation referred to as a torsion air ride. That keeps your car on an even keel going around a turn and prevents skidding. What is its cost? It is approximately $106.30. Most people get along without this device. It is a comfortable thing to have, but if a man drives around a corner slowly enough and carefully enough, then he gets around the corner. The man who can afford to pay $106.30 for that device on his car ought to be able to have it and he can have it if he wants it. But why force it on the man who doesn't want it? There is an electric eye beam which automatically dims your lights when you meet another car. That costs $50. It is a fine and convenient thing. But should Congress by giving this authority to the Secretary of Commerce enable him to say that everybody in this country who buys an automobile must have one of those things on his car? That is exactly the kind of thing you would be doing. Here is the cost of six seat belts; heating and defrosting unit for both rear and front windshields. That costs $207. Certainly, these are safety devices and many people have them on their cars. Many other people do not buy them. There is power steering and power brakes. Those are all safety factors on an automobile, but are you going to pass legislation here requiring that every person who buys an automobile pay $180 for power steering on his automobile whether he wants it or not? Are you going to make him pay $38 for power brakes? That is also a safety device. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] said a few moments ago that this bill is just a little harmless advice that we are giving the Secretary of Commerce. Here he is completely in error. This is arbitrary authority that a bureaucrat is directed to use. Nobody has any idea what it will cost and no one knows what kind of automobile he is going to come up with. He might come up with a perfectly square automobile. He may take off all the chrome. He could make it completely unattractive so that the public would not wish to buy it, yet, they would have to buy it if they want an automobile because Congress says the Secretary of Commerce, in the interest of safety, will have the authority to design and engineer automobiles for the American public.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I must point out that I do not share the gentleman's concern, of course, because as the gentleman said earlier in debate, one of his reasons for objecting to the bill is that the General Services Administration, according to the gentleman's own statement in the debate has the authority presently to require all of these things. Now the gentleman knows and I know——

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. That is on Government-owned automobiles.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Permit me to answer the question.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I wish the gentleman would allow me to finish my statement.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. The authority that exists is to purchase existing safety devices. The authority that this bill gives is to have the Secretary of Commerce design and engineer automobiles.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I would like to point out that we could be unreasonable in our approach here. It is true, according to the letter from the General Services Administration, they say presently all they have to do is to put in their specifications that they have to have these automatic dimming lights. That could be done now. All they have to do is to put that in the specifications. You could go right on down the list just as the gentleman from Michigan has been reading off a list of different items of what could happen under this bill. But, the gentleman simply does not want to do this to show that the Congress wants something done in this field. If we can do it, let us show them that we want something done on this matter of safety. It can save lives. We know that because of the research that has taken place. I have seen the movies taken at the Cornell University research project. I have seen movie after movie and fact after fact showing how these safety features can save lives.

Let us assert a little leadership here, let us be reasonable. The department is not going to do any more toward raising costs than they are doing right now, today; but if they know that we want them to take a little action I think we will see it taken. This is simply an added incentive to give them a little impetus.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman from Michigan, of course, offers an amendment the effect of which if adopted would be to wipe out the bill.

As to this business of study, this committee has been studying this for the past 3½ years. Here is a study paid for by the Congress on Federal highway safety which cost the Congress $200,000. I read out of this report, from page 119, where they say that the 10 public agencies which provided most of the cost of the highway safety activities spent about $6,500,000 annually for this purpose.

The Bureau of State Services has spent since 1956 a total of $887,000 in studies of accidents and injury prevention. The National Institutes of Health has spent $1,820,000 on the study. What we are trying to do in this bill is to give the public some return for these tremendous amounts of money that have been spent on studies.

The gentleman says that under the bill the Secretary of Commerce may build a square car, may build some other type of car. There is no intent in this bill for any such action to be taken by the Secretary of Commerce. They have a year in which to publish standards. They have a year and 90 days after the publication of those standards before the bill goes into effect. Congress is going to be meeting here all that time. They have got to come here when the matter of appropriations arises and the gentleman can certainly follow what the Secretary of Commerce does under this bill.

All I can say is that his amendment merely authorizes a study of all the studies that have already been made.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. If the study that has been completed is sufficient why does not the gentleman state and specify in the legislation what standards the Secretary of Commerce should set?

Mr. ROBERTS. Because I am not an expert. I am putting the authority in the only body about which I know anything in this field that is competent to set standards, and that is the Bureau of Standards.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. It is in the General Services Administration now, is it not?

Mr. ROBERTS. If it is there, I will say to the gentleman, it has never been exercised, or if it has been exercised it has been exercised very poorly.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. In connection with the new small cars which the three largest automobile manufacturers are sponsoring, there is quite a controversy over which is the safer, the rear end motor or the front end motor. One of the companies is pushing the rear end motor; the other two manufacturers are going to stick with the conventional front end motor. Would it be possible under this bill for the Department of Commerce to enter into this field of competition and say which it should be?

Mr. ROBERTS. No; it would not.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. The bill would permit that.

Mr. ROBERTS. No, the bill does not go that far. The bill states "such reasonable safety devices"; it does not say anything about the placement of the motor.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Under this bill he could very well say that it should be a rear end motor.

Mr. ROBERTS. I do not think he could.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. He certainly could under the terms of the bill.

Mr. ROBERTS. No; I do not think so. It says "such reasonable safety equipment or safety devices."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama what effect this legislation would have on the purchase and utilization of automobiles by members of the Armed Forces.

Mr. ROBERTS. On page 2 of the bill, line 14, it states "designed for use on the highways principally for the transportation of passengers, except any vehicle designed or used for military field training, combat, or tactical purposes."

Mr. MAHON. It then would apply to military vehicles, for many such vehicles do carry passengers.

Mr. ROBERTS. Those that carry passengers; that is correct.

Mr. MAHON. What has been the attitude of the Department of Defense with respect to this matter? Were witnesses before the gentleman's committee?

Mr. ROBERTS. One witness who appeared before the committee was Colonel Stapp, the head of the Aero Medical Unit at Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio. He testified that he believed that through the use of safety devices and better packaging they could save many of the people in the Armed Services; and as you know they do lose a great number in passenger vehicles in the Air Force.

Mr. MAHON. Do they advocate this legislation?

Mr. ROBERTS. The Department did not, but Colonel Stapp, who is also a doctor, did very strongly.

Mr. MAHON. Did the Department of Defense oppose the legislation?

Mr. ROBERTS. The Department of Defense is opposed to the legislation.

Mr. MAHON. Does the gentleman think this legislation would actually have any very material effect on the accident rate, the death rate, and so forth?

Mr. ROBERTS. I can only repeat to gentleman what the experts told us, experts from the American College of Surgeons, the National Safety Council, Gen. George J. Stewart, and others. In their opinion, they told us it would have a very great effect on cutting down the great toll of death and injury on our highways.

Mr. MAHON. Does not the gentleman think the great toll of death on our highways is brought about by reasons other than those that are affected by this bill?

Mr. ROBERTS. I may say to the gentleman that, of course, the driver has a lot to do with it, but I do not think you are going to change human behavior a great deal. We are not going to complete our highway program for 15 years. We know that these devices will be a step in the right direction. This bill is not offered as a cure-all or as a panacea. It simply will put the Federal Government on the side of safety.

Mr. MAHON. What would probably be the increase in Federal employees that will result from the passage of this bill?

Mr. ROBERTS. I doubt seriously if it will require many additional people in the Department of Commerce. I did not mention that in the implementation, but in prescribing the standards involved in the refrigerator bill they used the same personnel they had on other experiments and on other tests. A good deal of this help will come from the industry, it will come from organizations like the American Testing Association and the Society of Automotive Engineers. A good bit of it will be voluntary. The Bureau will act primarily as a liaison group to get these people together on what is a safety device.

Mr. MAHON. Would the various manufacturers of safety devices undertake, in your judgment, to bring pressure to bear on representatives of the Department of Commerce in order to get their type of contrivance adopted as a mandatory safety device?

Mr. ROBERTS. I will say to the gentleman from Texas I do not know what pressure will be brought. If a man has an invention or an idea that is patentable, if he believes it will make a contribution, certainly it is in our democratic tradition to give him a hearing and let him present his device. I think we should not foreclose anyone who has some contribution to make, and I am sure the gentleman is in agreement with that viewpoint.

Mr. MAHON. Did the hearings leave the inference that the safety device development would proceed more rapidly under this legislation than it has proceeded otherwise without this legislation? The gentleman and I know there have been many improvements made in so-called safety devices.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BENNETT of Michigan), there were—ayes 31, noes 43.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AVERY: On page 1, lines 4 and 5, after the word "acquired" strike out the comma and all that follows down to the word "by" on line 5 and insert the words "by purchase".

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has been discussed already sufficiently this afternoon. When you start to define the terms under lease whereby the provisions of this bill might be made applicable, it almost becomes impossible to write clear legislative language. So the effect of the amendment would be to confine the provisions of the bill strictly to vehicles acquired by purchase by the Federal Government in which title passes to the Federal Government.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROBERTS. The gentleman has a good amendment, in my opinion, and one that will improve the bill; therefore, I accept his amendment.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. Are you making it possible for them to buy foreign cars without complying?

Mr. AVERY. Did the gentleman say "foreign cars"?

Mr. WIER. That is right.

Mr. AVERY. There is nothing in my amendment that would throw any light on that matter at all. It is strictly up to the policy of the Federal Government, although I might say to my friend I do not think it is the policy of the Federal Government to purchase foreign cars.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

We have already eliminated the word "by" on line 5 by a previous amendment. We have struck out, I believe, everything from "by any officer or employee of the Federal Government" down to "for use" in line 6, is that not true?

Mr. ROBERTS. I will say to the gentleman that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas does not affect anything that has already been done by amendment. His amendment simply leaves the language "shall be acquired" but strikes "by lease, purchase, or otherwise."

Mr. YOUNGER. Down to the word "by" on line 5, and there is no word "by" on line 5, because we have already stricken it.

Mr. ROBERTS. Well, I will say to the gentleman that the amendment which was adopted simply struck out "any officer or employee." It did not strike the word "by." And what we have left is clear, and I think the gentleman's amendment will further make it a stronger bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BASS of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1341) to require passenger-carrying motor vehicles purchased for use by the Federal Government to meet certain safety standards, pursuant to House Resolution 342, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1341 to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 31, noes 57.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous agreement, the rollcall will have to go over until Wednesday. Does the gentleman withdraw his point of order?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I would like a vote on it, Mr. Speaker. Will this go over until Wednesday?

The SPEAKER. There has been a unanimous-consent agreement entered into that any rollcalls will go over until Wednesday.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Unless the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] objects to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, the vote by division would be binding, would it not?

The SPEAKER. We would have to take the vote on Wednesday, of course. Does the gentleman withdraw his point of no quorum?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have objected to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and made the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. No vote may be had on the bill until Wednesday. There was a unanimous-consent agreement that any rollcall votes would go over until Wednesday.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of no quorum.

USE OF GREAT LAKES VESSELS ON THE OCEANS

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 4002) to authorize the use of Great Lakes vessels on the oceans.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON H.R. 1341

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill H.R. 1341.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

DEPRESSED DOMESTIC MINING AND MINERAL INDUSTRIES

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 177) declaring the sense of Congress on the depressed domestic mining and mineral industries affecting public and other lands.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 177, with Mr. BASS of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the concurrent resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, before making the formal statement that I have to give to the Committee on the legislation which is now before us, I wish to make three or four short introductory remarks, and, if possible, allay any fears that some individuals may have about this legislation.

This legislation simply asks the Congress to express its position relative to the present condition of the mining industry and to ask the departments of the executive branch of Government to make a further study of the condition of the domestic mining industry and to report back.

There is no sleeper in this legislation. The committee has studied the matter for a considerable length of time. We agreed in the committee on the approach that we are taking.

The committee, as far as I know, is unanimous in its support of the resolution. We do not point the finger of criticism toward any particular branch of Government. We simply state that the situation is not good, that both branches of Government, the legislative and the executive, must assume some responsibility for this situation as it now is and that we should work together in trying to come to some straightforward, permanent policy that would help the domestic mining industry on which so much of our economy depends.

There has been a statement that the domestic mining industry is healthy, that it is in a better condition than it has been in decades past. Let me advise that although the national income from the domestic metals and nonmetals industry in 1958 was $4,830 million almost $700 million of that was the Government purchase program for uranium. Subtracting the uranium support program it is easily apparent that the domestic mining industry in these particular segments was not as good as it was in 1951, 1952, or 1953, and this at the same time when the gross national product was increasing by leaps and bounds.

The resolution does not propose an increase of stockpiles. While we were before the Committee on Rules, I was asked this question: Does this propose that we will go back to the stockpile approach? It does not. The hearings which we had reveal, and I will state it very simply, that the building of stockpiles is not a satisfactory foundation on which to build a stable and healthy domestic mining industry. The resolution does not provide for or propose to authorize the spending of any Government moneys. There are no moneys involved here whatsoever except those moneys that might be necessary downtown to help arrive at some program, and this can be taken care of from the general appropriations given by the Congress to those departments.

Mr. Chairman, the need for the quick adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 177 is abundantly established by the record of the extensive hearings on the measure held in June and July before the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining, and by the committee report on the measure—House Report No. 708.

The fairly satisfactory state of health of our mining industry when considered as a whole does not warrant our overlooking the fact that the health of certain individual segments of the industry is far from satisfactory, and in some cases is actually desperate, as I shall mention.

I commend to the attention of the members of this committee the hearings and the report as the most comprehensive and up-to-date treatment now available on the state of our domestic mining and mineral industries. Many Members of Congress, Government officers, and members of the mining industry have contributed generously of their time and knowledge in establishing this record.

The hearings contain statements of 21 Members of the House, two State Governors, and 67 other persons. These include mine executives, mineworkers, State officials, and others. All of these people endorsed the purposes of the resolution. The resolution is endorsed by the State department of mines or the State mining association of nine States. It is endorsed by the chairman of the Western Governors' Mineral Advisory Council. Clearly, the resolution reflects a wide cross section of opinion.

All that these people are asking is that we maintain in this country a sound and healthy domestic mining and minerals industry. Such an industry is essential to the long-range growth and prosperity of the country, and is vital to its defense.

A disturbing element is the overall decline in mining employment. The members of this committee are well aware of the severe unemployment in anthracite, bituminous coal, and certain metal mining industries. However, it is not so much the overall mining situation toward which the resolution is addressed as it is the critical situation in certain

areas and industries. These industries must be studied and approached on a case-by-case basis to a large extent.

Perhaps more disturbing is the seeming excessiveness to which our government has gone in sacrificing the well-being of our mining and mineral industries and the workers who comprise them to accomplish our foreign policy objectives. When our foreign policy conflicts with our domestic mining policy, it seems that the latter has been sacrificed at times, ruthlessly.

The members of this committee are familiar of course, with the great extent to which Government or Government-sponsored programs have stimulated and aided foreign minerals production. Some of the means by which this has been done is through purchase contracts, loans, grants, technical assistance, and barter transactions. Directly, indirectly, or perhaps inadvertently, the effect has been to stimulate competitive foreign mineral development and production. World overproduction and lower foreign production costs are the primary cause of present troubles in the depressed domestic mining and minerals industries.

In terms of size and number of establishments shut down, and number of workers and families distressed, the individual mining industry in greatest jeopardy at present is the lead and zinc industry. Most of the other industries that are especially distressed at this time are concerned with the production of critical or strategic minerals which were stimulated a few years ago by the stockpile program and other related Government actions, and are now virtually abandoned by the Government to practically free-trade competition from foreign sources. This list includes antimony, low-iron asbestos, chromite, cobalt, columbium-tantalum, fluorspar, manganese, and tungsten.

The anthracite industry is caught between a declining market and increasing costs. Bituminous coal is troubled by several difficult types of problems.

The once prosperous gold mining industry has dwindled under Government policies so that less than a dozen lode mines are operative where gold is the principal product. Silver mining is caught in a squeeze between rising costs and the fixed Government price for the sale of silver.

Geographically speaking, the Tri-State region of Kansas, Oklahoma and Missouri is perhaps the worst sore spot. Formerly the principal domestic source of lead and zinc, mining there is now virtually at a standstill. It is questionable whether mineowners can much longer prevent the total loss of their mines from flooding and other causes. The economic depression in the Tri-State communities approximates that of the Great Depression of the 1930's as to its human or social effects.

A very alarming development that has come to my attention is the attitude of some high Government officials that the Government has no interest in the economic status of the domestic mining industry now that Government stockpile objectives have been met. It is a sensible course of action and it is the policy of Congress to maintain a national stockpile. But the stockpile was never designed to take the place of a sound and healthy domestic mining industry and obviously it cannot do so.

Although the purpose of our hearings was to analyze the state of the affected industries, some of the witnesses commented on various types of Government action that might be taken. There are as you know various measures of differing types now pending in several committees. The consensus of the witnesses was that some major segments of industry, such as lead and zinc, cannot survive unless the Government permits them to maintain a fair share of the domestic market. No one asked or suggested the complete exclusion of foreign materials. The main suggestions were for tariffs or import taxes to maintain domestic production on a competitive basis, with subsidy devices to be used in specialized instances.

Mr. Chairman, the resolution is short and self-explanatory. It declares that it is in the national interest to foster and encourage a sound domestic mining industry, to provide for the orderly discovery and development of domestic mineral deposits, and to continue research pertaining to the use of domestic minerals. It states that national stockpiles do not in themselves assure national security and economic well-being. It states that Government efforts to date have not been effective in alleviating the conditions found to exist, and that unnecessary delay in recovery would result in damage to the physical mine properties, waste of human and natural resources, loss of productive capacity, and detriment to the Nation as a whole.

The essential purpose of the resolution is to stimulate the executive branch to take a fresh approach and a new look at these important problems. Section 1 of the resolution requests the President to have studies made, to advise the Congress of actions taken or proposed, and to submit any reorganization plans or legislative drafts that may be called for.

Mention is made of reorganization plans, in view of considerable dissatisfaction in the mining industry with the diffusion that now exists as to matters affecting it within the executive branch. At least nine major departments and offices are involved—Interior, Defense, State, Commerce, Agriculture, OCDM, GSA, AEC, and the Federal Tariff Commission. It is common knowledge that there are now pending in both Houses of Congress measures that would provide for centralization in one department of the mineral policies of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, the sponsors of the resolution, on the record that has been established, firmly believe that the actions contemplated by the resolution are necessary for the welfare of the country. Concurrence on significant phases of the policy content of the resolution has been received from the Department of the Interior. Some of the other departments felt that the resolution was unnecessary, but offered no objection to it. Opposition to the adoption of the resolution came only from the Secretary of Commerce. However, at a later date he testified before a committee of the other body that a slight amendment, bringing in the idea of an economically sound basis for the affected industries, would make the text of the resolution unobjectionable from the standpoint of his Department.

The resolution is needed to awaken the executive branch and its agencies to the pressing needs that have been outlined. Much educational value has already been gained from the hearings and the committee report. I urge that the resolution be adopted.

PROGRAM FOR AUGUST 25

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I want to advise the Members of the House that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means tomorrow will call up several bills reported out of that committee by unanimous consent, and I would like the details of the bills to appear in the RECORD so the Members will be advised and informed:

H.R. 6779, to amend section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954—relating to the unlimited deduction for charitable contributions for certain individuals.

H.R. 8725, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make technical changes in certain excise tax laws and for other purposes.

H.R. 6155, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation certain nonprofit corporations organized after August 31, 1951.

H.R. 135, to provide an income credit in the case of civil service annuities received by nonresident alien individuals not engaged in trade or business within the United States.

H.R. 6777, to amend section 421 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of certain stock held at death.

H.R. 6249, to liberalize the tariff laws for works of art and other exhibition material and for other purposes.

I do not state that they will be taken up in this order, but these bills will be called up by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means tomorrow by unanimous consent.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to commend the committee for its action. It is high time, in my opinion, that we focus the attention of our people in the United States to the plight of our domestic mining and minerals industry. The approach here is very sensible. It is high time that we mobilize all of the forces in Government in a sensible, intelligent way to seek to maintain our own internal security by preserving our mining and minerals industry.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF].

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, in the southern Appalachian region, of which Virginia is a part, lies perhaps the largest undeveloped low-grade manganese

deposit in the United States. The deposit is undeveloped only because the Government over the years has discriminated against this region. West of the Mississippi River there are three Government low-grade manganese purchase depots and stockpiles to each of which was assigned a quota of 6 million long ton units; east of the Mississippi River there is none. Based on extensive field surveys, the so-called Burgess report concluded that "there are sufficient reserves of low-grade manganese ores in the Southeastern States to warrant a purchase depot" and that "the present and prospective operators and small workers will deliver 6 million long ton units of acceptable ore by June 30, 1958." In 1956, Congress passed legislation which included authorization for such a depot for our region. Because the bill was unsatisfactory in other particulars, the President vetoed it.

The Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization has advised the Congress that the low-grade quotas authorized under current law were filled by the deliveries made during the second quarter of 1958 and that "there is no defense justification for any further purchase program by this agency." However, the Secretary of the Interior, although concurring in the foregoing, advises by letter dated February 2, 1959, that "should the national security in the future make it advisable to renew the low-grade purchase program, the location of a depot within the southern Appalachian region undoubtedly would receive consideration." I earnestly submit that recent international developments make it advisable to reactivate the program, at least insofar as required to repair the discrimination which has been practiced against eastern low-grade producers and stimulate the exploration and discovery necessary for an adequate domestic reserve.

By reason of cheap foreign labor, cheap water transportation, and low tariff rates, the United States has filled over 90 percent of its manganese stockpiles from foreign sources, either through direct purchase or barter of agricultural commodities. The May 30, 1959, issue of American Metal Market announced that the Commodity Credit Corporation has just recently tentatively contracted to exchange surplus farm commodities for Indian manganese under Public Law 488. While foreign barter and purchases may have resulted in some temporary economy, the long-range effect has been to jeopardize the defensive posture of the United States. Foreign purchases have closed down many domestic mines and have almost completely curtailed domestic exploration. It take several months to activate a known deposit of manganese and sometimes several years to locate new deposits for future activation. In the event of war, with coast lines blocked, sealanes closed and naval tonnage pressed into military transportation, these foreign sources would no longer be available. At that point, it would be too late to embark upon a program to encourage domestic exploration and production.

Such a program must be started in peacetime and maintained in peacetime so long as international tension creates a war-threat climate. The only possible incentive for domestic exploration, discovery and development is a ready market and a guarantee that the ready market will continue to exist for a period long enough to protect the necessary capital outlay of private enterprise.

How vital additional exploration, discovery, and development in America is can best be illustrated by a recent estimate of the Bureau of Mines concerning the world's total explored reserves of high-grade manganese. According to that estimate, Soviet Russia has 88 percent; the United States has less than 1 percent. Unless some action, either administrative or legislative is taken promptly, manganese exploration in America will expire before the end of the current calendar year. The last pertinent directive of the Office of the Defense Mobilization in 1956 extended the life of the high-grade carload lot program until January 1, 1961, or until 28 million long dry ton units had been delivered. Based on the rate of current deliveries, that quota will be exhausted sometime this fall.

While Virginia, being the second largest high-grade manganese producer in the continental United States, is vitally concerned about the high-grade program, we are no less concerned about the low-grade program. Unlike the high-grade producer, the low-grade producer must pay the freight from the mine to one of the western depots. These freight costs render low-grade production in the East economically impractical. Accordingly, the low-grade ores which result as a byproduct of the high-grade mining process and the low-grade wad deposits which lie in such abundance in the southern Appalachian region and which could do so much to relieve America of her dependence on foreign ores, cannot be exploited. This is admitted and corroborated in a memorandum of the Office of Defense Mobilization dated August 18, 1954, an excerpt of which reads as follows:

> It is recognized that establishment of a depot in Virginia could result in discoveries of new ore reserves in the course of mining ores for the depot, that this production would increase the domestic contribution to the manganese supply and that it would in effect eliminate a discrimination in favor of the West since no depots exist in the East.

Mr. Chairman, I confess that I know very little about the other strategic metals and minerals which are involved in House Concurrent Resolution 177. But I do know that neither war nor peace can be waged without steel and steel cannot be made without manganese. If the philosophy and purposes stated in House Concurrent Resolution 177 are to be fully effectuated, it will be necessary to do three things with respect to manganese, namely:

First. To increase the quota and extend the life of the high-grade carload lot program.

Second. To reactivate the low-grade program and endow it with a life span long enough to justify the necessary capital investment by private enterprise.

Third. To establish a low-grade stockpile and purchase depot east of the Mississippi River to serve the vast known deposits and stimulate the exploration and development of new deposits in the Southern Appalachian region.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending resolution. I was the author of a similar resolution and I am very much interested in this legislation. I want to commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], for his diligence in bringing this resolution before the House for consideration today. I also want to commend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] for his efforts to obtain assistance for the mines in Oklahoma. He has a very distressed situation among the lead and zinc mines in his district. As a member of a subcommittee, of which Mr. EDMONDSON was chairman, I visited this area in April and saw firsthand the desperate plight of the miners and mine operators. I believe only a couple of small mines were operating in the entire area. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] has also been most energetic in his efforts to assist not only the coal mining industry, but the entire domestic mining industry, and he deserves great credit for his efforts.

Those who are interested in mining, and those who want to do something to help our domestic mining industry, should read the hearings held by our committee on this resolution. I am sure you will enjoy reading the statements made by mining leaders from many States, who are personally familiar with conditions today. During the years I have served in Congress I have never seen a more complete and exhaustive study made of any industry.

The problems facing the different segments of the mining industry are not all the same. However, it soon became obvious in the hearings that perhaps the main difficulty is from the imports of cheap foreign metals, which are destroying the markets which our domestic mines have enjoyed over the years. Our domestic producers cannot compete with the low wages paid in these foreign countries, and they have consistently fought to maintain our high living standards. I feel they should be commended for doing so, and I want to see our American miners continue to enjoy the best wages and highest standards of living to be found anywhere in the world.

I want to recommend the hearings to those who are interested in the problems facing our domestic mining industry. You will find clearcut and convincing statements from those who are experts in the mining field. When you finish reading the hearings you will be impressed with the importance of the mining industry to the economy of our Nation. Certainly, as Members of Congress, we have an obligation to exert

every possible effort to find a way to assist our domestic mines and put these miners back to work. That is the purpose of this resolution, which should be passed by a unanimous vote.

