

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 2, 1959

Rev. Philip Gordon Scott, pastor, Westmoreland Congregational Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, who doth rule in the kingdoms of men, who in the days of old didst give to this land the benediction of Thy grace through heroes and strong men, able for the burdens of their day, bless, we beseech Thee, all who give themselves to the service of their fellow men, in wisdom, patience, courage, and commitment through this Senate of our people. Grant to each of them, according to Thy loving kindness, to live as becomes his duty. In all that contends within our hearts, and in the claims that plead their interest and their urgencies, enable us who stand before Thee to do the work Thou dost give us to do with singleness of heart, serving Thee, learning Thy will, and living in obedience.

Grant unto us, O God, a vision of our land, fair as she may be, that we may ever serve, in all her life, and power, as large a purpose as we can see, that the issues of our choice may be her strength and the peace of all the earth.

As we entrust this day to Thy keeping, our Father, may its tireless strivings be sustained of Thy Spirit, toward the goals Thou dost appoint for Thy people, and may our minds be led forward to Thy truth, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 26, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—
APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 17, 1959, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 961) fixing the representation of the majority and minority membership of the Joint Economic Committee.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:
I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Annual Report of the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 2, 1959.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING
MORNING HOUR

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

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING
SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following committees or subcommittees were authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate:

The Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF
COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance:

George N. Sundquist, of Wisconsin, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 36, with headquarters at Duluth, Minn.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Elwood R. Quesada, of California, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency;

James Tolman Pyle, of Maryland, to be Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency;

Capt. Chester L. Harding, U.S. Coast Guard, for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard;

Charles A. Webb, of Virginia, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner; and Cecil M. Thomas, and sundry other persons, for appointment as warrant officers in the U.S. Coast Guard.

By Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Robert J. Dodds, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Courtney Johnson, of Indiana, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

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

U.S. AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for temporary appointment in the U.S. Air Force under the provisions of chapter 839, title 10, of the United States Code.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

NOMINATIONS FAVORABLY RE-
PORTED AND PLACED ON THE
VICE PRESIDENT'S DESK

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army, the Navy and Marine Corps, and the Regular Air Force, which had been favorably reported and placed on the Vice President's desk, without being printed in the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the confirmation of all these nominations.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

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

CLARIFICATION OF REEMPLOYMENT PROVISIONS
OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND
SERVICE ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and clarify the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

COMPUTATION OF PERCENTAGE DEPLETION IN
THE CASE OF OIL AND GAS WELLS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to define the term "gross income from the property" for the purpose of computing percentage depletion in the case of oil and

gas wells (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON FINANCIAL CONDITION AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS OF HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the financial condition and fiscal operations of the highway trust fund, for the fiscal year 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

THIRD PROGRESS REPORT ON HIGHWAY COST ALLOCATION STUDY

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the third progress report of the Highway Cost Allocation Study, dated March 1, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time in conformity with the provisions of the act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON PERSONAL AND REAL PROPERTY MADE AVAILABLE FOR AND DISPOSED OF TO PUBLIC HEALTH AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on personal and real property made available for and disposed of to public health and educational institutions, for the calendar quarter, October 1 through December 31, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

HEADQUARTERS SITE FOR MOUNT RAINIER NATIONAL PARK, WASH.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide a headquarters site for Mount Rainier National Park in the general vicinity of Ashford, Wash., and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REVISION OF BOUNDARIES OF MONTEZUMA CASTLE NATIONAL MONUMENT, ARIZ.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise the boundaries of the Montezuma Castle National Monument, Ariz., and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF BOYS' CLUBS OF AMERICA

A letter from the chairman of the board, president, and national director, Boys' Clubs of America, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Boys' Clubs of America, for the year 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT ON CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR SOCIETY

A letter from the Secretary and Treasurer, Congressional Medal of Honor Society, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that Society, for the period ended December 31, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RELOCATION OF NATIONAL TRAINING SCHOOL FOR BOYS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the relocation of the National Training School for Boys, and for other purposes

(with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1915, TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO PROCEEDINGS IN FORMA PAUPERIS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1915 of title 28, United States Code, relating to proceedings in forma pauperis (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental report on positions filled under the Classification Act of 1949, in grades GS-16, 17, and 18, in the Commission on Civil Rights and the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp. (with accompanying papers) to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON HIGHWAY SAFETY

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the investigation and study made to determine what action can be taken by the Federal Government to promote the public welfare by increasing highway safety in the United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND LETTERS

A letter from the assistant to the president, the American Academy of Arts and Letters, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that academy, for the year 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

INCREASE OF APPROPRIATIONS TO ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Acting Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Public Law 85-590 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 2

"Whereas in recent years the trend of the Federal Government has been to encroach upon activities of government which were reserved to the several States by the Constitution of the United States of America; and

"Whereas this encroachment upon the rights of the several States has caused the States to be powerless to act or regulate in any field where the Federal Congress has enacted legislation; and

"Whereas this has seriously hampered the several States in protecting themselves from internal subversion, in regulating the learned professions and commercial enterprises within their boundaries; and

"Whereas, if the present trend is continued, the several States will be rendered mere political subdivisions of the Federal Government for the purpose of convenient administration of Federal laws; and

"Whereas the doctrine of dual powers, with neither the Federal Government nor the States encroaching upon the constitutional and historically recognized rights of the other, is the genius and identifying feature of the American political system: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of Alabama (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Legislature of Alabama does hereby memorialize and make application to the Congress of the United States of America to call a convention, as provided by article V of the Constitution of the United States of America, to consider submitting to the legislatures of the several States for their ratification an amendment to the Constitution in substantially the following form: 'No statute of any of the several States shall be held to be invalid as in conflict with any Federal statute unless such Federal statute expressly provides that such statutes of the several States in conflict therewith are invalid; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to each member of the Alabama delegation in the Congress of the United States of America to be filed and presented by said delegation to the Congress, and that copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state of Alabama to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress and to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States Congress.

*"ALBERT SOUTWELL,
President and Presiding Officer of
the Senate.*

"CHAS. C. ADAMS,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

Resolutions of the general court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT AND ENFORCE LEGISLATION TO IMPLEMENT THE DECISIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES OUTLAWING SEGREGATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States on the 17th day of May 1954, by unanimous decision, held that 'in the field of public education the doctrine of separate but equal has no place'; and

"Whereas the same Court expressed its desire that its decision should be complied with 'with all deliberate speed'; and

"Whereas the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides that no State shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction equal protection of the laws; and

"Whereas the interests of orderly government demand that respect and compliance be given to orders issued by courts possessed of jurisdiction of persons and subject matter: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the general court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress and President of the United States to enact and enforce legislation to implement the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States outlawing segregation in the public school system; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the Commonwealth transmit forthwith copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress of the United States, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

"House of representatives, adopted, February 16, 1959.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk.

"Senate, adopted in concurrence, February 18, 1959.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk.

"A true copy.
"Attest:

"JOSEPH D. WARD,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 7

"Joint memorial to the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Washington, D.C.

"We, your memorialists, the Senate of the State of Idaho, as assembled in its 35th session, the House of Representatives concurring, respectfully represent that—

"Whereas the State of Idaho has the largest known deposit of cobalt in the United States and is producing 70 percent of the entire production in the United States; and

"Whereas, owing to the reduction in prices paid by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, the cobalt operators in Idaho have been compelled to reduce the number of their employees from about 400 to 125; and

"Whereas, the existing contract will expire on or before July 1, 1959, unless it is extended; and

"Whereas under the various Acts of Congress, such as the Stockpiling Act of 1946, the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953, the Director was authorized to buy more domestic strategic metals; and

"Whereas Idaho has 15 million pounds in reserve ore blocked out with inferred reserves of 15 times that amount, or a total reserve of 225 million pounds; and

"Whereas the mining facilities are ample to handle twice the amount of tonnage; the concentrator is the latest design for the most efficient operation; housing facilities are available for 500 employees, together with modern schools, the very best fire protection, ample electric power, and a sewage disposal system for the entire community; and

"Whereas if forced to close down the mine it will entail a loss of \$15 million in expenditures and a layoff of at least 125 additional men; and

"Whereas the U.S. Government should afford its domestic industries equal or superior treatment with foreign countries; and

"Whereas the U.S. Government has made outstanding commitments to take foreign cobalt valued at about \$80 million, and as late as March 1957 entered into a contract involving \$47 million worth of cobalt from a foreign source; and

"Whereas 2,500,000 pounds of domestic cobalt a year are available and the mining industry should be protected with a price of \$2.30 per pound, to compare with the price paid foreign producers: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 35th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization be, and he is hereby, memorialized as follows:

"To exercise the powers heretofore conferred upon him and to enter into contracts with the producers of domestic cobalt at the rate of \$2.30 per pound to compare with the rate paid foreign producers; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be and he is hereby authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this senate joint memorial to the

Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 2

"Joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, as assembled in its 35th session, do respectfully represent that—

"Whereas abandoned and unclaimed property in the hands of the Federal Government cannot be removed from Federal records because of the lack of the power of escheat in the Federal Government; and

"Whereas those sums of money and other property abandoned and unclaimed in the hands of the Federal Government belong to the citizens of the various States, and

"Whereas by the 10th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the power of escheat and custodial possession of property belonging to the citizens of the various States has been especially reserved to said States; and

"Whereas the National Association of Attorneys General has, through its special committee on escheats and unclaimed property, prepared and submitted to Congress, a bill providing that reports should be prepared and made by the Office of the Comptroller General disclosing to the various States the amount of unclaimed money and other property held by the Federal Government and the persons to whom the same belongs or is believed to belong, according to the records of the Federal Government and the provisions of said bill, and permitting the return of the sums of money and other property to the various States entitled thereto: Said bill having been designated as Senate bill 3937 in the 85th Congress, 2d session, but having been introduced too late for action during said session: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho, and the House of Representatives therein concurring, That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States that said bill, formerly known as Senate bill 3937, as submitted to the 85th Congress, 2d session, or a similar one be introduced in Congress and given immediate consideration and approval; be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 6

"Joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States a bill known as H.R. 1929 to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System; and

"Whereas the economy of the State of Idaho is based upon its agriculture, mining, lumber, sheep and cattle industries, and the use of its waters for irrigation and hydroelectric power; and

"Whereas the enactment of this bill will deny to the natural resources industries of the State of Idaho the right to wisely develop the natural resources contained in the great primitive areas of this State, and further deny access to these primitive areas to millions of American citizens, all to the detriment of the said industries and to the people of the State of Idaho; and

"Whereas one of the great potential industries of the State of Idaho is its tourist trade and wildlife attractions: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives, State of Idaho, the Senate concurring, That we most respectfully oppose the enactment of said H.R. 1929, for the reasons that the enactment of said bill prevents the normal development and utilization of the natural resources contained in such a wilderness system, that the agricultural, mining, timber, sheep and cattle industries, and the wildlife and tourist industries will be irreparably damaged, and that the present very satisfactory and normal administration of our natural resources by the present land management agencies will be superseded and replaced by another unnecessary Federal bureau; be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Senators and the Representatives in Congress from this State."

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 7

"Joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, as assembled in its 35th session, respectfully represent that—

"Whereas House Concurrent Resolution 108, 83d Congress, has been used by the Bureau of Indian Affairs to defend and justify actions which are contrary to the best interests of Indian groups, and

"Whereas Indian Bureau and other Federal officials have repeatedly referred to House Concurrent Resolution 108, 83d Congress as a mandate from Congress; and

"Whereas House Concurrent Resolution 108, 83d Congress, has been strongly and repeatedly objected to by all Indian groups; and

"Whereas House Concurrent Resolution 108, 83d Congress, was passed in Congress without giving the Indians involved an opportunity to be heard on this policy statement: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives, State of Idaho, the Senate concurring, That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America that House Concurrent Resolution 108, 83d Congress, be repealed and that a statement of policy be enacted in regard to our Indian peoples which will provide for the adoption of a constructive approach by the United States toward Indian affairs, so as to offer an opportunity for reasonable progress to the American Indian communities without exacting termination of Federal protection of Indian property or of any other Indian rights as its price; that Indian culture and identity shall not be restricted or destroyed; that technical guidance and financial assistance shall be made available, that the request for assistance shall come from the Indians themselves after each Indian group has studied itself in terms of its own needs; that an impartial effort shall be made to develop the full capabilities of industrial and agricultural production, of improvements in housing, nutrition, clothing, sanitation, and health, that tech-

nical assistance shall be given to long-term, general, vocational, technical, and professional education to enable American Indians to share in and contribute to the total American society, and that older, revered values shall be respected and used as new forms of living are introduced, and that it should be made plain that Federal protection and services shall be ended for any tribe, band, or group only when such unit shall have adopted a plan for its organization and operation under State law, and such plan shall have been approved by the appropriate state and by the Secretary of the Interior prior to its submission to the Congress; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Senators and the Representatives in Congress from this State."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL No. 8

"Joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, as assembled in its 35th session, respectfully represent: That

"Whereas under present legislation (Public Law 815) providing for Federal aid for school construction where there are a certain percentage of Indian children in the school district, certain areas which do not quite meet said required percentage are still unable to finance their own school construction because of their exceedingly low valuation assessment due to the high percentages of the most valuable lands in the districts which are Indian owned and tax exempt; and

"Whereas Indian and non-Indian children alike in such areas are being deprived of educational facilities which should be available to all our youth, and

"Whereas if proper school facilities were available for Indian children there would be substantial increases in the number of Indian children attending public schools; and

"Whereas it is unreasonable and discriminatory to deny to non-Indian children adequate school facilities because of the large percentage of nontaxable trust land in their school districts: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives, State of Idaho, the senate concurring, That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America that Public Law 815, as amended, be amended as follows: At the end of title IV, section 401, subsection (a), after the word 'law', change the period to a semicolon, and add, 'except that where the reduction of the potential assessed valuation because of the presence of land held in trust by the Federal Government exceeds 50 percent, then Federal assistance to such district for public school facilities construction may be the need as recommended by the Commissioner of Education, and may be equal to the cost, but in no case to exceed the cost, of constructing adequate school facilities;' and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and to the Senators and the Representatives in Congress from this State."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 29

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress and President of the United States to safeguard and preserve established State and individual rights to the use of water within the separate States

"Whereas recent decisions of the Federal courts and recent assertions from the U.S. Department of Justice have deprived States, and persons, of rights which said States and persons previously enjoyed, to regulate and control the use of the water in those respective States; and

"Whereas said decisions and assertions are further a part of a general pattern developing gradually into Federal supremacy and usurpation over water, which will substitute an all-powerful centralized Government control thereover, and will continue to destroy individual and States' rights over water: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of Alabama, both houses thereof concurring, That the U.S. Congress and the President of the United States are hereby urged and requested to take all necessary action (1) to preserve the water rights of the individual and the States and to prevent Federal usurpation of those rights; (2) to see that legislation is initiated and supported to recognize and protect the rights of individuals and the States' rights taken from them by the Federal courts and the Justice Department; and (3) in every way possible to reaffirm, renew, and defend the concepts that water rights are property rights and that these established rights, to the use of water, by a State or an individual, should not be taken away without the process of law and adequate compensation; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Legislature of Alabama is cognizant of the great benefits derived from the Tennessee Valley Authority and is in accord and expresses approval of the Tennessee Valley Authority; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be promptly transmitted by the Clerk of the House, to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, the chairmen of the U.S. Senate and House Committees of Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Alabama legislative delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the House of Representatives of Alabama February 17, 1959. Concurred in and adopted by the Senate February 19, 1959. Approved by the Governor February 24, 1959."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL No. 6

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to the passing of legislation relating to the amendment of section 2(c) of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (41 Stat. 448, 30 U.S.C. 184) removing restriction on railroad companies in regard to the leasing of public lands for coal purposes.

"Whereas coal is a major resource in Wyoming and employment in the coal industry has been a major contributor to Wyoming's economy; and

"Whereas several nationally prominent industrial concerns have expressed interest in conducting research toward the establishment of industries utilizing Wyoming coals; and

"Whereas these industries have expressed intent to develop these tremendous coal deposits; and

"Whereas section 2(c) of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (41 Stat. 448, 30 U.S.C. 184), presently does not permit the development of these coal deposits because of the restrictive provisions put upon the leasing of public lands for coal purposes by railroad companies; and

"Whereas the unique ownership patterns of such coal areas by these railroad companies will restrict the development unless corrective legislation be employed by Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 35th Legislature of the State of Wyoming, the House of Representatives of such Legislature concurring, That the President and the Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to remove the restrictions in said section of the Mineral Leasing Act by repealing or suitable amendment; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, U.S. Senator GALE MCGEE, and Representative in Congress E. KEITH THOMSON.

*"JAY R. HOUSE,
"Speaker of the House.*

*"NORMAN BARLOW,
"President of the Senate.*

"Approved, February 20, 1959:

*"J. J. 'JOE' HICKEY,
"Governor."*

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION 2

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to abolishing personal income, estate, and gift taxes and prohibiting the United States Government from engaging in business in competition with its citizens

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring herein), That the members of the 35th Legislature of the State of Wyoming respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to propose to the people an amendment to the Constitution of the United States or to call a convention for such purpose, as provided by law, to add to the Constitution an article providing that:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise, except as specified in the Constitution.

"Sec. 2. The Constitution or laws of any State, or the laws of the United States shall not be subject to the terms of any foreign or domestic agreement which would abrogate this amendment.

"Sec. 3. The activities of the U.S. Government which violate the intent and purposes of this amendment shall, within a period of 3 years from the date of ratification of this amendment, be liquidated and the properties and facilities affected shall be sold.

"Sec. 4. Three years after the ratification of this amendment the 16th article of amendments to the Constitution of the United States shall stand repealed and thereafter Congress shall not levy taxes on personal incomes, estates, and/or gifts; and be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and

to each Member of Congress from the State of Wyoming.

"NORMAN BARLOW,
"President of the Senate.

"JAY R. HOUSE,
"Speaker of the House.

"Approved, February 26, 1959:

"J. J. 'JOE' HICKEY,
"Governor."

A resolution adopted by the American Municipal Association of Washington, D.C., favoring the enactment of legislation to authorize additional funds to adequately staff the U.S. Information Agency relating to the people-to-people program; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the Maui County (Hawaii) Committee for Statehood for Hawaii and the California-Nevada-Hawaii District of Kiwanis International, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide statehood for Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 7

"Joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Utah urging the Congress of the United States to take such remedial action as deemed necessary to preclude the closing of low power booster stations necessary for television reception in certain areas of the State of Utah

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah:

"Whereas there are many communities and farm areas within the State of Utah whose people depend upon low power booster stations as their only means of receiving television programs; and

"Whereas the rugged terrain of the Rocky Mountain region makes the use of ultra high frequency translator stations impractical, if indeed not impossible, according to the opinions expressed by competent and qualified broadcast engineers, as well as by certain members of the Federal Communications Commission; and

"Whereas it is economically impossible for these communities and farm areas to support, construct, or operate any other form of duly authorized television service; and

"Whereas there is ample proof that low power booster stations can be regulated so as to preclude interference with licensed television services or other services; and

"Whereas the Federal Communications Commission did summarily dismiss, without formal hearing, its own rulemaking proceedings relating to repeater or booster stations operating in the VHF television band of frequency assignments; and

"Whereas the Federal Communications Commission did on December 31, 1958, make formal announcement of its dismissal of petitions for reconsideration, including those filed by Gov. Stephen L. R. McNichols, of Colorado; the Honorable Edwin C. Johnson, former Governor and U.S. Senator from Colorado; and the Honorable Gordon Allott, U.S. Senator from Colorado, all of whom sought to procure reasonable rules which would permit the continued operation of said booster stations under the regulatory power of the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the Associated Civic Clubs of Southern and Eastern Utah and the County Commissioners Association of Utah have duly, regularly, and unanimously authorized the respective officers of each of such associations to prepare and execute, and such officers pursuant to such authorization have prepared and executed, a resolution urging the Congress of the United States and the Utah State Legislature take all action deemed necessary to preclude the closing of low power booster stations necessary for

television reception in certain areas of the State of Utah; and

"Whereas the Federal Communications Commission did also announce on December 31, 1958, that all booster stations would be given a period of 90 days in which to apply for conversion to ultra high frequency translators or some other authorized television operation, and upon failure to do so would be ordered to cease operation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the 33d Legislature of the State of Utah do hereby urge the Congress of the United States for such remedial action within such 90-day period as the Congress deems fit through the exercise of its authority over the Federal Communications Commission to insure the continued operation of low power booster stations, to the end that the people in the nonmetropolitan areas of the State of Utah shall not be denied their basic right to equality of access to the informational, educational, inspirational, cultural, and entertainment service of the American system of free television broadcasting; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Utah in the Congress of the United States.

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

Resolutions of the general court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES AGAINST GRANTING CONCESSIONS ON TEXTILE IMPORTS FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES

"Resolved, That the general court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States not to enact any legislation granting concessions on textile imports from foreign countries; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the president of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each member thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Senate, adopted, February 16, 1959.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,

"Clerk.

"House of Representatives, adopted in concurrence, February 18, 1959.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,

"Clerk.

"A true copy.

"Attest:

"JOSEPH D. WARD,

"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the general court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.)

Resolutions of the general court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL CEMETERY IN NEW ENGLAND

"Whereas the Secretary of the Army has taken the position that it is the responsibility of the Congress to decide as a matter of public policy whether or not new cemeteries shall be established; and

"Whereas New England, one of the most densely populated areas in the country has no national cemetery; and

"Whereas there are 34 States which have within their boundaries at least one national cemetery with grave space available; and

"Whereas there has not been any new national cemetery established since the year 1951; and

"Whereas the veteran deserves honor and recognition not only in life but also in a final resting place: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the general court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to establish a national cemetery in New England; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth and the New England States.

"House of representatives, adopted, February 16, 1959.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,

"Clerk.

"Senate, adopted in concurrence, February 18, 1959.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,

"Clerk.

"A true copy.

"Attest:

"JOSEPH D. WARD,

"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the general court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

Resolutions of the general court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO ENACT LEGISLATION PROVIDING FOR A MINIMUM WAGE OF \$1.25 PER HOUR

"Whereas at the present high cost of living compensation of less than \$1.25 per hour is inadequate to support workers and their families; and

"Whereas large numbers of persons engaged in industry are receiving compensation much lower than \$1.25 per hour: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the general court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact forthwith legislation providing for a minimum wage of \$1.25 per hour; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Senate, adopted, February 16, 1959.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,

"Clerk.

"House of Representatives, adopted in concurrence, February 18, 1959.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,

"Clerk.

"A true copy.

"Attest:

"JOSEPH D. WARD,

"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the general court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

By Mr. LANGER:

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

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION D-1

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to provide full 100 percent parity for products produced on family-type farms

"Whereas 90 percent of North Dakota's income comes from the soil; and

"Whereas the very existence of the farm home and the family-sized farm is endangered by continuing economic trends; and

"Whereas the best interests and general welfare of the Nation as a whole would suffer incalculable loss if the farm family home were to be replaced by large, commercial, manager-operated farms; and

"Whereas it is for the best interests and general welfare of the whole Nation that those who toil on these family-sized farms to maintain their farm homes and receive for their labors a fair return, comparable with industry, so that these farm homes may not be replaced by large, managerial-type commercially operated farms: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested and urged to provide price supports for the products of these family-type farms at 100 percent of parity; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state transmit copies of this resolution to U.S. Senator WILLIAM LANGER, U.S. Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, Representative QUENTIN N. BURDICK, and Representative DON L. SHORT.

"HJALMER C. NYGAARD,

"Speaker of the House.

"GERALD L. STARR,

"Chief Clerk of the House.

"C. P. DAHL,

"President of the Senate.

"VIC GILBREATH,

"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION E

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to provide additional funds for the construction of nursing homes

"Whereas there is an existing backlog of unmet needs in the provision of nursing homes in the State of North Dakota and the Nation; and

"Whereas the shortage will become more acute because of the aging population of this State and Nation; and

"Whereas appropriations by Congress for this purpose have been limited and the rising costs in the construction of nursing homes has even further restricted the program of construction of such homes: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the Congress be urged to increase appropriations for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 482, 83d Congress, 2d session, for the purpose of providing an expanded program of nursing home construction; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to members of the North Dakota congressional delegation, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Surgeon General of the Department of the U.S. Public Health Service, and the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"HJALMER C. NYGAARD,

"Speaker of the House.

"GERALD L. STARR,

"Chief Clerk of the House.

"C. P. DAHL,

"President of the Senate.

"VIC GILBREATH,

"Secretary of the Senate."

RESOLUTION OF FARMERS GRAIN DEALERS ASSOCIATION OF NORTH DAKOTA

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

the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of North Dakota, at Fargo, N. Dak., relating to wheat acreage allotments.

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

Whereas North Dakota has a record of producing high quality wheat and has steadily taken a large reduction in acreage planted to this crop while other States have been increasing their acreage in the production of lower quality wheat under the 15-acre exemption plan, thereby steadily adding to the wheat surplus: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we ask for an elimination of this 15-acre allowance, at present common usage in territories not usually recognized as wheat producing areas, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Representatives in Washington, D.C.

INTERNATIONAL SALMON TREATY—JOINT MEMORIAL OF OREGON LEGISLATURE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Honorable Robert B. Duncan, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Oregon Legislature, I present house joint memorial 1 of the 50th legislative assembly, respectfully urging the President to complete a treaty with Japan and other foreign countries on maximum salmon fishing in the North Pacific Ocean. Present difficulties over the taking of migratory salmon on the high seas make it essential that such an international treaty be agreed upon speedily if proper management of this fishery resource is to be maintained. I ask unanimous consent that the joint memorial of the Oregon legislature may be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

The joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

To His Excellency the Honorable PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

We, your memorialists, the 50th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the percentage of the total number of salmon taken from the high seas of the North Pacific Ocean by the fisheries of Japan and other foreign countries has been increasing at an alarming rate in recent years; and

Whereas this trend can operate only to the detriment of the salmon fisheries of the State of Oregon and the United States and the economies of the State of Oregon and the United States as a whole: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, the senate jointly concurring therein, That we urge the President of the United States to use every effort to complete a treaty with the Japanese Government prescribing the maximum amount of salmon which may be taken annually by the fisheries of the United States and Japan; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge that negotiations for such a treaty be commenced at the earliest possible date, and that all nations of the North Pacific Ocean area be urged to enter into such negotiations and to cooperate in the establishment of a treaty; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, all Members of the Oregon congressional delegation and the legislative assemblies of the States of Washington and California.

Adopted by house February 5, 1959.

RUTH E. RENFROE,

Chief Clerk of House.

ROBERT B. DUNCAN,

Speaker of House.

Adopted by senate February 12, 1959.

President of Senate.

Filed in office of secretary of state February 17, 1959.

Secretary of State.

MAINTENANCE OF AN ADEQUATE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAM—LETTER, RESOLUTION, AND ARTICLE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over the years an outstanding program that has helped our people, individually, and as citizens of this great country—to achieve their personal goals and fulfill their responsibilities—has been the vocational education program.

This program has benefited folks in a wide variety of occupations, including industry, homemaking, agriculture, labor, nursing, and other fields.

As we know, financing for vocational training has been provided by local, State, and Federal cooperation. The States and local communities are now bearing the major portion of the cost burden, matching Federal funds at about a 5-to-1 ratio. For example, for fiscal 1958 the State and local expenditures amounted to over \$4,500,000; by contrast, the Federal support is calculated at about \$995,000. This is particularly important since, at the Federal level, we have serious fiscal problems.

Fortunately, funds have been provided in the 1960 budget for continuation of this program.

We recognize, however, that currently thought is being given to reducing Federal support of vocational education.

Recognizing the benefits that program has provided for millions of people, it is extremely important, I feel, that we not take any steps that would handicap this program. Rather, we must, as possible, strengthen its ability to serve our people—and, in this way, ultimately our Nation. As we face the future, there now needs to be constructive thinking as to how this program can be further improved.

The question of how this best can be achieved deserves serious consideration.

Recently I received messages from individuals and organizations in Wisconsin stressing the need for a strong, improved vocational education program.

Included among the communications are: First, a letter from G. H. Faber, recording secretary of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America; and, second, a resolution adopted by the Madison Construction and Trades Council, and sent to me by Pierce L. Roberts, business representative.

In addition, the February 21 edition of the Wisconsin Agriculturist and Farmer carried an article entitled "Our Vo-Ag Education Needs Reappraisal." This

splendid article contains thought-provoking commentary as to how the vocational training program, particularly in agriculture, can be further improved to meet the challenges of the future. This is especially important, in view of the effects of the technological revolution upon farming.

I request unanimous consent to have these messages and the article printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter, resolution, and article were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF
CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,
LOCAL No. 314,
Madison, Wis.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: In the interest of all members of Carpenters' Local No. 314 it was voted that we write our Representatives regarding legislation for vocational education.

We believe that the program of vocational education in Wisconsin has had as a primary objective the development of the skills of the working youth and adults of our State. The program of vocational education in Wisconsin has been developed with the assistance of Federal aids allotted to the State under the provisions of the Smith-Hughes and George Barden Acts. With the elimination of Federal aids for vocational education under the Smith-Hughes and George Barden Acts it would require discontinuance of some established training programs for apprentices and employed workers which are essential to the basic economy of our Nation and would hinder the development of needed new programs. Also the elimination of Federal aids for vocational education would weaken the industrial training structure of our country the strength of which is so essential to successful competition with the Communist world.

President Eisenhower in his 1959 budget message to the U.S. Congress has recommended the elimination of Federal aids for vocational education under the Smith-Hughes and George Barden Acts beginning on July 1, 1960, and has stated that legislation will be introduced into the 1959 session of Congress to accomplish this objective.

Carpenters' Local No. 314 does vigorously oppose the recommendations of President Eisenhower for the elimination of Federal aid to vocational education beginning July 1, 1960, and we request your support to defeat any legislation that might be introduced to defeat Federal aid to vocational education and the apprenticeship program.

Very truly yours,

G. F. FABER,
Recording Secretary.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the program of vocational education in Wisconsin has had as a primary objective the development of the skills of the working youth and adults of our State; and

Whereas the program of vocational education in Wisconsin has been developed with the assistance of Federal aids allotted to the State under the provisions of the Smith-Hughes and George Barden Acts; and

Whereas the elimination of Federal aids for vocational education under the Smith-Hughes and George Barden Acts would require discontinuance of some established training programs for apprentices and em-

ployed workers which are essential to the basic economy of our Nation and would hinder the development of needed new programs; and

Whereas the elimination of Federal aids for vocational education would weaken the industrial training structure of our country, the strength of which is so essential to successful competition with the Communist world; and

Whereas President Eisenhower in his 1959 budget message to the U.S. Congress has recommended the elimination of Federal aids for vocational education under the Smith-Hughes and George Barden Acts beginning July 1, 1960, and has stated that legislation will be introduced into the 1959 session of Congress to accomplish this objective: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Madison Building Construction Trades Council, AFL-CIO, meeting in the Labor Temple, Madison, Wis., February 23, 1959, take action vigorously opposing the recommendations of President Eisenhower for the elimination of Federal aids for vocational education beginning July 1, 1960; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be presented to the executive board of the Wisconsin State AFL-CIO for their consideration and copies be sent to the executive board of the AFL-CIO, Washington, D.C., and to all Wisconsin congressional Representatives requesting their support to defeat any legislation that might be introduced to deny Federal aids to vocational education.

[From the Wisconsin Agriculturalist and Farmer, Feb. 21, 1959]

OUR VOCATIONAL-AGRICULTURE EDUCATION NEEDS REAPPRAISAL

Vocational agriculture is well into its second 40 years in this country. The program has done much for American farming, and it will do more. But there will need to be changes in vocational agriculture to keep pace with the changes in farming. Below, in excerpts from a speech, are some of the views of Louis M. Sasman, chief of agricultural education in Wisconsin.

Constant evaluation of any program is desirable. There is no question but that there are weaknesses in our school system. For my part, I believe that our educational system is the best in the world and that we need to continually improve it rather than to tear out the foundation stones upon which it rests.

OFFERED SPECIAL TRAINING

About 1,900 educational systems all over the Nation began the introduction of vocational courses that would aid in the preparation of the majority of people for the occupations in which they were most apt to engage and to offer technical training for those who were not going to college.

The advancement of vocational education was certainly not intended to preclude general education. Reading, writing, and arithmetic are still basic in the curriculum.

If people get the schooling that fits them the best individually, the whole Nation will benefit by the activities of trained individuals.

It is just as important to have well-trained farmers as to have well-trained personnel in any other field.

For these reasons, vocational education in agriculture must continue to be stressed in our educational system along with the other subjects that combine to produce an intelligent people.

How can vocational agriculture best move ahead to be sure that during the next 40 years it continues to provide the valuable training to farmers that has been provided since 1917?

Vocational agriculture must, if it is to continue to serve its purpose, be truly vocational.

Agricultural teaching cannot be vocational unless it combines study and practice. There must be class instruction but also individual instruction geared to the individual needs of the student and combining practical experience and theoretical training.

Strong farming programs must continue to be developed. These must be practical farming programs, too, adapted to the student and his circumstances and providing the best possible experience in farming.

All the farming experience that a student gets must be recognized as part of his farming program. Much of it he gets under the direction of his parents. Farming in Wisconsin is, for the most part, a family occupation. A student's responsibilities to his family and to his situation in his family must be fully considered in developing the farming programs.

Some of the greatest problems of the instructor in agriculture are involved in keeping up to date with the rapidly changing science and technology of agriculture.

Programs must also continually be developed to provide professional advancement to the instructors. The instructor in agriculture is a scientist. When he goes out to teach, he has studied more chemistry of various kinds than any other subject. He is continually called upon for a knowledge of soils, feeds, crops, and fertilizers as well as genetics, biology, and physical geography. He must have the opportunity for periods of intensive study.