Mr. Chairman, I represent a large coal producing area, and I have noted the decline of the coal mining industry over the years. The problems facing the coal industry are somewhat different from those facing other types of mining. We have seen coal lose markets to other fuels, and some of these markets are lost forever. However, I have been impressed with the optimism that prevails in the coal mining industry, and there is a feeling that coal is coming back as a fuel within the next 10 years or so. Our problem is to keep our mines operating so that they will be ready when the demand comes. I personally feel that coal is coming back as an industrial fuel, and that the markets will increase in the years ahead. I feel that the Coal Research Commission that is being established in other legislation will be most helpful in finding new uses for coal.

Mr. Chairman, I also represent the Cripple Creek and Victor gold mining district in Colorado. Mr. Merrill E. Shoup, of Colorado Springs, president of the Golden Cycle Corp., and a gold mine operator, presented the plight of the gold mining industry. The price of $35 per ounce, fixed by law, is wholly unrealistic, and gold cannot be produced at this price.

We have been concerned over the withdrawal of gold from this country by foreign nations, and our gold reserve is less than $20 billion at this time. Surely we should be interested in building up our stocks of gold, rather than see them depleted at such a rapid rate. To do this we must find a way to increase the production of gold, and Mr. Shoup suggested a bonus of $70 per ounce to be paid by the Government on newly mined gold. I feel that his suggestion has merit, and I hope it will receive careful consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I want to do all that I can to assist our domestic mining industry. The situation is acute in many areas, as you will note from the hearings. By the passage of this resolution we call attention to the need for immediate help if our domestic operators are to survive. We should produce our own metals so far as possible, and not be dependent on foreign production. We cannot afford to let our mines close, as in many cases they will never reopen.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I support the pending resolution. It is very necessary and worthwhile to help an important segment of our entire economy, the domestic mining industry. In my opinion, much good will come from the approval of the measure, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to add my word of commendation to the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for bringing this resolution not only to the committee but to the House floor for action.

Certainly no harm can come from the passage of such a resolution, and possibly a great deal of good may result.

While this resolution is directed to the executive branch of Government, I am confident nothing will be accomplished until Congress itself decides to protect the American mining industry from complete destruction through the importation of foreign mineral products.

It is the importation of foreign minerals that has destroyed the American mining industry and will continue to destroy the American mining industry until tariffs and quotas are levied on such imports. Congress sits idly by and condemns the executive branch for not protecting the industry through the peril point and escape clause in the Reciprocal Trade Act.

With one hand the Congress directs the executive branch and the State Department of the executive branch to contract with these foreign countries for the imports of their mineral products, and then on the other hand when these imports do come in and do flood our market and put our mining industry out of business, they condemn the executive branch for not invoking the peril point and the escape clause provisions of the act.

The responsibility, Mr. Chairman, is that of Congress. It is Congress that represents the people of these United States and the industries of these United States. It is Congress and Congress alone that has the authority to levy import tariffs, quotas, and duties. That authority, that responsibility, and that duty is placed upon the shoulders of Congress, and we cannot shift it to some other branch of Government.

Those who espouse the one-world philosophy contend that we must keep our borders free to all foreign imports, and if we have an industry which cannot compete with foreign competition, the companies engaged in such industry should go out of business and the people employed in such industry should find work elsewhere because, they contend that Americans, with all their ingenuity and efficiency, must be able to compete with countries less fortunate than ours.

This argument, Mr. Chairman, does not take account of the fact that our industries and our mines are not given an opportunity to compete on the same basis with foreign industry and foreign mines. This argument does not take into account the fact that the cost of operation of a mine or an industry in the United States cannot start on an equal footing with its foreign competitors.

That argument does not take into account the fact that the cost of operation of a domestic mine or a domestic industry, which must be added to the cost of the product before we can hope to begin to compete, are such items as salaries, taxes, and foreign aid.

Competitors of the American mining industry operating foreign mines are able to hire help working for one-half or one-third of the salary that must be paid to American workmen. Not only that, but they are working 12 hours a day 7 days of the week, where labor in the United States operates under wage-hour laws, minimum wage laws, a cost-of-living standard that is being forced higher and higher annually. The labor expense, which is a large part of the domestic mining cost cannot be offset by efficiency in operation.

The second thing the internationalists forget in their contention that domestic industry must be more efficient to compete with foreign industry and foreign minerals, is taxes. The internationalists would like to have us forget that our foreign competitors are not required to add onto the cost of their production, the defense of their country. The American taxpayer defends them. The American mine and the American mining industry carries a heavy burden of taxes to defend their competitors in these foreign countries. American labor carries a heavy burden of taxes to defend, if you please, the laborers in these foreign countries who are in competition with them. Yes, the American producer is required to add to his product the cost of the defense of not only the peoples of these foreign countries, but the very industries that are in competition with them. This cost must be added to the cost of the domestic product, all of which is free to the foreign competitor.

Not only is the domestic mining industry and domestic labor defending them, but they are at the same time required to finance these countries for the operation of their own government. Through foreign economic aid and public assistance, we are constructing public powerplants and reclamation projects for the nations within whose borders the competing mines are located. They are not required to pay taxes to finance these programs in their country. The American taxpayer, the American miner, and the American laborer are carrying that burden for them—a burden which must be added to the product we are producing and must be added to the cost of our minerals before we are permitted to even begin to compete with foreign imports.

The third unfair competition the American mining industry is required to meet, and which is added to the cost of the product produced domestically, was brought out forcefully on the House floor last week when we were debating the extension of Public Law 480.

Not only are the American industrialist, the American laborer, and the American miner required to pay taxes to maintain the agricultural support program, but in addition to that, we turn around and give to the people of these competing countries the food and fiber necessary for them to be able to live on a starvation wage that is being paid by the mines in these foreign countries.

Not only is the domestic mining industry required to pay taxes to maintain and defend his foreign competitor, and at the same time compelled to compete with low salaries and low standards of living, but in addition to that, he is forced through Public Law 480, through our foreign aid program, and through these other assistance programs to provide the food, free of charge in many instances, that goes into the household

of the laboring man employed by these competing industries.

No, Mr. Chairman, the internationalists argue that if the American industrialist and the American miner are not able to compete with foreign industry and foreign minerals through greater efficiency, greater per capita and greater per hour production, then they should go out of business.

Equalize these burdens, Mr. Chairman, and American industry and American mines will meet the competition of any country in the world. Equalize the variance in the standard of living, equalize the variance in the salary differential, require them to pay for the food that the American taxpayer has purchased from the American farmer, require them to levy their own taxes to finance their own public works programs, and, Mr. Chairman, require them to levy their own taxes to pay for their own defense and the defense of the rest of the free world, and our mines and our industries will compete with the mines and industries of any country in the entire free world.

Until that is done, it is the duty and the obligation of this Congress to levy upon the foreign importer the cost of this unequal burden that is levied upon the American producer, the American laborer, and American industry, through an import tariff or an import duty, or at least, Mr. Chairman, an import quota.

I sincerely hope this House will pass this resolution. I hope some good will come from it, but I know, as every Member on this House floor must know, that this Congress cannot shift its responsibility and that this problem cannot be solved until Congress is willing to fulfill the obligation and duty reposed in it by the Constitution and protect these industries as the Founding Fathers provided they should be protected and, as we have learned by experience, they must be protected if the economy of this Nation and the strength of this Nation is to be preserved.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, first I want to pay tribute to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], for having been the leader in sponsoring this resolution and seeing to it that full and complete hearings were held by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on a matter which I know is affecting not just one congressional district but the entire economy of the United States.

In a country such as ours, where business after business can point to the economic trends and show that at the present time the number of people employed, the gross volume of business, profits, and everything else are on the ascendancy, it is rather startling to hold hearings and invite representatives of the mining and minerals industry to come before your committee and hear the representatives from each and every segment of that industry testify that today there are less people employed than there were in 1952; that their volume, dollarwise and tonnagewise, in segment after segment of the mining industry is lower than it was in 1952.

Representatives of each segment of the mining industry testify that, as far as their domestic production is concerned on a dollar basis, they are lower now than they were in 1952.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the members of this committee should be startled by these employment figures. In 1952 there were 885,000 people employed in the mining industry in the United States. In March of 1959 there were 686,000 employed in the mining industry in this country, a loss of approximately 25 percent of the employable people in a 6-year period.

Employment in U.S. mining industries, 1939 and 1952–59

[Thousands]

Year	All mining	Metal mining	Iron ore mining	Copper mining	Lead-zinc mining	Anthracite	Bituminous coal	Nonmetals	Oil and gas
1939	845	103.0				89.0	388.0	76.0	189.
1952	885	99.8	33.5	26.5	21.2	63.4	327.8	103.8	289.8
1953	852	106.0	40.1	28.6	17.8	54.0	288.9	105.9	297.4
1954	777	99.3	35.2	27.9	16.4	41.1	226.7	105.1	298.8
1955	770	101.0	34.2	28.9	16.6	31.3	218.7	108.3	317.1
1956	807	108.3	35.1	33.3	17.4	29.3	228.6	115.2	324.8
1957	809	111.2	38.9	32.6	16.7	28.4	230.0	113.3	326.2
1958 (average)	721								
March	733	95.9	31.3	28.9	14.1	22.8	206.3	105.0	302.6
June	717	92.9	30.4	28.2	13.3	19.2	190.1	111.8	303.2
September	711	90.7	31.8	28.4	11.4	18.5	187.2	113.0	301.5
December	713	93.4	30.3	30.2	12.7	19.6	192.2	107.3	300.7
1959: March	686	92.9	32.3	29.0	12.4	16.4	179.8	104.2	292.8

Source: Monthly Labor Review.

Now, the resolution which we are considering stresses first the importance to our national economy of the domestic mining industry. I think that every economist in this country will agree that if this country is to remain strong, if it is to remain sound economically, every segment of our country's economy must be strong. Every person that has appeared before our committee has stressed the fact that in the communities wherein you have mines the economy in that area is down.

It is interesting, if you will study the reports of the Department of Labor and notice the distressed areas in this country, you will find that practically every distressed area in the United States is an area wherein one of the principal industries is mining.

The second thing which this resolution calls attention to is the fact that as a matter of national security we did accumulate large stockpiles of strategic metals and minerals and in doing so we increased production in some sections of our country and stimulated mines in some areas. However, these same programs artifically and abnormally stimulated foreign development and expansion of foreign production capacity far beyond the needs of their own country and also our own. But now that the requirements of the stockpile have been met, the competition which our domestic mines have from foreign imports means that they can no longer produce at a profit and have no alternative but to shut down, or operate at a loss. One of the things that startled me as I listened attentively to the hearings was the number of companies which, under the various programs that our country has initiated in other parts of the world, have spread out and are developing mining properties in other parts of the world and are now bringing those mined products into the United States. Now, these foreign mining operations have been far overexpanded beyond the normal needs of those foreign countries themselves and this excess production has been brought directly to the United States.

Now, another thing that startled me was to realize that while there are upon the statute books of the United States provisions which might protect some of our industries, various Government agencies have refused to use the methods that are available to protect our domestic mining industry. I might say that as I have looked at this situation, you know, if we returned to a good, old-fashioned Republican protective tariff, maybe the domestic mining industry in this country would be in pretty good shape. And, I would suggest to the people downtown who are going to take a look at this protective tariff as a means of saving not only this industry, but many others as they prepare an overall program that they might make possible the continued development of our domestic mining industry and let us try to protect these folks at home.

One of the important differences between the resolution which the Members of the House are being asked to consider and the one which is being considered by the other body is that we are asking the executive branch of the Government to make a review of the existing programs for the purpose of using these programs more efficiently to provide for increased production on a domestic basis and on an economically sound basis. This is no request for any handout, this is an honest effort to get all of the agencies of Goverment that have anything to do with our domestic minerals policy, to sit down, iron out their differences. Then, when they have agreed to a set of ground rules that are economically sound to all, operate on the same set of rules. I think that is a very important factor.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague, the Chairman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is it not true that the last report we have had from the executive department, from the President's Cabinet Committee on Minerals Policy, which set a policy, is dated November 30, 1954?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. It seems to me that it is high time this Congress and the executive branch of Government get together and give the mining industry a program that they can follow and on which they can make a decent profit and keep the people in this country employed. After all, the Good Book says, "Charity begins at home," and the domestic mining industry has not come to our committee—and I think this is very important—asking for a handout. All they ask is the opportunity so that they will not have to take their money and go to foreign countries to make a living. But that being Americans, they can operate in our own country, keep our own people fully employed and keep our Nation developed so that we can produce our own minerals and not have to import them from other countries.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his statement. It reflects exactly the facts that exist in many parts of the country. Also I commend our chairman, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], for the work he has done in that direction. This is not a myth. What you have heard today is not a myth. It represents one of the most dire needs in our country. I can tell you, from the State of Utah, that three-fourths of our lead zinc mines have closed on account of foreign competition. Our miners are out of work. Our mining towns are ghost towns. They have got to have some help. I sincerely hope that this resolution is passed .

I thank the gentleman for his kindness in yielding.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. chairman, I, too, wish to commend my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], for the work he is doing here in conjunction with other members of his committee including of course, the distinguished chairman, in the interest of fine American citizens who find themselves out of work, the kind of work they want to do, the kind of work they have been taught to do. They are forced to come to Government, and because of their own Government's policies undertake to have Government reverse those policies and provide work for them here in this country of ours so that they may do the things which the country must have done.

Specifically I refer to the men who are engaged in mining of all kinds, who are facing competition from abroad. And in that category I should like to include workers in many lines of industry who today find themselves forced to be idle, or to go into some other area of employment to which they are not particularly adapted. And they have to do so because this Government, in my judgment, is encouraging producers from abroad to manufacture, in many instances with substandard labor, and ship those goods to the United States, where we are providing a market for their products.

I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania that anyone who looks at the entire national picture and sees the vast increase of imports into the United States, anyone who visits any one of our great department stores today and sees the products from abroad being given a preferred position of sale to American consumers, can do nothing else but admit that something is being done which is bound to lower the American standard of living, if it is allowed to continue without some protection.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman and his committee, necessarily within the limited area to which they have given their attention, on bringing this matter to the attention of the people of the United States. I hope in due course, certainly in the next session of this Congress, we shall see fit to examine this entire field before the harm comes to the American economy which is threatened.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. I, too, congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania and his very fine committee for bringing this resolution before us. For many years I have been trying to tell the Congress of the United States of the plight in which the mining industry finds itself, particularly as it applies in my own community to the anthracite mining industry. Your report on page 7 indicates the employment in the various mining industries in the United States. As you look at that table, you find that the anthracite mining industry has gone down from the year 1939 when they had some estimated 89,000 employees to 16,000 miners today. I could go back even further than that to 1917 and 1918 when we, in the anthracite fields, had a population of about 144,000 or 145,000 miners. Now they are down to the number of 16,000. It just indicates that if we were to get into another depression or some other emergency, we would have trouble finding miners to operate the mines that we have today. So I think it is very appropriate that this resolution be passed.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the great Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for bringing out this resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the resolution. My State has long been a contributor to our mineral self-sufficiency in war and peace. The contributor of the small miner to this picture cannot be measured by shipping records alone. He has been the explorer and prospector that has found the deposits and developed them. We can ill afford to permit the extinction of this man, his skills and organization. He is the support of much of our frontier. The dollars we pay for the product of his mines go to meet his payrolls—power, supplies, and transportation. They all feed back to sustain the local economy.

Any set of conditions that destroys this domestic mining industry impairs our national security, both miiltary and nonmilitary. For instance the last manganese mines in my State have just been shut down. For the miners, their families and the owners it is a hardship, but it can be a catastrophe to our country and our national security. For us to rely solely upon long ocean hauled imports of millions of tons of a strategic mineral such as manganese while our own deposits remain underdeveloped is certainly unwise from the standpoint of military and nonmilitary defense and the maintenance of the industrial base that supports them. This resolution should help to create the climate for the essential moves.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do I get the impression that this resolution is made necessary by reason of the foreign imports of minerals; is that correct?

Mr. SAYLOR. I can say that in my opinion foreign imports are the greatest single contributing factor.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder where some of the people were a couple of years ago when the trade agreements extension act was passed—I do not mean the gentleman from Pennsylvania presently in the well of the House nor the gentleman from Iowa—but there were a good many people who voted to extend the trade agreements act a year or two ago; were there not?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct, many who voted to continue the trade agreements are now beginning to feel the squeeze in their own congressional districts.

Mr. GROSS. With the progressive 5 percent reduction in tariffs and duty; is that not right?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. On Wednesday of this week, we will have a bill before us to rehabilitate the New England fishing fleet because it is being punished because of the foreign imports. So we will have that bill up on Wednesday to take care of some of the free trade people; those who have been advocating free trade, and compensatory payments from the U.S. Treasury. We will get a good treatment of that on Wednesday of this week, that is the compensatory payment idea. I do not know, perhaps, all I ought to know about this resolution or about the mining industry, but I am wondering how we are going to separate the sheep from the goats down here on this subject of foreign trade. Are we just going to go to the U.S. Treasury and give them compensatory payments, if they are hurt by foreign imports and, if so, when do we get to the bottom of this Treasury in so doing?

Mr. SAYLOR. If I had my way, we would not go to the Treasury. I believe the Congress in the past has provided some protective measures, and the Congress in the future should provide more measures. After all, one of the most important duties we have as elected Members of the House of Representatives is to take care of the folks at home, and

some of the things that we have done in the past look as if we had been looking out at the world and forgotten about the folks at home. Now, our past actions are coming home to roost and they are the cause of some of the problems in this country, which some of us warned about and our warnings were disregarded.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I just do not know how we can continue what we are doing. I just do not see how we can continue to permit the cheap products of cheap foreign labor in foreign countries to continue to come in and displace the productivity of the American laboring man unless we are going to put ourselves on a world price level.

Mr. SAYLOR. I might say to my colleague and to the other members of the Committee what I have said again and again—I am perfectly willing to help to raise the standards of the other peoples of the world to our level, but I refuse to be a party to lowering the standards of the American people to that of some of the other nations of the world just to meet this foreign competition.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. VANIK. I am interested in this resolution but I regret it does not go further, because I think there are a great many other things than the impact of imports. On page 75 of the report dealing with the subject of bituminous coal the statement is made that the export of bituminous coal has become a substantial factor. Does the gentleman feel that we can cut back on imports and not have a corresponding reaction from other parts of the world on the exports we make of bituminous coal?

Mr. SAYLOR. Let us look at just what happened in bituminous coal. Since we began to export bituminous coal some Western European countries——

Mr. VANIK. Western Germany.

Mr. SAYLOR. Found that their miners were being put out of work because we could mine coal in this country and deliver it to Germany cheaper than they could produce it themselves. They immediately put an embargo on American coal. This is typical of the action of our Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, all the reciprocity is our giving it to other nations and getting nothing in return.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, this resolution I think is the outgrowth of a crisis brought about by two things: First, increased foreign production; and second, downward revision of national stockpiling requirements. These have been important contributing factors to the emergency which exists right now, today, in our domestic mining industry.

There are no mines in the Fourth Missouri District, but there are in the neighboring Seventh, also the Eighth Missouri District. I was a member of a special subcommittee which last April went out to hold hearings in that area. I refer to the so-called lead belt area. Southwest of St. Louis, Mo., there they were operating just 1 or 2 days a week, solely and only to maintain the mines and prevent them from being flooded, because once they are flooded there is irrevocable damage and one that cannot be repaired both from a financial standpoint, and as a matter of safety from an engineering approach.

As the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] said, the purpose of the resolution is to stimulate the executive branch, and not to be critical of anyone, anything, or any department. This is not partisan and should not be made partisan. Maybe the appropriate word is "stimulate," but whether it results in alerting, awakening, or whatever the process, it is hoped that the desired result can be accomplished in studying this problem and focusing attention on the serious situation in the domestic mining industry.

Let me reaffirm an observation recently made that there need be no conflict with our reciprocal trade agreements, but simply action provided for in such agreements. This resolution if acted upon certainly can be highly beneficial and helpful. It should be adopted and I urge favorable action on the resolution.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING].

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. Chairman, what has happened to our domestic mining program and our minerals industry during the past several years is a disgrace to our present administration. The development of a stable domestic mining and minerals industry is absolutely essential to the security of America. It is ridiculous and absurd to assume for even a minute that this country can survive another war under our present foreign policy, depending to such a very large extent on the importation of minerals from foreign countries.

Why have we forgotten so soon? Only a few short years ago we had to establish a national agency to channel critical materials into the most important and urgent military and civilian programs. I refer, of course, to the War Production Board. Through a controlled materials plan and an elaborate priority system, our dwindling stockpiles of nonferrous metals, of steel, of critical building materials, of Freon for refrigeration, and many other basic materials were distributed with the utmost care and deliberation. Every industry had a representative division in Washington to contribute to the overall job. Steel became so scarce that substitute materials had to be used.

Under the Hyde Park Declaration, Prime Minister Mackenzie King and President Roosevelt agreed to combine the resources of both the United States and Canada in an effort to build a strong continental defense. This was because we did not have either basic minerals or plant facilities to meet the emergency. The lack of tungsten limited production of electronics equipment so badly needed. In order to eke out in a limited way the tremendous demand for silver for industrial use, all nonessential use of this metal was prohibited. Construction was sharply curbed and authorized only for military production or to meet the barest community requirements. Have we already forgotten all this? Stockpiling is not alone the answer. We need current production and we need a stabilized mining and minerals industry.

Today, mining in the western part of our country is dead. Virtually every tungsten producing property in the State of Nevada has been closed. Pioche, Nev., looks like a ghost town. Pioche, but a few years ago, was a thriving lead and zinc producing area. Gold cannot be recovered profitably at its present monetary value. We cannot compete domestically with the cost of Chilean copper.

After waiting for 10 years, I recently arranged a meeting with the Secretary of the Treasury. At that meeting I asked him point blank to define our present gold mining policy. Frankly, after talking with him for an hour and a half, I am more confused than ever. We do not have a clearly defined policy and we might as well face it. What is the answer? I think the administration's point 4 program is wrecking not only the economy of this Nation but our security as well. What use is it to attempt to buy friendship if we, the strongest Nation on the face of the earth, cannot industrially mobilize in the event of invasion? What good is Korean tungsten if we cannot bring it into this country during an emergency, when it would be so vitally needed? What good are our tungsten mines, filled with water, that could not possibly be reactivated in time to prevent our total destruction? And what good is a peacetime economy warped by administration policy in an attempt to increase the productivity of 80 other nations at the expense of limiting our own productivity? But to add insult to injury, under the present so-called mutual security program we are not actually increasing the productivity of other countries.

For example, a recent report submitted to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN by Congressman WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, stated that we forced excessive cash grants into the Lao economy at a faster rate than it possibly could be absorbed, causing an excessive Lao Government foreign exchange reserve reaching, at one point, $40 million, equal to a year's aid; inflation, doubling the cost of living from 1953 to 1958; and profiteering through import licenses and false invoices which made possible the purchase of U.S. cash grant dollars for 35 kip. Those dollars could be resold in the free market for as much as 110 kip. Much of the overspending was the direct result of a determination to maintain a 25,000-man Lao army.

Expenditures requested for domestic programs must be justified in detail and can then be expended only for the purposes for which they are appropriated. The amounts requested are scrutinized minutely and more often than not the

amounts are cut and limited. Yet, we force our cash dollars into the Kingdom of Laos at the rate of $40 million a year, disrupting their economy and doubling the cost of living in a period of 5 years.

I could go on, but all of you know the sad saga of what was first adopted as the Marshall plan. You all know the story of our aid to the Dominican Republic—of the $600,000 annually the United States pays to the son of Dictator Trujillo, who is chief of his father's air force, and of his extravagance.

I am concerned not only with the possibility of a world crisis, although in the event of a third world war I have grave doubts that we could again recover industrially as we did prior to and during World War II—I am concerned with preserving a normal peacetime economy. I am concerned with increasing our national productivity in order to increase the national income other than by increasing our taxes. I am concerned with the employment of hundreds of thousands of people who are today living in once thriving mining communities, hopefully praying that some day they can return to the mines they love. And most particularly, I am concerned with the State of Nevada, which 100 years ago contributed so much wealth to the preservation and development of our Nation.

Therefore, I request that favorable consideration be given House Concurrent Resolution 177, as it does memorialize the President to place a plan before the Congress to maintain and develop a sound and stable domestic mining and minerals industry, without critical dependence upon foreign sources.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN].

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 177. As a sponsor of identical legislation and as a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I urge prompt enactment of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, it is indeed paradoxical that our mining industry has been allowed to languish at the very time when the mineral needs of the Nation are expanding. Nearly everyone agrees that our country stands on the threshold of an era of unparalleled economic expansion. All agree that natural resources will be required for this economic development. Yet, mines continue to close, domestic production continues to fall and chronic unemployment continues as the norm for the Nation's miners.

I believe this is a serious situation requiring immediate remedial action. From the standpoint of a sound economy, it is essential that a stable domestic mining industry be fostered; from a standpoint of our national defense, it is equally essential to develop domestic mineral reserves adequate for any foreseeable national emergency.

We in the West are proud of the role mining has played in the development of our section of the Nation. We are confident that mining can be of equal importance to our present economy. Rich deposits of mineral wealth exist throughout the West. Small independent mining operators stand ready to insure the proper and expeditious development of these natural resources. All that is lacking is a national policy providing necessary incentives for the expansion of this essential industry.

Passage of the legislation now under consideration will effectively declare congressional dissatisfaction with the lack of a mining program and congressional support for a policy of encouragement for the discovery and development of mineral wealth. Enactment of House Concurrent Resolution 177 is consequently of signal importance and I ask its prompt approval.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this resolution. I hope the Congress will pass it without delay. And I hope the President will heed its message.

This Nation is pursuing a minerals policy that is shortsighted and unwise.

No thinking person opposes reasonable imports of minerals. In fact, reasonable imports are essential.

But one trip to the tristate lead and zinc mining area and you will see that our own domestic mining industry is in serious trouble because of excessive imports. People who have devoted their lives to mining are out of work and have lost all faith in the future.

Mine owners are pumping surface water out of idle mines at heavy monthly expense.

They feel, and have ample proof to justify their feelings, that America is more interested in developing foreign mines than in preserving American mines.

They feel that there is no place in America's planning for the American miner.

Surely a better minerals policy can be devised. Surely there are ways to limit imports to reasonable quantities and not completely destroy our domestic mining industry. Surely there is a place in America for a Missourian or Kansan or Oklahoman who wants to mine lead and zinc for a living.

This resolution asks the President to review the national minerals policy and to come up with a better program.