NEED MORE GENERAL WORK

The instructor in agriculture is a vocational worker in an academic institution. The proportion of agricultural students to the student body of the school is bound to decrease. In Wisconsin, if we are to maintain really vocational programs there must be some actual decrease in the number of students under an instructor. As our rural nonfarm and urban population increases, more general agricultural schooling is needed to provide the necessary understanding of the problems of agriculture.

But a general agriculture program should not be developed at the expense of the vocational. Never have present and prospective farmers needed more training for farming and the necessary amount of training is going to increase rather than decrease.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

H.J. Res. 198. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Robert V. Fleming as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution (Rept. No. 58).

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

S. 102. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Wojczul (Rept. No. 61);

S. 210. A bill for the relief of Pantaleon Ibarra, also known as Elmo Gomes Archibiel (Rept. No. 62);

S. 244. A bill for the relief of Alexander Antoniou (Rept. No. 63);

S. 319. A bill for the relief of Theodore Burtzos (Rept. No. 64);

S. 323. A bill for the relief of David Forbes (Rept. No. 65);

S. 324. A bill for the relief of Johann Kalatschan (Rept. No. 66);

S. 333. A bill for the relief of Ethel Auth (Rept. No. 67);

S. 501. A bill for the relief of Balbina Borenstein (Rept. No. 68); and

S. 537. A bill for the relief of Benedict Eremenko (Ben Zuke), Victor Tatarnikov (Victor Kalin), Mikhail Ivankov-Nikolov

(Michael Nikolas), and Victor Solovvey (Rept. No. 69).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 46. A bill for the relief of Ben Chassin (Rept. No. 70);

S. 110. A bill for the relief of Yaeko Inouye (Rept. No. 71);

S. 191. A bill for the relief of Marie Silk (Rept. No. 72);

S. 320. A bill for the relief of Sofija Laica (Rept. No. 73); and

S. 322. A bill for the relief of Dr. Stasys Sereika (Rept. No. 74).

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

S. 192. A bill for the relief of Clarina Veiga (Rept. No. 75).

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

S. 667. A bill for the relief of Pauline D. Kimbrough (Rept. No. 76).

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

S. 611. A bill for the relief of Harry H. Nakamura (Rept. No. 59).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 607. A bill for the relief of the estate of Sinclair G. Stanley (Rept. No. 60).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 1206. A bill for the relief of Ljubica Dajcinovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1207. A bill for the relief of Rosette Sorge Savorgnan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

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

S. 1208. A bill to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 1209. A bill to clarify paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 363); to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1210. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HART, Mr. HILL, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SPARKMAN and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 1211. A bill to strengthen the Nation by providing auxiliary credit resources required to preserve the family-size farm, providing additional credit for farm enlargement and development, refinancing of existing indebtedness, expansion and simplification of farmownership and operations credit programs by amendment of the Bankhead-

Jones Farm Tenant Act, and extension and simplification of emergency and disaster farm credit by amendment of the acts of April 6, 1949, as amended August 31, 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 1212. A bill to revise the boundaries of Wright Brothers National Memorial, North Carolina, and for other purposes;

S. 1213. A bill to authorize Federal assistance to Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in major disasters;

S. 1214. A bill to amend the act of March 11, 1948 (62 Stat. 78), relating to the establishment of the De Soto National Memorial, in the State of Florida;

S. 1215. A bill to add certain public lands in California to the Pala Indian Reservation, the Pauma Indian Reservation, and the Cleveland National Forest, and for other purposes;

S. 1216. A bill 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. 1217. A bill to add certain public domain lands in Nevada to the Summit Lake Indian Reservation;

S. 1218. A bill to amend the act of December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1036, 43 U.S.C., sec. 36b), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands or interest in lands for the Geological Survey"; and

S. 1219. A bill to extend the leasing provisions of the act of June 14, 1926, as amended by the act of June 4, 1954 (68 Stat. 173; 43 U.S.C., secs. 869-869-3), to certain lands in Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1220. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to raise the amount of outside income recipients of insurance benefits thereunder are permitted to earn, to lower the age after which outside earnings are no longer considered for purposes of deductions from benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

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

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

S. 1221. 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; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1222. A bill for the relief of Floyd R. Lamb, Carlton Lamb, and Monte C. Lamb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON):

S. 1223. A bill for the relief of Alan John Coombs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1224. A bill for the relief of Corah Decker and Janet Decker Lincoln; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1225. A bill for the relief of Dr. Josephine Shou-Chen Chu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 1226. A bill to provide for the construction of the Knowles Dam project on the Flathead River in the State of Montana for the protection and development of the Flathead and Columbia River Basins; to

promote the agricultural and industrial development primarily of the State of Montana, but also of downstream areas; to improve navigability and to assist flood control on the Flathead and Columbia Rivers; to provide for the national defense and welfare by advancing the integrated comprehensive development of the water resources of the Pacific Northwest, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1227. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act so as to permit injured employees entitled to receive medical services under such act to utilize the services of chiropractors; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1228. A bill to amend Public Law 85-590 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

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

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

S. 1229. A bill for the relief of Delphia E. Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 1230. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt a corporation from the corporate income tax where its operations are carried on in an economically depressed area and provide employment for a specified minimum number of persons in that area; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 1231. A bill to prescribe the procedure of courts of the United States in the issuance of injunctions and the punishment of disobedience thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1232. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1233. A bill to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to clarify the status of the faculty and administrative status of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, to establish suitable personnel policies for such personnel, and for other purposes;

S. 1234. A bill to extend the provisions of title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to war-risk insurance, for an additional 5 years, ending September 7, 1965;

S. 1235. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences; and

S. 1236. A bill to amend section 432(g) of title 14, United States Code, so as to increase the limitation on basic compensation of civilian keepers of lighthouses and civilians employed on lightships and other vessels of the Coast Guard from \$3,750 to \$5,100 per annum; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 1237. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to provide for its more effective

administration, and to bring to bear an informed public opinion upon price and wage increases which threaten economic stability; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1238. A bill for the relief of Emily B. Grier, widow of Samuel Grier, Jr.; and

S. 1239. A bill for the relief of Herbert Westermann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1240. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property in the State of Mississippi to J. P. Carter; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1241. A bill for the relief of Sirvart Kasabian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEUBERGER (by request):

S. 1242. A bill to authorize the use of the revolving loan fund for Indians to assist Klamath Indians during the period for terminating Federal supervision; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

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

S. 1243. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, to establish standards of foreign language proficiency for the Foreign Service of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. PROXIMIRE, and Mr. BARTLETT):

S. 1244. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to establish policies with respect to productive capital investments of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 1245. A bill to promote mining and development research for beryl, chromite, and columbium-tantalum from domestic mines; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. PROXIMIRE:

S. 1246. A bill for the relief of Ahmed H. Moukaddem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12) to restate Federal responsibility toward Indians and the Federal Government's relation with Indian tribes or groups; which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

LIMITATION OF BUDGET EXPENDITURES DURING FISCAL YEAR 1960

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask that it be printed and lie on the desk for 3 days,

to enable other Senators who may wish to join me as cosponsors to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be received, and will lie on the desk for 3 days, and be printed.

The resolution (S. Res. 86) was received, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President and the Congress should cooperate in taking all necessary steps to limit budget expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, to \$77 billion, as contemplated in the budget for such year submitted by the President.

ROSETTE SORGE SAVORGNAN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Rosette Sorge Savorgnan. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1207) for the relief of Rosette Sorge Savorgnan, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Rosette Sorge Savorgnan, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 2 of the Citizenship Act of 1907, and sections 104, 401, and 403 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, may be naturalized by taking, prior to one year after the effective date of this Act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 301 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the appropriate oath prescribed by section 335 of the said Act. From and after naturalization under this Act the said Rosette Sorge Savorgnan shall have the same citizenship status which existed immediately prior to its loss.

CLARIFICATION OF PARAGRAPH 4, SECTION 15, PAY READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1942

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to clarify paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table for 1 week, in order that other interested Senators may join as cosponsors.

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

The bill (S. 1209) to clarify paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368), introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. KEFAUVER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

DONATIONS OF SURPLUS PROPERTY TO VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTING ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit donations of surplus Federal property to volunteer firefighting organizations.

It was my privilege to join with the late Senator Kerr Scott, of North Carolina, in sponsoring this same measure in the last Congress, S. 2745.

This bill would amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949. This act presently provides that personal property which becomes surplus to all Federal requirements may be donated without cost (except for costs of care and handling) for use in any State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Territories and possessions of the United States for use for purposes of education, public health, or civil defense, or for research for any such purpose when the property is determined by proper authority to be useful and necessary for such purposes.

The bill which I introduce today would amend the present act so as to include volunteer firefighting organizations.

There are thousands of volunteer firefighting organizations throughout the land which are inadequately equipped for their responsibilities in protecting life and property. Tens of thousands of civic-minded individuals give unstintingly of their time, effort, and resources to maintain these units. Modern fire engines may cost from \$25,000 to \$30,000 or even more. Other types of needed equipment are also costly.

Except for such engines volunteer firefighting organizations' equipment needs are relatively small, consisting of such items as water tanks, pumps, fire-hose, tank trucks, rope, axes, tarps, picks, shovels, lanterns, hooks, and, when a kitchen is maintained, items such as chinaware, knives, forks, spoons, and cooking utensils and sometimes stoves, and so forth. Witnesses have testified that much of the equipment is in Federal Government warehouses, unused and unwanted, and sometimes it is sold for scrap. Also that sales of this property are usually in larger lots than the volunteer firefighting organizations can afford to acquire, and hence they must purchase at higher retail prices.

Testimony has also revealed that many items of surplus firefighting equipment are not utilized by the Federal agencies nor by the education, health, and civil defense agencies and hence are sold at small return to the Government and then offered for sale to firefighting organizations. It is my opinion that this property bought with public funds, if useful and needed, should be donated to such a high public purpose as protecting life and property by volunteer firefighting organizations.

This proposal, I might add, Mr. President, passed the House of Representatives on August 12, 1958 (H.R. 13673). A similar bill has been offered in the House of Representatives by Mr. FOGARTY (H.R. 3722) again this year.

It is my hope that this measure will be promptly considered and enacted into law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RANDOLPH in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1210) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

FAMILY FARM YARDSTICK CREDIT ACT OF 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators BYRD of West Virginia, CARROLL, CHAVEZ, HART, HILL, KEFAUVER, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, MCCARTHY, MCGEE, MORSE, MOSS, MURRAY, NEUBERGER, PROXMIER, RANDOLPH, and SPARKMAN, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a "yardstick" family farm credit bill providing for liberalizing improvements in existing credit programs, as well as for the establishment of new credit services.

Not a day goes by without further evidence that additional credit sources are of vital necessity to the family farmers of this country. Every mail delivery to my office brings accounts from individual farmers telling of their plight. Continued falling farm prices, rising costs of what the farmer must buy to stay in business, and higher interest rates on his increased indebtedness, are more than the farmer can stand without more credit assistance.

Last session, when I introduced a bill similar to this, I pointed out that we are in another of those eras which have come twice in the past 50 years when the Nation must make a major reform in its farm credit policy. This was indisputably true then, and it is indisputably true now. In these past 2 years, the need has intensified. In the interim, too many farmers have been forced to give up their occupation and move into town where they were confronted with rising industrial unemployment. Some tell me that they have changed their type of farming operations so that they might sell their farm machinery for enough cash to carry on for still another year.

Mr. President, these farmers have been in a deepening depression, brought about not because they were inefficient producers, or bad businessmen, but because national farm policies have not been planned or executed with the wholehearted intention of using agricultural resources and production wisely. Corrective legislation is needed in many phases of agriculture. The bill which I am introducing today with my colleagues deals with the farm credit phase, and I recommend that it be given careful consideration and approval.

Let me point out that this bill maintains the yardstick 5-percent interest rate set up in existing law. Attempts have been made to eliminate this protective yardstick in the law, but happily Congress saw fit to block such attempts.

There is certainly no inflation in the agricultural segment of the economy which could give even a surface justification for increasing the interest rates on farm credit.

As long as private commercial credit sources are able and willing to meet the farmers' credit needs at 5 percent interest, farmers are not eligible for the lower cost loans proposed in this legislation. It is only when private credit sources lift their interest rates beyond the farmers' ability to pay that Federal programs should offer an emergency backstop. That is the yardstick aim of this proposed legislation.

In brief, here is what this measure would do:

First. Reactivate the former depression-time programs of the Department of Agriculture for assisting farmers and creditors with voluntary farm debt adjustment procedures;

Second. Reestablish the policy of adjusting repayment schedules on farm loans to a variable basis taking into consideration the net earnings of borrowers from year to year;

Third. Create a comprehensive family farm development or domestic point 4 program in the 500 most poverty stricken rural counties of the Nation. This urgently needed program was developed basically by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] out of hearings he conducted several years ago to seek a long-range answer to the problems of low-income farmers. His recommendations should have been implemented long ago. The rural development program instituted by the Department of Agriculture is no more than a token effort in this direction. There is no solid base for action in the Department's so-called program. It serves to give an illusion of action, thus diverting attention and efforts away from a worthy program such as proposed here.

Fourth. Lower interest rates and expand loan authorizations for both farm ownership and farm operating loans under existing programs for those farmers who are unable to borrow through commercial channels at not to exceed 5 percent interest rate.

Fifth. Raise maximum permissible size of water-facility loans to cooperatives, irrigation districts, and municipalities.

Sixth. Amend the Production Disaster Loan Act to extend the special livestock loan program, and add refinancing of existing indebtedness as a permissible purpose for such loans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a more complete analysis of the bill, section by section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis of the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1211) to strengthen the Nation by providing auxiliary credit resources required to preserve the family-size farm, providing additional credit for farm enlargement and development, refinancing of existing indebtedness, expansion and simplification of farm ownership and operations credit pro-

grams by amendment of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and extension and simplification of emergency and disaster farm credit by amendment of the acts of April 6, 1949, as amended, and August 31, 1954, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED FAMILY FARM YARDSTICK CREDIT ACT OF 1959

The proposed bill provides for improving amendments in the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended; the Water Facilities Loan Act; the Emergency and Livestock Loans Act (formerly RACC); the special Emergency Loan Act of August 31, 1954, as amended; directs the Secretary of Agriculture to reactivate the program of assisting farmers and creditors with voluntary farm debt adjustment procedures; and reestablishes the policy of adjusting repayment schedules of loans to the net earnings of borrowers from year to year.

Section 2 of the proposed bill amends title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, providing for long-term loans to farm tenants and part- and full-time farmowners to buy farms or enlarge their units, as follows:

Reduces the rate of interest charges to the borrower from 5 to 3 percent.

Increases the authorization for annual appropriation for such loans from \$50 million to \$200 million beginning in fiscal year 1959.

Increases mortgage insurance guarantee fund for insured private long-term farm loans from \$25 million to \$50 million.

Reduces interest rate paid to insured private lenders from 4 percent to 3 percent—this would involve the Government absorbing the cost of the loan insurance risk and administration of such insured loans—since under the amendment the borrower would be charged 3 percent interest on such insured loans and the entire payment would go to the insured creditor. Under existing law the borrower pays 5 percent interest and the creditor gets 4 percent, the Government taking the 1 percent difference.

Eliminates the existing requirement that only farms smaller than average size in the county can be purchased with proceeds of these loans.

Eliminates the existing requirement that the borrower be charged initial service fees for inspection, appraisal and other service charges, and also eliminates the requirement that the borrower pay the 1 percent annual mortgage insurance charge.

Section 3 of the proposed bill amends title II "Farm Operating Loans" of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, as follows:

Raises the permissible maximum amount of an initial loan from \$10,000 to \$35,000 and the permissible size of total indebtedness from \$20,000 to \$50,000.

Reduces rate of interest charged the farmer-borrower from 5 percent to 3 percent.

Eliminates the 7-year maximum period of indebtedness which existing law allows the Secretary to set aside up to 10 years.

Note: The proposed bill does not change any other provisions of existing farm ownership and farm operating loans titles of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; of special note is that the proposed bill does not either raise or lower the requirement in existing law that a borrower leave the program whenever he can obtain other commercial credit at not to exceed 5 percent per annum; nor does the proposed bill change the requirement that a potential borrower shall have

exhausted all other possible sources of obtaining needed credit at not to exceed 5 percent interest before being considered eligible to apply for loans under these programs. The proposed bill neither raises the yardstick-5-percent-interest-figure of existing law nor lowers it.

Section 4 of the proposed bill raises from \$5 to \$15 the permissible maximum per diem payment of county Farmers Home Administration committeemen when engaged in public business in connection with their official duties under the law; and reduces from 5 percent to 3 percent the maximum interest rate the Secretary may charge to farmers under provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

Section 5 of the proposed bill raises the maximum permissible size of water facility loans to cooperatives, irrigation districts and municipalities from \$250,000 to \$1 million, and eliminates requirement that water facility borrowers pay certain mortgage insurance and service charges and fees; and establishes as 3 percent per annum the maximum rate of interest that the Secretary of Agriculture may require the borrower to pay for water facility loans.