I urge the House to pass this resolution and pass it now.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. SAUND].

Mr. SAUND. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the resolution. It is a good resolution but it is late and of course provides no immediate relief to the small mining industry.

There is no substitute in our military and civil defense economy for an active and productive mining industry. The attainment of a measure of self sufficiency in our mineral industry is worthy of our best efforts. Stockpiling alone is not a substitute. The maintenance of the mines, with their specially skilled staffs is a far greater source of strength and security and it may be of even greater importance as a deterring factor in our defense picture.

Whatever the complex reasons may be, our small mines over the last several years have been closing down. Almost none remain. Just 3 weeks ago all the manganese mines closed down. They were producing our No. 1 strategic and critical metal. The carlot program that kept these small manganese producers in business provides us annually with only enough manganese to meet our requirements for less than 3 weeks. A sound policy can be developed but, in the meantime, steps should be taken to keep the industry alive.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BREEDING].

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman for yielding to me. I want to compliment the chair of this committee and the committee for bringing out this resolution. I am highly in favor of this resolution and hope it is adopted.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA].

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the members of the committee for initiating this great step. It may open the eyes of the policymakers to the plight of the mining industry in this country.

The United States is the largest consumer of manganese in the world and yet today practically every manganese producer has been closed down and thousands of skilled metal miners have been forced out of employment because our governmental agencies prefer to place the safety and security of our Nation in foreign production for this No. 1 strategic metal rather than keeping our mines open.

I am informed that the Government has a $165 million contract with AMAPA, a Brazilian company, 49 percent of which is owned by the Bethlehem Steel Corp., for manganese to be imported into this country for stockpile but refuses to honor the commitments made to small businessmen in the manganese industry in the United States that the carlot program would be continued until June 30, 1961, as made in open testimony by Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, then director of ODM, in a Senate hearing when he said:

> There is no question in my mind at all but that under the present rules of the game, which includes the 10,000-ton limitation, that we would be in a position to accept whatever is put to us through June 30, 1961.

Relying on this promise, mining people invested their savings in mining operations, built roads over the desert in California, Arizona, New Mexico, and other States, built camps, mills, and mining plants in an all-out effort to produce a vital metal for their country. They were closed down on August 5 by arbitrary action on the part of those who prefer to place our Nation in total dependence on foreign production.

Of course low costs of production exist where labor is cheap in Africa, Brazil, and India. They are also cheaper in the

U.S.S.R. where for years we depended upon that country for the bulk of our production. In 1949 Russia simply cut us off. This could happen today elsewhere in spite of the multi-million-dollar loans being made to foreign producers by an international loaning agency largely financed by American taxpayers. Our Navy does a good job in protecting the sea lanes but what is the cost per ton of manganese imported? Our ships are subsidized because we believe it is in the national interest. We subsidize many other defense industries but we let our manganese industry go to pot.

Steel cannot be made without manganese. Fourteen pounds is used in every ton. Manganese is indispensable for an industrial country. Our requirements will increase as the Nation grows. It is a heavy tonnage industry and yet the limitations placed on the procurement from small producers was placed at 28 million units—650,000 long tons—about enough to meet current consumption for 4 months. Think of it, only 4 months, and yet while the manganese producers have pleaded with their Government for a continuation of the program until 1962, as promised by Dr. Flemming, they have been given a close down order by the OCDM.

We need a realistic program to encourage and continue the production within this country. We need to keep our mines operating if for no other reason than to prevent gouging of consumers by foreign producers such as has been done in the case of nickel and other metals by importers when we found ourselves in short supply and our requirements great.

The cost of continuing the domestic carlot manganese program is trivial indeed when you consider the benefits to be derived therefrom. Surely our enthusiasm for pouring money abroad cannot justify our neglect of domestic programs which involve the national interest. It is not in the national interest to liquidate the domestic manganese industry. I favor the resolution with the hope that pending the formulation of a long-term program, the agencies involved will see fit to continue the manganese carlot program and prevent the continuation of the destruction of American industry and our very economy which is presently taking place.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I do want to congratulate the great chairman of this committee and the members of the committee for the excellent work they have done. I certainly hope this resolution passes and that the administration takes cognizance of the resolution and acts upon it. It may mean a great deal to my State of Kansas.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], for granting me this time to support the pending resolution.

Although the resolution does not directly mention bituminous coal, the hearings and the report of the committee certainly demonstrate that the language of the bill in its stress on a "sound and stable domestic mining and minerals industry" clearly contemplates the inclusion of coal within its terms.

Our national security rests on a healthy bituminous coal mine industry just as surely as on the adequacy of other critical minerals. As a Nation we cannot afford to shut down mines, allow machinery to rust, displace miners, and then expect to go into emergency production if a crisis should develop. Furthermore, all talk of a full and expanding economy comes as small comfort to the unemployed coal miners of my State of West Virginia and the other great coal mining areas of the land. That is why I am grateful that the pending resolution deals with this problem not only in terms of industrial prosperity and company income, but more particularly in relation to the human factors of unemployment in depressed areas.

I believe that it has been amply demonstrated that rising imports of residual oil have seriously threatened the coal industry, and the recent slight cutback in such imports will afford a slight measure of relief. I trust that passage of this resolution will further strengthen actions to curb the ruinous competition of foreign residual oil.

In a national emergency, coal is the most dependable fuel we have. We must take active steps to protect and strengthen this vital industry through the kind of policy which I believe this resolution will help to crystallize. I would think that some attention should also be paid to the effects of tax policies on our overburdened coal industry.

In short, Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that this resolution is in the national interest and I urge its adoption.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I support House Concurrent Resolution 177 with considerable reservations. I hope that it will not result in mandatory controls over the import of minerals and residual oils.

A report published today by the American Enterprise Association, prepared by Dr. William H. Peterson, of New York University, indicates that current mandatory controls over the import of oil into the United States has resulted in higher prices, thereby contributing to the inflationary impact. Our economy cannot afford an extension of price-support programs.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, this resolution is a very valuable one and I commend the committee for bringing it out. I rise in support of it. Let me explain very briefly why I think this is sound public policy and sound economics as well.

When you operate an industry like mining on a feast-and-famine basis, as we have operated for far too long in the United States, you have a rapid acceleration of mining communities on the boom side. I have several in my district that mushroomed. You also build and extend the mines.

Then when the prices fall you shut down the mines, you leave the people stranded or they move away, you destroy the business and you see the mining machinery go to rack and ruin. My district has more mills lying idle as tourist attractions than it has operating mills.

Then when a new need for minerals arises again, the price rises rapidly because there is no regular source of domestic supply. You have to reassemble the crews, you have to go back into the mines and pump them out and reestablish them, or open new ones because the old ones have been ruined.

From the standpoint of sound public policy, it would be better to maintain a going operation, a stable labor force, a basic working crew, a set of operating mills, and mines in good repair. If the country had a mining policy which provides a guaranteed continuing program that would keep alive the basic sources of supply in this country, it is really unlikely that the prices would bound up as they have from time to time in the past, because you would have a domestic business which you could expand at a much lower cost. The real cost to the community in the policy we have followed is not always reflected in the profits or loss of mine industries. It is also reflected in the lives of the people in those communities.

I commend the committee for its report. The American people need an assured supply. They need to avoid the waste of men, material, and mine reserves that our past policies have created.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish that every Member of this body could have been with the subcommittee mentioned by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] which visited the tristate mining area last April. I wish you could have seen in the midst of this land of plenty the idle mines, the silent mills, the shutdown installations across that great area and have observed at firsthand the human misery and human suffering that accompany a shutdown of this kind. This subcommittee looked at the mine situation and talked to the people. We visited a small town where 700 families are on food relief as a result of the shutdown in the Missouri-Kansas-Oklahoma area. We saw vividly at firsthand the impact of what has been described by this committee as a real national emergency. It is not possible for other Members of the House to make that tour, but it is possible for them to look at the hearings and read the record made all over the United States as to what has happened to our mining industry.

You can turn to those pages of these hearings and find at page 148 where the mines in New Jersey and in Virginia are shut down. You can turn to page 97 and find the testimony of the director of the State of Oregon's department of geology and mineral industries, Mr. Hollis M.

Dole, that "unless a sympathetic or understanding Government reverses or corrects its present policy, metal mining in Oregon is finished."

You can turn to page 95 and find there the witness from Utah, Mr. Miles Romney, who testified that "the small mines in Utah are gone." He stated further:

> We have three lead and zinc mines operating in Utah today. These three mines operated last year at a loss of $1 million.

You can turn to the picture in Idaho and find the miners in Idaho are closing down their great cobalt industry.

You can turn to the witness testifying for New Mexico, Mr. William F. Darmitzel, and find there the statement that the lead and zinc industry "for all practical purposes was completely closed down by the end of 1958."

The same condition obtained in New Mexico's fluorspar industry. "Our producers were priced out of the market by foreign competition."

In my own tri-State area there was testimony by Mr. Tom Kiser, that "in 1947 to 1949 we produced 14.8 percent of the U.S. annual domestic production of zinc. In 1958 we produced 2.1 percent. Today our production is zero."

You can turn to the State of Colorado, page 79, and you will find there the testimony of Mr. Bob Palmer, speaking for the Colorado mining industry, where he says:

> Lead and zinc studies show that in 1939 there were 1,455 mines operating in the State. * * * Today, Mr. Chairman, only four major mining operations in this field can actually be listed, and at least two of these are operating close to the precipice of destruction or on the ragged edge.

Mr. Palmer said further:

> The destruction of the domestic metal industry is the result of the lack of a domestic mineral policy, together with a well-conceived plan, carefully carried out, designed to increase production of practically all metals abroad and to encourage their importation into the United States at prices below the cost of production within our borders.

Whatever the reason is, there is need today in this country to take another look at this situation and to come up with some new answers. The mining industry in our country is entitled to nothing less than a new approach to this problem. It is entitled to constructive and imaginative programs to put the miners of the Nation back to work. That is what this resolution calls for. It calls for recommendations. It calls for new ideas. It calls for action in a field that has too long been neglected.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to be a sponsor of the legislation. I am proud of the fact that it has bipartisan support, and I believe I will have reason to be proud in a few minutes of a practically unanimous vote in this House in support of this resolution.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I think the debate that has occurred in connection with this resolution must point up to each Member present that this legislation purports to deal with a very limited field in which the great difficulty confronting the employees in the mining industry finds a similar relationship in many, many industries in the country. Reference was made a bit ago to the reciprocal trade agreements program, to which I personally attribute a great many of the ills that are reflected in unemployment in industrial and mining areas of the Nation. The suggestion was made by one of the distinguished gentlemen that the reciprocal trade agreements program had no direct relationship to this difficulty in the mining areas. Perhaps I do not correctly quote the gentleman, but I just want to say to the Committee that the reciprocal trade agreements program is directly related to this matter of unemployment in many, many areas.

Putting it another way, with the reciprocal trade agreements program and the so-called commitments we have made under that program, we are limited in the relief which this great Congress of the United States can give to the unemployed miner, to the unemployed worker in many, many of our industries. While we might want to exercise our jurisdiction as legislators in the Congress of the United States and pass a law directing that this or that be done to help the unemployed miner by safeguarding his job against destructive imports or to help the gentleman who is unemployed in industry because of cheap foreign imports, we find that we cannot do it without paying a penalty through compensatory tariff cuts. Very often we forget that these alleged reciprocal trade agreements in fact have not proved to be reciprocal, and we are the ones who make the sacrifice and the other nation does not abide by its concession made to us. Time after time it has been proved that when these negotiators of ours, originally described as "Yankee traders" make their agreements abroad and come back home, we find that unhappily the other country, hardly before the ink is dry on the agreement, through depreciating their currency or voiding the agreement, have, in effect, wiped out the concession which they made to us. In fact, instances exist where the foreign country raised more barriers against American exports abroad than there were at the time we started with the reciprocal trade agreement program. American manufacturers today cannot ship many American-produced articles into Western Europe because quota barriers and other trade restrictions have been raised against our exports. Today this great Congress is called upon to consider legislation which will authorize American business to send our dollars abroad to build plants, under the promise of preferential tax treatment so that we can service markets from factories we are to build abroad.

But now I come back to the point as to why we in Congress here have not seen fit to protect the jobs of our American citizens. If we do something that imposes a quota, if we in any way whatever tend to interfere with the trade agreements program, under which the foreigner is today taking our market, my friends, we have to pay for it. We have to say to some other manufacturer in this country or to some other industrialist, "You are going to be called upon to pay for the protection given to one American industry by less protection for your industry because we are committed to unilaterally abide by the trade agreements concessions even though the other signatories to those agreements do not."

Under the reciprocal trade agreements program when we undertake to protect the American worker who is threatened with unemployment, where we undertake to protect an industry providing domestic jobs, we have to, in effect, obtain permission of the GATT member countries and if a member country asks us to make concessions in some other area as compensation, we have to pay dollar for dollar for the protection we have bought for the American worker.

This reciprocal trade program, I repeat, is not reciprocal because we do not get the concessions that are promised. We do not insist on them. We sit back and let the other countries have their way with us. And then if and when—and a case in point is in front of us right now—if and when we want to protect the jobs of our own workers, if we want to reopen certain mines which under the reciprocal trade program are facing unfair competition, we have to pay the other country by making concessions in some other field of industrial output.

So I say that this area is worth while for a studious examination of this picture. I hope the resolution may find its counterpart in many other industries or in an overall review by the appropriate committees of Congress of this entire subject. And I hope that may be done certainly during the next year. I note the distinguished chairman of my great committee, the Committee on Ways and Means, on the floor. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that we will see fit to examine into this subject which is of ever-increasing importance to the American people as imports of foreign goods are threatening the employment of skilled American workmen. I hope that our committee may have the opportunity of going into this subject in the next year.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BERRY. Will the gentleman agree with me that there are three principal reasons why our domestic mining and other industries cannot compete with foreign mines and foreign industries? First, because of the salary differential, because of the minimum wage we have in this country, whereas in foreign countries some of them may be working for one-fourth of the wages that our people get, and not only that, but working 12 hours a day, 7 days a week. In this country the period of employment is limited.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I do agree that one of the factors is the unequal labor situation.

Mr. BERRY. And the second is taxes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] has again expired.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this resolution.

I speak in support of House Concurrent Resolution 177 and commend my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and his committee for the diligent efforts put forth for a healthy and strong mining and minerals industry—an essential if America is to remain secure.

I appreciate this opportunity to speak in behalf of the most important lead mining area in the United States, and one of the most important in the world which is located in my congressional district in Missouri. The Lead Belt of Missouri has been producing lead for over 100 years, and we in Missouri are proud of the part our lead resources have played in war and peace to the benefit and prosperity of the Nation. It is, therefore, particularly distressing to Missourians, and to me, to find the Lead Belt in a precarious position with production and employment curtailed owing to the extraordinary flood of imports from foreign countries with which the lead output of Missouri must compete.

The Lead Belt has for some time been on a 4-day week. The principal mining companies of my district have accumulated large unsold stocks of lead in an effort to maintain employment as long as possible, but were ultimately forced to curtail production.

I realize the importance of mutually satisfactory international political and commercial relationships, and that it is long-established congressional policy to lower trade barriers, reciprocally, wherever possible. But, it is also clearly the intent of Congress not to injure American industry in doing so. Congress very carefully put in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act safeguards to protect the American business and industry jeopardized by extraordinary foreign competition.

I do not think any industry has been more carefully examined and evaluated than the lead mining industry by the Tariff Commission, charged, as it is, with making recommendations when injury to industry is indicated by a tariff cut. I do not think there is anything more that the lead mining industry can do to present the equity of its case than it has already done. I strongly feel that it is time for action to be taken to remedy the plight of the miners.

Even though there are many of our people who do not like Government subsidies, I went along with the administration's bill of last year to provide subsidies for the lead miners in lieu of a tariff. That, too, failed in the House by a very close margin although overwhelmingly carried in the Senate. Without using either tariffs or subsidies, about the only other device was quotas on imports. This the President imposed on imports of both lead and zinc in raw material form only, but not, be it noted, on manufactured lead products. The quotas were set by the President at 80 percent of imports during the years of 1953, 1954, 1955, 1956, and 1957. These happen to be years of excessively heavy imports and 80 percent of these heaviest import years is more than the economy can absorb. Unfortunately, as the lead market price indicates, the lead quota has not been sufficiently effective. To be effective it must be tightened. Some foreign countries, I believe, are now becoming acutely aware of the restrictive and troublesome manner in which quotas always operate. I should not be surprised to find them now reconciled to a tariff increase rather than to have quotas continue.

There is another highly important aspect of quotas which must be given more attention; namely, the loophole open to the manufacturers of lead products to import such articles as pipe, sheet, solder, storage battery parts, and other items made of lead, if the domestic lead price rises by virtue of the imposition of quotas on the raw material. As I have already indicated, the manufactured items are not subject to quotas. This loophole has led to serious impairment of vital markets of the American lead miners.

Since the Tariff Commission acts in making recommendations for relief only when injury has actually been proven, I suggest that measures be taken so that, whenever an increased tariff or quota on agricultural or mineral raw materials is recommended, it should also provide a compensatory adjustment in the rates or quotas on articles manufactured from those agricultural or mineral raw materials.

I have been observing the effort of the State Department trying to bring about some voluntary adjustment, worldwide, of lead and zinc production to consumption. This would be helpful to improve the domestic situation, but some more formal, long-term solution is necessary. My mining friends tell me that the country possesses a large potential supply of metals and minerals, and that there are still opportunities awaiting the miner's pick or drill to develop our latent mineral resources. Missouri has established a great production record mineralwise. I hope to see this record continue. I will continue to support in the Congress whatever incentives are necessary for our mining companies to assume the speculative risks which necessarily accompany prospecting for more mineral deposits.

I express my appreciation and the appreciation of the people of my district for the work of a special subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs headed by Representative ED EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma, that investigated the situation in the tristate region of Kansas, Oklahoma, and Missouri. At my request, my colleague from Missouri, WILLIAM J. RANDALL, a member of the subcommittee, was kind enough to visit the Lead Belt area in Missouri. Upon his return he advised me that he considered the situation in that area extremely serious.

I quite agree with this committee that the plight of the lead-zinc industry is the direct result of administrative procrastination. Actions that have been taken were not only too little and too late but they did not use the existing administrative authority for remedies such as that available under the escape clause provision of the latest Trade Agreement Extension Act.

An emergency exists in my district and I urge the House to adopt this resolution which is certainly in the national interest and which would foster and encourage the maintenance and development of a sound and stable domestic mining and minerals industry.

Mr. HARGIS. Mr. Chairman, the present sad plight of the hard-pressed miners and mine operators in the lead-zinc areas of my home district make the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 177 a matter of great concern to me. The aims and purposes outlined in this resolution are truly commendable, and are worthy of unqualified support.

We need to make every possible effort to restore domestic mine and mineral production to a high level. We must do something to curb unemployment in mining areas. And above all, we must take steps toward ending the ruinous policy of impoverishing this Nation's mining areas through continued and excessive purchases of foreign imports. Immediate action is imperative.

In April this year, I went along with four of my House colleagues—ED EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma; CHARLIE BROWN and WILLIAM J. RANDALL, of Missouri; and J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, of Colorado—for a firsthand look at the lead-zinc situation in the tristate area of Kansas, Oklahoma, and Missouri. The tour included sections of my own congressional district in southeast Kansas.

The conditions we found were appalling, and they are no better now. Decreased prices because of foreign imports have caused a virtually complete shutdown of the mines for 2 full years. Unemployment in this area is as bad as it was during the worst years of the depression in the 1930's. Two-thirds of the miners and their families have left this once-prosperous region. Many of those remaining are enduring privation and hardship.

In Picher, Okla., alone, we found that more than 700 families were on relief. Many were dependent on Government distribution of surplus foods.

This was once the leading lead and zinc production area in the United States. Now, employment has shrunk from thousands of men to fewer than 100 men. The few that are left are fighting a constant battle, through pumping and maintenance, to prevent mining properties that are still valuable from deteriorating.

We need a full-fledged plan for reorganization of the entire Government-related program. And this should be followed promptly by remedial legislation. Action must be taken to assist this essential industry—reduce economic losses in the mining areas—and put an end to the personal tragedies resulting from unemployment and dire need. This program is an urgent necessity.

It is up to Congress to begin corrective measures at once. The resolution now being considered is a meritorious effort. Its passage would be a long and decisive step in the right direction.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I am delighted to yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I most heartily endorse this great resolution from a great committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak on this resolution because I think the membership of the House is well aware of the problems involved. Most of them will remember that last year an attempt was made by this same committee to bring to the floor of this House and pass a minerals stabilization bill that would shore up the sadly defective minerals industry in this country. At that time charges were made that it was subsidy, that we should not subsidize this industry. Again this year we had hearings on this very sick industry and tried to come up with something that we thought would perhaps open the door to solving the problem.

The heads of the minerals industry throughout this Nation came before our committee. I think we had as good a panel on this subject as you could gather together anywhere.

The big problem that we are faced with is the question of how we are going to cure these ills, whether it is going to be by subsidy, whether it is going to be by tariff, whether it is going to be by quotas, or whether it is going to be by some other means. The fact is that we must cure the ills of this industry because it is an industry involving thousands upon thousands of American citizens who depend upon it for a livelihood. Something must be done to correct the situation and bring about a stabilization of a most important industry.

Few people realize that with our moving into the so-called space age we are treading upon very dangerous ground when we begin to depend upon foreign sources for many of the strategic minerals we need. We are also treading on very dangerous ground even though we have those minerals, if we allow the mines to become so economically unstable that they must be closed.

Some people say that is all right, we will use this foreign ore now and save our own. The time may come when we will need our own strategic minerals and we will not have the time to put these mines into operation to bring about a fulfillment of our needs. I know there has been much said about stockpiling of materials, and the statement has been made that we have a tremendous amount in the stockpile. When we are dealing with an economic situation, we can also take this into account—that the surplus stockpile of these minerals and metals is not a bad thing in itself. They do not deteriorate with age. We have places that we can store them throughout the United States and it will not injure anyone and it will not cost hardly anything. As a matter of fact, there are many places now owned by the Federal Government where there would be no cost involved. But the number one thing involved in this whole situation is Mr. John Q. America. He is depending upon this for a livelihood and when we use these foreign sources of ore and say, "Well, we are sorry but we got these materials cheaper over there so we are going to let these mines be closed." Where is that fellow going to get a job? He has to go into some other segment of our economy and that has got to be spread out and extended further in order to take care of him. So why do we not face up to the issue and meet it head on and solve this problem while we have a chance?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HARGIS] may extend his remarks previous to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the Constitution empowers the Congress to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory or other property belonging to the United States, to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the States, and to provide for the common defense and general welfare; and

Whereas mining and the extraction of minerals from Federal, State, and privately owned lands situated within the United State and its Territories and possessions are basic industries upon which the transporting, processing, and distributing industries and the consumers of the Nation depend; and

Whereas the interests of national security have brought about Government programs for the establishment and maintenance of national stockpiles of strategically important metals and minerals and for the development of mine and plant capacities for the production thereof; and

Whereas the administration of these and related programs, through Government purchases, contracts, loans, grants, technical assistance, barter, and other means, has resulted in the abnormal and artificial stimulation of foreign metal and mineral exploration and development and the expansion of foreign capacities for the production of metals and minerals; and

Whereas increased foreign production of certain metals and minerals, together with downward revision of national stockpile requirements, has resulted in depressed domestic prices for these materials, drastic curtailment of domestic production, economic disaster to individual firms, hardships for dependent industries, extensive unemployment, and severe contraction of business in the affected communities; and

Whereas an emergency exists since further delays in the recovery of the domestic mining and mineral industries would cause irreparable damage to mining and mineral properties, wastage of human and natural resources, and loss of production capacity, and would have a depressing effect upon the national economy and threaten national security; and

Whereas all governmental efforts to date have not been effective in alleviating these detrimental effects: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President is requested—

(a) to have reviews made at once of the existing programs of the departments and agencies of the executive branch with the purpose of using them more effectively to provide for increased production and employment in critically depressed domestic mining and mineral industries;

(b) to advise the Congress at the earliest possible date as to the actions taken or proposed to be taken to this end; and

(c) to submit any reorganization plans or recommendations for legislation that may be necessary to accomplish this objective.

SEC. 2. It is the sense of the Congress that it is in the national interest to foster and encourage (a) the maintenance and development of a sound and stable domestic mining and minerals industry; (b) the orderly discovery and development of domestic mineral resources and reserves on Federal, State, and privately owned lands; and (c) mining, mineral, metallurgical, and marketing research to promote the wise and efficient uses of domestic metal and mineral resources.

SEC. 3. It is the sense of the Congress that the maintenance and development of a sound and stable domestic mining and minerals industry, without critical dependence upon foreign sources, is essential to national security and the welfare of the consuming public, and that this objective is independent of and cannot be accomplished by the maintenance of national stockpiles for planned defense needs in a single emergency or the existence of productive capacity based upon the importation of foreign materials.

Mr. ASPINALL (during the reading of the concurrent resolution). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be considered as read, and be open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] stated a short time ago that there was no conflict between this resolution and the reciprocal trade agreements. There may be no "conflict," in the strict sense of the word, but very definitely the resolution is before the House because of conflict in the operation of the Trade Agreement Act. In other words, the resolution would not be here were it not for the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. I am going to be very much interested in looking up the record of those who voted for the extension of the Trade Agreements Act last year when it was before the House, and those who now support a resolution of this kind. This is again the result of giving away the markets of this Nation to foreign countries.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. RANDALL. With reference to the remarks made a few moments ago about a conflict, the point I was trying to make was I think the mining industry would be very happy if the plan worked as it was originally conceived under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, but it is not working.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, but the gentleman said there was no conflict.

Mr. RANDALL. Perhaps that was an error to use the word "conflict." What I meant was that they were not poles apart. I meant that it could work under the reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. GROSS. I doubt very much that it could because we are finding more and more evidences of injury to American industry and labor. I am disturbed by section 2 of the resolution and I would like some assurance from the chairman of the committee with reference to that section, which reads as follows:

SEC. 2. It is the sense of the Congress that it is in the national interest to foster and encourage (a) the maintenance and development of a sound and stable domestic mining and minerals industry.

Just what does that language entail? May I preface that by pointing out that the House just completed debate on a bill the proponents of which said that only a year or two ago the House voted for a resolution authorizing a study of safety features on Government-owned vehicles. Now comes a bill to implement the study. I do not know what it is going to cost; no one else knows what the bill which was just debated is going to cost.