Section 6 of the proposed bill amends the Production Disaster Loan Act (Public Law 38) as follows:

Eliminates the July 14, 1961, termination date of the special livestock loan program and eliminates from the language of the act the already repealed provisions prohibiting such loans of smaller than \$2,500.

Adds refinancing of existing indebtedness as a permissible purpose for special livestock loans.

Raises the permissible repayment period of special livestock loans from 3 years to 10 years.

Eliminates requirement that large loans be personally reviewed and approved by the Secretary and reduces the maximum chargeable rate of interest from 5 percent per annum to 3 percent.

Authorizes a special loan-in-kind program allowing Secretary to extend all or part of proceeds of special livestock loans from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of feed grains and also allows repayment in kind. These special food loans must be repaid within 3 years at 3 percent interest.

Section 7 of the proposed bill amends the special Emergency Loan Act approved August 31, 1954, as amended, as follows:

Eliminates the June 30, 1959, termination date.

Eliminates the \$65 million aggregate limitation of total loans of this type that may be made during life of the law.

Eliminates the \$15,000 maximum amount of any one loan and the maximum of \$20,000 indebtedness to any one borrower of such loans provided in existing law.

Keeps existing maximum interest rate of 3 percent on such loans.

Eliminates requirement that a prospective borrower live in an area that has been designated as a disaster area.

Section 8 of the proposed bill adds a new title V to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, which new title V provides for the establishment of a family farm development program in not to exceed the 500 most poverty-stricken rural counties of the Nation. The family farm development program established by this new title provides (a) direct and insured loans and technical advisory assistance to farmers and stockmen to encourage and facilitate their development of economically-adequate full and part-time family farms; (b) strengthening of the services of the State employment services in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Labor to facilitate and ease the economic adjustments of farm people who wish to obtain part- and full-time off-farm employment; (c) directs the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide

special augmented adult vocational training in both farm and nonfarm work in the designated counties; and (d) provides that agencies of the executive branch shall provide technical advisory and service assistance to encourage more rapid industrialization of the low income rural areas in the designated counties.

Section 9 of the proposed bill prohibits the Secretary of Agriculture from requiring the borrowers, or the lenders in insured programs, under any of these farm loan programs to pay fees or make other payments for insuring or servicing of the loans.

Section 10 of the proposed bill makes mandatory the existing discretionary authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to reactivate the voluntary farm debt adjustment program formerly conducted by the Farmers Home Administration and its predecessor agencies.

Section 11 of the proposed bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of Agriculture to establish with respect to all loans authorized by the act variable repayment plans with payments adjusted, without regard to previous ahead-of-schedule repayments, to the net earnings and debt-paying capacity of the borrower from year to year. Existing law permits the Secretary to establish such a variable repayment schedule only if the borrower has previously gotten ahead of schedule on his repayments.

INCREASED AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend Public Law 85-590, last year's AEC Authorization Act, to increase the authorization for project 59-c-5 from \$2,250,000 to \$3,550,000.

This is an important atomic weapons project at Los Alamos which was authorized by the Congress last year. The AEC has found that the estimated cost has increased by \$1,300,000, which is more than the 25 percent permitted under the act, and therefore has requested authorization of the larger amount.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point, the letter from the Atomic Energy Commission to me dated February 24, 1959, forwarding the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1228) to amend Public Law 85-590 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The letter presented by Mr. ANDERSON is as follows:

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., February 24, 1959.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: I have submitted today to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate, proposed legislation which would amend the 1959 Authorization Act (Public Law 85-590) to increase the amount authorized for project 59-c-5, phermex installation, Los Alamos, N. Mex., to \$3,500,000 from \$2,250,000.

The increase of \$1,300,000 is attributable to a sharp rise in the cost of components, the need for considerably more monitoring and control equipment than had been originally anticipated and changes in machine design to insure more satisfactory performance. No change is being made in the scope of the project. Since even greater emphasis must be placed upon nonnuclear methods of development during a test moratorium, the need for the phermex installation becomes more compelling than at the time the project was originally requested.

Copies of the proposed legislation and the unclassified analysis of the project are enclosed. Copies of the classified analysis will be furnished separately to your staff.

Sincerely yours,

H. S. VANCE,
Acting Chairman.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, RELATING TO OUTSIDE INCOME OF CERTAIN RECIPIENTS OF INSURANCE BENEFITS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill which I am introducing today, to increase, from \$1,200 to \$2,400, the amount of outside income which recipients of insurance benefits under the Social Security Act may be permitted to earn, in view of the impact of inflation upon the purchasing power of social security pensions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1220) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to raise the amount of outside income recipients of insurance benefits thereunder are permitted to earn, to lower the age after which outside earnings are no longer considered for purposes of deductions from benefits, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROCEDURE OF U.S. COURTS IN ISSUANCE OF CERTAIN INJUNCTIONS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the true significance of the term "civil rights" has become obscured by the political connotations given it in recent years.

Historically and constitutionally, the civil rights of the American people are those inalienable individual freedoms which are insured in perpetuity by the Bill of Rights of our Constitution.

They are the rights which begin with freedom of religion and extend through all other rights not prohibited to the individual by the Constitution.

They do not include fancied rights synthesized in the imaginations of political opportunists as lures for the votes of this or that pivotal minority.

Neither are they sometime things to be alternately enjoyed and denied according to the dictates of expediency or the whims of whatever majority may be in control of Congress at any given time.

Our Founding Fathers knew from the lessons of history that people lose their civil rights because of governmental action. And it was in recognition of that fact of life that they wrote into the Bill of Rights express prohibitions against

any governmental interference with the enjoyment of them.

While it hardly is likely that the framers of our form of government considered any of the rights which they enumerated in the Constitution to be any more or less important than others, it is most interesting to note that only one was specified more than once.

That is the right of trial by jury which is guaranteed in four separate passages of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Section II of article III provides that "the trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury."

The fifth amendment states that "no person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous offense, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury."

The sixth amendment guarantees that "in all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed."

And the seventh amendment specifies that "in suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed \$20, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved."

No other conclusion can be drawn from the sum of those four passages, Mr. President, but that the men who founded this Nation considered the right of trial by jury to be fundamental to the preservation of individual liberty and the maintenance of constitutional government.

It is more than coincidental, Mr. President, that those who have cried the loudest for legislation to force compliance with their notions of civil rights also are those who have been the most active in seeking to weaken, circumscribe and destroy the right of trial by jury.

The most recent case in point is found in the debates leading up to the unfortunate passage of the misnamed Civil Rights Act of 1957 by the 1st session of the 85th Congress.

Proponents of that legislation wanted a statute which would have permitted the summary punishment without jury trial of individuals accused by the Attorney General of the United States of violating someone's civil rights. They argued in defense of their position that Congress already had set the precedent for such action in enacting 28 regulatory acts beginning with the Interstate Commerce Commission Act of 1887.

Happily, that bill was shorn of its infamous part III by the Senate; but, unhappily, with regard to voting, it placed an unconstitutional qualification upon the right of trial by jury in that it authorized Federal judges to impose jail sentences up to 45 days and fines up to \$300 without jury trials.

It cannot be denied, Mr. President, that Congress in conditioning the right of trial by jury and by placing a dollars-and-cents premium upon its exercise violated the constitutional prohibition against the enactment of laws respecting the enjoyment of rights enumerated in the Bill of Rights.

I wish to reiterate, Mr. President, the strong feelings about that so-called compromise which I expressed before the

Senate at the time it was adopted. I said:

If a thing is right, it is right and it must be upheld. If it is wrong, it is wrong and it must be denied.

There is no middle ground when it comes to fundamental truths and basic rights. The question of right and wrong is a question of black and white. There can be no shading of gray in the definition of either.

That is true of the right of Americans to trial by jury.

That right either is fundamental or it is not.

That right either is guaranteed by the Constitution or it is not.

That right either is inalienable with the individual or it is not.

If our Founding Fathers had meant that the right of trial by jury should depend upon the benign generosity of an appointed Federal judge, I believe they would have so specified in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

If our Founding Fathers had felt that it was constitutional for appointed Federal judges to incarcerate American citizens for 45 days and fine them \$300 on their own arbitrary motions, I believe they would have so provided in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

It was on that same occasion, Mr. President, that I sought to emphasize that the mere fact that trial by jury has been denied in 23 instances is no justification for denying it a 29th time. As I stated at that time:

Jury trial opponents have sought to make much of the fact that there are now 28 laws under which Congress has authorized contempt proceedings without jury trials. Granted that that is true, it must be pointed out that none of them apply to individuals; and, even assuming they did, there is no logic under which justice can be built upon injustice or two wrongs added together to make a right.

One of the most lamentable developments of modern history, Mr. President, has been the ever-broadening tendency to extend the jurisdiction of courts of equity so as to invest them, in effect, with the enforcement of criminal laws.

The result has been to frustrate the administration of justice at the hands of a jury of one's peers and to substitute government by injunction for government by law.

The right of trial by jury both in criminal cases and in suits at common law was aptly described by the distinguished senior Senators from North Carolina and South Carolina (Mr. ERVIN and Mr. JOHNSTON) in their minority views on the Senate version of the 1957 civil rights bill as "the best part of the inheritance of America from England." They emphasized that trial by jury "is the best security of the people against governmental oppression" and pointed out that "tyranny on the bench is as objectionable as tyranny on the throne."

The early history of this Nation affords a graphic example of the tyranny which results from denial of trial by jury in the attempt by King George III to enforce the Stamp Act and other oppressive measures through the courts of admiralty in which trial by jury was not permitted.

As we all know, our forefathers listed deprivation of "the benefits of trial by jury" as one of the "injuries and usurpa-

tions" which led them to fight for their independence.

Those who contend that trial by jury should be limited or denied because juries sometimes do not convict either forget or choose to ignore that the basis of American jurisprudence is that the accused is presumed to be innocent until proved guilty. Only in totalitarian countries is it otherwise and to my mind it would be far better for 100 guilty men to go free than for 1 innocent person to be punished.

No free man, Mr. President, should be forced by his government to place his life, freedom, or property in jeopardy except upon the judgment of a jury of 12 of his equals.

It is true, Mr. President, that juries sometimes err. But I submit that it is far more likely that any error made will be made by one judge secure in his life tenure than by 12 impartial citizens cognizant of the fact that their fates, too, might some day rest in the hands of their peers.

I am in complete agreement, Mr. President, with the words of that great liberal, the late Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, who declared in this Chamber in advocating the adoption of the Norris-La Guardia Act in 1932:

I agree that any man charged with contempt in any court of the United States in any case, no matter what it is, ought to have a jury trial. It is no answer to say that there will sometimes be juries which will not convict. That is a charge which can be made against our jury system. Every man who has tried lawsuits before juries, every man who has ever presided in court and heard jury trials knows that juries make mistakes, as all other human beings do, and they sometimes render verdicts which seem almost obnoxious. But it is the best system I know of. I would not have it abolished; and when I see how juries will really do justice when a biased and prejudiced judge is trying to lead them astray I am confirmed in my opinion that after all, our jury system is one which the American people, who believe in liberty and justice, will not dare to surrender. I like to have trial by jury preserved in all kinds of cases where there is a dispute of facts.

It is out of that conviction, Mr. President, that I am today introducing a bill proposing to amend titles 18 and 28 of the United States Code to guarantee that all individuals cited for contempt in Federal courts shall have "a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the contempt shall have been committed."

Furthermore, Mr. President, my bill specifies that no person can be bound by a Federal injunction unless one of three essential conditions is met. They are: First, unless the individual is a party to the proceeding; second, unless the individual is named in the injunction and is served with a true copy of it; or, third, unless the injunction is read and explained by a judge in open court in the presence of the individual named in it.

The measure would apply, Mr. President, in all cases of contempt of court involving individuals except in those instances of contempt committed in the presence of the court.

Mr. President, I have made my bill applicable only to individuals for two reasons: First, because the right of trial by jury is one of those rights vested by

the Constitution in the individual; and second, I have no desire to upset the Nation's body of regulatory law without a full study of all its ramifications.

However, I wish to state before the Senate that I personally favor assuring the right of trial by jury in all cases in which there are facts to be determined with the one exception of cases of direct contempt committed in the presence of the court. And I would be pleased to join with those who profess interest in protecting the civil rights of Americans to make certain that every American, corporate and individual, is accorded that right when before the courts.

The enactment of such a law, Mr. President, would protect all Americans from abuses arising through misuse of the judicial power of contempt and would constitute the most significant civil rights legislation to come out of Congress since the adoption of the Bill of Rights.

Mr. President, I herewith introduce my bill to be read twice and appropriately referred and ask unanimous consent that the text of it be printed at this juncture as a portion of my remarks.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1231) to prescribe the procedure of courts of the United States in the issuance of injunctions and the punishment of disobedience thereof, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TALLMADGE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) sections 3691 and 3692 of title 18 of the United States Code are amended to read as follows:

"§ 3691. Jury trial of criminal contempts—generally

"Whenever a contempt charged shall consist in willful disobedience of any lawful writ, process, order, rule, decree, or command of any district court of the United States (other than an injunction or restraining order) by doing or omitting any act or thing in violation thereof, and the act or thing done or omitted also constitutes a criminal offense under any Act of Congress, or under the laws of any State in which it was done or omitted, the accused, upon demand therefor, shall be entitled to trial by a jury, which shall conform as near as may be to the practice in other criminal cases.

"This section shall not apply to contempts committed in the presence of the court, or so near thereto as to obstruct the administration of justice, nor to contempts committed in disobedience of any lawful writ, process, order, rule, decree, or command entered in any suit or action brought or prosecuted in the name of, or on behalf of, the United States.

"§ 3692. Jury trial of criminal contempts—
injunctions and restraining orders

"In all cases of contempt arising from the disobedience of any injunction or restraining order the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the contempt shall have been committed. This paragraph shall not apply to contempts committed in the presence of the court or so near thereto as to interfere directly with the

administration of justice nor to the misbehavior, misconduct, or disobedience of any officer of the court in respect to the writs, orders, or process of the court.

"No individual may be punished for contempt arising from the disobedience of any such injunction or restraining order unless—

"(a) such individual was a party to the proceeding in which such injunction or restraining order was issued, or willfully combined or conspired with any party to such proceeding to violate any prohibition or requirement of such injunction or restraining order;

"(b) such individual before such disobedience received notice of the terms and conditions of such injunction or restraining order through (1) the service upon him of a true and correct copy of such injunction or restraining order, or (2) a full and complete oral explanation of the provisions of such injunction or restraining order and the effect thereof given by the judge in open court in the presence of such individual at the time of the issuance thereof; and

"(c) the prohibitions and requirements of such injunction or restraining order were described therein with sufficient particularity and certainty to provide adequate notice to such individual as to the specific acts prohibited or required thereby.

This paragraph shall not apply to any proceeding for the punishment of any individual for any act or omission committed in his capacity as a director, officer, employee agent, or member of, or attorney for, any corporation, partnership, association, or labor union in disobedience of any injunction or restraining order issued against and duly served upon such corporation, partnership, association, or labor union."

(b) The analysis of chapter 233 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"Sec.

"3691. Jury trial of criminal contempts—generally.

"3692. Jury trial of criminal contempts—
injunctions and restraining orders.

"3693. Summary disposition or jury trial;
notice—rule."

Sec. 2. (a) Chapter 155 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 2285. Injunctions and restraining orders—
requirements

"Every injunction or restraining order issued by any court of the United States must describe each prohibition and requirement imposed thereby with sufficient particularity and certainty to provide adequate notice to each individual subject thereto as to the specific acts prohibited or required thereby. Each such injunction or restraining order must name specifically each individual who is subject to each prohibition and requirement imposed thereby, except that—

"(a) an injunction or restraining order issued against any corporation, partnership, association, or labor union may be made applicable to directors, officers, employees, agents and members thereof, and attorneys therefor, without naming in such injunction or restraining order each such individual; and

"(b) an injunction or restraining order may be issued against a specifically described class or group of individuals if (1) the court determines, upon a satisfactory showing made by the applicant therefor, that each such individual cannot be named specifically and that the applicant would suffer immediate irreparable harm if such injunction or order were not made applicable with respect to such class or group, and (2) such injunction or restraining order provides specifically that it shall not apply with respect to any individual until such individual has received notice of the terms and conditions of such injunction or restraining order

through (A) the service upon him of a true and correct copy thereof, or (B) a full and complete oral explanation of the provisions thereof and their effect given by the judge in open court in the presence of such individual at the time of the issuance thereof. This section shall not relieve any court or party from compliance with any additional requirement prescribed by any statute or rule of court for the issuance of any injunction or restraining order."

(b) The analysis of such chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"2285. Injunctions and restraining orders—
requirements."