My question is: What is this resolution going to cost at some future time?

Mr. ASPINALL. This bill should not cost anything—if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield to my friend from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. This bill provides that the executive department can get advice that is necessary as to what should be done by using the officers and the employees of the departments interested in this area of operation.

Mr. GROSS. Are we then going to run into the question of compensatory payment out of the Treasury to take up the slack for the damage that has been done?

Mr. ASPINALL. If the gentleman will yield, I was one of those who supported the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 2 years ago. I did so with the understanding that we would have from the executive department some aid as far as the execution of that particular program was concerned by the different provisions we had in it, especially with what was known as the peril-point and the escape clauses. The administration has used them but I do not believe they have used them effectively. I am not offering any pointed criticism at the present time, I am just asking them to look over the problem again.

Mr. GROSS. The whole record of administration of the Trade Agreements Act refutes any reason to believe that the peril-point and escape clauses have been or will be used as intended. The whole history of the administration of the act shows that the peril-point and escape clauses have not been made effective in the past; and some of us, especially the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON], tried to cure that, but he did not succeed; he did not get the necessary number of votes on the right side of the aisle to cure it when the Trade Agreements Act was last extended.

Mr. ASPINALL. I have no quarrel with my friend from Iowa. It simply means I see matters a little differently than he does, but I do think the industry known as the domestic mining industry in this country is sick at the present time.

Mr. GROSS. We are going to have more resolutions of exactly this type until the Congress of the United States decides to do something about the Trade Agreements Act; decides to quit playing Santa Claus all over the world, and decides to quit playing fast and loose with the productivity of American labor and industry.

Coming before the House on Wednesday is a bill that I hope you will read. Unless you have already seen the bill you are going to be interested by one of the provisions. It provides that in the case of the New England fishing industry, damaged by virtue of foreign imports of fish, and where the President has overturned the Tariff Commission finding of relief under the escape clause, that Federal subsidies shall be used to rebuild the fishing fleet. This is the beginning, if the bill is approved, of compensatory payments to industry and labor where damaged by foreign imports. This, like the resolution before us, will be dealing with effect and not cause.

I have every sympathy for all those engaged in the mining industry in this country who are fighting a losing battle against foreign imports but I warned when the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act was up for extension that it would live to haunt those who voted for it and I submit again for the record that there are only two alternatives—either revise the Trade Act to protect those who are being injured or face widespread raids on the Federal Treasury to provide compensation.

I reiterate that there will be more and more resolutions of this kind in the months ahead unless Congress takes firm and courageous action to protect American labor and industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BASS of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the resolution (H. Con. Res. 177) pursuant to House Resolution 347, he reported the concurrent resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Under the agreement previously entered into further proceedings will go over until Wednesday.

Does the gentleman withdraw his point of no quorum?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I withdraw the point of no quorum.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight, August 24, 1959, to file a report on the bill H.R. 8725, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to make technical changes in certain excise tax laws, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

BONDING OF CERTAIN LICENSEES

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H.R. 2317, to amend section 7 of the act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes, approved July 1, 1902, as amended, so as to provide for the bonding of persons licensed to engage in a business, trade, profession, or calling involving the collection of money for others, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 3, lines 8 and 9, strike out "third, fourth," and insert "third (except the last sentence thereof)."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the amendment is merely to clarify a possible inconsistency that may arise upon enactment of the proposal. The amendment makes no change in the substance of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO ASSOCIATION OF OLDEST INHABITANTS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H.R. 303, to provide for the conveyance of certain real property in the District of Columbia to the Association of the Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia, with Senate amendments and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out "convey, without monetary consideration," and insert "convey."

Page 3, after line 11, insert:

"SEC. 3. The conveyance authorized by this Act shall be conditional upon the Association of the Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia paying to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia as consideration for the property conveyed an amount equal to 50 per centum of its fair market value as determined by the Commissioners after appraisal of such property."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the amendment adopted by the Senate conditions the conveyance of the property to the Association of the Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia upon the payment by the association to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of an amount equal to 50 percent of the fair market value of the property as determined by the Commissioners after appraisal of the property. There is no objection to this amendment on the part of any of the parties concerned.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what time is this sought to be conveyed?

Mr. McMILLAN. The Commissioners have to have an appraisal made on the property.

Mr. GROSS. Does it have anything to do with the stadium?

Mr. McMILLAN. It is not connected with the stadium. This property was owned by the old fire station, and it seemed necessary to tear down the old fire station.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING REGULATION OF CLOSING-OUT AND FIRE SALES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 2318) to provide for the regulation of closing-out and fire sales in the District of Columbia, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 12, strike out "District Commissioners" and insert "Commissioners of the District of Columbia."

Page 4, line 8, strike out "damaged."

Page 4, line 10, strike out "as damaged merchandise."

Page 5, line 9, after "Act" insert "and regulations promulgated under the authority of this Act."

Page 5, after line 20, insert:

"SEC. 9. The Commissioners are authorized to promulgate regulations to carry out the purposes of this Act, including, without limitation, regulations limiting the period of time a closing-out sale or a sale of goods, wares, or merchandise damaged by fire, smoke, water, or otherwise may be conducted, subject to extension as authorized by section 5: *Provided,* That no such regulation shall be put in effect until after a public hearing has been held thereon."

Page 5, line 21, strike out "9" and insert "10."

Page 5, line 23, strike out "10" and insert "11."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina.

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the amendments 1, 2, 3, and 4 are simply for the purpose of clarification.

Amendment 5 provides that the Commissioners shall have authority to promulgate regulations to carry out the provisions of the act with a proviso that no regulation shall be put into effect until after a public hearing has been held thereon.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on House Concurrent Resolution 177.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

JOHN A. BURNS

Mr. ASPINALL. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present on the 20th of this month when several of our colleagues were giving their tributes to our friend and coworker, John A. Burns, the last Delegate from the Territory of Hawaii, as he was making final preparations to turn his representative responsibilities over to his successor, the Honorable DANIEL INOUYE, who took his oath today as the first Member of Congress from our newest State. I wish to say "thank you" to Delegate Burns for a job well done and services well performed. At the same time I desire to wish Representative INOUYE the best of success in his new responsibilities.

In my remarks today I have no desire to trespass upon the role of a eulogist. Neither do I desire to assume the task of a judge or an appraiser. Rather would I speak as a friend of him whom I seek to honor—as one who has lived closely with him for whom I hold great admiration and brotherly affection. Feeling the hesitation of the poet I might say with him:

Words, once my stock, are wanting to commend
So great a servant and so good a friend.

Accordingly, I would write a treatise on friendship if it were in my power to express my thoughts as I would like. As I speak I fully appreciate that—

Praise from a friend, or censure from a foe
Are lost on hearers that our merits know.

It is my honest opinion that during my years in this body no one has made more friends for himself from among our Members than has John A. Burns. At the same time no one has undertaken to be a better friend to his fellows than has John A. Burns. He came to Congress dedicated to one labor—to one love and that was to so serve his people that their ambition of decades might be realized—the attainment of the status of full sisterhood among the sovereign States of the Union. Remembering the limitations which I gave myself when I began these remarks, and recalling now the sacrifices and services of the legion of others who helped in the struggle, may I say that it is my studied and considered opinion that to John A. Burns more than to any one other individual should go the credit for the final victory. It was his personal decisions, made with the full knowledge of the risk to his own welfare, that brought the victory when it came. I shall be glad to leave to historians the responsibility for writing the full record. But may I add this much at this time. When others, before his service and during his service, permitted selfishness of personal attainment and political partisanship to frame their decisions and actions, John Burns with his unselfishness and keen insight as to what was necessary kept his eye on the 50th star and saw to it that it was given the place to which destiny beckoned it.

John A. Burns rode the crest of success with the humility of a Christian gentleman. He received his accolades and plaudits as becomes one who knows when a task is well performed but without attempting by any thought or act on his part to take from a legion of others the credit due them.

With one goal attained he immediately made his preparations to win if possible the right and privilege of serving his people still further. He fought a great and clean fight. The changing fortunes of politics have temporarily denied him the responsibilities which he sought. But after the battle he returned to us with no bitterness on his tongue or in his spirit. His eyes are as friendly and bright as ever. When he speaks of his fellow citizens of Hawaii his affection and love for them remain as constant and enduring as ever. As he leaves us he returns to them to continue his efforts in their behalf. I may not be here when Jack returns to Congress, but return he will. He has walked tall and straight, clean and sure, humble and confident, strong and good among us. I join with his friends—universal in this body—in wishing him, his good wife Beatrice, their two sons and daughter, life's share of happiness and good fortune along the way—enough success to bring joy sufficient to chase away the despair of temporary setbacks—but always the confidence that abides with the knowledge of service well rendered.

A LETTER TO MARDI AND CINDY EPPS

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Dave Epps, of Sweet Home, Oreg., died unexpectedly June 29. He was the warm and valued friend of many persons in Oregon and elsewhere. At the time of his death he was serving as the State chairman of the Oregon Democratic Central Committee.

He left a wonderful wife, Nancy, and two small daughters, Mardi and Cindy. This insertion today is in the form of a letter for Mardi and Cindy, Mr. Speaker, in the hopes that they will file it away to read when they reach voting age. This will be about 1973 for Mardi, the older, and a little later for Cindy.

So here is the letter to Dave's girls:

Dear Mardi and Cindy: You loved your daddy because he was a warm, affectionate, fun-loving, sympathetic, and thoughtful daddy. Many other persons, outside of your family, loved and respected him, too. I was one of them.

We first met back in 1952 when we both campaigned for Adlai Stevenson. Those were the days when Oregon Democrats had real trouble making their party effective.

His hometown newspaper, the Sweet Home New Era, expresses very well what your neighbors thought of your daddy. The following editorial was published August 7, 1959:

A SEVERE LOSS TO SWEET HOME

Many words of commendation and praise have been said of Dave Epps after his untimely death, most of them pertaining to the impressive mark he had put upon the political scene of Oregon. Few words, however, have credited Dave with the accomplishments for which he will be best remembered in Sweet Home—his civic and personal achievements in the city he chose for his home and business.

Being friends—and the people of Sweet Home can consider him a close friend—who were used to seeing Dave in the function of his daily operation of his business and while he was participating in the many civic activities in which he was interested, we are the ones who will most feel his absence and will most severely feel his loss.

Dave was friendly to each person he met and his personality was the type that gave an added life to each meeting he attended because of his presence. In recent years he made his most impressive mark locally as president of the Sweet Home-East Linn Chamber of Commerce and as president of the local Rotary club. As a final tribute, we would like to use the words of Stewart Weiss, a friend who was active with Dave in both of these organizations:

"Dave Epps was the friend of all. Master of the witty use of words, he never deliberately harmed anyone. He was a leader in the causes he believed to be right. Unafraid to take a position that might not be popular, he strove for the betterment of all people as he believed the right to be. His type of leadership was rare and will be sorely missed. His kindly acts and words created a memory of him that will endure through the years to come. We have lost a good friend, but are richer for our friendship with him."

Bill Tugman, longtime editor of the Eugene Register-Guard and now editor-publisher of the Port Umpqua Courier, is a shrewd judge of men, especially politicians. Here is what he had to say about your daddy in the Register-Guard, April 7, 1952:

PROBLEMS OF DEMOCRATIC PARTY IN OREGON

A rather distinguished looking gent with a silvery thatch walked into the office the other afternoon and said he was running for delegate to the Democratic National Convention from the Fourth Congressional District. Noting the blankness of the editorial stare, he grinned and said:

"I'm Dave Epps. Un-huh, I guess I've changed a bit. I'm in the furniture business now at Sweet Home and Albany. Haven't done so bad, either. I'm still a Democrat and I can afford to have a little fun in politics."

So we told Dave to "set," and he did. Dave played some pretty potent baseball and basketball at the University of Oregon back in 1929, graduated, took a whack at law school, knocked about a bit at odd jobs through the depression years, went to war and became one of the "top EM's" in Europe, saved a little money, came home, bought a paper at Mill City, and graduated into furniture business.

"It took me a long time to find out what it's all about. I guess that happens to a lot of fellows who get involved in athletics. Nothing else meant much until I got a lot of bumps."

Then the talk turned to politics and what ails the Democratic Party in Oregon. We have thought for many years that Democratic weakness in Oregon—in spite of registered strength—was due to conflict between old line and New Deal Democrats. Dave (who trains with Dick Neuberger, Monroe Sweetland, Howard Morgan, and what might be called the liberal wing), has a different theory:

"It's a struggle between the Portland boys who play politics for what's in it and people like Sweetland and a few others who think the Democratic Party ought to mean something. You may think of 'em as radical, but they're sincere. The other faction plays it big city style. You know what I mean."

One of the most obvious weakneses of the Democratic Party in Oregon has been a dearth of able candidates for office at any level. Dave thinks that trouble will be corrected in a few years—if the young progressive element can gain firm control and get rid of some of the old boys who play it "Chicago style" in Multnomah County. We said:

"Looks to us like you've got a three-way spit—the old 'Jeffersonians' who vote Republican, the Multnomah crowd you speak about, and the younger progressive element."

Dave thinks NEUBERGER is doing a wonderful job, now that he has matured, says DICK is doing an effective job of selling the Democratic Party to every type of audience. (Dave himself has always had a touch of evangelism and apparently does pretty well on the luncheon club circuit in his own right.

The boys grow up. Dave Epps, the prosperous businessman, has rounded out his education with a lot of things not taught in classrooms. He recalls what Goodwin Thacher told him one time when he was "getting his lumps":

"It's what you do and learn after you leave college that counts."

Married? Yes—and "expecting," after these many years. Not quite sure that this business success is real. Can't help being happy about it, though. Still a Democrat. One that can "run for fun."

"I wonder how many men have a lot of 'lost year?' "

That question is too profound. It's more difficult that Democratic Party politics.

Forest Amsden, another keen appraiser of politicians, on July 1, 1959, paid tribute in the Coos Bay World to the frankness and warmth for which your daddy was noted:

PRAISE OF FOES WON BY EPPS

Dave Epps' death Monday night brought statements of sorrow from friends and enemies alike. This is to be expected. In the unwritten code of politics, the attack stops in times of personal tragedy. But there was no straining or artful wording in the statements about Epps from Republicans.

He was liked and respected by his opposites.

As chairman of the Oregon Democratic Party during its greatest troubles in recent years (the defeat of the Democratic Governor and the rift between Senators) he had little chance to achieve success through demonstrable achievement. And a number of Democrats, unjustly, blame at least part of both troubles on him.

Nevertheless, he kept on plugging, usually with good humor. On the several "good government" projects—such as the study of voting laws—participated in by representatives of both parties, he played straight. He was even known to praise good work on the other side. He tempered his bluster with warmth. And there never was doubt about his enthusiasm.

Within his own party dissident factions made his life miserable. But most of the dissidents respected Epps because they knew where he stood—sometimes painfully so because he was bluntly outspoken. He frequently spoke his mind on first meeting without introductory small talk, which left a lasting and occasionally traumatic impression.

He was no outstanding political philosopher, as he was dedicated to making the best of what is. But he fought the battle of the moment well and preserved friendships, always a difficult achievement in politics.—Salem Capital-Journal.

The Oregon Journal on July 2, 1959, stressed his honesty and his unaffectedness, qualities we like to see in people—and especially in politicians:

DAVE EPPS WAS ALWAYS HONEST

Dave Epps, whose untimely death cut short a successful business and political career, was a paradoxical figure.

He came from a conservative background—his father was a Portland police captain. In high school and college one of his major interests was athletics. He became a furniture dealer.

He started his political career as a Republican, but even as a Republican, in his first try for office, he advocated public distribution of Bonneville Dam power, extension of civil service, a unicameral legislature and producer and consumer cooperatives.

Shortly after this first try for office he became a Democrat and member of the Oregon Commonwealth Federation. All of this earned him, at that time, an "extreme left" label. Despite the fact that in his position as State Democratic chairman he flailed away at the opposition, Epps never created the enmity which frequently characterizes political activity.

He was one of those who picketed the campaign train of RICHARD NIXON in the hectic days of 1952 just before NIXON made his celebrated television performance defending his campaign fund. Yet after NIXON became Vice President, Epps visited him and apparently the two got on famously.

Newspapermen knew him for an honest, straightforward approach which frequently

involved relating the bad as well as good in intraparty politics.

Perhaps the paradox was not so much in Epps as it was in the society in which we live.

Epps was always himself and was completely honest about it. Society isn't used to such an approach, particularly among its politicians. The State has lost an honest and respected citizen.

Even the opposition agreed about his honesty and sincerity. Here the Albany Democrat-Herald on July 3, 1959, mentions the personal sacrifices he made, unflinchingly, in support of his beliefs;

EVERYBODY LIKED DAVE

While he had many political foes, David C. Epps had few personal foes, and of those few, if any, none have we ever heard question his honesty and sincerity.

Even in the heat of political arguments, in which he was often engaged, Dave Epps never became vindictive toward nor abusive of his opponents. His convictions were strong and he defended them diligently. He never flinched at making personal sacrifices in supporting the principles in which he believed but never allowed himself to become totally blind to the other fellow's viewpoint.

Dave Epps was an ardent and capable sportsman during his young manhood. He was an outstanding basketball and baseball player, good enough to play semipro baseball and might have been able to go on up the baseball ladder had he elected to make that sport his career. He chose, however, to abandon it in favor of social and political pursuits, but carried into all his endeavors the same sportsmanship he had displayed in the gymnasium and on the baseball diamond.

Dave was personable, public spirited, and was endowed with a sense of humor that effectively staved off any ill feeling that may have threatened to mar political debates in which he took part.

We ourselves sometimes took issue with Dave Epps, but never failed to enjoy our contacts with him, not infrequently profiting from them, and we have frankly, from time to time, said so. We know he will be missed at Sweet Home and, for that matter, throughout the State, for the respect in which he was held was not only local but statewide. We share with his family and closer friends the grief we know they feel over his untimely departure.

The State Republican house organ, the Oregon Voter, July 11, 1959, refers to his "personable influence in the trend in political thinking in Oregon." Their words are as follows:

David Claire Epps, 51, so widely and popularly known as Dave Epps, Democratic State central committee chairman who died unexpectedly June 29 will be remembered by political friend and foe as a political leader whose personality and affability transcended any difference in political philosophy, a characteristic that made him very effective. With his political philosophy Oregon Voter could not always agree but we always responded to his personable good nature in a political contest. He was a dedicated Democrat, once a Republican, and on his way to prominence espoused the now-discredited Commonwealth Federation. He served in war so ably as to receive the Bronze Star. At one time he headed the American Civil Liberties Union in Oregon; was a candidate for secretary of state in 1946 and on several occasions for the legislature. Much to his credit he found time with all his political activity to be a civic leader. History may record his personable influence in the trend in political thinking in Oregon. In recent years he steered many of his party candidates to success, and held together the Oregon Democratic Party when factional difference threatened it seriously.

On August 1, 1959, the Oregon Democrats sponsored a memorial dinner for your daddy. Senator KENNEDY was the main speaker and he was introduced by Congresswoman EDITH GREEN. Many heartfelt words of praise and sorrow were spoken. I know your mother must have them tucked away for you girls.

Your daddy did many fine things for people, not only in politics but in other areas also. Here is a story from the New Era telling of what he did for four refugees:

SWEET HOME IS NEW HOME FOR FOUR DISPLACED PERSONS

"They were very kind to me over there. I'm glad to have them here," said Dave Epps, Sweet Home furniture dealer, as he watched four Yugoslavian refugees eat their first breakfast in Oregon today.

When he met them at the Union Station this morning, it was the first time Epps, an ex-GI, had seen his European friends in 4 years. It also was the first time he had been with them when he was not in uniform. He is their sponsor in this country.

For the Glavan family—Leo and Helen and their son, Branko, 22, and daughter, Mira, 19—it is a new world, a new life.

ARRIVED MONDAY

They arrived in New York City Monday aboard the Army transport *Marine Jumper*. After a few days with friends there, they were whisked by train to Portland, where they were met by Mr. and Mrs. Epps, a reception committee of the Council of Catholic Women, and by Miss Ellen Schank, Catholic resettlement worker.

The reception committee brought an interpreter, who wasn't needed. All the Glavans speak English—in fact, the senior members of the family speak Czechoslovakian, German, Italian, and French.

MET IN ITALY

Epps met them while he was serving in Italy. The Glavans even then were displaced persons, having left their native Yugoslavia. When they wanted to come to the United States, Epps was glad to help. They will go to Sweet Home with him, where he has employment waiting.

As Epps says: "They are certain to make good citizens. They are alert, capable, and intelligent."

Branko, most voluble of the four Americans-to-be, looked around the hotel dining room after breakfast and smiled:

"I still can't believe it is true we are here at last. It is like a dream."

These editorials and the news story are only part of the evidence that your daddy was an outstanding and well-loved man for many reasons. I am going to close with an editorial written by another great and warm Oregon Democrat, Monroe Sweetland, also a close friend of your daddy.

These words were published in the Milwaukie Review July 1, 1959:

DAVID C. EPPS—1907–59

Every great cause must have, if it be truly great, a few utterly dedicated men or women. Oregon democracy, in its broader sense and in its partisan application, has had such a man in David Claire Epps. Suddenly, on Monday evening, death came to him.

To Dave Epps liberalism was a dedication. Only rarely in politics do men come along who seek neither power or profit or position for themselves, but only the success of the common cause. Warmhearted and outgoing, with boundless enthusiasm, Dave enlivened and enriched every person, every group, he touched. His monuments are all around us in the better Oregon he loved greatly and helped to build. To his mother, to his wife Nancy, and to his daughters Mardi and Cindy he leaves a rich, unforgettable heritage.

His motto might well have been:

"There was no limit to the good he could do, because he never asked who'd get the credit."

Indeed, your daddy left us all with a rich, unforgettable heritage. As citizens of a free country we salute him because we know our freedom and our happiness depend on his kind of devotion. We shall do our best to honor his memory by remembering his example.

With every good wish.

Sincerely,

CHARLES O. PORTER,
Member of Congress, Fourth District, Oregon.

HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE, FIRST CONGRESSMAN FROM THE STATE OF HAWAII

Mr. WOLF. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. DAN INOUYE, the first Congressman from the State of Hawaii. I am sure that he will bring great honor to the State of Hawaii and to the United States just as Hawaii will become an important and integral part of our Federal Union. Indeed, this is a great day for the United States for the swearing in of the Hawaiian Representatives to the Congress shows that the United States finally realizes the importance of Asia and its great cultural heritage, which can and will enrich the civilization of mainland United States.

FINANCIAL POSITION OF THE TREASURY

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am sure each Member of the House is concerned about the financial position of the Treasury and would support any sound method to improve its cash balance. Yet, no action has been taken on legislation I introduced which would immediately place more than $103 million in the Treasury for current use and would save the Federal Government approximately $3,650,000 a year without costing the taxpayer one red cent.

I am referring to my bill H.R. 5691, the old currency bill, which lies before the Committee on Banking and Currency. This legislation is the same as legislation I introduced back in 1957.

For 2 years now this committee has been sitting on legislation which would help solve part of our fiscal problem. For 2 years, Congress has had within its power a means of improving the cash position of the Treasury, but there has not been any hearing.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] has introduced similar legislation, although it may be more detailed than my own. I do not care which bill is considered by the committee and the House. All I am concerned with is the improvement and savings that are possible. I believe either bill would receive unanimous consent of the members of the committee. Every day this legislation remains in committee the Government loses $10,000 a day and the opportunity to increase the cash in its hard-pressed Treasury.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, has the support of the Treasury, and the Department has prepared a memorandum which explains the bill. I believe the material contained in this memorandum should be read by all Members of the House and, under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

TREASURY MEMORANDUM RE DRAFT OF PROPOSED BILL TO AUTHORIZE ADJUSTMENTS IN ACCOUNTS OF OUTSTANDING OLD SERIES CURRENCY, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The proposed legislation would provide (1) that certain outstanding currency issues be liquidated as such, and constituted a part of the outstanding debt bearing no interest, and (2) that the amount of each denomination of each kind of old large-size currency now outstanding that has been destroyed or irretrievably lost and so will never be presented for redemption, be determined and written off the Treasury statements and accounts.

Old large-size paper currency means any paper currency issued prior to July 1, 1929, and gold certificates issued subsequent to July 1, 1929, and prior to January 30, 1934. The Treasury and the Federal Reserve System are carrying gold, silver, and other reserves against this old currency, a large portion of which, in all probability, has been destroyed while in circulation, and consequently, will never be presented for redemption. The adjustments authorized by the bill would free these reserves and permit the Treasury to obtain the benefit of their use for current purposes. The bill provides for the amount of this old currency which is outstanding to be carried as a part of the public debt bearing no interest, and any such old currency presented to the Treasury would be redeemed from the general cash in the Treasury and the amount of public debt outstanding would be correspondingly reduced. The proposal would have the effect of improving the Treasury's cash position by more than $100 million. This would consist of about $32 million in gold, which would increase the balance in the general fund of the Treasury, and more than $68 million additional cash, including about $37 million to be received from the Federal Reserve banks on account of Federal Reserve notes. These adjustments would not constitute public debt subject to the debt limitation.

This approach to an adjustment of the old large-size currency accounts is along the line of the precedent established by law and regulations for the adjustment of discontinued national bank circulation and Federal Reserve bank notes.

The bill would also authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to determine the amount of the old currency which, in his judgment, has been destroyed or irretrievably lost and so will not be presented for redemption, and to reduce accordingly the amount, or amounts, thereof outstanding on the records of the Treasury. Except for writeoffs of $8,375,934 in 1880 and $4,842,066.45 in 1920 of the fractional currency issued in the 1870's, the Treasury has never reduced its outstanding currency accounts for currency held in private ownership and destroyed by fires, floods, or in other ways. For example, about $1,100,000 of old Treasury notes of 1890, which have not been issued since 1893, are outstanding, and only about $25,000 of such notes have been presented for redemption in the last 18 years.

The proposed bill also contains a provision to permit the Treasury to withhold from destruction pieces of each currency issue to provide a historical collection of the paper currency of the United States.

There are enclosed a number of statistical statements relating to currency in circulation.

Enactment of this bill would benefit the Treasury without impairing in the least the redeemability of the old currency.

FEDERAL TAX RATES

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the fact that I am today introducing a bill which is identical to H.R. 3000 and H.R. 3001, the companion bills which were introduced, respectively, by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG], and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER].