STATUS OF FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF AT MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to clarify the status of the faculty and administrative staff at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, to establish suitable personnel policies for such personnel, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement of the purpose of the bill, together with a sectional analysis, may be printed in the RECORD.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement and sectional analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1233) to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to clarify the status of the faculty and administrative staff of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, to establish suitable personnel policies for such personnel, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement of the purpose and sectional analysis of the bill, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, are as follows:

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 216, MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, AS AMENDED

GENERAL PURPOSE

In the administration of the maritime training program under section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1126) since 1942, it has been the practice of the former Maritime Commission and of the Department of Commerce (to which the Maritime Commission was transferred in 1950) to enroll in the U.S. Maritime Service not only volunteers for training and reserve purposes, known as trainee enrollees, but also other persons assigned to administrative duties, known as administrative enrollees. The term "administrative enrollees" includes the employees serving as the permanent cadre at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N.Y., which comprises the executive staff, administrative force, faculty, custodial, and service groups.

These administrative enrollees have been employed (i.e., "enrolled") under the authority of the above-mentioned section of the Merchant Marine Act. They have been given ranks and ratings, and have been compensated and granted allowances at rates similar to those provided by law for the Coast Guard under authority of section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, the annual appropriation

acts, and section 509 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by the act of May 19, 1952 (66 Stat. 79). The enrollees have been granted leave under a leave system prescribed by regulations pursuant to implied power under the Merchant Marine Act. Insofar as circumstances and applicable laws have permitted, administrative enrollees have been administered on the same basis as members of a military-type organization performing similar duties.

Over the years a number of questions have been considered by the Civil Service Commission, General Accounting Office, and Department of Justice concerning the employment status of these employees. In order to clarify and regularize the employment status of administrative enrollees, it has become apparent that it would be administratively desirable to convert the enrollees, as far as practicable and appropriate, to positions subject to the same civil service, compensation, and leave laws, which are generally applicable to other civilian employees of the United States.

In the interest of simplified and more efficient administration, and of making available and preserving to these employees the same benefits as are granted to other civilian employees of the United States, the Department of Commerce and the Civil Service Commission have reached agreement (1) that an appropriate, flexible system of employment and compensation should be provided by law for the faculty of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, similar to that now provided for the faculty at the Naval Academy; (2) that future appointments to nonfaculty positions should be made in accordance with the civil service and classification laws (except as otherwise authorized by law, e.g., to wage board positions); and (3) that present administrative enrollees should be converted to positions subject to the civil service, classification, and leave laws under provisions of law which will authorize adjustments to be made that will avoid undue personal hardship or inequity to the employees and avoid any adverse effect upon the efficiency of the Academy.

As a result of careful study for several years of the problems involved in effecting this transition for persons presently serving as administrative enrollees, the Department, the Civil Service Commission, and the General Accounting Office have reached agreement that legislation is necessary to (1) provide an appropriate compensation system of the type described above for faculty members at the Merchant Marine Academy; (2) avoid serious loss of compensation to nonfaculty administrative enrollees upon conversion to positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or to wage-board positions; (3) avoid serious curtailment of enrollees' existing leave benefits upon conversion to a position under the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, as amended; and (4) provide for creditability of prior service as administrative enrollees for all purposes.

The proposed legislation would accomplish these purposes and enable the Department to administer these positions on the same basis as other comparable civilian positions in the Government service. Upon enactment of this legislation, it is contemplated that faculty members will be employed under excepted appointments authorized by the Civil Service Commission under schedule A of the civil service rules, and that they will be compensated under a system of compensation appropriate to the requirements of an accredited educational institution and similar to that now provided for the faculty of the Naval Academy. It is contemplated that nonfaculty administrative enrollees will be employed under the civil service laws, and that they will be compensated in accordance

with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or an appropriate prevailing wage schedule, as appropriate. Both groups of employees will receive leave, medical and other benefits under the same laws as apply generally to other civilian employees of the Government.

In view of the fact that the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, currently the only federally operated maritime training installation, was made a permanent institution by Public Law 415, 84th Congress, the Department recommends favorable consideration of the attached proposed legislation in order that basic personnel policies and problems in administering the maritime training program may be considered and acted upon by the Congress. The need for clarifying the status of administrative enrollees of the U.S. Maritime Service in order that present uncertainties may be eliminated and the Merchant Marine Academy may proceed on a stable basis in personnel matters was recognized in the Report of the 12th Congressional Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy. The report included the following provision:

"The Board urges those charged with carrying on the discussions directed toward establishing the status of the administrative enrollees of the U.S. Maritime Service to make every effort to bring about an appropriate resolution of this problem, to the end that suitable personnel policies may be established."

Additionally, the report of the Advisory Board to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, made to the Maritime Administrator, U.S. Department of Commerce, May 2, 1957, stated, among other things, "the Maritime Administrator has issued appropriate orders defining the status of the existing faculty and setting forth probationary periods for those to be appointed to the faculty in the future. This is all that could have been done and it has been well done. But the position of the faculty at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy will not be thoroughly satisfactory until appropriate legislation has been enacted."

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

Section 216(a): This section is amended to (1) Make clear that henceforth enrollments will be made only for training and reserve purposes in the U.S. Maritime Service, as distinguished from administrative duty purposes such as instruction of trainees, clerical work, maintenance work, and the like; (2) make clear that the Secretary's authority to fix the rates of pay for trainees also includes authority to fix their allowances; (3) provide clear authority for the Secretary to prescribe and regulate the furnishing and wearing of uniforms of persons in the Service; (4) transfer to a new subsection (e) the existing provision for employment of instructors; and (5) make an appropriate, minor correction in a pronoun in the second sentence to refer to discretion transferred to the Secretary from the former Maritime Commission.

Section 216(e): This subsection would provide authority for the employment, and compensation without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, of all levels of civilian professors, lecturers, and instructors as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, as amended. Such professors, lecturers, and instructors would be considered civilian officers and employees of the United States for purposes of laws of general application to civilian employees of the United States.

Under existing law the Civil Service Commission is empowered to authorize the Department to employ professors, lecturers, and instructors under excepted appointments, on the same basis (schedule A) as is now pro-

vided for the faculty at the Naval Academy. This section will also make possible the establishment of an appropriate compensation system for the faculty of the Merchant Marine Academy, similar to that provided for faculty of the Naval Academy.

Section 216(f): This subsection provides for (1) conversion of existing administrative enrollees, both faculty and nonfaculty, on a date mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of Commerce and the Civil Service Commission, in order to effect an orderly transition; (2) clear-cut legal recognition that after conversion, former administrative enrollees will be subject to laws of general applicability to civilian employees of the United States except as otherwise authorized by law; and (3) certain authority necessary to make possible the conversion of enrollees without undue personal hardship or inequity and without any adverse effect upon the efficiency of the Merchant Marine Academy, with particular reference to compensation, leave, and creditability of prior service for various purposes.

Section 216(f)(1): This subsection defines how the basic compensation of administrative enrollees shall be determined upon conversion and provides for salary-saving and related safeguards in order to avoid reducing the compensation of enrollees as a result of conversion. For example, if an administrative enrollee's total basic pay, quarters and subsistence allowances amount to \$5,226.70, and his position is classified at Grade GS-5, he would have his salary set at GS-5, \$5,240, which is the next longevity rate over the total amount he is receiving for basic pay, quarters and subsistence. An enrollee receiving a total of \$8,850.96 for basic pay, subsistence and quarters allowances whose position is classified at GS-10, for which the maximum longevity rate of the grade is \$7,855, will have his salary set at \$8,950, which is the top longevity step at GS-11, until he leaves such position, or otherwise is entitled to receive a higher rate by reason of operation of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or other applicable law, as indicated below.

This subsection applies only to persons serving as administrative enrollees on the date preceding the date of conversion. It does not provide retroactive benefits to any person.

Section 216(f)(2): This paragraph makes provision to specifically ensure what is commonly referred to as salary saving by establishing the fact that the basic compensation as set upon conversion, as provided for in section 216(f)(1), will continue until the employee affected thereby is either separated from his position or receives a higher rate of basic compensation by operation of law or regulation as might occur in the case of promotion, Federal salary adjustments, etc.

Section 216(f)(3): This paragraph takes cognizance of the fact that administrative enrollees have earned, accumulated and used annual leave on a calendar day basis, and most enrollees have a much greater leave accumulation than the accumulation which would be authorized on conversion of such personnel under provisions of the Annual and Sick Leave Act. This paragraph would provide for the conversion of all unused annual leave without actual loss of leave for purposes of future use to the enrollee on the basis of 5 work days' leave for each 7 calendar days of leave.

Administrative enrollees are authorized to take sick leave, up to 4 months in emergencies, as may be necessary, but do not accumulate sick leave. If they had been permitted to accumulate sick leave, most administrative enrollees by reason of their length of service would now have a large accumulation of sick leave. To minimize the effect of losing the sick leave benefits to which administrative enrollees have been entitled, it is proposed that they be credited

on the date of conversion with 13 days' sick leave. Thereafter, sick leave credits would accrue on the same basis as for other employees subject to the Annual and Sick Leave Act.

Section 216(f) (4): This paragraph makes specific provision to recognize active service as an administrative enrollee performed prior to the date fixed for conversion as civilian employment creditable for all purposes in the executive branch of the Federal Government, with the exception that in computing length of service as used under the Classification Act for the determination of one periodic step increase or one longevity step increase, all such prior service shall be counted toward the attainment of same which occurred immediately preceding the date fixed for conversion, as provided in subsection (f). Thus, for such basic purposes as retirement, leave accruals, seniority, length-of-service awards, etc., all previous active service as an administrative enrollee would be creditable as civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for every purpose, except that in computation of length of service for salary step increases or longevity step increases, only such service as was continuous and uninterrupted immediately prior to the date fixed for conversion would be creditable in the determination of said step increases. Under these circumstances, an employee's salary thus established which is less than the maximum scheduled rate of the grade would be immediately considered against the requirements for one periodic step increase; and, as provided in subsection (f) (1), for purposes of determining eligibility for a periodic step increase, the basic compensation as an administrative enrollee would be considered as the total amount or value of basic pay, subsistence and quarters allowances. Such prior service and basic compensation would also be considered in determining eligibility toward the 10-year aggregate period and 3-year waiting periods for one longevity step increase.

Section 216(f) (5): Administrative enrollees disenrolled from the Maritime Service are entitled to payment of travel and transportation expenses to their place of enrollment, etc., whether or not such transportation is actually furnished in kind. Administrative enrollees on active duty also receive free medical, dental, surgical and hospital care under the provisions of paragraph (6) of section 322 of the Public Health Service Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 696, U.S.C. 249).

This paragraph is for the purpose of making two practical provisions. First, it provides that administrative enrollees who accept conversion shall forfeit such rights to travel and transportation expenses. Those who elect to resign prior to conversion will be entitled to such benefits in keeping with the terms under which they were "enrolled" as administrative enrollees. Second, it provides that administrative enrollees after the effective date of conversion as authorized by this legislation shall not continue to receive free medical, dental, surgical and hospital care pursuant to paragraph (6) of section 322 of the Public Health Service Act of 1944.

EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF TITLE XII OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, RELATING TO WAR RISK INSURANCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend the provisions of title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to war risk insurance, for an additional 5 years, ending September 7, 1965.

There is attached to the bill, a statement, outlining the purpose and provi-

sions of this bill, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1234) to extend the provisions of title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to war risk insurance, for an additional 5 years, ending September 7, 1965, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

The bill would extend the life of title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1281, et seq.) for an additional 5 years. Section 1214 of the act now provides for expiration of marine war risk insurance authority September 7, 1960.

The Marine War Risk Insurance Act (title XII, 1936 act), which will expire September 7, 1960, is standby legislation which authorizes the Secretary of Commerce with the approval of the President, to provide war risk and certain marine and liability insurance for protection of vessels, cargoes, and crews and personal effects, when commercial insurance cannot be obtained on reasonable terms and conditions. At present, as at the time of enactment of the War Risk Insurance Act, commercial policies covering maritime war risks are issued only subject to automatic termination clauses in the event of outbreak of war between any of the four powers—United States, France, Great Britain, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Even though the United States may not be involved immediately, American vessels would be without protection against loss by risks of war. Ships and cargoes could not be moved without adequate insurance coverage.

War risk insurance was provided by the Government in both World Wars I and II, and proved both necessary and effective in protecting the United States and its civilian and military commerce, with premium receipts in excess of losses paid.

Arrangements necessary to have war risk insurance immediately available when its protection is needed for the commerce of the United States are in effect under the Marine War Risk Insurance Act. The United States is now prepared to put into effect in case of need a full wartime insurance program on hulls, cargoes, and personnel.

General Order 75 (revised) of Maritime Administration, published in the Federal Register on February 28, 1957, states that the Maritime Administrator is prepared to provide hull, protection and indemnity, and crew life and personal effects war risk insurance as specified in section 1203 (a), (d), (e), and (f) of title XII, except for vessels under construction as specified in section 1203 (a), for the interim period between the time commercial insurance subject to the automatic termination clauses is automatically terminated through the operation of such clauses and the time a full wartime insurance program is placed in effect.

Binders and extensions of binders outstanding as of September 30, 1958, were hull, 917; protection and indemnity, 914; and crew life and personal effects, 825. Amendment 2 to General Order 75, published in the Federal Register on July 2, 1958, extended the expiration date of interim binders to September 7, 1959.

Binder and extension fees (not premiums) have been collected up to and including September 30, 1958, in a net amount of \$204,625.48, after payment of agency fees and

expenses. General Order 82, published in the Federal Register on November 1, 1958, establishes title XII war risk hull insurance values, pursuant to Public Law 958, 84th Congress, for certain self-propelled ocean-going iron and steel vessels.

Under the authority of section 1203 (a) of title XII war risk insurance on American vessels under construction in shipyards in the United States (which insurance is not available in the commercial market), has been furnished. As of September 30, 1958, the Maritime Administration was providing such insurance on 22 vessels under construction. From the inception of this program to September 30, 1958, premiums received have totaled \$532,717.73.

At the request of the Secretary of the Navy, second seamen's war risk insurance is being provided without premium, as authorized under sections 1205 and 1206 of title XII, on tankers operated for the account of the Military Sea Transportation Service. This arrangement has been in effect continuously since January 1, 1954. Under section 1205 the Secretary of the Navy has agreed to indemnify the Maritime Administrator against all losses covered by such insurance. As of September 30, 1958, 34 tankers were covered under this program. The USNS *Mission San Francisco* was involved in a collision with a foreign-flag vessel on March 7, 1957. To date 42 personal effects claims totaling \$14,537.75 have been paid; and there remain 9 death and 3 personal effects claims, for which an estimate of \$46,250 has been retained as a reserve. The USNS *Mission San Miguel* ran aground October 9, 1957, and became a total loss. Claims involving personal effects and repatriation expenses, totaling \$18,562.18, have been paid and no further claims are anticipated. Under this program, there remains a net premium saving to the Government estimated at \$41,000 as of September 30, 1958.

At the request of the Secretary of the Army and pursuant to sections 1205 and 1206 of title XII, legal liability insurance is being provided, without premium, to a maritime contractor and its subcontractors, with a limit of \$10 million for the aggregate of all claims arising from the same event. This insurance has been necessary to cover legal liability resulting from explosion of ammunition transported, and has been in effect continuously since July 1, 1951, when commercial insurance in the required amount could not be obtained. The arrangement provides for indemnification by the Army for all losses paid by the Maritime Administrator. To date no claims have been reported.

Public Law 253, 82d Congress, provides that the Secretary of Commerce may transfer to the fund authorized by section 1208 (a) of title XII not in excess of \$10 million from the vessel operations revolving fund created by Public Law 45, 82d Congress. It has not been necessary for the Secretary of Commerce to make any transfer of funds under this authority.

To avoid the likelihood of total disorganization of the United States oceangoing commerce and the danger of catastrophic failure of our shipping in support of our defense forces and activities, the War Risk Insurance Act should be extended promptly in advance of its termination.

There is submitted herewith a bill to accomplish the proposed extension.

The Department urges consideration and enactment of the bill at the first session of the 86th Congress, in order that there will be no hiatus in the continuance of the arrangements for immediately furnishing full insurance programs in case of breakout of war or critical emergency, and to continue in effect the insurance required under sections 1205 and 1206 of title XII by the Defense Department and shipyard war risk insurance currently in effect, as above stated, under section 1203 (a) of title XII.

CONTRACTS FOR CONDUCT OF RESEARCH IN FIELD OF METEOROLOGY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences.

There is attached to the bill a statement of purpose of and need for the proposed bill, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

I am advised that the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1235) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement of purpose and need of the bill, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, is as follows:

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

Section 1 of this proposed legislation would clarify the authority of the Department to enter into research contracts in the various meteorological fields. At present the only specific authority for entering into such projects is contained in section 803 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 783), which authorizes the Department to enter into research contracts with public and private agencies for the purpose of increasing the safety and efficiency of air navigation.

As a result, the Department, rather than relying upon inherent authority to enter into research contracts, places the contracts on the basis that they relate to civil aviation. It would appear to be preferable to recognize the value of research programs in the entire field of meteorology by removing this artificial limitation on such contracts.

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

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

terest of private organizations in securing such contracts.