I consider it a great privilege to join with these distinguished members of the Ways and Means Committee and others who have also introduced bills identical to H.R. 3000 and H.R. 3001 because it is my deep conviction that these bills encompass the most realistic and enlightened proposals for the reform of Federal tax rates and methods that this body has been called upon to consider for a long time.

It would be presumptuous—even futile—to attempt to improve on the unassailable case made for the adoption of H.R. 3000 and H.R. 3001 in the joint remarks of the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Tennessee before this body on January 21. These remarks have been widely hailed as a magnificent appraisal, in depth, of the tax-wrought erosion of our economy and a well-documented prospectus delineating the manner in which the measures provided in the bills would restore the economy to increasingly greater rates of sustained, non-inflationary growth.

I shall, therefore, confine my remarks to some of the features of these proposals with the sincere hope that they will serve to bring about a re-reading of the joint remarks of the authors by all the Members of this body, because if this is done it is certain that a majority—and from both sides of the aisle—will urge an immediate consideration of the bills by the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I make that prediction with assurance, secure in the knowledge that when the proposals in the bills are weighed against the ever-worsening effects of our Federal tax system on our national well-being the critical urgency for prompt action will become entirely obvious.

It is hardly necessary for me to provide a bill of particulars of all the domestic ills stemming from our present and debilitating Federal tax rate structure. There is concrete evidence, on every side, of the manner in which it attacks the very foundation of our economy by draining off—through excessive and confiscatory rates—vast amounts of potential capital funds so vital to the proper functioning of the process of free competitive enterprise.

The rate of our economic growth is a prime barometer, as it reflects the unbearable weight of heavyhanded taxation. The steadily declining figures show that our rate of growth—as measured by the gross national product—has dropped to an average of 2 percent for the 6 years ending in 1958 whereas the rate of growth for the 60 years preceding the depression of the 1930's was 4 percent a year.

But, we do not need to resort to cold statistics to prove the point. Every taxpayer is aware of the pernicious way in which the tax structure stifles individual initiative and business enterprise by denying proper and earned rewards for success; how it appropriates the savings that otherwise could provide the job-creating capital for financing the start and development of business. It is upon the success of these processes that all economic growth depends.

It is just as evident that the fallout from the degenerative taxation bomb has such a sterile effect on economic progress as to bring on or intensify inflation, recession, and unemployment.

How then can there be any possible, objective refutation of the pressing need for enacting H.R. 3000, H.R. 3001, and my bill which deal so forthrightly with the tax-born problems by providing for the moderation of both individual and corporate income tax rates over a 5-year period; the establishment of more realistic depreciation rules; the deferring of taxes for individuals on long-term capital gains until such time as the taxpayer "disinvests" and the reduction of confiscatory rates of taxes on estates and gifts?

The long overdue and comprehensive reform embraced in these bills would be manifest in benefits spreading throughout the economy, principally because they substitute long-range and positive solution for the ineffectual, piecemeal approach which have marked our remedial efforts up to now.

The authors of the bills gave high priority to the need for this reversal of governmental tactics as the following passage from their introductory remarks so perceptively points out:

The Nation cannot correct the fundamental tax problems of our times by nibbles and bites. By removing tax blocks to progress our bills would contribute more than any other possible Government action to our domestic welfare and national security.

Any tax method or rate which impedes the accumulation, use of or preservation of capital is a tax on human betterment and national strength. Our Federal tax structure

must stand convicted of this fault. By use of its capital-destroying tax rates and methods we have prevented our economy from achieving anything like its potential for progress.

A singular illustration of the futility of stop-and-go prescriptions for economic ailments lies in our recent experiences with unemployment. Here we chose to ignore the fundamental fact that all jobs spring from and are irrevocably tied to capital. Instead of resorting to the real and lasting solution—an increase in the flow of investment funds unleashed by reform of personal and corporate tax rates—we elected to deal only with the effect and voted funds to permit the States to prolong unemployment compensation payments. Not one single job was created by this wrong-end treatment despite the tremendous expenditures involved.

This deplorable passing up of a golden opportunity to deal competently with the fountainhead of the trouble takes on an even more tragic complexion when arrayed against the backdrop of the provisions of these present proposals. These bills would release a veritable flood of private, job-creating capital funds by reducing—in five annual steps—the first bracket personal tax rate from 20 to 15 percent and bringing the top rate down from 91 percent to 47 percent, with corresponding reductions in the interim rates.

This is a frontal attack on the real culprit—the sharp progression in the tax rates—which has been choking off the greater bulk of risk capital.

Another glaring example of ineffectual, catch-as-catch-can dealing is the manner in which the small-businessman situation has been handled at the national governmental level. Even granting them to be well-intentioned, the hearings, the studies, the investigations, have brought too few changes for the better. I submit that there have been no satisfactory results because there seems to be an obsession, on the part of some, to treat the small businessman as a problem child instead of as a respected member of the business community, who has problems. The erratic piecemeal approach, has failed to penetrate to the root cause of the trouble besetting him.

The root cause, Mr. Speaker, is the Federal tax structure which makes it virtually impossible for the businessman to increase his capital by plowing back earnings or attracting the investment of individuals. With proper access to his own and outside funds—which these bills would make possible—the opportunity for full-fledged expansion will be available, consistently, to the small businessman and his major stumbling block thus removed.

My singling out of the small businessman should not give the impression that the bills are designed to afford him preferential treatment. That is far from the actual case. The beneficial reforms extend throughout the business community, to the large and medium-sized businesses as well as to the small. And the small businessman would be the first to testify to the fact that the flourishing of his business, depends, in large measure, on the success of businesses in general, regardless of size.

I come now to the matter of the revenue effect of the bills. Naturally, this was of grave concern to me, as it undoubtedly is to most Members of this body. Therefore, I made a special study of this aspect of the bills and I am pleased to report that I share the conviction of the authors that, with passage of the bills, economic growth over the next 5 years would be more than adequate to offset any revenue loss from rate reduction.

In support of their contention, the authors had this to say in their remarks:

> It is roughly calculated that each 1 percent annual increase in the rate of economic growth, as measured by the gross annual product, will produce a billion dollars in Federal revenues. It is also estimated that the revenue effect of our bills would average out at less than $3.5 billion annually, or the equivalent of a 3.5 percent of economic growth. Thus, if with enactment of this legislation economic growth should average 5 percent annually over the next 5 years there would be an average annual surplus of revenue increase of at least $1.5 billion over the requirements for effectuating the reforms provided.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that my strong opposition to deficit spending and my efforts in pursuit of economy in Government are matters of record. In the light of this background it is especially gratifying for me to be able to point out that these bills have a built-in safeguard against a renewed wave of deficit spending.

This safety valve is a provision that permits postponement of succeeding reductions after application of the first year's reductions in the event that a determination by the President, as of November 15 in any year, that spending for the fiscal year is running in excess of $77 billion and a state of budget unbalance is threatened.

It will be recognized that the current fiscal year's Presidential budget estimate was chosen as the benchmark when the original bills were drafted, in January of this year, and that the events that have transpired support the soundness of the choice of the $77 billion figure.

By helping to hold budgetary appropriations the bills perform another worthwhile and badly needed service by striking an important blow for economic growth in its ceaseless struggle against the danger of being overrun by the growth of the Government. Government growth can only be had at the expense of economic growth—upon which it feeds—and any policy that holds Government spending in check will, in conjunction with reform of tax rates and methods, contribute greatly to the routing of obstacles in the path of economic growth.

For far, far, too many years we have been taking the easy fiscal road by seizing the added Federal revenues resulting from economic growth and using it for public expenditures — in many cases seeking new ways to spend it — instead of applying it, as it should be, to increasing the rate of economic growth through tax rate reform.

Mr. Speaker, as compelling as are the domestic reasons for reform of tax rates and methods, another and ominous threat, the bold challenge of Soviet Russia to outstrip us in a deadly serious economic race, should make us more determined than ever to remedy the unfortunate situation to which unsound tax policies have relegated us.

We must remember that the Soviets do not enter struggles unless they feel they have the upper hand. They know, of course, that they could never hope to surpass our productive might if the business community had the freedom of unfettered access to adequate financial resources to withstand the challenge. Therefore, since they are fully aware of the strangling effect of our present Federal tax structure, they are banking more on the handicaps we are imposing on ourselves, than on their ability to beat us in an equal contest.

I spoke earlier of our declining rate of growth. In sharp contrast to our current 2 percent average is Russia's spectacular climb to an estimated growth rate of 8 percent. This is a spectacle steeped in irony. In effect, the Soviets have usurped the economic dynamism that has been our country's trademark since the turn of the century.

For a Nation that has always prided itself on unfailingly meeting headon its internal problems and challenges from abroad, we now find ourselves in the position of retreating from an economic dilemma even though the ultimate fate of our country could very well depend on its solution.

It would be understandable, even acceptable, if the solution was not readily at hand. But it is. It lies in the speedy passage of this legislation because, as the authors of the original bills contended in their remarks:

> Our bills would contribute more than any other possible Government action to our domestic welfare and national security. In enabling the economy to grow more rapidly and consistently than in recent years, these bills would—
>
> Increase the supply of venture capital, thus insuring a rebirth of the American genius for the starting and development of businesses;
>
> Provide new and better job opportunities;
>
> Counter the challenge of Russian communism for world economic leadership;
>
> Insure adequate revenues for military preparedness, and all other necessary Federal expenditures; and
>
> Smother inflation with growth.

Mr. Speaker, I concur, most heartily, in this appraisal of the benefits that passage of the bills would bring to our country. Nothing is to be gained, and much may be lost by delay. I am positive that the start of the 5-year cycle of reductions proposed will launch our country on a program that would raise our living standards to new heights and crush, once and for all, Soviet Russia's aspirations to supplant us as the world's economic leader.

MILLIONS NOT FOR DEFENSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the following is an article by Mary V. R. Thayer:

MILLIONS NOT FOR DEFENSE—CULTURE IS COIN OF DIPLOMACY

(By Mary V. R. Thayer)

A very few years back, "culture" was almost a dirty word, regarded alike with suspicion by simple citizens and doughty Congressmen. But just look at culture now. People are crazy about it. Nations are swapping it like mad. And Congress, with scarcely a struggle, appropriates around $215 million annually to underwrite international cultural, educational and technical exchanges, while private institutions spend an equal sum.

Why this almost-sudden popularity? Well, culture has lost its highbrow tinge. Now it's spread to include all facets of everyday life. Athletics, machinery, jazz, plumbing, even comics in addition to the more conventional arts, have made the cultural grade. But most important, statesmen have discovered culture as the most persuasive instrument in making friends and influencing people. And down in the State Department they've coined a new slogan: "Cultural diplomacy survives political diplomacy." It's true, too. Thousands of Latin American music lovers will remember the Washington National Symphony Orchestra concert, not the rock-throwing of the Castro brothers; and, over in Russia, Moscovites will sigh for that gorgeous electric kitchen long after the acid Khrushchev-Nixon repartee blurbs.

Yet, curiously, with all this lavish spread of cultural exchange, no one knows precisely where all the money goes, nor has the value of these expenditures at home and abroad been appraised.

Here's how, so far, the U.S. Government's cultural pie has been sliced and approximately what the dollars buy: $129 million by the International Cooperation Administration; $35 million by the Defense Department; $20 million by the State Department; $20 million for the U.S. share in multinations spending, and $10 million by the U.S. Information Agency.

The ICA funds go to technical assistance programs including training and teaching here and overseas, defense spending, some of which is necessarily secret, is invested in military advisory missions abroad, training of foreign officers here and a variety of special projects like the Army Language School. The USIA uses its funds for libraries, Voice of America broadcasts, motion picture and literature distribution, all in foreign countries. The multination agencies, in which the U.S. pays its share (and more) are various organizations in the United Nations and the Organization of American States. The State Department employs this particular sum mostly for exchange of persons activities.

Naturally, in this wide field where so many different government agencies, so many separate interests and organizations are involved, there's sure to be duplication. Something simply had to be done to straighten out culture.

And now, a long overdue move has been made to clear the cloudy picture, fix greater emphasis on U.S. cultural relations and give cultural diplomacy a big boost. Last December, under the provisions of a bill jointly sponsored by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, (Democrat, of Arkansas), and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY (Democrat, of Minnesota), a job with an exhausting title—Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for Coordination of International Educational and Cultural Relations—was created. Former Minister to Rumania Robert Helyer Thayer was tapped for the task, which primarily was one of cultural coordination among Government agencies and assurance that these international programs were consistent with U.S. foreign policy.

Then, in June, culture was promoted again. The State Department set up a Bureau of International Cultural Relations with Thayer as head. For the first time the State Department's cultural activities are being shepherded into a spot of their own.

Scorned less than a decade ago, culture is now sitting pretty as a very important factor in international relations. Under Bureau chaperonage fall such things as UNESCO relations; exchange of students and "leaders"; an advisory committee on the arts; the much publicized East-West contacts which have been building up better palships with Russians; and cultural presentations, an office which sends such stars at Satchmo Armstrong and "Oklahoma" zinging to foreign parts as our cultural ambassadors.

How can anyone untangle such masses of often unrelated "culture" which tentacles all over the world? First step is to find out just what agencies and organizations are doing, what they're spending and why. Private institutions cooperate companionably to avoid competition. But, it's rumored, Government agencies tend to go their own sweet and congressionally sweetened way.

So first thing Thayer did was to launch a survey of cultural activities in 15 Government agencies. Next, he hopes to persuade some private organization to undertake a similar cataloging in every foreign country.

It will take a year, he estimates, to assemble this basic information, and not until then can policy recommendations be made to Government agencies. Once corraled, this tremendous windfall of cultural information will be made available to everyone, and kept updated by IBM machines which, in their uncanny way, will keep track of every single exchange activity, both governmental and privately paid for. Thus, it is hoped, duplication will be avoided, expenses reduced, and the Bureau of International Cultural Relations prepared to cope with the avalanching culture boom, spurred by cheaper travel, easier communications, and the curiosity of once-isolated peoples.

Robert Thayer is well backgrounded for his difficult cultural chores. His father, the late Dr. William Greenough Thayer, was headmaster of St. Mark's School in Southboro, Mass., for more than three decades. As a young lawyer, Thayer was one of the bright young men who toiled as assistant district attorney in New York County in the days when Tom Dewey was racket-busting. After running up a distinguished wartime Navy record, he acted as special assistant to John Foster Dulles on trust territories at the first United Nations conference.

In the early fifties, he was an attaché of the U.S. Ambassador in Paris, and then, after 2 years as Minister to Romania, returned to the State Department Intelligence Division. He's had a hand in politics, too, working as GOP treasurer in New York State, and, in 1946, taking on the thankless job of running for Congress in a 100 percent Democratic district in Coney Island.

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INFAMOUS MOLOTOV-RIBBENTROP AGREEMENT WHICH TOUCHED OFF WORLD WAR II

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to address the House today to remind my colleagues that yesterday, August 23, marked the 20th anniversary of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, which touched off World War II.

I believe it is of utmost importance that we recall this infamous agreement between the Soviet Union and the Nazis at this particular time when our Nation is preparing to greet the boss of the Communist conspirators, Premier Nikita Khrushchev, here in this country in another 3 weeks.

It is my firm belief that if the President would review Soviet treachery in 1939, and recall that the thousands of American boys who had to make the supreme sacrifice in World War II could have been spared if the Soviet Union had not given Hitler the green light to touch off World War II, perhaps Mr. Eisenhower's decision to invite Boss Khrushchev to this country might have been avoided.

Let there be no doubt in the mind of a single American that the Soviet Union is just as responsible for World War II as was Hitler. And try as anyone may, the Molotov-Ribbentrop agreement stands as indelible proof of this indisputable fact.

It is indeed regrettable that the thousands upon thousands of American Gold Star Mothers whose sons died in World War II; the thousands upon thousands of American veterans who are today still in our hospitals or walking the streets as cripples from injuries received in World War II; the thousands upon thousands of European refugees who are now Americans and who have lost all of their possessions to Nazi-Soviet aggression, and finally, the thousands upon thousands of Americans whose relatives were destroyed by the Nazi butchers in the concentration camps and the Soviet butchers at Katyn and other Communist torture centers, are being asked by the President and the Vice President and other responsible Americans to pay respect to Mr. Khrushchev—one of the coconspirators in the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact.

Those two monuments in front of the National Archives Building on Pennsylvania Avenue proclaim the philosophical message that, "What is past is prologue; study the past."

It is clearly apparent to me that those who have engineered the invitation to Khrushchev to visit this country have been blind to this admonition. We as Americans can only pray that their folly will not lead ultimately to a third world war when it is safe to assume America would indeed find it difficult to survive.

Let there be no doubt in anyone's mind that the secret pact signed on August 23, 1939, between Soviet Foreign Commissar V. M. Molotov and Nazi Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop cleared the way for the beginning of World War II. That the tragic effects of this agreement upon the course of world history have been great goes without saying.

God grant that I could have the ability to impress upon every American who in just 3 short weeks will be asked, as Mr. NIXON has suggested, that we show Mr. Khrushchev the same courtesies that the Russian people extended to Mr. NIXON, the striking parallel between

events and the conduct of the Communist leaders today and their conduct during the period immediately preceding Hitler's plunge into Poland. I am sure that if every American was made aware of this striking parallel, he would denounce Khrushchev's pending visit to this country with all the vigor capable by a human being.

In reviewing the events which preceded the signing of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, I shall show here today that we as Americans who want to preserve peace, but an honorable peace, must, for the sake of survival, study the past.

I should like to emphasize, just as strongly as I know how, that the importance of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact lies in the fact that it was a pact of war. It was a pact that gave Hitler a free hand to crush Poland, knowing full well he could do so with impunity from the Soviet Union.

It is indeed the height of hypocrisy for Boss Khrushchev to benignly proclaim in Moscow that he is coming to America as a peaceful man, when at this very moment, with the full blessings of the Moscow rulers, the Communists are plotting an assault on Laos. Can there be any doubt in your minds what this despot who is coming here with the blood of millions of European people on his hands is going to tell the Chinese Communists when he arrives in Peiping to participate in the 10th anniversary of their rape of China on October 1, following his visit to America?

Yes, my colleagues, I beg of you to study the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact so you can understand the full depth and meaning of Communist treachery. Here was the formula for deceit. This pact stands out as a shining example of how the Communist mind operates and how the Soviet rulers will use any tools of deception to ultimately force international communism upon the entire world.

When you understand the full significance of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact and how it helped establish the Soviet rulers to their present position of dominance, you can then only realize that Khrushchev's boast to Mr. NIXON that his grandchildren will live under socialism—which to the Soviet rulers means communism—was no hollow boast and cannot be treated lightly by the free world.

The world has forgotten too soon that the Soviet armies sat idly by while the free West was locked in deadly battle with the Nazi forces during roughly the first half of World War II, and the Communists in this country did everything they could to cripple our own war effort until that day when Hitler finally plunged his armies into Russia. I have said and will continue to say that the Soviet Union was just as responsible as was Hitler and we in this country today cannot in good conscience absolve Khrushchev of his guilt in this conspiracy.

The circumstances that produced the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact are fascinating, and for us today, they are instructive. The year 1939 was a critical year for the Western World. Europe was divided into three major camps: Great Britain and France, representing the status quo powers; Nazi Germany and Italy on the side of revisionism; and Soviet Russia, the great question mark in the balance of power in Europe. British and French interests were predicated upon the firm belief that the European system established at Versailles following World War I had to be preserved. Nazi Germany wanted to revise this system by regaining territories lost as a consequence of the Treaty of Versailles; but even more, to assert German domination over the European Continent. In a word, Nazi Germany wanted to reverse the established order by reducing French and British power and creating a new status quo only this time in the Nazi image. Soviet Russia, hostile to both the status quo powers and Nazi Germany, was in fact the vital counterpoise in the precarious balance of power in 1939. Whichever way the Russians threw their weight would inevitably be a determining factor—indeed a vital one—in the course of European history.

At this time, the United States played no key role on the European Continent. After World War I, it was content with a policy of disengagement from European affairs. For the Nazis and Communists, American power could only be calculated as possibly a long-term potential factor for the status quo nations. Nor did the Japanese directly enter into the European picture. Although the Japanese were allied with the Nazis in an anti-Communist pact, they were, nonetheless, totally taken up with their attempted conquest of China and the business of establishing a new order in the Far East.

Such was the general power alinement in Europe at the end of 1938 and early 1939.

Two events occurred at this time which were to have a direct bearing upon the shift in this power alinement: One was the concessions made by the status quo powers to Nazi Germany at Munich in September 1938; the other was the destruction of the Czechoslovak Republic in March 1939. Both events meant a further decline in the power of the status quo nations to maintain their system; it meant also a dangerous attempt by the Germans to upset the delicate balance on the European Continent. It was a clear assertion of German claims to hegemony in Central and Eastern Europe. Munich and the collapse of Czechoslovakia were for all practical purposes public declarations by France and Britain that they abdicated their interests in Eastern Europe. By their refusal to resist German pressure during these months of crisis they, in effect, opened the floodgates for the expansion of German power into Eastern Europe.

After the destruction of Czechoslovakia by Hitler, the Western Powers were shocked from their lethargy of appeasement. Britain and Poland undertook immediate negotiations for a mutual assistance pact directed against Germany. This was concluded on August 25, 1939. The Baltic States, clinging to the phantom of neutrality, tried desperately to remain aloof from the impending struggle. On the other hand, France, Britain, and the Soviet Union began negotiations to establish a peace front to contain Germany's aggressive ambitions. For the next 4 months it appeared that the Russians were casting their lot with the Western Powers, despite their insistence upon direct guarantees for the independence of states along the east European border and further guarantees against direct and indirect aggression.

Differences suddenly dissolved in the course of negotiations when on July 24 the Soviet Government made some apparent concessions. London and Paris had great expectations that Moscow was determined to conclude a pact that would mean establishing a "peace front" as a deterrent to further German aggression. On August 11 special British and French military missions arrived in Moscow to confer with Soviet military authorities. They were feted with cordial and respectful enthusiasm. However, all this was only an empty gesture; for Molotov's concessions to the British and French were no more than a cunning move to gain time and create the impression in the official German mind that the Russians were about to establish a "peace front." If successful, they could strike a better bargain with the Germans with whom they were carrying on simultaneous negotiations. As events later proved, the Russians were playing a dual game; one with the West and one with the Nazis.

Early in the spring of 1939, straws were in the wind of a Nazi-Soviet rapprochement. At the 18th Congress of the Russian Communist Party in March 1939 Stalin laid down terms for continued peace with Russia which included the preservation of the integrity and inviolability of the Soviet frontiers. On May 3, Soviet Commissar Litvinov was replaced by Molotov. Litvinov, described as being "notoriously anti-German," had long symbolized the Soviet policy of collective security with the West, a policy of which he had been the vociferous champion. Soviet motivations remained in doubt, however, until July 22, when trade discussions were resumed in Berlin. Simultaneously, political discussions were carried on and culminated in the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact on August 23, 1939. Attached to the nonaggression pact was a secret protocol, later brought to light, which called for the division of Eastern Europe into spheres. By the terms of the protocol western Poland and Lithuania were placed in the Nazi sphere; eastern Poland, Estonia, Latvia, and Bessarabia were placed in the Soviet sphere. Determination of the Soviet-Nazi boundary in Poland was to be a subject for future discussion. A subsequent protocol was concluded on September 24, 1939, after Poland fell to the Nazi and Soviet invaders. In this agreement Lithuania was placed in the Soviet sphere and certain adjustments were made for the partition of Poland.

World opinion outside of Germany and Russia was shocked by the news of this pact. It would have been appalled had ever the secret stipulations been published and the consequences of the agreement known.

Today, with the benefit of some historical perspective, we can evaluate the real meaning of the Molotov-Ribbentrop agreement. In the simplest terms, this pact was a pact of war, and for bringing on this war the Soviet Union must share with Nazi Germany equal responsibility. The equilibrium of Europe had depended solely upon Soviet Russia; it was the Russians who held the vital counterpoise in the balance of power. Whichever way their Government chose to cast its weight was destined to be the determining factor in deciding the question of war or peace. Taking what the highest bidder had to offer, the Soviet Union which seemingly had more to gain in the short run from a German rapprochement, chose the path of conquest for itself, a choice which meant war for the rest of Europe, and for itself, immediate aggrandizement through seizure of the Baltic States, eastern Poland, and other areas on the borderlands of Eastern Europe. Thus, the Soviets succeeded, temporarily, in partial fulfillment of their fundamental objective of Communist world dominion. By diverting German aggression to the West, the Russians hoped to create in addition the conditions for what they termed the "second imperialist war" among the Western Powers, from the ruins of which, according to Communist dogma, the U.S.S.R. might thereafter stand supreme among nations with strength unimpaired and energy undiminished ready to advance the cause of world communism.

CHEMICAL, BIOLOGICAL, AND RADIOLOGICAL WARFARE IN TODAY'S PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a matter of importance to national security. I speak now of the chemical and biological warfare programs of the Department of Defense which are referred to in a news item appearing in the press of August 14, 1959; an item which was based on a press release from the office of Congressman KASTENMEIER.

I want to read this news item to you, and I do so on the assumption that it accurately reflects the statement which my honorable colleague from Wisconsin made to the press. I quote:

CHEMICAL WARFARE QUIZ URGED

A congressional investigation of the Defense Department's chemical and biological warfare program was urged yesterday by Representative ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, Democrat, Wisconsin.

He said this should be undertaken before the Department develops "odorless, invisible, and substanceless killers which could detroy whole cities and poison the entire atmosphere with a 50-mile radius."

"There should be a full and open discussion of the hazards involved in this type of program before the weapons are developed by the Soviet Union and the United States," he said.

KASTENMEIER quoted Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Research and Development for the Defense Department, as stating it is difficult, if not impossible, to counteract biological and chemical agents since they cannot be detected.

KASTENMEIER urged the Department to "lift the veil of secrecy which surrounds this area" on the premise the dangers should be made known to the American people.

Now I want to take a little time to discuss the implications of this news item and more particularly the concepts expressed because I sincerely believe that they could, unwittingly to the author I am sure, cause harm to our national defense should they be left unanswered. I might add here that my knowledge of the current status of chemical and biological warfare programs upon which I base my answers comes from the testimony I was privileged to receive in my capacity as a member of the Appropriations Committee during the hearings on the Defense Department budget in April of this year, coupled with the information contained in this excellent report which I hold in my hand entitled "Research in CBR—Chemical, Biological, and Radiological Warfare." This report was prepared by the House Committee on Science and Astronautics under the very capable direction of the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, the Honorable OVERTON BROOKS, and it is based on both the open and executive session hearings before the full committee, held on June 16 and 22, 1959. It is a most thorough study of a subject the facts of which have been too long withheld from the American people and I commend it to your sincere attention as a matter of the highest priority.

Before I proceed, I would like to say that I am glad to see the interest which Congressman KASTENMEIER is taking in chemical and biological warfare. I only wish that he had studied this report of the Science and Astronautics Committee or attended their hearings before speaking to the press, for I am convinced that had he done so, he would have taken a different attitude toward this most serious matter.

First of all, the gentleman from Wisconsin urges a congressional investigation of the Defense Department's chemical and biological warfare programs before the Department develops "odorless, invisible, and substanceless killers which could destroy whole cities and poison the entire atmosphere within a 50-mile radius." My distinguished colleague is further quoted as saying:

There should be a full and open discussion of the hazards involved in this type of program before the weapons are developed by the Soviet Union and the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the Defense Department's chemical and biological warfare programs have been thoroughly studied and carefully screened by both the House Appropriations Committee and the Science and Astronautics Committee. Individual members of both the House and Senate have been briefed on these programs and have visited a number of the laboratories and plants where this work is carried on. I know, for example, that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] maintains an intense interest in the Pine Bluff biological warfare facilities which are in his congressional district and has visited there several times. A complete report of the status of these programs is made annually to the members of the congressional reserve unit and in fact several of their meetings have been held at chemical and biological warfare installations. Congress is not unaware of what is happening in this most important field of national defense.

I shall mention only briefly the inaccuracy in the statement concerning the destruction of whole cities because it is clearly evident that the one thing these agents will not do is to destroy cities. Unlike the high explosive and nuclear weapons, chemical and biological weapons would leave cities undamaged and undestroyed. They are effective only against personnel, animals, and crops. And they can be only temporarily incapacitating. After the shocking destruction and death of the last war this fact should invite most hopeful scrutiny.

Congressman KASTENMEIER certainly cannot mean that a congressional investigation would prevent the Soviet Union from developing weapons of this nature. There is nothing the Soviets would like better than to have us vulnerable to chemical and biological weapon attacks, and nothing would be more likely to invite such attacks than the knowledge that this vulnerability exists.

And I want to interject here that our sole concern does not necessarily arise from the known Russian capability to use chemical and biological weapons. Unlike the nuclear club, the entrance fee for membership into the field of chemical and biological weapons is relatively cheap. Even if we and the Russians could agree on a foolproof system of inspection that would guarantee the abolishment of these weapons—and our experience with the Russians does not appear to favor such an agreement—we would still have no assurance that some other nation would not proceed to build up a capability. Mr. Speaker, these weapons are the poor man's nuclear bomb, and although designed for other purposes, in many ways they are just as dangerous, just as effective, and just as serious to national defense. Let me quote here from the Science and Astronautics Committee report:

One can conceive the possibility that a very powerful nation with great industrial resources and standing military forces could be toppled by a latter-day David of a smaller nation by quiet and sustained effort in the CBR field. Only a thoroughgoing research program of our own, coupled with proper attention to warning devices and civil defense will insure that this country is not the Goliath to fall.

I am in complete agreement with the final statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin as reported in the press. He urges the Department of Defense to lift the veil of secrecy which surrounds this area on the premise that the dangers should be known to the American people. I want to say that this is almost exactly the recommendation of the Science Committee, made after an exhaustive study of this work. This committee recommends:

There is an urgent need for greater public understanding of the dangers and uses of CBR if proper support is to be given to our defenses and counter measures.

Mr. Speaker, I share the concern of my colleague in this most serious matter for the CBR field offers potentially a dangerous likelihood of international anarchy and we in the Congress have serious responsibilities to see that everything possible is done to reduce and minimize these dangers.

I am concerned that perhaps we are not placing sufficient emphasis on this work and not supporting it at levels compatible with the efforts of the Communist nations. For the best guarantee we can have that CBR will not be used anywhere against the free world if for the United States to establish a capability second to none.

I am particularly concerned about the weakness of our civil defense efforts against these forms of warfare. We know that the Soviets have a vast program in operation to provide for the defense of their civilian population. And we have been warned not once but many times in public statements of Russian leaders, both political and military, that the next war will include the use of chemical and biological weapons.

Mr. Speaker, the possibilities which confront us today in this area were virtually unknown even a few years ago. What may lie ahead will be even more important, for as science and technology advance there will be concurrent advances in weapons of warfare. I wish to join the gentleman from Wisconsin in urging that the Congress take a deeper interest and a more important role in this work that is being carried on by the Department of Defense. For in the words of the Science and Astronautics Committee report:

> Perhaps CBR research for another decade would not alter the general military balance of power. But if it does, and the United States has not gained the same capability as others, the cost to the Nation would be beyond calculation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FORD (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), on account of official business as delegate to Interparliamentary Union in Warsaw, Poland.

Mr. HOLLAND (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 3 days, on account of death in family.

Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), on account of official business as delegate to Interparliamentary Union in Warsaw, Poland.

Mr. ADAIR (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), on account of official business as delegate to Interparliamentary Union in Warsaw, Poland.

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. SIKES, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. BARR, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. JARMAN, for 1 hour, on August 26.

Mr. HOLIFIELD, for 45 minutes, on Wednesday and Thursday next.

Mr. NELSEN, for 1 hour, on August 26.

Mr. BROYHILL, for 15 minutes, on August 26.

Mr. BRAY, for 15 minutes, on August 31, and for 15 minutes, on September 1.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DOYLE.

Mr. PORTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALGER.

Mrs. KEE.

Mr. RAY.

Mr. QUIE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ADAIR and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAGUE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATMAN, to extend his remarks following the passage of the Small Business Administration bill and include certain extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. ALBERT, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. MORRISON.

Mr. CARTER.

Mrs. KELLY.

SENATE BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTION, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills, a joint resolution, and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 662. An act to amend section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to provide for administration of farm programs by democratically elected farmer committeemen; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 861. An act to provide for the control of noxious plants on land under the control or jurisdiction of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1136. An act to provide for the transfer of title to irrigation distribution systems constructed under the Federal reclamation laws upon completion of repayment of the costs thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1216. An act to approved an order of the Secretary of the Interior adjusting, deferring, and canceling certain irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1221. An act to amend the act authorizing the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon, in order to increase the capacity of certain project features for future irrigation of additional lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1282. An act relating to acreage allotments for durum wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1514. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 618); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1735. An act to repeal the honorarium provision in subsection (b) of section 4 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1737. An act to authorize the imposition of forfeitures for certain violations of the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission in the common carrier and safety and special fields; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2291. An act to authorize the erection of a plaque in honor of the late Honorable Sam D. McReynolds on or near the site of the Chickamauga Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2539. An act to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the renewal of urban communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S.J. Res. 128. Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for a memorial to James Madison; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of hearings on "Fallout From Nuclear Weapons Testing"; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 72. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of hearings on "Biological and Environmental Effects of Nuclear War"; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 271. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide a further period for presuming service connection in the case of veterans suffering from Hansen's disease (leprosy);

H.R. 4329. An act to provide for the conveyance to any public or private organization of the State of Virginia of certain dwellings acquired in connection with the Chantilly Airport site, Virginia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6288. An act to establish a National Medal of Science to provide recognition for individuals who make outstanding contributions in the physical, biological, mathematical, and engineering sciences;

H.R. 7106. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, with respect to forfeiture of benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration;

H.R. 7978. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 115. Joint resolution to reserve a site in the District of Columbia for the erection of a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to provide for a competition for the design of such memorial, and to provide additional funds for holding the competition.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 900. An act to amend section 204(b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend the authority of the Administrator of General Services to pay direct expenses in connection with the utilization of excess real property and related personalty, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On August 21, 1959:

H.R. 109. An act to designate the dam and reservoir to be constructed on the Pound River near Bartlick, Dickenson County, Va., as the "John W. Flannagan Dam and Reservoir";

H.R. 255. An act to amend section 358 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for apportionment of compensation of veterans who disappear;

H.R. 267. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that multiple sclerosis developing a 10 per centum or more degree disability within three years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service connected;

H.R. 802. An act to validate and confirm a contract entered into between the United States and the town of Bridgeport, Wash.;

H.R. 1074. An act to repeal the Act of August 9, 1939, creating the Louisiana-Vicksburg Bridge Commission;

H.R. 1705. An act for the relief of Louis J. DeWinter and Simone H. DeWinter;

H.R. 1718. An act for the relief of Oather S. Hall;

H.R. 2188. An act to set aside certain lands in Washington for Indians of the Quinault Tribe;

H.R. 2191. An act to designate a stream in California as the "Petaluma River";

H.R. 2193. An act to designate the Coyote Valley Reservoir in California as Lake Mendocino;

H.R. 2398. An act to provide for the establishment of a fish hatchery in the northwestern part of the State of Pennsylvania;

H.R. 2405. An act to amend section 101 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that a child shall be deemed to be the adopted child of a veteran where the child was a member of the veteran's household and is adopted by the spouse of the veteran within two years of the veteran's death;

H.R. 2465. An act to authorize the conveyance by the Secretary of Commerce of certain lands in Arlington County, Va.;

H.R. 2722. An act to supplement the act of April 26, 1906 (34 Stat. 137), entitled "An act to provide for the final disposition of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes";

H.R. 2934. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of Fort Walton Beach, Fla.;

H.R. 3365. An act to authorize the crediting of certain services for purposes of retired pay for nonregular service, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4328. An act to amend provisions of the Canal Zone Code relative to the handling of the excess funds of the Panama Canal Company, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5854. An act to clarify a provision in the Black Bass Act relating to the interstate transportation of fish, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6378. An act to authorize the American Society of International Law to use certain real estate in the District of Columbia as the national headquarters of such society;

H.R. 6500. An act to amend Public Law 85-818;

H.R. 7112. An act to amend section 1005(c) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize the use of certified mail for service of process, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7165. An act for the relief of Filip Lawensztejn (Harry Lipa Lewenstein);

H.R. 7907. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate St. Ann's Infant Asylum, in the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1863, as amended;

H.R. 8225. An act to amend the Uniform Narcotic Drug Act of the District of Columbia, as amended, to permit paregoric to be dispensed by oral as well as written prescription; and

H.R. 8527. An act to exempt certain pension and other employee trusts from the laws of the District of Columbia relating to perpetuities, restraints on alienation, and accumulation of income.

On August 24, 1959:

H.R. 271. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide a further period for presuming service connection in the case of veterans suffering from Hansen's disease (leprosy);

H.R. 4329. An act to provide for the conveyance to any public or private organization of the State of Virginia of certain dwellings acquired in connection with the Chantilly Airport site, Virginia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6288. An act to establish a National Medal of Science to provide recognition for individuals who make outstanding contributions in the physical, biological, mathematical, and engineering sciences;

H.R. 7978. An act making supplemental appropriations for the year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 115. A joint resolution to reserve a site in the District of Columbia for the erection of a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to provide for a competition for the design of such memorial, and to provide additional funds for holding the competition.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 25, 1959, 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:

1326. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to plans for works of improvement relating to the Blackberry River and North Branch Park River watersheds, Connecticut; Taylor Creek watershed, Florida; Potato Creek watershed, Georgia; Crab Orchard Creek watershed, Kentucky; East Fork of Clarks River watershed, Kentucky and Tennessee; SuAsCo watershed, Massachusetts; Bowman-Spring Branch watershed, Nebraska; Santa Cruz River watershed, New Mexico; Willakenzie Area watershed, Oregon; Greene-Dreher watershed, Pennsylvania; Caney Creek watershed, Texas; pursuant to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1327. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report for June 1959 of the General Sales Manager on Commodity Credit Corporation sales policies, activities, and dispositions; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1328. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on a violation involving an overobligation as of January 30, 1959, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1329. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a notice of a proposed disposition of approximately 1,500,000 pieces of partially processed quartz crystals now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1330. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

1331. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce transmitting a report on aviation war risk insurance as of June 30, 1959, pursuant to title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1332. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to a plan for works of improvement relating to the Caney-Coon Creek watershed, Oklahoma, pursuant to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

1333. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in certain cases of aliens who have been found admissible into the United States, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; 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. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 107. An act to amend title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to Federal ship mortgage insurance, in order to include floating drydocks under the definition of the term "vessel" in such title; without amendment (Rept. No. 964). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1453. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey certain lands in the State of Iowa to the city of Keosauqua; without amendment (Rept. No. 965). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1521. An act to provide for the removal of the restriction on use with respect to a certain tract of land in Cumberland County, Tenn., conveyed to the State of Tennessee in 1938; without amendment (Rept. No. 966). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 2013. An act to amend section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to extend the time for commitment of construction reserve funds; without amendment (Rept. No. 967). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 2118. An act to amend section 4488 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating to prescribe regulations governing lifesaving equipment, firefighting equipment, muster lists, ground tackle, hawsers, and bilge systems aboard vessels, and for

other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 968). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 2334. An act to transfer from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Labor certain functions in respect of insurance benefits and disability payments to seamen for World War II service-connected injuries, death, or disability, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 969). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 24. A bill to provide that certain real property of the United States situated in the State of Nevada shall be held in trust for members of the Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe of Indians of the Fort McDermitt Indian Reservation, Nev.; with amendment (Rept. No. 970). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4279. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, rehabilitate, operate, and maintain the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas, La Feria division; with amendment (Rept. No. 971). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 4874. A bill to amend section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide that for certain purposes of this section, farms on which the farm marketing excess of wheat is adjusted to zero because of underproduction shall be regarded as farms on which the entire amount of the farm marketing excess of wheat has been delivered to the Secretary or stored to avoid or postpone the payment of the penalty; without amendment (Rept. No. 972). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4952. A bill to amend the act authorizing the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon, in order to increase the capacity of certain project features for future irrigation of additional lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 973). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER. Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 5004. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to undertake continuing research on the biology, fluctuations, status, and statistics of the migratory marine species of game fish of the United States and contiguous waters; with amendment (Rept. No. 974). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 5813. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1958, to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to undertake continuing studies of the effects of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and other pesticides, upon fish and wildlife for the purpose of preventing losses of those invaluable natural resources, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 975). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 6669. A bill to amend the act of July 14, 1945, to provide that the Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College may use certain real property heretofore conveyed to it by the United States for general educational purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 976). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 8043. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956; with amendment (Rept. No. 977). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 8074. A bill to amend section 602 of the Agricultural Act of 1954; without amendment (Rept. No. 978). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 8726. A bill to amend the acts approved April 16 and June 27, 1906 (34 Stat. 116 and 519), so as to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands on the Huntley reclamation project, Yellowstone County, Mont., to school district No. 24, Huntley Project Schools, Yellowstone County, Mont.; without amendment (Rept. No. 979). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 135. A bill to provide an income credit in the case of civil-service annuities received by nonresident alien individuals not engaged in trade or business within the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 980). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4714. A bill to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property adjacent to the Rocky Mountain Arsenal, Denver, Colo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 981). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6155. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation certain nonprofit corporations or associations organized after August 31, 1951; with amendment (Rept. No. 982). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 6108. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Arkansas Post National Park, in the State of Arkansas; with amendment (Rept. No. 983). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6249. A bill to liberalize the tariff laws for works of art and other exhibition material, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 984). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6777. A bill to amend section 421 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of certain stock held at death; with amendment (Rept. No. 985). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 5764. A bill to change the name of the Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park at Hodgenville, Ky., to Abraham Lincoln's Birthplace, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 986). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1372. An act to extend the jurisdiction of the domestic relations branch in the municipal court for the District of Columbia to cover the adjudication of property rights in certain actions arising in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 988). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER: Committee of conference. H.R. 4002. A bill to authorize the use of Great Lakes vessels on the oceans (Rept. No. 990). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6779. A bill to amend section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the unlimited deduction for charitable contributions to certain individuals); with amendment (Rept. No. 991). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 8725. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make technical changes in certain excise tax laws, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 992). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 6136. A bill to authorize the sale of certain tribal land of the Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians, Wisconsin; without amendment (Rept. No. 961). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 8437. A bill to provide for the reinstatement and validation of U.S. oil and gas lease BLM 028500; without amendment (Rept. No. 962). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 669. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the Bethel Baptist Church of Henderson, Tenn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 963). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 685. An act to exempt from all taxation certain property of the Association for Childhood Education International in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 987). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1921. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the United Spanish War Veterans, Inc., in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 989). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 8765. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for scheduled personal and corporate income tax reductions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota:

H.R. 8766. A bill to extend the conservation reserve program for 3 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 8767. A bill to amend subchapter S of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to election of certain small business corporations as to taxable status; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 8768. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 8769. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the establishment of country-by-country quotas for the importation of shrimps and shrimp products, to impose a duty on all unprocessed shrimp imported in excess of the applicable quota, and to impose a duty on processed shrimp

and prohibit its importation in excess of the applicable quota; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland:

H.R. 8770. A bill to provide that the silver service originally donated to the battleship *Maryland* by the State of Maryland shall be transferred to the Maryland Historical Society; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 8771. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to undertake continuing research on the biology fluctuations, status, and statistics of the migratory marine species of game fish of the United States and contiguous waters; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 8772. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act to provide a revolving fund for certain loans by the Secretary of Agriculture, for improved budget and accounting procedures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H.R. 8773. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for payment of benefits to the widow of any World War I veteran who was married to him for 1 year or more; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 8774. A bill to bring employees of the agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COAD:

H.R. 8775. A bill to bring employees of the agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 8776. A bill to bring employees of the agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 8777. A bill to bring employees of the agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 8778. A bill to amend the act of October 9, 1940, to provide that the 10-year statute of limitations applicable to claims against the United States shall not bar the payment of such claims where they are filed with an appropriate agency of the United States during such 10-year period; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 8779. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the establishment of country-by-country quotas for the importation of shrimp and shrimp products, to impose a duty on all unprocessed shrimp imported in excess of the applicable quota, and to impose a duty on processed shrimp and prohibit its importation in excess of the applicable quota; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 8780. A bill to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 8781. A bill to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 8782. A bill to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 8783. A bill to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H.R. 8784. A bill to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 8785. A bill to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 8786. A bill to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 8787. A bill to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 8788. A bill to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 8789. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the establishment of country-by-country quotas for the importation of shrimps and shrimp products, to impose a duty on all unprocessed shrimp imported in excess of the applicable quota, and to impose a duty on processed shrimp and prohibit its importation in excess of the applicable quota; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 8790. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the establishment of country-by-country quotas for the importation of shrimps and shrimp products, to impose a duty on all unprocessed shrimp imported in excess of the applicable quota, and to impose a duty on processed shrimp and prohibit its importation in excess of the applicable quota; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 8791. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the establishment of country-by-country quotas for the importation of shrimps and shrimp products, to impose a duty on all unprocessed shrimp imported in excess of the applicable quota, and to impose a duty on processed shrimp and prohibit its importation in excess of the applicable quota; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 8792. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the establishment of country-by-country quotas for the importation of shrimps and shrimp products, to impose a duty on all unprocessed shrimp imported in excess of the applicable quota, and to impose a duty on processed shrimp and prohibit its importation in excess of the applicable quota; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 8793. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the establishment of country-by-country quotas for the importation of shrimps and shrimp products, to impose a duty on all unprocessed shrimp imported in excess of the applicable quota, and to impose a duty on processed shrimp and prohibit its importation in excess of the applicable quota; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 8794. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt in the National Capital" to provide for the construction of such memorial by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 8795. A bill to prohibit advertising in commerce of articles produced in the Soviet Zone of Germany unless the advertisement clearly states that fact; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 8796. A bill to declare that the United States holds title to certain land in trust for the White Mountain Apache Tribe, Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H.J. Res. 506. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to designate the year 1960 as Pony Express Year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. Con. Res. 408. Concurrent resolution establishing a basic fuels policy for the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. Con. Res. 409. Concurrent resolution establishing a basic fuels policy for the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H. Con. Res. 410. Concurrent resolution establishing a basic fuels policy for the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SILER:

H. Con. Res. 411. Concurrent resolution establishing a basic fuels policy for the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. Con. Res. 412. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H. Con. Res. 413. Concurrent resolution providing for certain priorities for the temporary employment of civilian personnel to conduct the decennial census; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H. Con. Res. 414. Concurrent resolution establishing a basic fuels policy for the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. Res. 353. Resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the hearings on space propulsion; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 354. Resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the hearings on missile development and space sciences; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H. Res. 355. Resolution favoring an international agreement for a suspension of nuclear weapons tests; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. Res. 356. Resolution to authorize printing of additional copies of the Joint Committee print entitled "Summary-Analysis of Hearings on Biological and Environmental Effects of Nuclear War"; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING: Joint Resolution No. 9 of the Nevada State Senate, a joint resolution to amend the Social Security Act to provide assistance for adults living in public nonmedical institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate moneys for the Interstate Highway System for the fiscal years

1961 and 1962; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 8797. A bill for the relief of Augustus Silvera Gordon also known as Franklin Gordon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 8798. A bill for the relief of Romeo Gasparini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8799. A bill for the relief of Col. Alfred P. Kitson; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

H.R. 8800. A bill for the relief of Kiriaki Papapaschaly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 8801. A bill for the relief of the Maco Warehouse Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H.R. 8802. A bill for the relief of Rev. Thomas Kolakowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 8803. A bill for the relief of Nimia R. Concepcion, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8804. A bill for the relief of Salvadora Galope Batol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H.R. 8805. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Andja Mirich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 8806. A bill for the relief of the Philadelphia General Hospital; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 8807. A bill for the relief of Theodoros Spiros Psitos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 8808. A bill for the relief of Dr. Irfan A. Orer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. Con. Res. 415. Concurrent resolution honoring the memory of Mrs. Elsie Winters Mitchell, who was killed in Oregon by the explosion of a Japanese balloon bomb during World War II, and expressing congressional recognition of her heroism in attempting to prevent the death of five children in such explosion; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

261. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city clerk, Alameda, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting that every effort be expended in behalf of legislation which will continue the financing of the Federal interstate highway program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DAV Services in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, an exceptional record of vital rehabilitation services freely extended to thousands of Oregon citizens has recently come to my attention. These splendid humanitarian services are not sufficiently appreciated by those who have benefited thereby, directly and indirectly.

Among the several congressionally chartered veteran organizations, which have State departments and local chapters in Oregon, is the Disabled American Veterans. The DAV is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war.

Formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx, DAV legislative activities have benefited every compensated disabled veteran. Its present national commander is Bill H. Tribley, of Crestline, Kans. Its national adjutant is John E. Feighner, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Its national legislative director is Elmer M. Freudenberger; its national director of claims, Cicero F. Hogan; and its national director of employment relations, John W. Burris—all located at its National Service Headquarters at 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Inasmuch as less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans are receiving monthly disability compensation payments for service-connected disabilities—some 2 million—the DAV can never aspire to become the largest of the several veteran organizations. Nevertheless, since shortly after its formation in 1920, the DAV national headquarters, located in Cincinnati, Ohio, has maintained the largest staff of any veteran organization, of full-time trained national service officers, 138 of them, who are located in the 63 regional and 3 district offices of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, and in its central office in Washington, D.C. They have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given them their powers of attorney. All of them being war-handicapped veterans themselves, these service officers are sympathetic and alert as to the problems of other less well-informed claimants.

The two DAV national service officers in Oregon are Mr. Gerald S. Kelsey and Mr. James W. Hudson, located at the VA Regional Office, 208 South West Fifth Avenue, Portland, Oreg. The department commander is Mr. Dan Cole, 2520 J Street, Springfield, Oreg., and the department adjutant is Mr. T. F. Van Laningham, 429 South West Fourth Avenue, Portland, Oreg.

The three VA hospitals in Oregon are a 1,000-bed DOM hospital at Camp White, a 567-bed GM hospital at Portland, and a 670-bed NP hospital at Roseburg. VAVS representatives: Camp White, Patrick Graham; Roseburg, Charles T. McCoy; Portland, George Youmans.

During the last fiscal year, the VA paid out $52,414,000 for its veteran program in Oregon, including $13,730,806 disability compensation to its 17,408 service-disabled veterans. These Federal expenditures in Oregon furnish substantial purchasing power in all communities. Only about 11 percent—1,859—are members of the 27 DAV chapters in Oregon.

This 11 percent record is strange, in view of the very outstanding record of personalized service activities and accomplishments of the DAV national service officers in behalf of Oregon veterans and dependents during the last 10 fiscal years, as revealed by the following statistics:

Claimants contacted (estimate)	31,357
Claims folders reviewed	26,131
Appearances before rating boards	12,892
Compensation increases obtained	2,634
Service connections obtained	792
Nonservice pensions	828
Death benefits obtained	430
Total monetary benefits obtained	$933,996.15

These above figures do not include the accomplishments of other national service officers on duty in the central office of the Veterans' Administration, handling appeals and reviews, or in its three district offices, handling death and insurance cases. Over the last 10 years, they reported 83,611 claims handled in such district offices, resulting in monetary benefits of $20,850,335.32, and in the central office, they handled 58,282 reviews and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of $5,337,389.05. Proportionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for Oregon veterans, their dependents and their survivors.

These figures fail properly to paint the picture of the extent and value of the individualized advice, counsel, and assistance extended to all of the claimants who have contacted DAV service officers in person, by telephone, and by letter.

Pertinent advice was furnished to all disabled veterans—only about 10 percent of whom were DAV members—their dependents, and others, in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation or pension, VA guarantee loans for homes, farms and businesses, and so forth. Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement into suitable useful employment—to utilize their remaining abilities—civil service examinations, appointments, retentions, retirement benefit, and multifarious other problems.

Every claim presents different problems. Too few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are not automatically awarded to disabled veterans, not given on a silver platter. Frequently, because of lack of official records, death or disappearance of former buddies and associates, lapse of memory with the passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service connection of a disability becomes extremely difficult, too many times impossible. A claims and rating record board can obviously not grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impressions or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific, detailed, pertinent facts are essential.

The VA, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendant, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits provided under the laws administered by it, only under certain conditions.

A DAV national service officer can and does advise a claimant precisely why his claim may previously have been denied and then specifies what additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving affidavit evidence. The experienced national service officer will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before presenting same to the adjudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances and facts, and of the pertinent laws, precedents, regulations and schedule of disability ratings. No DAV national service officer, I feel certain, ever uses his skill, except in behalf of worthy claimants, with justifiable claims.