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

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

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

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

INCREASED LIMITATION ON BASIC COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF COAST GUARD

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 432(g) of title 14, United States Code, so as to increase the limitation on basic compensation of civilian keepers of lighthouses and civilians employed on lightships and other vessels of the Coast Guard from \$3,750 to \$5,100 per annum.

There is attached to the bill, a letter of transmittal, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1236) to amend section 432(g) of title 14, United States Code, so as to increase the limitation on basic compensation of civilian keepers of lighthouses and civilians employed on lightships and other vessels of the Coast Guard from \$3,750 to \$5,100 per annum, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

JANUARY 13, 1959.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 432(g) of title 14, United States Code, so as to increase the limitation of basic compensation of civilian keepers of lighthouses and civilians employed on lightships and other vessels of the Coast Guard from \$3,750 to \$5,100 per annum.

The purpose of the bill is to increase the limitation of \$3,750 per annum placed upon

the basic compensation which Lighthouse Service personnel may receive. Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Coast Guard may fix the hours of duty and compensation of such personnel, except that basic compensation may not exceed \$3,750 per annum. It has been the policy of the U.S. Coast Guard, with the approval of the head of the Department in which the service operates, to adjust by administrative action the rates and salary ranges of keepers when legislative adjustments are made in the rates applicable to the grades under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. Following the amendment of the Classification Act on June 20, 1958, which allowed increases to employees under that act, the Coast Guard, by administrative action, adjusted the compensation of keepers, subject, of course, to the \$3,750 limitation.

Even prior to June 20, 1958, the limitation precluded some keepers from being advanced to the maximum of their salary ranges as established. Now, about 75 percent of all keepers are being denied the full benefits they would otherwise enjoy. The limitation is unfair to this small group of deserving employees. The suggested increase would not mean that any keeper would be advanced forthwith from \$3,750 per annum to \$5,100. The latter figure would be the maximum of the highest salary range of the keeper compensation system. In fact, there is currently no one eligible to advance to that salary.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

A. GILMORE FLUES,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

SPECIAL LOAN PROGRAM FOR WITHDRAWING KLAMATH INDIANS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the use of the revolving loan fund for Indians to assist Klamath Indians during the period for terminating Federal supervision. The legislation is proposed by the Department of the Interior to meet the special needs of Indians who are withdrawing from the Klamath tribe and who are of less than one-fourth Indian blood. This bill will apply to approximately 253 withdrawing tribe members not covered by existing departmental authority. The loan program will permit the Department to make non-interest-bearing loans to all withdrawing members of the Klamath tribe from the revolving credit fund of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, during the period when tribal forest assets are being liquidated.

The proposed legislation is fully justified and is necessary to prevent economic hardship among withdrawers during the coming months. As chairman of the Senate Indian Affairs Subcommittee, I will do my utmost to provide early committee consideration of this bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the bill, a copy of a letter from the Department of the Interior to the President of the Senate, dated February 26, 1959, and a copy of a Bureau of Indian Affairs

press release of February 26, 1959, containing information about the loan program proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and press release will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1242) to authorize the use of the revolving loan fund for Indians to assist Klamath Indians during the period for terminating Federal supervision, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (by request), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, 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 Interior is authorized to make loans, without interest, from the revolving fund authorized by the Acts of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986, 25 U.S.C. 470), and June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1968, 25 U.S.C. 506), as amended and supplemented, to members of the Klamath Tribe of Indians who elected to withdraw from the tribe pursuant to the Act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 718, 25 U.S.C. 564), as amended, regardless of the degree of Indian blood of the borrower, and to collect such loans by setoff against funds payable to the borrower pursuant to said Act of August 13, 1954, as amended. The Secretary is also authorized to refinance from such revolving fund any loan made by a lending agency to a withdrawing Klamath Indian that is secured by encumbrance of his beneficial interest in tribal property with the approval of the Secretary as required by section 4 of said 1954 Act, and to include therein a nonreimbursable grant equal to the interest charges incurred by the borrower prior to such refinancing. In the event adequate funds are not available from the revolving fund to refinance a loan by such lending agency, the Secretary is authorized to pay from the revolving fund, without reimbursement, the interest charged on such loan.

The letter and press release presented by Mr. NEUBERGER are as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., February 26, 1959.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is draft of a proposed bill "to authorize the use of the revolving loan fund for Indians to assist Klamath Indians during the period for terminating Federal supervision."

We recommend that the proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

The act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 713) as amended, provides for the termination of Federal supervision over the property and affairs of the Klamath Tribe of Indians and the individual members of the tribe. The members who chose to convert their interests in the tribal estate into cash and to withdraw from membership in the tribe were permitted to do so. Those who chose to retain the remaining assets in common ownership, but under Oregon State law, likewise were permitted to do so. The final roll contains the names of 2,133 persons of whom 1,659 elected to withdraw and 474 elected to remain with the tribal entity.

Approximately 77 percent of the tribal assets must be sold on behalf of the withdrawing members. The 1958 amendment to the Termination Act provides for the sale of the forest units during the period April 1, 1959,

to April 1, 1961. This delay in the sales procedure means that the withdrawing members will not get the larger portion of their money until sometime in 1960 or 1961. The only source of money available for distribution to the withdrawing members prior to this time will be from the sale of "fringe" units, which will be insufficient for their needs.

Per capita payments in varying amounts have been made to Klamath Indians for many years. The average for the past 3 years has been approximately \$1,000 per person per year. Many members have looked to these payments for their livelihood. In order to avoid hardships and an avalanche of welfare assistance requests, and in view of the fact that large sums of money will be available at a later date following the sale of large forest units, assistance to these people in the form of Federal loans, secured by their shares in the tribal asset, is justified.

The Klamath Indians of more than one-quarter degree of Indian blood who have elected to withdraw are eligible for loans from the revolving fund established under the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986), as amended and supplemented. As of June 30, 1958, the balance in the fund was \$7,314,910. The acts of May 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 698), and May 7, 1948 (62 Stat. 211), however, prohibit loans from the fund to any Indian of less than one-quarter degree Indian blood. A total of 253 (or about 15 percent of the 1,659 withdrawing members) are of less than one-quarter degree Indian blood. The proposed legislation will make them eligible for loans from the fund.

Because the delay in the payments to the withdrawing Klamath Indians is due to no fault of theirs, the proposed legislation also provides that loans made to them from the revolving fund shall be without interest. There is no legal requirement that interest be charged on loans from the revolving fund, but because interest has been and is being charged on other loans, with the exception of a few educational loans made years ago, it is advisable to have such authorization included in the legislation in order to avoid any misunderstanding on the part of members of other tribes who are paying interest on loans. The \$3,369,775 outstanding in loans at June 30, 1958, bore interest at the following rates:

1 percent.....	\$3,594,158
2 percent.....	1,963,956
3 percent.....	159,796
4 percent.....	50,857
4½ percent.....	2,526,005
5 percent.....	17,760
6 percent.....	53,002
No interest.....	4,241
Total.....	8,369,775

The withdrawing members of less than one-quarter degree of Indian blood, until the proposed legislation is enacted, will be obliged to look to banks and other institutions for financing and in order to obtain funds they will need to encumber their beneficial interests in tribal property as security pursuant to section 4 of the act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 718), as amended. They will be obliged to pay interest on such loans. In order to avoid discrimination between withdrawing members of the Klamath Tribe, the bill authorizes the Secretary to refinance from the revolving fund any loans such members may obtain from banks or other lenders for which their shares in the tribal asset were pledged as security, and to reimburse the borrower for interest charges incurred prior to refinancing.

It is estimated that from 250 to 275 families will require assistance. The amount of the loans needed will vary from small sums to as much as \$10,000 per family, depending upon the time needed to distribute the tribal assets. The collection of the full amount

of such loans before August 13, 1961, the termination date, is, of course, assured.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER ERNST,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

A BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE USE OF THE REVOLVING LOAN FUND FOR INDIANS TO ASSIST KLAMATH INDIANS DURING THE PERIOD FOR TERMINATING FEDERAL SUPERVISION

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make loans, without interest, from the revolving fund authorized by the Acts of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986, 25 U.S.C. 470), and June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1968, 25 U.S.C. 506), as amended and supplemented, to members of the Klamath Tribe of Indians who elected to withdraw from the tribe pursuant to the Act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 718, 25 U.S.C. 564), as amended, regardless of the degree of Indian blood of the borrower, and to collect such loans by setoff against funds payable to the borrower pursuant to said Act of August 13, 1954, as amended. The Secretary is also authorized to refinance from such revolving fund any loan made by a lending agency to a withdrawing Klamath Indian that is secured by encumbrance of his beneficial interest in tribal property with the approval of the Secretary as required by section 4 of said 1954 Act, and to include therein a nonreimbursable grant equal to the interest charges incurred by the borrower prior to such refinancing. In the event adequate funds are not available from the revolving fund to refinance a loan by such lending agency, the Secretary is authorized to pay from the revolving fund, without reimbursement, the interest charged on such loan.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT PROPOSES BILL AUTHORIZING SPECIAL LOAN PROGRAM FOR WITHDRAWING KLAMATH INDIANS

To meet the special needs of Indians who are withdrawing from the Klamath Tribe of Oregon, the Department of the Interior is proposing legislation that would permit the Bureau of Indian Affairs to make loans to them without interest, Assistant Secretary Roger Ernst announced today.

Such loans are justified, Assistant Secretary Ernst said, because of the fact that sales of tribal forest lands to compensate the 1,659 withdrawing members will be made under existing laws over a 2-year period beginning on April 1, 1959. This delay in sales procedure means that the withdrawing members will not get the larger portion of their money until sometime in 1960 and 1961.

Because this delay is due to no fault of the Indians, the Department proposes to make non-interest-bearing loans to them from the revolving credit fund of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The loans would be collected by setoffs against the payments due the borrowers from the proceeds of sales of tribal property.

Loans to the withdrawing Klamath members who are of one-fourth or more Indian blood were authorized by an amendment of the Federal regulations approved last December 12. Legislation is needed, however, to permit such loans to the 253 withdrawing members who are of less than one-fourth Indian blood.

The bill proposed by the Department would also permit Indian Bureau refinancing of any loans these members may obtain from private sources prior to enactment and reimbursement of the borrowers for interest charges incurred prior to refinancing.

The Department estimates that from 250 to 275 Klamath families will need the as-

sistance. Loans are expected to range from very small sums to as much as \$10,000 per family.

STANDARDS OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY FOR THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, to establish standards of foreign language proficiency and to improve recruitment and training for the Foreign Service of the United States. This is a revision of a very similar bill (S. 3552) which I introduced on March 25, 1958, in the 85th Congress. I ask unanimous consent that parts of my statement made at the time I introduced the earlier version of this bill be printed in the RECORD. This statement will explain the background of the bill I am introducing today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the excerpts of the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1243) to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, to establish standards of foreign language proficiency for the Foreign Service of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The excerpts from the statement presented by Mr. SALTONSTALL, are as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT BY HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, OF MASSACHUSETTS, IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. President, I introduce for myself and Mr. MANSFIELD and send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, to improve recruitment and training for the Foreign Service of the United States.

On May 25, 1956, I introduced Senate Resolution 272 (84th Cong.) calling on the Committee on Foreign Relations to make a full and complete study and investigation of ways and means by which personnel of the Foreign Service of the United States may be more effectively recruited and trained, with particular reference to the desirability of improving and implementing the program of the existing Foreign Service Institute, or, as an alternative, the establishment of a new Foreign Service Academy.

It was subsequently decided that the committee staff should make a study of the subject covered by my resolution. The staff has recently completed its study which has been printed as a committee print entitled "Recruitment and Training for the Foreign Service of the United States." The study, which has been prepared with the full cooperation of appropriate officials of the State Department, is very thorough and searching within its scope.

It contains a draft bill providing legislative proposals designed to implement the recommendations of the staff to improve recruitment and training for the Foreign Service. I have reviewed the staff's study and its recommendations and am very pleased to offer a bill to implement the recommendations of the staff and particularly pleased to have Mr. MANSFIELD, who is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, join me in the introduction of this bill.

I commend to my colleagues the study on recruitment and training for the Foreign Service. It sets forth in much detail and with much background the need for this bill. The study goes into the recommendations of the Wriston committee report, "Toward a Foreign Service," issued in June 1954, dealing with recruitment and training and the State Department's record of implementing those recommendations. I do not wish to take the time of the Senate to discuss all these details and background.

I would say only now briefly that I am sure we all recognize the tremendous importance to our country that we be well represented abroad. We need a strong Foreign Service staffed with well-qualified and well-trained people just as much as we need strong military services staffed with well-qualified and well-trained people. I think that generally speaking we have such services.

This bill will materially assist in assuring that we continue to have a strong Foreign Service and will also provide for the strengthening of one particular aspect of the Foreign Service which in my judgment needs strengthening. This is the matter of foreign language ability. I think it is very important that our Foreign Service representatives abroad have a good working knowledge of the language of the countries to which they are posted. There are too many instances now where this is not the case. This bill will go a long way toward correcting this deficiency.

In closing I want to compliment our Foreign Relations Committee and its entire staff, and in particular, Dr. Carl Marcy, the chief of the staff, and Mr. George C. Denney, Jr., the staff member who I understand did the largest share of the work on the study, for the excellent job they have done. I would also pay my respects to Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration Loy W. Henderson and Dr. Harold B. Hoskins, Director of the Foreign Service Institute, and their associates for the fine cooperation which I understand they gave to the Foreign Relations Committee and its staff during the preparation of the study and for what they are doing for the benefit of our country in working for a strong Foreign Service.

AMENDMENT OF EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946, RELATING TO PRODUCTIVE CAPITAL INVESTMENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on several occasions recently, I have spoken in the Senate about the current controversy over the budget recently submitted by the President. A week has not passed since it was submitted that there has not occurred in this body a debate, sometimes a very heated one, over the state of balance in that budget. We have heard argued whether it really is balanced, whether it ought to be balanced, and if it is, who is responsible, and if it is not, who is responsible for that.

In my opinion, much and perhaps all of this debate has been meaningless. I, for one, do not know any more about the budget than I would have known without the debate.

But I do know one thing: the form in which the Nation's budget is now presented to Congress and the Nation is totally inadequate in terms of helping us judge whether or not that budget provides for the needs of the American people.

We are going at our national budgeting like the proverbial blind men who tried to describe an elephant by feeling it. The Republicans in this body have grasped only the tail of the budget; they

know only that its last, final figures are in balance, and over and over again they have been telling us: "Ah, it is a balanced budget, therefore it must be a good one."

Well, some of the rest of us have been doing a little more groping around, and we are increasingly concerned about the things that are not to be found in it.

Today I am introducing once again a bill that I think can do much to help us understand the budget. My bill is a capital budget bill; in simple terms, it calls for a separation in the budget between operating expenditures and capital investments. Under the present system, we have no knowledge of the elementary facts on which every private corporation bases its decisions—namely, which outlays are for current operating expenses and which are investments for which full and systematic repayment is planned.

COMING STUDY BY JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

I say it is time we put the National Government on a businesslike basis.

But before I go further into that subject, I want to mention the fact that the Joint Economic Committee, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Illinois, has been given the green light to proceed with what I believe, and hope, will be a landmark in our understanding of national economic forces. The idea of my bill is, I feel, closely related to this study.

The basic question before the committee will be whether or not reasonable prosperity and high level of employment must inevitably be accompanied by rising prices. Or, how can we have prosperity and full employment without having inflation?

A related question before the committee is that of economic growth, and its part in stabilizing the price level as well as providing sufficient jobs for all Americans who seek work.

This body passed the Employment Act of 1946 13½ years ago. The version actually approved by the Senate was considerably more far reaching than the version that finally became law.

I was an original cosponsor of S. 380 when it was introduced in the Senate. Few laws enacted since then have greater significance for the Nation and its future than that one, and I am proud to be numbered among such authors of it as the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

More than any other single piece of legislation, the Employment Act was a product of the great depression. It was the expression of the Nation's fervent hope and prayer that the disaster of economic depression might never again visit our land, and that the Federal Government had a responsibility and an obligation to see that it did not.

Unfortunately, 13 years later we still do not know exactly where we are going in terms of economic growth and whether our rate of growth is sufficient to provide both the necessary number of jobs and a stable price system. There is much economic evidence to indicate that rising prices over the last decade are due to an increasing power of industry to fix its

own prices, regardless of market conditions. Price competition seems to be disappearing; the price level does not fall as consumer incomes fall—we saw that last year when prices resisted the decline in consumer purchasing power.

Economic growth, and by that I mean competitive growth, is the free enterprise system's greatest weapon against administered prices.

I want the members of the Joint Economic Committee, and particularly their great chairman who is a leading authority on this whole subject, to know just how important I think their study is to the future of the Nation.

Today I am offering an amendment to the Employment Act of 1946, and that is why I have prefaced my remarks with this reference. The Employment Act has not been amended in any significant way since it was passed. It remains an expression of policy, rather than a program to assure the country against the twin disasters of depression and runaway inflation.

**BILL INTENDED TO HELP ACHIEVE PURPOSES OF
EMPLOYMENT ACT**

My amendment does not offer any economic plan. But it does offer an economic tool.