The VA has denied more claims than it has allowed because most claims are not properly prepared. It is very significant, as pointed out by the DAV acting national director of claims, Chester A. Cash, that a much higher percentage of those claims, which have been prepared and presented with the aid of a DAV national service officer, are eventually favorably acted upon, than is the case as to those claimants who have not given their powers of attorney to any such special advocate.

Another fact not generally known is that, under the overall review of claims inaugurated by the VA some 4 years ago, the disability compensation payments of about 37,200 veterans have been discontinued, and reduced as to about 27,300 others at an aggregate loss to them of more than $28 million per year. About eight-tenths of 1 percent of such discontinuances and reductions have probably occurred as to disabled veterans in Oregon, with a consequent loss of about $224,000 per year.

Most of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other veteran organization. Judging by the past, such unfavorable adjudications will occur as to an additional equal number or more during the next 3 years, before such review is completed. I urge every disabled veteran in Oregon to give his power of attorney to the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, or of the American Red Cross, just as a protective measure.

The average claimant who receives helpful advice probably does not realize the background of training and experience of a competent expert national service officer.

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about $12,197,600 during a 10-year period, one would find that it has expended about $3.50 for each claim folder reviewed, or about $8.80 for each rating board appearance, or, again, about $22.70 for each favorable award obtained, or about $123 for each service connection obtained, or about $54 for each compensation increase obtained, and has obtained about $14.10 of direct monetary benefits for claimants for each dollar expended by the DAV for its national service officer setup. Moreover, such benefits will generally continue for many years.

Evidently, most claimants are not aware of the fact that the DAV receives no Government subsidy whatsoever. The DAV is enabled to maintain its nationwide staff of expert national service officers primarily because of income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income on its Idento-Tag—miniature automobile license tags—project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or their widows, or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project in thus furnishing them with useful employment. Incidentally, without checking as to whether they had previously sent in a donation, more than 1,400,000 owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Idento-Tag department, 3,538 of whom, during the last 8 years, were Oregon residents.

Every eligible veteran, by becoming a DAV member, and by explaining these factors to fellow citizens, can help the DAV to procure such much-needed public support as will enable it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis. So much more could be accomplished for distressed disabled veterans, if the DAV could be enabled, financially, to maintain an expert service officer in every one of the 173 VA hospitals.

During the last 10 years, the DAV has also relied on appropriations from its separately incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, aggregating $3,300,000, exclusively for salaries to its national service officers. Its reserves having been thus nearly exhausted, the DAV Service Foundation is therefore very much in need of the generous support of all serviced claimants, DAV members, and other social-minded Americans, by direct donations, by designations in insurance policies, by bequests in wills, by assignments of stocks and bonds, and by establishing special types of trust funds.

A special type of memorial trust fund originated about 3 years ago with concerned disabled veteran members of the DAV chapter in Butte, Mont., which established the first perpetual rehabilitation fund of $1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation. Recently it added another $100 thereto. Since then, every DAV unit in that State has established such a special memorial trust fund, ranging from $100 to $1,100, equivalent to about $5 per DAV member.

Each claimant who has received any such rehabilitation service can help to make it possible for the DAV to continue such excellent rehabilitation services in Oregon by sending in donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 1707 18th Street NW., Washington 9, D.C.

Every serviced claimant who is eligible can and should also become a DAV member, preferably a life member, for which the total fee is $100—$50 to those born before January 1, 1902, or World War I veterans—payable in installments within 2 full fiscal year periods.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interests and viewpoints—labor unions, trade associations, and various religious, fraternal, and civic associations. All of America's veterans ought to be members of one or more of the patriotic, service-giving veteran organizations. All of America's disabled defenders, who are receiving disability compensation, have greatly benefited by their own official voice, the DAV.

Reply to the Carey Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I place in the RECORD a copy of my reply to the form letter sent to many Members of Congress by Mr. James B. Carey last week:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 24, 1959.

JAMES B. CAREY,
President, IUERMW,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have your letter of August 18 regarding my vote for the Landrum-Griffin bill, H.R. 8400. You do not like my vote on that bill and, of course, I take no exception to your so advising me.

I take strong exception, however, to your suggestions that I voted to punish or repress or weaken all labor unions, or that I yielded to pressure from any business organization. Those suggestions have no basis in fact.

My vote was determined by my own judgment, exercised in the light of my own conscience as to what was needed to protect the public and particularly union members and their families and small business against such abuses of power, whether by management or union officials, as have been exposed in various committee hearings. The foregoing statement has special importance in connection with the provisions in H.R. 8400 which relate to the bill of rights, organizational picketing, secondary boycotts, hot cargo, and no man's land. Enactment of H.R. 8400 will not, in my judgment, interfere with any legitimate union activity of which I have been informed.

You may be sure that I studied the effects of H.R. 8400 before I decided how to vote upon it. In that process I carefully considered the views of all who had written to

or talked with me about abuses of power by either labor officials or management, and I talked with union officials and everyone else who came in to discuss H.R. 8400. Some union members who live in my district think that H.R. 8400 does not go far enough to protect them against loss of their union cards—and that means their livelihood—without a fair hearing.

Many union members and their families live in my district and you may be sure I advised union officials who had talked with me as to how I would vote.

Members of unions in my district are good citizens. They will resent and reject, as do I, your notion that if unions are to be strong, their officials must be allowed to continue abuses of power of the kind which H.R. 8400 seeks to prevent.

Taken as a whole, your letter confirms the need for legislation such as H.R. 8400.

Yours truly,

JOHN H. RAY,
Member of Congress.

Inter-American Development Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include copy of my newsletter which was released today.

KEENOTES BY REPRESENTATIVE ELIZABETH KEE, OF WEST VIRGINIA

WASHINGTON, August 24, 1959.—Quite often Congress passes significant legislation which is largely if not completely ignored by the press and the public. A case in point is the Inter-American Development Bank which was recently created by Congress with a capitalization of $1 billion.

The United States will provide $450 million of the capital. Latin American nations will provide $550 million and will be represented on the governing board.

The significance of the new Bank lies in the fact that it marks an entirely new departure in our economic relationship with friendly nations to the south. Economic aid, in the form of direct grants and gifts, are to be played down. Instead, our Latin neighbors will look to the new Bank for loans to provide the capital necessary for economic development.

The United States is prone to forget just how important Latin America is to this country. Trade between the two areas runs into the hundreds of millons each year. Also, it is important to our national security to make sure that Communist regimes do not gain a foothold in the Western Hemisphere.

All of our neighbors to the south, with the possible exception of Mexico, are experiencing dangerous economic difficulties. All of them need to expand trade and to speed up industrial development. The United States cannot provide all of the capital that is needed. Even if we could, it would not be good policy to do so. The countries themselves need to feel they have a vital stake in their own development programs.

The new Bank will fill this great need. It is going to be a businesslike operation. Borrowing nations will have to come up with sound programs which bank officials can accept as having a good chance of paying off.

This is a cooperative venture. Direct grants or gifts are too one sided to be completely effective.

This shift of emphasis in our economic aid program in Latin America is significant. I hope it will point the way to a gradual elimination of the economic aid program on the present basis.

Also, this year Congress approved another far reaching international financing plan which attracted very little attention. This was the International Development Association which is to be an adjunct of the World Bank.

It is hoped this new Bank can put to useful, productive work much of the $3 billions in foreign currency which the United States has acquired since the end of the war. It would work like this: Country X applies to the World Bank for a loan of $50 million. The World Bank feels it cannot loan but $30 million. The new organization would then make a secondary loan of $20 million, almost all in foreign currency of various kinds which can be used to buy materials in all parts of the world.

The new organization should make it possible for the World Bank to greatly step up its operations. And the more the Bank can loan, the less will be the need for direct grants of money by the United States to underdeveloped nations struggling to build a sound economy.

The people are getting tired of Congress voting billions each year for gifts to foreign countries. The new loan programs offer a sound, workable alternative and they should be much more successful. It puts our economic relations on a sound, businesslike basis and should in the long run help end the annual drain on our Treasury.

Carey Letter Is Unworthy of U.S. Labor Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, along with many of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, I received a threatening letter several days ago from Mr. James B. Carey, president of the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers.

Because Mr. Carey resorted to outright intimidation, he has been justifiably criticized in the press and by many people, regardless of their views on labor reform legislation.

I am sure that, in addition, Mr. Carey received many answers to his letter from the Members of Congress he vowed reprisal against. As one such Member, I sent him my answer on August 20.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD Mr. Carey's letter and my reply:

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ELECTRICAL,
RADIO AND MACHINE WORKERS,
Washington, D.C., August 18, 1959.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Only you know, in the privacy of your own conscience, whether you carefully considered the possible consequences of the Landrum-Griffin bill when you voted for it on August 13, 1959. If you did, and realized that it is a punitive, repressive measure intended to weaken all labor unions and thereby all working men and women, you have much to answer for. If you did not, and merely yielded to the pressures of the chamber of commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, your guilt is perhaps even greater.

You should realize now, if you did not during the heat of battle, that this vindictive assault on the labor movement will, in the long run, prove to your constituents that you are less interested in individual rights and democracy than in property rights and the concentration of power in the hands of big business.

You may believe that you are safe in such action because organized labor is relatively weak in your district, and cannot call you to account for the damage you have sought to do to it. You may be right—at the moment.

We wish to assure you, however, that we shall do all in our power to prove to the working men and women in your district that you have cast your lot against them and they should therefore take appropriate action at the ballot box.

Very truly yours,

JAMES B. CAREY,
President.

AUGUST 20, 1959.

Mr. JAMES B. CAREY,
President, International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, Washington, D.C.:

DEAR MR. CAREY: Throughout the day I have been rereading your threatening letter of August 18.

I can't tell you how sorry and disappointed I am to receive such a letter from a man who has been elected to a very high position in the labor movement. The letter is not only unworthy of you, but it embarrassed the great membership you are obliged to represent.

Up to now, the mail I received on labor legislation has been extremely helpful. The great majority of letters, cards, and wires were from people in the first district who favored the Landrum-Griffin bill. But I must say that the people who supported the Elliott and Shelley bills were just as kind and considerate as they could be in their letters to me.

People who are just as partisan in their opinions as you, Mr. Carey, were courteous, reasoned, and balanced in their judgments.

For example, until you wrote nobody implied that I was uninformed, stupid, or a tool of special interest groups. I was not threatened in any way until your letter arrived. The people who have disagreed with me have managed to tell me so without shaking their fists—in a spirit of the interchange of ideas, without resorting to abuse.

Since the Landrum-Griffin bill has passed, the response has been gratifying. Even folks who are still unconvinced that the Landrum-Griffin bill was the best we could do, share in a sense, the belief of the Washington Post and Times Herald which says editorially today:

"We do not think the labor movement will suffer any real loss. * * * Nor will any union be killed by a reasonable compromise of the present Senate and House bills—unless it be some racket-ridden units that are a disgrace to organized labor in any event."

You did not ask me why I supported the Landrum-Griffin bill, but I believe you deserve to know why. I feel the bill provides the best means by which we can correct the abuses which exist in some areas of the country, and still remain true to the goal in not being punitive to the many unions which have been dealing fairly with their memberships.

Your letter is really unique, Mr. Carey, in that you have not given me your views on the important subject of labor legislation.

Its purpose was to convey a threat. I am not, in any way, afraid of what you pledge to do to me because I believe that such a threat, underscored as it is with anger and revenge, will get nowhere.

But, if I may, I would like to give you a word of advice. You hold a very responsible position in the labor movement, and I am sure that the many fine people you represent are looking to you for leadership. You owe it to these people to be an effective spokesman for labor. Because you wrote the letter you did, you damaged your effectiveness greatly. I believe that you owe your constituents—the rank and file electrical, radio, and machine workers—a great deal. You might begin repaying their confidence by exercising the reasoned, temperate leadership they have a right to expect.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT H. QUIE,
Member of Congress.

A Bill To Make Civil Service Retirement Available to ASC Employees on a Voluntary Basis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN V. CARTER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill in the House of Representatives which proposes to extend to the employees of the agricultural stabilization and conservation committees the opportunity to come within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act. I am joined in the introduction of this bill by the other Democratic Members of the House from Iowa, the Honorable MERWIN COAD, NEAL SMITH, and LEONARD WOLF.

All of us have, in recent weeks, received considerable mail from ASC people in our congressional districts of Iowa in which they have protested a ruling by the Iowa State ASC Committee making retirement mandatory at age 65. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the retirement age under civil service is specified at 70 years of age.

It seems to me somewhat shortsighted to force these men into retirement at age 65 when they have accumulated such a wealth of experience and when they still have several years of valuable service they could render to the program. Furthermore, such a mandatory ruling fails to take into account a man's individual capabilities and makes chronological age the only criterion of his value and effectiveness in his profession.

I want to emphasize that this bill would not force people to come under civil service retirement who do not desire to do so. This is intended to be purely a voluntary matter. The proposed piece of legislation is designed simply to empower the Secretary of Agriculture to prescribe and issue such regulations as may be necessary to make civil service retirement available to the persons desiring to take advantage of it.

I wish to point out that the Department of Agriculture has no policy which will prohibit a man in the ASC service from working until the age of 70 years.

I should add that my understanding of this matter is that the State committees are presently authorized to request and obtain an employee's resignation for reasons of unfitness or inability to perform his duties. Therefore, such a bill as I have proposed here would not preempt any prerogatives that the State committees now have in the area of personnel management. The purpose of the bill is simply to establish certainty as to retirement from ASC service where such certainty does not now exist. Judging from my mail, the ruling by the Iowa State Committee has had an unsettling effect on the morale of ASC employees, and it is simply my wish to restore that morale and at the same time make it possible to utilize the professional capabilities of ASC employees to the fullest extent.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 8774

A bill to bring employees of the agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act, employees of the agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees shall be held and considered to be employees of the Government of the United States.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to prescribe and issue such regulations as may be necessary to provide a means of effecting the application and operation of the provisions of such Act with respect to such employees.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, annuity benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act resulting from the operation of the first section of this Act shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

James B. Carey: Humorist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, a rereading of the letter I received last week from Mr. James B. Carey, president of the International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, confirms my original conclusion that the man is a humorist. The very fact that Mr. Carey sets out to intimidate those who voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill marks him as either a man with a sense of humor or as one who is so naive that he thinks Congress will grovel in the face of his awesome threats. Of course, there is the possibility that Mr. Carey is just another arrogant labor leader who is inclined to use his muscles rather than his head but I really do not think so.

In any event I have dignified his outburst to the extent of the following reply:

AUGUST 24, 1959.

Mr. JAMES B. CAREY,
President, International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CAREY: Thank you very much for your letter of August 18. I am having it reproduced for circulation among my constituents in order to acquaint them with the ill temper and bad manners of certain labor leaders, which would seem to further justify our support of the so-called Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill.

Incidentally, I am amazed that you are so poorly informed in regards to the voting habits of the people of my district. In each campaign in which I have sought reelection the leaders of organized labor have hit me with everything in the book. That I have been victorious each time attests to the conservatism of the voters rather than to my popularity.

Again my warmest thanks for the best piece of campaign material I have ever received.

Very truly yours,

PAUL B. DAGUE.

It has always been my firm conviction that the leaders of organized labor have been completely out of step with the thinking of the people in the Ninth Congressional District of Pennsylvania. Public reaction, however, to such bald threats as made by Mr. Carey is, in my opinion, accurately reflected in the following editorial which appeared in the Daily Local News of West Chester, Pa., on August 21, 1959:

THREATS

The type of letter received yesterday by Members of the House who voted for the Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill warning them that labor union members will try to throw them out of office represents the kind of thing that should not be countenanced in this country.

Representatives are chosen to represent all of the people and not the interests of simply one group of constituents. No Member of the House in recent weeks could mistake the sentiment of the people as a whole in regard to the need for curbing certain labor leaders of whom James R. Hoffa is a fair example. Because the public demanded effective labor legislation at this session of Congress, the Landrum-Griffin bill was approved by a margin of 178 votes.

Every House Member who supported that bill received a letter yesterday from James B. Carey, AFL-CIO official, warning them of what union members intend to do because they voted for what the union considers "punitive repressive" labor legislation.

Every properly registered citizen has the privilege of going to the polls at election time and voting for the candidate which he feels is best qualified for the office to be filled. Once elected, the official must be free to vote for legislation which he feels best serves the welfare of the people as a whole. He must be free to do this without fear of threats or reprisals. Otherwise, he could not possibly represent the people as he should.

It is also the privilege of every citizen to keep in touch with elected officials so that they may know how they (the people) feel in regard to current legislation. Officials welcome such contacts. But no official welcomes the kind of communication that has reached supporters of the Landrum-Griffin bill. In effect it said—because you voted for that bill, we're out to get you.

One Representative termed the letter "bitter and ill tempered," and in a reply wrote: "Please do not insult me by threats." That probably pretty well summed up the feelings of the 229 House Members who were the targets of Carey's letter.

The Honorable PAUL B. DAGUE, who represents Chester and Lancaster Counties in the House, told the local News last night when he feels that he must bow to corruption in the ranks of union labor then his effectiveness as a Member of the House is over. Representative DAGUE supported the Landrum-Griffin bill on the first vote when it squeezed through with only 28 votes to spare. He was also in the "aye" column on the final vote. His stand in regard to the kind of labor legislation needed to deal with corruption is thus a matter of record.

James B. Carey also sent letters to 201 other House Members who saw fit to vote against the bill, pledging them his support. That is his privilege. But letters which breathe of intimidation and mailed to rep-representatives who voted in the interests of the national welfare, have no part in a Nation which believes in a free and representative government.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the newsletter of August 22, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

AUGUST 22, 1959.

The first session of the 86th Congress is struggling to a close, many Members think, although in the next breath some concede the possibility of endless debate ahead. Here's a roundup.

Controversial issues to be carried over include minimum wage, aid to education, aid to depressed areas, Federal unemployment compensation, Federal health insurance, social security expansion, interest rate ceiling removal (and others?).

Controversial issues considered earlier and scheduled for further action include labor reform, housing, and the farm program. New items for House debate include Public Law 480, (surplus food disposal), civil rights, highways and gasoline tax increase, and foreign investment tax incentive (H.R. 5).

Controversial clashes of viewpoint continue and include the political front, for example, who's for big spending, and the balanced budget; our international policy embodied in foreign aid (including food surplus disposal) and the Khrushchev visit.

Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade and Assistance Act of 1954, to dispose of surplus commodities, with amendments, was the week's big floor debate, centered around a barter provision. The big question—should the United States dispose of our surplus food products in exchange for strategic materials for our national stockpile rather than sell for foreign currency, which currency may or may not be of any use to the United States. If not, then the food in effect becomes a gift. The complicated, confusing, and at times self-defeating nature of this program led me to observe in debate that the problems confronting us arise because of a very basic problem, quite overlooked; namely, that the Federal Government is not set up nor intended constitutionally to be in the distribution of food, clothing or other necessities, neither at home nor abroad. The original emergency nature of disposal of farm surpluses has now, in my view, been distorted so that surpluses are encouraged, Government regulation fostered, and the free market destroyed in the United States and throughout the world. The fact is, our surpluses endanger the economies of other nations, too. This basic fault of the program itself was not debated. Government has been accepted as a food distributor at the taxpayers' expense. All I can hope to do is to keep the criticism alive, until the people demand an accounting. This I have done and shall so continue.

Civil rights, already through the Senate, will probably be before the House soon. The Democrat leadership is committed to advance in this field. The questions to be resolved: (1) A tough bill or a relatively innocuous one? (2) This year, or next (election) year? Odds are, in my opinion, an innocuous bill this year, because: (1) Few can show any real need (other than political in some districts) for further legislation; and (2) many Republicans may feel constrained to cooperate with those Southern Democrats who helped in enacting a legitimate labor reform act. I expect a bill to extend the Civil Rights Commission and give the Justice Department a little greater authority to investigate local election practices. The gasoline tax increase may take time, now that the Ways and Means Committee has voted out a 1-cent increase for 22 months and a later 5-percent excise tax allocation to highways. I am among those opposing a tax increase. (See newsletters of July 25 and August 1). Highways can be built without more tax, I believe.

Earlier controversial issues yet to be resolved are headed by labor reform, which is now in conference between the House and Senate. Housing could continue as a tremendous struggle in view of the veto, the Senate's attempt to override (both Texas Senators so voted), and the legitimate needs embodied in the earlier outrageous bill, that require that a bill be passed. The present suggested compromise is only a lesser degree of the faults of the vetoed bill, including more public housing direct loans for college classrooms (back door Treasury financing beyond Congress' control), urban renewal (though reduced), and others. As before, this bill probably will be held until the last minute and then railroaded through. As for agriculture, the general recommendations of the President for reduced price-support levels and eased acreage requirements will get little if any attention, I believe, even though the President may urgently so request of Congress.

The interest rate ceiling's removal (see newsletters of June 13, 27, and July 11) so urgently requested by Treasury Secretary Anderson to reduce the cost of Government financing has become a political football. By a party line vote (Democrats for, Republicans against), the Committee on Ways and Means voted to shelve such needed action until next year. The Government thus is forced to continue to compete with families and small business men for the available money in the short-term loan market. As I see it, it is wrong for Congress after spending the money to tie the hands of the Secretary in financing the Government debt.

So Congress struggles on, not all good, not all bad, but just like people. Congress will improve only as the people force improvement by demanding right action. Adjournment date is anyone's guess.

Prelude to Annual Report by Congresswoman Edna F. Kelly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, every year it has been my practice to submit a report to my constituents in the 10th Congressional District in New York on important legislation enacted during the session of Congress. In my report, which of necessity is brief, I try to be factual on key legislation enacted. The report this year will only cover the first session of the 86th Congress and should be sent out shortly after the adjournment of Congress. It is, of course, impossible to predict with accuracy when Congress will adjourn and, more important, what specific legislative measures will be enacted into law. At this point I have, therefore, decided in a preliminary statement to describe to the people of my district the difficult and complicated atmosphere hovering over this session. This, then, is the prelude to my report.

The first session of the 86th Congress convened and will adjourn with war clouds engulfing the entire world. The density of the clouds fluctuated with the actions of the leaders of the Kremlin. As heavy and ominous as the clouds were with the appearance of the sputnik and lunik, they increased with the overt, aggressive actions of the "comrades" in the Middle East, the Far East, Tibet, Latin America, Central America, including Cuba, in Europe again with the Berlin impasse and once more in southeastern Asia, Laos.

A diminishing of the war clouds followed appeasement of the comrades in the Ministers' meeting, a pending but never accomplished summit meeting, and finally plans for an exchange of heads of state.

Thus, it can be said with no exaggeration that Congress met and will adjourn in one of the most trying times in the history of the United States.

The international outlook for the Democratic-controlled Congress was not made felicitous by the Republican-controlled executive branch of the Government. Congress convened labeled by President Eisenhower, in his role as leader of the Republican Party, as being controlled by "political radicals, spendthrifts, and gloom-dogglers."

Bear in mind that when Congress convened, President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message, promised "a sensible posture of defense against the growing might of the Soviet Union," and in the next breath he warned we must "guard against feverish building up of vast armaments." The observing public saw Congress placed publicly between the horns of the dilemma.

Congress was faced with the problem of meeting the Soviet menace, of placat-

ing the administration in its request for the highest budget in "peacetime," of grappling with a $9 billion interest on the national debt, of increasing the limit on the national debt, and of passing a Mutual Security Act. Domestic issues became secondary and/or dependent upon the cost of meeting the Soviet menace, balancing the budget and controlling inflation.

The entire policy of the Republican administration was in a state of fluctuation. A cooperative state of mind and action on the part of Democratic legislators was tried to the point of frustration. President Eisenhower requested legislation and then vetoed bills because they were too much or too little. Most of the bills passed to date have been cut below the President's recommendations.

A most astounding turnabout has been the long negotiations for exchange visits of Khrushchev and President Eisenhower. The same man who recently lamented the apathy of Americans in the face of the Soviet menace has invited the head of the Soviet regime to be a guest of the United States. This appears to many to be a colossal swallowing of principle, a betrayal of our civilization, a quashing of the loyalty we owe to American youths who perished at the hands of Soviet treachery, and a gross insult to the millions of once free men enslaved by that dictatorship.

Adherence to the absolute moral principles upon which our country was founded should dissuade us from conferring respectability and legitimacy to the dedicated enemy of free men and free institutions.

This action, preceded by the humiliation inflicted upon the Western representatives at Geneva, makes it more difficult to understand. President Eisenhower predicated a summit meeting on progress made at Geneva. What progress? The West did not bring up the question of the captive nations. East German observers were given equal status with the observers of West Germany which conferred de facto recognition of East Germany. What happened to the demand that the Berlin and Germany problems be considered as one? The West capitulated and conceded them as separate issues. What happened to the challenge of the blockade of Berlin? This has been shelved. The United States now speaks of "rights of access" after proving that the West had rights of occupation since 1945. Now we are practically conceding that the Soviet has rights to terminate this agreement.

The intended visit of the Soviet Premier is repugnant to me because no credence can be placed upon the word of a Mikoyan, a Kozlov, or a Khrushchev. The gain, if any, does not outweigh the loss of trust by our allies, the creation of more apathy and misinterpretation by Americans, causing a quasi-insecurity among free people everywhere, and the propaganda use this visit will be made of in Moscow and other capitals inimical to the U.S.S.R. All of this created confusion in Congress on legislation without positive leadership from the executive branch.

The reversal of policy and the confused and confusing pattern of weak executive leadership has, in effect, pulled the rug from under the Congress. Despite this background, I predict that the record of the 86th Congress, 1st session, will make history on the positive side of the ledger, thanks to a strong and dynamic democratic leadership.

Itinerary of Annual Official Tour of the Fourth District of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, with the adjournment of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, I am preparing for my annual official tour of the Fourth District of Indiana, to meet with the constituents I am privileged to represent.

This year I am planning to visit a number of the post offices in the district and will be available for conferences and interviews at each of these places. I believe this will be convenient for persons who desire to discuss legislative or governmental matters with me.

These official tours of the district are always most helpful. They afford a first-hand opportunity of obtaining views of constituents on the most important legislative issues of the day and at the same time of furthering the understanding between the people and their Representative in Congress.

Upon the completion of the tour, I will then have my district office—room 925, Lincoln Tower, Fort Wayne—open to carry on my official duties while I am home between sessions of the Congress. Meanwhile, my office here—room 1511, House Office Building—will be open as usual for the conduct of official business.

I cordially invite my friends and constituents to call upon me for whatever service or assistance I can render with respect to their problems relative to legislative or governmental matters, either while I am on the tour or in my office.