It adds to the declaration of policy of the Employment Act by declaring an additional policy of separating capital from operating expenditures in order to assist in achieving the economic goals already stated in the act.

The bill also directs the Council of Economic Advisers to recommend, for inclusion in the Economic Report, a minimum and maximum program of proposed capital investments.

It then provides that in addition to the budget figures he now submits, the President shall add figures differentiating between operating expenses and capital investments.

In general terms, this is known as a capital budget. It is the kind used by corporations, by many of our large cities, by some States, and by many foreign countries to show which expenditures in the budget are really investments and will be repaid to the Treasury.

Proposals for a capital budget have been before the Congress for many years.

PRECEDENT IN TAFT AMENDMENT

A form of it was actually offered by Senator Taft as an amendment to the Employment Act. Much of the controversy in the Senate over that bill involved the same arguments heard on the floor today—will the budget be unbalanced? Do we dare incur more national debt? Who is responsible for adding on to the national debt?

Senators Taft and Radcliffe offered an amendment to the Employment Act that would have brought a considerable degree of order out of the chaotic discussions of the budget and whether it is really unbalanced.

Their amendment provided, and I quote:

That any program of Federal investment and expenditure for the fiscal year 1948, or any subsequent fiscal year when the Nation is at peace, shall be accompanied by a program of taxation over a period comprising the year in question and a

reasonable number of years thereafter, designed and calculated to prevent during that year any net increase in the national debt (other than debt incurred for self-liquidating and other reimbursable expenditures) without interfering with the goal of full employment.

The exclusion of debt incurred for self-liquidating and other reimbursable expenditures from the definition of public debt is the second major budgeting provision of my bill.

It may surprise Senators to know that the Taft-Radcliffe amendment was adopted by a rollcall vote of 82 to 0.

In defining the terms of his amendment, Senator Taft said this about it:

As a matter of fact, I have been very liberal because I exclude debts incurred for self-liquidating projects, which mean irrigation projects, such as Boulder Dam, any large expenditures which are self-liquidating and will pay themselves off, and other reimbursable expenditures.

I would even except loans. We may question whether they will be paid, of course, but, so far as the system of taxation is concerned, I would not require that taxation be levied to such an extent as to bring in the amount of money needed to make the loans. (Sept. 28, 1945, C.R. vol. 91, p. 9134.)

The definition of self-liquidating investments in my bill is much stricter than the one contemplated by Senator Taft, because it requires full repayment of both interest and principal.

Madison Avenue coined a new word early last fall for the present occupant of the White House, and now he uses it with abandon. This word is the "spenders." He is putting this label on the Democrats at every possible moment. His simple approach bodes no distinction between operating expenditures and capital investments, yet for his corporate buddies this distinction goes to the very heart of corporate finance.

Just how businesslike a proposal my bill is was emphasized in the report of the first Hoover Commission.

**HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDED CAPITAL
BUDGET**

In 1949, the desirability of a capital budget got further recognition in the report of the first Hoover Commission.

In its report on budgeting and accounting, the Hoover Commission recommended the separation of capital outlays in the budget upon its presentation to Congress. I quote the Commission report on "Budgeting and Accounting," as follows:

There is, at present, constant confusion in Federal budgeting and accounting because current expenditures and capital outlays are intermingled. These two types of expenditures are essentially different in character, and should, therefore, be shown separately under each major function or activity in the budget. This is an important feature of performance budgeting.

The appropriations for capital purposes, provided each year, are usually only a part of the total cost of the numerous projects which the Federal Government is initiating or has under way. Many of these appropriations are made for a year's work on a given project without an adequate understanding of the total previous expenditure and the cost commitment which has been authorized in order to have a complete structure or improvement. This is not good business on the part of the Federal Government.

While capital projects may be carefully analyzed for usefulness, timeliness, and total probable costs at the time of original authorization, the total remaining costs of all capital projects should be set forth in the budget each year, together with costs incurred to date. These costs should be revised in succeeding years to keep them current with later developments.

Recommendation No. 3: We recommend that the budget estimates of all operating departments and agencies of the Government should be divided into two primary categories—current operating expenditures and capital outlays.

The use of this type budgeting has been demonstrated by the budgeting of Government corporations under the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945. Government corporation budgeting practice at the present time amounts to a partial adoption of many of these simplifications based upon functional budgeting, accurate accounting, and separation of capital outlays from current expenditures. It has greatly added to flexibility of management and to simplification of budgeting, accounting, and audit.

Since that time, several bills have been offered in Congress to direct the President to submit the budget in that form. My own bill of 1949 carried such a directive. At that time, I did not regard it as a capital budget, but I think the term is general enough as it is now understood, to apply to a simple separation of operating and capital expenditures.

A budget of this kind would mean that the Federal Government would be practicing what it preaches; it would be keeping the same kind of books that it requires of its taxpayers.

The Internal Revenue Service and all of the Federal regulatory agencies have issued voluminous and exacting accounting instructions and systems requiring all corporations and other business enterprises to conform to the fundamental business practice of distinguishing between operating expenditures and capital investments. If we are to have a businesslike administration of the Government, as well as one that makes possible a reasonable estimate of our economic growth, it seems obvious that a minimum requirement would be the adoption of the same standards of book-keeping by the Federal Government as the Federal Government requires of private business enterprises, and which they use themselves as a means of judging their expenditures.

I wish to make clear that I do not stand unmovably on all the terms of this particular bill.

In 1949, the capital budget provision in my general budget and tax reform bill provided simply, and I quote from my bill of that year:

Federal budgetary practice shall be revised to distinguish between operating and capital expenditures, and in transmitting to the Congress the estimates called for in section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended, the President shall, to the extent and in such detail as may be feasible (a) separate operating expenditures from capital, developmental, and recoverable expenditures, and (b) estimate of capital, developmental and recoverable expenditures by agencies and/or purposes of the 6 ensuing fiscal years.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has also introduced capital budget legislation in recent Congresses

that simply directs the President to make this distinction under such definitions and terms as he deems appropriate.

It may well be that that is all that is needed. My bill this year is framed in the Employment Act because by so doing, I hope to relate the usefulness of the capital budget to the issue of the Nation's growth.

I am very anxious that the appropriate committees of Congress take up this matter. It would be useful, I think, for other capital budget bills to be introduced that might be referred to other committees so we could get a wider legislative discussion of the subject.

BILL DOES NOT ELIMINATE PRESENT BUDGET

Let me make a brief reference to some of the objections that have been raised against capital budgeting. I recognize, of course, that economists are not unanimously in favor of it. I shall not present any exhaustive review of opinions pro and con because a committee hearing is the place for that. And I have already referred to the Hoover Commission report on this matter.

One authority on Federal budgeting, Prof. Arthur Smithies, in his book "The Budgetary Process in the United States" makes out a mild case both for and against it. His objections seem to depend mainly upon the taxation and spending policies he assumes would accompany a capital budget.

I mention this because it should be understood that my bill does not substitute a capital budget for the present one. It adds a capital breakdown to the estimates as they are presently submitted. Certainly the qualms of economists about an exclusively capital budget should be allayed by the fact that I am only asking for a submission of these estimates along with the present form of the budget.

As a matter of fact, in 1947, I requested and received from the Budget Bureau a capital expenditure breakdown of the budget we then had before us. The Budget Director, Mr. Webb, provided me with a list of all outlays in the budget the President had submitted that would fall into the classification of capital expenditures; it came to \$7,341,062,000 out of a total budget of \$37.5 billion.

I suppose the purpose of my bill could be achieved if I were to ask for such a breakdown each year and then put it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as I did in 1947. But we should be more systematic than that; and the outlays should be related to the capital investment needs of the country through the machinery of the Council of Economic Advisers and the President's Economic Report.

OTHER OBJECTIVES STEM FROM BUDGETARY ABUSES

During the 1930's, many European governments resorted to dual and even triple budgets in order to handle the extraordinary deficits caused by the depression. Budgetary devices were also used in those days to cover up rearmament which was sometimes going on in violation of treaties.

Unfortunately, that turbulent depression era of dual and extraordinary budgeting tended to scare people away from legitimate reform.

Because of this recent history we should be extremely cautious to insure that when the United States adopts the capital budget that it be done on a conservative basis and in the direction of a more responsible government.

Both Presidents Roosevelt and Truman took some tentative steps toward the capital budget idea, but that period of budgetary evolution was chiefly occupied with the development of the performance or program budget idea which has now largely been adopted.

In my opinion, a capital budget is the next logical step in the process of budget reform.

NO PREFERENCE IMPLIED IN THIS DISTINCTION

My final point is this: The fact that the reimbursable expenditures would be separated in a capital budget in no way implies that revenue-consuming expenditures are less necessary or desirable.

No one of us would vote against a justified defense expenditure on the ground that it is not revenue producing. Such an outlay would be wealth protecting; it is possible to think of many examples of defense expenditures that we would give preference to over a revenue-producing project.

When we consider proposals for other Federal expenditures, as for example, financial aid to the States for education, we get into another area where a non-reimbursable outlay is just as much an investment in the future of America as a reimbursable one. It has been shown that the money the Government spent for the World War II GI bill has been repaid many times in the higher taxes these veterans have paid as a result of the education they received from the GI bill.

When we have some experience with capital budgeting, we may find ways of refining these programs. That is why I have left wide discretion up to the President in making the distinction, guided only by the rules now used by the Internal Revenue Service. Beyond that basic division of expenditures into two categories, capital and operating, however, I have then asked the President to refine the capital outlays to show those having a useful economic life of 10 years or more which are self-liquidating. These would be excluded from the public debt. I would anticipate that Federal grants for construction programs would be classified as capital expenditures rather than operating, but would not fall into the reimbursable category with FHA loans, power projects, and the like.

I put no premium on the desirability of one group of expenditures over another. I expect to work just as hard in the next few weeks to get passed a bill making grants to the States for school construction and teachers' salaries as I will be working for appropriations to start construction of Green Peter Dam.

But when we have a capital budget showing that the funds for Green Peter Dam will be repaid, we may find that \$1 billion a year for education is not only an essential improvement but one we can afford better than we thought. We would also be able to see just how much of the grant now being proposed for edu-

cation would go into capital assets, namely, new classrooms.

My plea, therefore, is not that we plan through this bill for any new national program. It is simply that we adopt a device for classifying expenditures that will give us a better picture of where we are going, and where we should be going. I hope the appropriate congressional committees will give some study to the role a capital budget could play in clarifying the great economic decisions the Nation makes through its budget.

I ask consent that my bill lie on the desk for 1 week so that Senators wishing to cosponsor it may do so before the bill is printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The bill (S. 1244) to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to establish policies with respect to productive capital investments of the Government, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. PROXMIER, and Mr. BARTLETT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed in the RECORD, together with a section-by-section analysis of it, which I have prepared.

There being no objection, the bill and section-by-section analysis were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, 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 "Employment Act Amendments of 1959".

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and by adding thereto the following subsection:

"(b) To assist in achieving these objectives it is the further policy of the Federal Government (1) to distinguish between its operating expenditures and capital investments, (2) to exclude certain productive capital investments from the public debt, and (3) to retire the public debt."

FUNCTIONS OF COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

SEC. 3. Section 4(c) of such Act (relating to the duties and functions of the Council of Economic Advisers) is amended by changing the designation of paragraph (5) to (6) and inserting after paragraph (4) a new paragraph (5) to read as follows:

"(5) to evaluate each year the Federal budgetary situation as related to the prospective gross national product and other economic indicators and needs, and to recommend, for inclusion in the Economic Report, a minimum and maximum program of proposed capital investments, including, on a segregated basis, productive capital investments for the next fiscal year, and a six-year projection of such proposed investments;"

CAPITAL BUDGET

SEC. 4. (a) Such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 6. (a) In transmitting to Congress the estimates called for in section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, the President shall also—

"(1) to the extent and in such detail as he shall designate by Executive order (and so

far as practicable consistent with the practices of the Internal Revenue Service) distinguish between operating expenditures and capital investments of the Government, and further set forth the productive capital investments, including mortgage loans, which have a useful economic life of more than ten years and which are revenue producing or self-liquidating in nature;

"(2) advise the Congress as to the progress made in identifying and computing capital investments and more particularly such productive capital investments; and in computing the public debt exclude therefrom an amount equal to such productive capital investments;

"(3) advise the Congress as to a minimum and maximum program of proposed capital investments, including, on a segregated basis, productive capital investments for the next fiscal year, and a six-year projection of such proposed investments; and

"(4) advise the Congress as to the amount of the public debt as computed in accordance with this section and of the effect of the proposed budgetary program upon the retirement of the public debt.

"(b) The amount of obligations issued to finance productive capital investments shall not be considered a part of the public debt for the purpose of limitations on the public debt contained in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be effective with respect to each budget transmitted to the Congress pursuant to section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, after the date of enactment of this Act.

APPLICATION OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATION CONTROL ACT

SEC. 5. The provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, with respect to budgets, reporting, auditing, and accounting, shall apply to the functions exercised by any officer or agency of the Government proposing the investment of Federal bond proceeds in productive capital, to the same extent as applicable to wholly owned Government corporations.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS ADDS TO DECLARATION OF POLICY

Section 2 amends the declaration of policy of the Employment Act of 1946 in three ways. In order to assist in achieving the goals already set forth in the Employment Act, my bill further declares it to be the policy of Congress to distinguish between operating expenditures and capital investments in order to clarify and make more logical the conduct of Federal financial operations including the budgetary, accounting and appropriate processes.

This, of course, has implications not only for the operating statement of the Federal Government but also for its balance sheet, therefore the second declaration of policy.

The second policy addition permits the Federal Government to exclude from the computation of the public debt certain productive capital investments as defined in section 4.

The third declaration of policy calls for retirement of the public debt.

These three further declarations supplement and implement the existing policies of the Employment Act of 1946. Whatever the Federal Government does directly to promote maximum employment and the other objectives of the Act would be expressed for the most part in the annual budget message. The budget would then be the Government's fiscal plan of action for the ensuing year.

NEW DUTIES FOR COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Section 3 adds a new paragraph to section 4(c) of the Employment Act of 1946 relating to the duties of the Council of Economic Advisers by directing the Council to recommend for inclusion in the Economic Report, a minimum and maximum program of proposed capital investments. This recommendation would be submitted to show productive capital investments for the next fiscal year and a 6-year projection of such proposed investments.

This paragraph should facilitate coordination and consistency between the Economic Report and the annual budget message.

CAPITAL BUDGET

Section 4 adds the new subtitle "Capital Budget" at the end of the Employment Act of 1946, and provides the mechanisms and basic definitions for carrying out the policies set forth in section 2.

Section 4(a) adds to the Employment Act of 1946 a new section 6 calling upon the President in addition to his other duties under the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 to do four things as set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4).

Paragraph (1) asks the President to submit the annual budget in a form which distinguishes between operating expenditures and capital investments. He is given broad flexibility in defining these terms and as the new procedure evolves he may change the definitions. All these details are to be handled by Executive order of the President.

One guiding suggestion is given to the President in that it is to be "so far as practicable consistent with the practices of the Internal Revenue Service." This should avoid the double standard problem which now prevails as between Federal business and private business in regard to the book-keeping for capital investments.

Then within the capital investment category the President is asked further to separate out those certain productive capital investments which meet both of two tests, (1) that they represent a useful economic life of over 10 years, and (2) that they are revenue producing or self-liquidating in nature.

The 10-year economic service life is used as a basic test in order to exclude automobiles and other equipment which generally are on a 10-year or less depreciation period.

The second test is that the productive capital investment must be revenue producing or self-liquidating; this is intended to insure the repayment of both principal and interest.

Municipal and State governments have evolved a distinction between general obligation bonds, which are tax supported, and revenue bonds, which are supported only from revenues. This basic difference is here applied to the Federal productive capital investments without going as far as the Hoover Commission recommendation of issuing revenue bonds for each such Federal revenue producing activity.

It is not proposed to change the types of Federal bonds and other borrowings, nor to segregate the income from the projects in separate funds. The differentiation is only made in the budgets, accounts and appropriations records of the Government.

Mortgage loans, such as REA and FHA loans, are included in productive capital investments, because they meet both tests.

The net worth of Federal corporations and similar activities, such as Bonneville Power Administration, should be treated as productive capital investments.

Flood control dams would not meet the test of revenue producing. Irrigation invest-

ment would not meet the test of interest repayment. Farm crop mortgages would not meet the test of revenue nor the test of 10 years life. Thus none of these capital investments would qualify as productive capital investment as here defined. The definition is intentionally severe. The productive capital investment is treated in much the same manner as if each such activity were financed strictly by means of revenue bonds.

Paragraph (2) modifies the definition of the public debt so as to exclude an amount equal to the productive capital investments. Utilizing this interrelated definition the President is required to advise Congress annually as to the level of capital investments and, as a part thereof, the productive capital investments, and the residual public debt.

This requires, of course, an identification of the presently existing productive capital investments of the Federal Government such as FHA, REA and other gilt-edge loans, the net worth of Government corporations and such long range revenue-producing assets as hydroelectric facilities, the Alaska Railroad, the St. Lawrence Seaway and many others. These would reduce the public debt to a much more meaningful figure.