The itinerary of my official tour is as follows:

October 14, 9:30 a.m.: Post office, Ossian.

October 14, 11 a.m.: Post office, Bluffton.

October 14, 2 p.m.: Post office, Decatur.

October 14, 4 p.m.: Post office, Berne.

October 15, 10 a.m.: Post office, Garrett.

October 15, 11:30 a.m.: Post office, Auburn.

October 15, 2:30 p.m.: Post office, Butler.

October 15, 4:30 p.m.: Post office, Waterloo.

October 20, 10 a.m.: Post office, Angola.

October 20, 1:30 p.m.: Post office, Fremont.

October 20, 4 p.m.: Post office, Lagrange.

October 21, 10 a.m.: Post office, Albion.

October 21, 1:30 p.m.: Post office, Kendallville.

October 21, 4 p.m.: Post office, Ligonier.

October 22, 9:30 a.m.: Post office, Columbia City.

October 22, 1:30 p.m.: Post office, South Whitley.

October 22, 4 p.m.: Post office, Churubusco.

Food Donations Set Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the record set by the administration in donating nearly 3 billion pounds of surplus foods during fiscal year 1959 is surely a record of which all Americans can be proud.

It has been announced recently that this food has been provided for use in our own school-lunch programs and charitable institutions as well as to needy persons at home and abroad. The distribution shows an increase of 5 percent over the previous fiscal year, and marks a high point in donations of Government-owned foods.

The increase has been distributed to domestic outlets, as donations to needy persons, schools, and institutions total more than a billion pounds for the year—a considerable rise over the 871,600,000 pounds distributed the previous year and a tremendous increase from the figure of 161,100,000 pounds in 1953.

Foreign distribution amounted to 1,867,200,000 pounds in donations in fiscal 1959, compared to the 24 million pounds donated in 1953. The administration reports that increased donations of wheat flour were offset by decreased amounts of cheese which was removed from the list of foreign donations last year.

I believe the administration deserves unsparing praise for the manner in which it is handling this important feature of our surplus disposal program. Foods acquired through surplus removal and price support programs are distributed to eligible recipients in our country through designated agencies of State and local governments—while distribution in 91 countries has been handled by voluntary church and welfare organizations. It is important to note that surplus foods are donated for relief overseas only after they have been made available to meet needs in our own country.

Because I believe it is important for all of us to see where the food is going in our own country, I am including a table which sets forth the numbers of

needy persons in family units who received donated commodities in June 1959:

Alabama	127,127
Arizona	50,423
Arkansas	178,341
California	23,215
Colorado	18,799
Connecticut	587
Delaware	3,062
District of Columbia	29,604
Georgia	30,878
Illinois	79,281
Indiana	75,485
Iowa	65,919
Kansas	11,370
Kentucky	280,968
Louisiana	120,604
Maine	56,543
Maryland	44,532
Massachusetts	4,114
Michigan	380,343
Minnesota	33,314
Mississippi	179,055
Missouri	93,153
Montana	8,877
Nevada	992
New Hampshire	6,703
New Jersey	13,789
New Mexico	35,628
New York	364,056
North Dakota	5,320
Ohio	113,568
Oklahoma	232,186
Pennsylvania	735,368
Puerto Rico	595,430
Rhode Island	11,432
South Dakota	23,994
Tennessee	149,458
Texas	118,138
Utah	11,667
Vermont	11,633
Virginia	37,404
Washington	3,977
West Virginia	295,345
Wisconsin	40,076
Wyoming	7,468
Trust territory	3,218
Samoa (American)	2,905
Total	4,715,349

Mr. Speaker, the total figure of 4,715,349 should be compared to the 100,000 needy persons in family units who received donated food in fiscal 1953. This is truly a great demonstration of the worth and success of this vital program.

Review of Record of 1st Session of 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during the weekend, I was pleased to comment over Wisconsin radio stations on the record of the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

Naturally, it is possible in a broadcast to touch only the highlights of the manifold, complex legislative actions in Congress.

Generally, however, I feel that—when Congress winds up—the record of accomplishments will be moderately good, particularly in two major fields of which have been required bipartisan cooperation:

First, keeping the peace; and

Second, successfully recovering from our economic setback.

I was privileged, also, to review the tasks still ahead of us upon which constructive action is needed prior to adjournment.

And finally, the broadcast covers problems that—as we all recognize will remain unresolved in a number of fields.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the broadcast printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

WILEY SAYS KEEPING PEACE AND RECOVERING FROM RECESSION ARE TWO MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF NATION—EVALUATES RECORD OF 86TH CONGRESS MODERATELY GOOD

(Address by Senator WILEY over Wisconsin radio stations.)

Friends, I welcome the opportunity to be with you.

As you know, the adjournment of Congress is not far away.

In reviewing our progress in Congress, and as a nation, it is important to take a look at the record.

Insofar as it reflects bipartisan accomplishments, I believe the record is moderately good.

With adjournament there will, of course, be efforts—often "colored" in a partisan manner—to evaluate its record by either attempting to take credit for the accomplishments, or, conversely attempting to blame the other party for failures.

Without engaging in such partisanship, however, I would like to review the record briefly, including achievements we have made as a nation.

Question. Senator WILEY, what are the major marks of progress?

Answer. Although there have been advancements in a great many fields, I believe that two major accomplishments stand above the rest in the record. These include: keeping the peace; and successfully recovering from the economic recession.

PREVENTING WORLD WAR III

First of all, we have supported policies and programs that have helped to keep the peace; for the most part, this means preventing the cold war from degenerating into a hot war.

By and large, our foreign policy has had bipartisan support. Naturally, honest men may differ on national policy.

Overall, however, I believe the Nation can be gratified that the majority of its leaders—both Republican and Democrat—have been big enough to rise above lesser considerations and work for what is best for the country.

We are aware, of course, that keeping the peace and promoting greater security is not something that can be achieved—then forgotten. Rather, this is a continuous task.

Although there has been a superficial "thaw" in the East-West relations, we must remain alert and keep our powder dry.

Around the globe, the Communists are continuing their efforts at penetration of more areas and seeking control of more people.

Consequently, we must not be deceived by the words of peace of Khrushchev or any other Communist; rather, it will be necessary to keep up our guard—until words of peace are backed up with actual deeds.

Among the steps that Congress still must take is the approval of an adequate mutual security program—to further strengthen the alliance of free nations.

UNITED STATES MAKES ECONOMIC COMEBACK

Question. What is the second major accomplishment, Senator WILEY?

Answer. I believe the fact that we have successfully recovered from the economic recession is a real victory for the country.

Contrary to predictions of the prophets of gloom and doom, the Nation—despite an economic setback—did not succumb to a major depression. Instead, the Congress, administration leadership, and, most important, the confident outlook of Mr. and Mrs. Average Citizen, demonstrated the spirit and zeal necessary to prevent what might have been a serious depression, with ultimately disastrous international results.

Again, it is gratifying to acknowledge that—though there were differences of views at times—the leadership of both parties again rose to the challenge.

Now, it is true—that, economically speaking, inflation still plagues us—the cost of living is high—and there are still a number of unemployed. However, there also is a number of factors that brighten the outlook.

Question. What are these, Senator WILEY?

Answer. Today, the Nation is experiencing new highs in the economic field. These include the gross national product—that is, the value of all goods and services—amounts to about $485 billion; and national income is at a record high of $374 billion; civilian employment is at a peak of over 67 million.

In Wisconsin, too, the outlook is brightening.

According to a recent survey, the State hit record high levels in a great many facets of the economy.

Employment has hit a high level of 1,582,300—although this still leaves about 2.5 percent of the labor force unemployed (as compared, however, to 5.4 percent this time last year).

Average weekly earnings for production workers in our manufacturing industries are earning an average of $94.57 weekly—an increase of 7.1 percent over last June.

The trend in homebuilding is up over last year;

Sales of cars and trucks are well above comparable 1958 levels;

Department stores sales gained 12 percent in the 5-month period beginning in January;

Business and corporations have set a new record—up nearly 50 percent over last year.

We recognize, of course, that we still have economic problems—including the need for action to reach an early settlement of the steel strike. Based on the record, however, I believe we can continue to deal with these successfully.

There has, of course, been real progress, also, in a great many other fields.

Question. Senator WILEY, we appreciate a quick look at the record of major accomplishments. Now, looking ahead, what are the jobs that must still be completed by the 86th Congress prior to the adjournment of its 1st session?

JOBS STILL TO BE ACCOMPLISHED BY 86TH CONGRESS

Answer. There are, of course, a number of major tasks ahead of us. These include:

Providing financing for the highway program;

Enacting an effective labor reform law;

Strengthening our civil rights status;

Enactment of a good housing program;

Approval of funds to strengthen our mutual security alliance.

In addition, there are a substantial number of other bills still pending on the calendars in both the Senate and House of Representatives that deserve the consideration of Congress.

WHAT CONGRESS—OR THE COUNTRY—FAILED TO ACCOMPLISH

Question. Are there any fields in which it looks like Congress—and the country—still must face serious challenges in the future?

Answer. Yes. Unfortunately, solutions have not yet been found for a number of problems. These include:

First, the farm problem. Despite high costs, the economic outlook for the American farmer has not been substantially improved, nor have surpluses been reduced;

Second, we need tax reform, along the lines recommended in the Wiley bill, S. 1885, to establish a Hoover-type Tax Commission to make an overhaul of the overall tax system.

Third, the economy has not succeeded in mustering forces to block inflation. Regrettably, this economic hazard is still reducing the buying power of dollars, diminishing value of savings, investments in bonds, and life insurance; making it extremely difficult for folks on modest retirement incomes to meet the high costs of living and otherwise plaguing the economy.

Unfortunately, this general but brief review does not provide an opportunity to touch upon activities in a great many other important fields. These include: conservation, veterans' programs, education, programs for the aging, brightening the outlook for youth, and a great many others.

COMPLETION OF THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Prior to closing, I would like to mention one more significant major mark of progress; that is, the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Dedicated in June of this year, there has been a tremendous increase in the first-season traffic through the improved, deepened, and modernized waterway.

As a sponsor of the seaway law, I am particularly happy that the completed project promises fulfillment of the great expectations which we envisioned in enacting legislation for U.S. work on the St. Lawrence program.

STOPPING THE "CHICAGO WATER STEAL"

Question. Senator WILEY, now turning to a closely related subject, we recall that the bill, H.R. 1, proposing to divert more water from Lake Michigan, was favorably reported out of the Public Works Committee this week.

Answer. Yes; unfortunately, the measure is now before the Senate. As things look now, it may come up for consideration next week.

Question. What is your strategy, Senator WILEY?

Answer. Naturally, I shall fight the bill. Among other things, I shall attempt to have the measure recommitted to committee; this time to the Foreign Relations Committee, where it rightfully belongs.

Question. Why do you say that, Senator?

Answer. In the U.S. Senate, legislation affecting our relations with other countries, and relating to treaties with other nations, should be handled by the Foreign Relations Committee.

The dangerous water diversion bill touches upon both these criteria in these areas of activity.

First, it threatens to jeopardize our relations with our good neighbor, Canada, by diverting waters of the Great Lakes in which Canada has a vital interest; and secondly, the unilateral action to divert dangerously large volumes of water threatens to violate our treaty with Canada relating to the utilization of common waters between the two countries.

Time after time, the Canadian Government has resoundingly voiced its strong opposition—and wisely, I believe—to the proposed water steal legislation.

The Congress of the United States, I believe, ought not to let go unnoticed the voice of a friendly government in such a critical matter.

There are, of course, sufficient reasons at home why the bill should not be enacted. If this is done, it will seriously jeopardize safe shipping, reduced tonnage carried on the lakes, damage lakeshore property, and impair dock facilities and port and harbor development projects. In addition, it would endanger the St. Lawrence Seaway and threaten to damage beaches and resorts.

CONCLUSION

Question. Thank you, Senator WILEY, for this preadjournment review of the record of the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

Answer. I have been happy, once again, to have the opportunity to discuss with you a variety of programs, issues, and challenges.

Now, this is your senior Senator, ALEXANDER WILEY, saying "Thanks for listening."

Health Coverage Needed for Retired Career Federal Civilian Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to provide voluntary health benefits coverage for retired career civilian employees of the Government. I do so in recognition of my responsibility as chairman of the Civil Service Subcommittee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

My bill is a companion bill to the bill introduced Friday in the Senate by Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, who has rendered such an outstanding service to the Government and Federal civilian employees in developing the legislation which became S. 2162, providing a comprehensive governmentwide health benefits program for 2 million active Federal civilian employees.

My bill provides health coverage for career retired civil employees on the same basis that active employees and those who will retire after June 30, 1960, are covered in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, which passed the Senate on July 16 by a vote of 81 to 4 and early this week was unanimously reported by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

ANNUITANTS AND GOVERNMENT SHARE COSTS

This bill would provide health benefits coverage for approximately 260,000 retired Federal employees, Federal employees disabled while in service for the Government, and their spouses and minor children. The premiums under this bill are the same as provided for under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, and are not to exceed $3.80 per month for an annuitant who enrolls for himself only, and $9.20 for an annuitant who enrolls for himself and members of his family. These premiums would be matched equally, on a 50–50 basis, by the Federal Government. The retired annuitant may have a free choice of plans: a service benefit plan, such as offered by Blue Cross-Blue Shield; an indemnity plan, such as offered by the insurance industry; a group practice prepayment plan, such as offered by the Kaiser Foundation on the west coast and Group Health Asosciation here in Washington, D.C.; and an employee organization plan, such as offered by national employee organizations.

CONTRACTS, COVERAGE, ANNUITY DEDUCTIONS

Specific health benefits would be negotiated by the U.S. Civil Service Commission, as the administering agency, with the various carriers. Annuitants would have 90 days after July 1, 1960, to elect coverage, and those who had not elected coverage within this period would lose the opportunity to do so. The annuitant's contribution, which would equal one-half of the cost, would be withheld by the Civil Service Commission from the annuity check.

COSTS

Reliable figures as to the family composition of the presently retired annuitants of our Government are not readily available and, of course, the cost of such a program could not be ascertained until this information is studied by the Civil Service Commission. Another factor in determining costs would be the number of annuitants who might elect coverage under this voluntary health plan. However, reliable estimates place the first year's cost of health coverage for retired Federal civil employees at around $40 million, which cost will be shared equally by the Federal Government and by the annuitant. The first year's cost will be the greatest since the presently retired and those who retired prior to July 1, 1960, is a group which inexorably will decline in size.

PRIVATE INDUSTRY PROTECTS RETIRED EMPLOYEES

The Federal Government cannot ignore the progressive examples of many large private employers who sponsor health benefits programs and have included in these programs persons already retired. These number, for example, the Arkansas Power & Light Co., B. F. Goodrich Co., Eastman Kodak Co., Goodyear Tire Co., Firestone Tire Co., Gilmore Belt & Rubber Co., American Sugar Refining Co., Swift & Co., Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., and the First National Bank of Oregon.

If present retirees are not included in health benefits legislation on the same basis as future retirees will be included under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, large groups of retired employees may be penalized because they may lose such health insurance as they now have, or if they do not lose it, the premiums for continuing the insurance may be so greatly increased and become so high that it will be difficult for them to continue it. The reason for this is that many retirees are now insured in small local groups or under the

plan established by the National Association for Retired Civil Employees—NARCE—or other plans composed of active employees which allow them to continue such coverage after retirement. When the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 becomes effective on July 1, 1960, the presently active employees may promptly abandon these policies and seek coverage under the favorable terms of the new act. Without an influx of new members and newly retired members, the rates for these policies would become prohibitive, since the group would continue with only the presently retired, who, of course, become older each year.

It is my opinion that the need of older people in our area for voluntary health coverage has long been neglected. Providing health coverage for presently retired Federal employees would prove an important step forward in meeting the health needs of our older people. It is well known that the need for health services is extremely critical in older groups. We must not shut our eyes to this urgent need.

CHAIRMAN OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION RECOGNIZES NEED

Chairman Roger W. Jones of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, in a letter to Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER dated May 18, 1959, stated:

> Anyone who expressed indifference to the plight of our already retired employees in being unable to obtain adequate health insurance at a price they can afford to pay would be callous indeed. * * * To require retirees to assume all or a major portion of the cost would put the insurance out of their financial reach. The only possibility which suggests itself would be to consider already retired employees as a separate group from active employees and try to work out separate legislation for them.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE FAVORS

The report of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on S. 2162 contains the following statement:

> In making this recommendation, we have not overlooked the fact that the bill does not address itself to the problem of health insurance for those who are already retired, a fact that has given us much concern. We consider it essential that legislation for active employees and future retirees be supplemented in the near future by providing similar protection for those already retired. While we recognize the complexity of the problems involved in providing effective health benefit coverage to those already on annuities, the pressing health insurance needs of retired Federal employees suggest the importance of an early formulation of ways and means to meet their problems * * *. The Bureau of the Budget advises that it perceives no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

NEW YORK PROVIDES HEALTH COVERAGE FOR ITS RETIRED STATE EMPLOYEES

The State of New York has wisely made health benefits coverage available to its retired State employees as of June 1, 1958, with the State paying 50 percent of the cost of the coverage for the retired employees. I am pleased also to report that our northern good neighbor, the Dominion of Canada, has adopted a national hospitalization program which includes its already retired senior citizens.

Health coverage for retired employees on a voluntary basis also has been endorsed by the insurance industry and the Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans. I am also pleased to report that the Government Employes' Council of the AFL–CIO, representing over 600,000 Federal employees who are members of the AFL–CIO affiliated unions, have endorsed coverage for retired Federal civil employees.

As chairman of the Civil Service Subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, it is my hope that health coverage for presently retired Federal civil employees and those who retire prior to July 1, 1960, will take effect on July 1, 1960, the same date when coverage begins for active and future retirees.

Legislation to provide voluntary health coverage to our career retired Federal civil employees is of vital importance and our Government, the Nation's largest employer, will be following in a pattern already established by progressive private industry and our most populous State, the State of New York.

White House Issues Text on Flag of the United States of America, Its Use and Background, Issued in Connection With Proclamation by President Eisenhower on Admission of Hawaii as the 50th State

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of a statement issued Friday, August 21, 1959, by the White House giving the background history of the flag of the United States of America. This official statement was issued in connection with the addition of the 50th star to the flag of the United States on the official admission of Hawaii as the 50th State of the Union.

This statement is so informative and pertinent to the development of the flag of the United States as the symbol of our beloved Nation now that two additional stars have been added to the blue background of our national emblem on account of the admission of both Alaska and Hawaii as the 49th and 50th States, respectively, that I am sure the within text, as issued by the White House will not only be of interest but of historical value to all Americans.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I commend to all interested that they obtain copies of Public Law 829 of the 77th Congress and Public Laws 107 and 396 of the 83d Congress. These, I am informed, may be obtained from the Government Printing Office.

WHITE HOUSE TEXT ON FLAG LISTS ITS USE AND BACKGROUND

(Text of a statement issued by the White House giving background on the history of the flag. The statement was issued in connection with the addition of a 50th star to the flag on the admission of Hawaii as a State.)

THE NATIONAL FLAG

In connection with the admission of Hawaii as a State of the Union, the President today issued an Executive order adding the 50th star to the Union of the flag. The new flag will supersede the 49-star flag which was prescribed on the admission of Alaska as a State of the Union.

By law, the new 50-star flag will become the official flag of the United States on July 4, 1960, the birthday of the Union. Display of the new flag before that time would be improper. However, it would not be improper to display the 48-star flag or the 49-star flag after that date; with limited exceptions agencies of the Federal Government will continue to display the 48-star flag and the 49-star flag so long as they remain in good condition and until existing stocks of unused flags are exhausted. It is appropriate for all citizens to do the same.

Following is certain information with respect to the historical and symbolic aspects of the national flag:

History of national flag

Before we became a Nation, our land knew many flags. Long ago, the Norsemen probed our coastal waters sailing under the banner of the black raven. Columbus carried a Spanish flag across the seas. The Pilgrims carried the flag of Great Britain. The Dutch colonists brought their striped flag to New Amsterdam. The French explored the continent under the royal fleur-de-lis. Each native Indian tribe had its own totem and insignia. Immigrants of every race and nationality, in seeking a new allegiance, have brought their symbols of loyalty to our shores.

During our Revolution, various banners were used by the not-yet-united colonies. A green pine tree with the motto, "An appeal to Heaven," was popular with our young navy. The rattlesnake's warning "Don't tread on me," was displayed by aroused colonists along the Atlantic seaboard. The Moultrie liberty flag, a large blue banner with a white crescent in the upper corner, rallied the defenders of Charleston, S.C., in 1776. The Bunker Hill flag was a blue banner with a white canton filled with a red cross and a small green pine. The flag of the maritime colony of Rhode Island bore a blue anchor under the word "Hope." Strikingly similar to the Stars and stripes was the flag carried by the Green Mountain Boys of Vermont at the Battle of Bennington on August 16, 1777.

When Washington took command of the Continental Army at Cambridge, Mass., in 1776, he stood under the Grand Union Flag which continued to show a dependence upon Great Britain. The canton of this flag was filled with the crosses of St. George (England) and St. Andrew (Scotland).

The first Stars and Stripes was created by the Continental Congress on June 14, 1777. This date is now observed nationally as Flag Day.

In this flag the 13 stars, representing a constellation, were arranged in a variety of designs. The most popular—with the stars in a circle so that no State could claim precedence over another—is known as the Betsy Ross flag, in honor of the seamstress who is supposed to have sewn the first one.

As the American frontier expanded, two new States were added to the Union, and these were incorporated into the flag. This meant that 2 stars and 2 stripes were added to the design—making a total of 15 each. It was this flag that withstood enemy bombardment at Fort McHenry, Md., September 13–14, 1814, and inspired Francis Scott Key to write "The Star-Spangled Banner."

Later, when other States were added to the Union, the Congress, feeling that more stripes would blur the basic design, returned to the original 13 red and white stripes.

Since 1818, each new State has brought a new star to the flag. This growing pattern of stars could be said to reflect the growing dimensions of America's responsibilities, as the 13 stripes reflect the constant strength of our country's traditions.

The 50 States and the dates of their entry into the Union:

Alabama, December 14, 1819.
Alaska, January 3, 1959.
Arizona, February 14, 1912.
Arkansas, June 15, 1836.
California, September 9, 1850.
Colorado, August 1, 1876.
Connecticut, January 9, 1788.
Delaware, December 7, 1787.
Florida, March 3, 1845.
Georgia, January 2, 1788.
Hawaii, August 21, 1959.
Idaho, July 3, 1890.
Illinois, December 3, 1818.
Indiana, December 11, 1816.
Iowa, December 28, 1846.
Kansas, January 29, 1861.
Kentucky, June 1, 1792.
Louisiana, April 30, 1812.
Maine, March 15, 1820.
Maryland, April 28, 1788.
Massachusetts, February 6, 1788.
Michigan, January 26, 1837.
Minnesota, May 11, 1858.
Mississippi, December 10, 1817.
Missouri, August 10, 1821.
Montana, November 8, 1889.
Nebraska, March 1, 1867.
Nevada, October 31, 1864.
New Hampshire, June 21, 1788.
New Jersey, December 18, 1787.
New Mexico, January 6, 1912.
New York, July 26, 1788.
North Carolina, November 21, 1789.
North Dakota, November 2, 1889.
Ohio, March 1, 1803.
Oklahoma, November 16, 1907.
Oregon, February 14, 1859.
Pennsylvania, December 12, 1787.
Rhode Island, May 29, 1790.
South Carolina, May 23, 1788.
South Dakota, November 2, 1889.
Tennessee, June 1, 1796.
Texas, December 29, 1845.
Utah, January 4, 1896.
Vermont, March 4, 1791.
Virginia, June 25, 1788.
Washington, November 11, 1889.
West Virginia, June 20, 1863.
Wisconsin, May 29, 1848.
Wyoming, July 10, 1890.

Customs and usage as to flag of the United States

Laws have been written to govern the display of the flag and to insure a proper respect for it. Custom has decreed certain other observances in regard to its use. As a symbol of the Nation, standing for our heritage of liberty and justice, the flag is naturally held in highest honor by all citizens.

In recent years, the Congress of the United States of America has drawn together "The existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag." These can be found in Public Law 829 of the 77th Congress and in Public Laws 107 and 396 of the 83d Congress. Copies may be obtained from the Government Printing Office.

SENATE

TUESDAY, AUGUST 25, 1959

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of mercy and grace, bowing at this noontide altar, we would subdue the day's noisy claims to silence as we listen for the divine voice which guides and blesses and reassures.

We would submit ourselves to the test of Thy white, scorching purity with which nothing unclean can live and to the rebuke of Thy absolute honesty in the searching scrutiny of which no refuge of lies can stand.

By the judgment of that purity and that honesty deliver us from the dangerous sophistries which afflict our day of elevating cleverness above goodness, and humor above honor.

Give us to know that our true life, our very effectiveness in the daily duty placed in our hands, depends always on the degree of the surrender, or failure to surrender, our self-centered inclinations to the final control of Thy will in which alone is our peace.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., August 25, 1959.

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 Monday, August 24, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on August 24, 1959, the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolutions:

S. 196. An act for the relief of Grover J. Cole;

S. 822. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain property administered as a part of the San Juan National Historic Site to the municipality of San Juan, P.R., in exchange for its development by the municipality in a manner that will enhance the historic site, and for other purposes;

S. 1330. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of the city of Fort Myers, Fla., and Lee County, Fla.," approved July 22, 1958;

S. 1590. An act for the relief of the Government of the Republic of Iceland;

S. 1828. An act for the relief of Kum Hung Seeto and Kum Wo Seeto;

S. 2099. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the admission of West Virginia into the Union as a State;

S.J. Res. 24. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand; and

S.J. Res. 106. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive instruction at the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Belgium.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the acting President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H.R. 2773. An act to amend section 1701 of title 38, United States Code, to provide the same educational benefits for children of Spanish-American War veterans who died of a service-connected disability as are provided for children of veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict; and

H.R. 7373. An act to amend section 801 of title 38, United States Code, to provide assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing to certain veterans seriously disabled during a period of war.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 8599) to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

H.R. 303. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property in the District of Columbia to the Association of the Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia;

H.R. 1579. An act for the relief of Basile Ignatios Mavridis;

H.R. 1595. An act for the relief of Victor Hoffer;

H.R. 2078. An act for the relief of Gannon Boggs;

H.R. 2296. An act for the relief of the estate of Seth E. Libby, Jr.;