Paragraph (3) asks the President to employ these distinctions in presenting his budget and to include therewith a 6-year projection of proposed investments.

Paragraph (4) asks the President to advise the Congress annually as to the amount of the public debt and the effect of the proposed budgetary program upon the retirement of the public debt.

One of the major perspectives of this bill is implicit in the otherwise paradoxical situation which simultaneously justifies an increase and a decrease in the public debt. In boom times when Government revenues are high and there is inflationary pressure it is appropriate to decrease the public debt. Yet at the same time the Government must go ahead with certain productive capital investments.

This bill eliminates this paradox because it distinguishes between what is sometimes called "live weight debt" from "dead weight debt." In certain areas it will be desirable for the Government to increase its "live weight debt" namely for productive capital investments. But these amounts should not be confused with the "dead weight debt" which is the net national debt.

Subsection 6(b) amends section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, by stating that the amount of obligations issued to finance productive capital investments shall not be considered a part of the public debt for the purpose of debt limitations.

Section 4(b) states the effective date of this act.

Section 5 under the subtitle "Application of Government Corporation Control Act" adds the requirements that Federal officers and agencies which propose investment of Federal bond funds in productive capital shall observe the Government Corporation Control Act with respect to budgets, reports, audits, and accounts.

Thus the bill interrelates various existing laws such as the Budgeting and Accounting Act, Employment Act, Public Debt Act, and Government Corporation Control Act by providing a common terminology and financial reference.

This system of terminology and financial reference will not preclude the making of Federal grants and subsidies and the handling of other operating expenditures, but these will all fall generally under the category of operating expenditures. Nor is this to say that the intrinsic benefit-to-cost ratio of a dollar grant for education may not be double that of some certain proposed productive capital investment.

Given a few years of experience with capital budgeting these additional finer distinctions may commend themselves to the President and the Congress. This bill represents a starting point for this rational process. It will be and must be evolutionary in its unfolding.

It is the perspective of this bill to contrast the long run and the short run, to flag the difference between the revenue producing St. Lawrence Seaway and the revenue consuming defense expenditure. This bill puts the pluses and minuses of our budgetary puzzle into two separate columns.

Mr. PROXMIER subsequently said: Mr. President, I am happy, indeed, to join the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] as a sponsor of his bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 by providing for the submission by the President of a capital budget, to accompany the regular budget as now submitted.

The provisions of this bill are a moderate and constructive first step in making the Federal budget procedures more understandable and meaningful, both to Congress and to the public. In my opinion, it will accomplish vitally important improvements in our Federal budget procedure.

Under the present budget there is no distinction between a 100 percent sound Government loan, which is sure to be repaid to the Government on the one hand, and spending for a plane, a tank, or a Government salary, which is sure not to be repaid on the other.

This is wrong. It is unwise. It is self-deceptive. It is self-defeating. It prevents the Government from making investments that will help the taxpayer as well as the economic strength of the economy. This is true because the soundest kind of Government loans are treated in the budget as spending. There is enormously strong pressure on Members of the Senate, with real wisdom behind it, to vote to keep the Federal Government from spending more than it is taking in. The consequence of this pressure is not simply to put pressure on Members of the Senate to vote against real spending. The pressure on Members of Congress is to vote against Government loans no matter how sound, how conservative, or how sensible they may be from any standpoint.

This pressure is just as unwise and unfortunate in its consequence on the Government as it would be on a family that steadfastly refused to invest their idle savings in savings bonds because such a loan to Government under Federal bookkeeping procedures would be considered spending.

There is a fundamental difference between spending and investment. Yet, this is not shown clearly in our present budget procedures. Investments such as loans for rural electrification, Small Business Administration loans, or outlays for construction of hydroelectric projects are self-liquidating and wealth creating, in exactly the same way as a businessman's investment in productive machinery, buildings, land, and other productive property are.

Surely these investments by the Federal Government need to be differentiated from spending for current operations. There are times when it might be

extremely unwise to curb investments which are wealth creating, even when the need might be particularly acute to cut the cost of operating the Government to the bone. In fact, the same conditions that make severe economy on current operations of the Government urgently necessary may make it of utmost importance to maintain or to expand the Government's rate of investment in wealth-creating projects. This is exactly what occurs frequently in the case of private businesses: When overhead operating costs are excessively high, the wise course for the businessman is to cut those costs to the bone, while increasing his investments in productive property so as to expand his base of income-creating capital in order to provide a more adequate base to support his overhead operating costs.

The support for the budgetary reform provided for in this bill which has been given by the late Senator Robert Taft, and the second Hoover Commission, is a most impressive endorsement of this purpose. This is a step which it is long overdue for our Government to take. It will give to Congress and to the public an effective tool for more conservative and enlightened management of our Nation's finances and economic policies, toward the end that we can achieve greater control over inflationary tendencies resulting from governmental policies, better selection of alternative governmental policies, and more effective contributions by Government policy toward the goal we all seek for our Nation—constantly rising living standards, fulfillment of public needs for schools, health, and other services, fully adequate national defenses, and rigorous economy in the operations of the Government.

PROMOTION OF MINING AND DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH FOR BERYL, CHROMITE, AND COLUMBIUM-TANTALUM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, during times of defense emergencies chrome is of the highest strategic importance. Despite that fact, our Government is following a policy concerning the production of chromite ore which I believe is of extremely questionable wisdom. If we were to be faced with a serious defense emergency tomorrow, we would have only two sources of chromite ore—that which we import from foreign sources, and that which constitutes our present national defense stockpile.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, I feel that we should be prepared at all times to meet the Nation's needs for strategic metals and that we should not be called upon to rely solely on foreign sources and upon stockpiles that would dwindle swiftly under the pressures of defense requirements. Our reliance upon foreign sources of strategic metals is particularly shortsighted because I recall vividly the difficulties we faced during the early days of World War II when our shipping lanes were exposed to constant danger of submarine attack.

Wise planning for defense emergency requires that we keep our domestic mining industry on at least a minimal operating basis to assure an existing and an expandable source of supply on short notice.

Mr. President, let us consider chrome for a moment. The production of strategic chromite ore on the west coast has been at a standstill for almost a year. The stockpiling program was called to an abrupt halt with the closing of the Federal Government's chrome depot at Grants Pass, Ore. A substantial number of the chrome miners in my State belong to the category of small business operators. When they shut down their mining operations they did not automatically shut off the expenses of maintaining their mines in standby condition. In fact, in most instances if these chrome miners did not expend money in keeping their mines in good condition they would be faced ultimately with staggering costs of mine rehabilitation operations.

Mr. President, in order that these mine operators may be placed at least on a minimum operating basis, I am today introducing a bill which is designed to promote mining and development research for chromite and for two other highly strategic minerals, beryl and columbium-tantalum. I ask that this bill be received and referred to the appropriate committee, and I express the hope that the committee may take prompt action on this legislative proposal.

The bill I have introduced provides an incentive for domestic chromite producers. It will not assure the miners the profit to which they are really entitled, but it will give them enough of an incentive to keep the mines in operating condition and to produce at least modest quantities of ore. My bill is framed so as to give every possible assistance to the small producer. For example, the bill contains a limit of 5,000 long dry tons for any one producer annually under the program, and an overall limitation 50,000 long dry tons for all producers.

Mr. President, this legislative proposal is designed primarily to be of assistance to the small producer who constitutes the backbone of our strategic minerals production during periods when the needs of the Nation for these metals are urgent. For the strength and safety of the Nation we should keep these small operators in business. My bill is a step in that direction.

The bill is being introduced on behalf of myself, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1245) to promote mining and development research for beryl, chromite, and columbium-tantalum from domestic mines, introduced by Mr.

MORSE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, 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 Interior is hereby authorized and directed to establish and maintain a program of incentive payments to domestic producers of beryl, chromite, and columbium-tantalum in order to promote mining and development research for these minerals, as provided in this Act.

SEC. 2. (a) The production incentive payments authorized by this Act shall be made for the following minerals newly mined from deposits located within the United States, its Territories and possessions, in the amounts and subject to the limitations herein specified:

(1) For beryl concentrates (10 per centum BeO basis), \$70 per short ton, with premiums and penalties as set forth in the regulations issued pursuant to this Act, for not more than one thousand short tons annually. Incentive payments shall not be made for production in any one year on more than one hundred and fifty short tons originating in any one mining district from properties controlled by any one producer.

(2) For commercial grade metallurgical chromite (46 per centum basis), \$46 per long dry ton for the first one thousand long dry tons produced each year by each producer, and \$35 per long dry ton for each additional long dry ton produced in such year by such producer, with premiums and penalties as set forth in the regulations issued pursuant to this Act. Incentive payments shall not be made for production in any one year of more than fifty thousand long dry tons by all producers or more than five thousand long dry tons by any one producer.

(3) For commercially acceptable columbium-tantalum concentrates (basis 50 per centum contained combined pentoxides), \$2.35 per pound of contained combined pentoxides with ratios of Ta₂O₅:Cb₂O₅, with premiums and penalties as set forth in the regulations issued pursuant to this Act, for not more than fifty thousand pounds annually. Incentive payments shall not be made for production in any one year on more than ten thousand pounds originating in any one mining district from properties controlled by any one producer.

(b) The incentive payment program for any of these materials shall not be initiated until the termination of existing purchase programs of the Federal Government for that material set forth in the regulations issued under authority of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act (53 Stat. 811), as amended; the Defense Production Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 798), as amended; and the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 579), as the case may be.

(c) No incentive payment shall be made pursuant to the provisions of this Act except upon presentation of evidence satisfactory to the Secretary that the material has been produced and sold in accordance with regulations issued under this Act. For the purpose of this Act, material shall be deemed to be sold, whether or not payment therefor has been received, whenever the producer disposes of, or irrevocably empowers another to dispose of, all of his right, title and interest therein (excepting only a bona fide security interest) to a consumer, mill, processing plant, cooperative marketing agent, or dealer therein.

SEC. 3. The provisions of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first quarter next following the date of enactment of this Act, and shall terminate on June 30, 1964.

SEC. 4. The Secretary is authorized to establish and promulgate such regulations and require such reports as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, but such regulations shall assure equitable distribution of the benefits of the programs provided by this Act throughout the domestic industries affected.

SEC. 5. The Secretary may delegate any of the functions authorized by this Act to the Administrator of General Services.

SEC. 6. (a) For the purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) The term "producer" means any individual, partnership, corporation, or other legal entity engaged in producing ores or concentrates from mines within the United States, its Territories or possessions.

(3) The term "newly mined" means domestic material severed from the land or processed into concentrates subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act, and normal inventories of crude ore then existing. The term does not refer to material recovered from mine dumps, mill tailings, or from smelter slags and residues derived from material mined prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

(4) The term "produced in any one year", and similar terms, include normal inventories of crude ore existing at the beginning of that year.

(5) The term "quarter" means the calendar periods commencing on the first day of the months of January, April, July, and October.

(b) For the purposes of this Act, the Secretary may determine what constitutes a mining district and what constitutes a single operating unit producing ores, and, in the event that more than one producer claims payment for sales from production of a single operating unit, the Secretary may determine the quantity of sales for each such producer to which the above limitations shall apply.

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, to remain available until expended, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 8. The Secretary shall make semiannual reports with respect to operations under this Act not later than March 1, and September 1, of each year, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives. Any such report shall contain such recommendations as the Secretary may deem appropriate.

SEC. 9. Any person who willfully violates any provisions of this Act or any regulation issued under this Act shall upon conviction be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned for not more than ten years, or both.

FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY TOWARD INDIANS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution sponsored by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] and myself.

The effect of this concurrent resolution would be to restate the Federal obligation toward Indians. House Concurrent Resolution 108, adopted by the 83d Congress, has been misinterpreted. It has raised fears among Indians that the Federal Government was going to withdraw from responsibility toward some groups of Indians before they were suitably prepared for such action.

I think all of us will agree that eventually Federal responsibility toward Indians will be terminated. However, as this resolution states, "the relationship

between the Federal Government and any Indian tribe or group should not be terminated unless such tribe or group has clearly demonstrated that it understands the plan under which such a program terminating Federal supervision and control would go forward, and that the tribe or group affected concurs in and supports the plan proposed."

Furthermore, this concurrent resolution points up the primary importance of Indian attainment of equality in health and education, with appropriate Federal aid, before Federal responsibility is ended.

Mr. President, I believe this concurrent resolution can and will enjoy wide support on both sides of the aisle. The concurrent resolution frankly is based upon a speech made by the Secretary of Interior in Flagstaff, Ariz., on September 18, 1958. The text of the concurrent resolution and a copy of the Secretary's speech will be inserted following these remarks.

I am willing, Mr. President, to accept the words of the administration's spokesman on Indian policy and give them the force of congressional approval.

The cosponsor of this concurrent resolution, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] is a conscientious student of Indian affairs. I am proud to be associated with him in the sponsorship of the concurrent resolution. During the 85th Congress, as chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, a position which he also holds in the 86th Congress, the junior Senator from Oregon conducted long hearings on the subject of Federal Indian policy, taking testimony from representatives of many Indian tribes, as well as their legal advisers and officials of the Department of Interior.

Mr. President, I believe that the adoption of this concurrent resolution can be a milestone of progress in the unhappy history of this Government's relations with the first Americans.

In the belief that other Members of the Senate may wish to join in cosponsorship of this resolution, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution lie on the table for additional cosponsorship until Friday, March 6.

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

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution, together with the speech of the Secretary of the Interior to which I have made reference, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, under the rule, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD; and, without objection, the speech will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12) to restate Federal responsibility toward Indians and the Federal Government's relation with Indian tribes or groups, submitted by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER), was re-

ferred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

Whereas the policy of the 83d Congress expressed in House Concurrent Resolution 108, agreed to August 1, 1953, with respect to according Indians the privileges and responsibilities applicable to others, and to ending their status as wards of the United States, has been misinterpreted as proposing unilateral termination by the Federal Government of trusteeship over Indians prior to the time the tribes concerned may be willing and able to have removed from their tribal and individually allotted lands the protections of the trust restrictions against the encumbrance and loss of their lands now provided by law, without regard to the cultural differences and the economic disadvantages of the Indians concerned whereby they may be unable to compete on terms of equality with the non-Indian culture and economic advantages surrounding them; and further has been misinterpreted as calling for termination, without tribal consent, of tribal jurisdiction over its own members within reservation areas; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior on September 18, 1958, in Flagstaff, Ariz., stated that "no Indian tribe or group should end its relationship with the Federal Government unless such tribe or group has clearly demonstrated first, that it understands the plan under which such a program would go forward, and second, that the tribe or group affected concurs in and supports the plan proposed": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is declared to be the sense of Congress (a) that House Concurrent Resolution 108, agreed to August 1, 1953, 83d Congress, shall be interpreted as stating an objective, not an immediate goal; (b) that the relationship between the Federal Government and any Indian tribe or group should not be terminated unless such tribe or group has clearly demonstrated that it understands the plan under which such a program terminating Federal supervision and control would go forward, and that the tribe or group affected concurs in and supports the plan proposed; (c) that no consideration shall be given to forcing upon an Indian tribe or group a so-called termination plan which does not have the understanding and acceptance of a clear majority of the members affected; (d) that no Indian tribe or group shall be cast into the stream of American life until and unless the educational level of that tribe or group is one which is equal to the responsibilities which it is shouldering; (e) that the goal shall be that of eventually attaining a position of parity for Indians with other Americans, socially and economically; (f) that tribes or groups should receive appropriate Federal aid if they are to finally attain the objectives toward which they and the Federal Government are cooperatively striving; and (g) that the attainment by Indians of a position of equality in health and education is a matter of primary importance to these goals, including both projects to assist those adults who have never attended school and to provide adult Indians between the ages of 18 and 35 with salable work skills thus to free them of dependency on reservation resources.

The speech of the Secretary of the Interior, presented by Mr. MURRAY, is as follows:

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR FRED A. SEATON, BROADCAST SEPTEMBER 18, 1958, OVER RADIO STATION KCLS, FLAGSTAFF, ARIZ., AND TO BE REBROADCAST SUBSEQUENTLY OVER RADIO STATIONS KTAR, PHOENIX, ARIZ., KIKO, GLOBE, ARIZ., AND KGAK, GALLUP, N. MEX.

For the past 2 days I have had the pleasure of visiting the Navajo country and, frankly,

I am very much pleased and encouraged by what I have seen.

On August 1, 1953, House Concurrent Resolution No. 108 was adopted expressing the sense of the Congress of the United States to be that of ending the wardship status of Indian tribes as rapidly as possible. Certain additional provisions applied to Indian tribes located in the States of California, Florida, New York, and Texas, and to some other tribes in other States, with relation to the earliest possible elimination of Federal control over their persons and properties.

This stands as the most recent congressional declaration upon the subject.

Since that time—that is since 1953—the pros and cons of public opinion relative to congressional policy on Indian affairs have been given wide expression in the press and in other media throughout the country. Some people have interpreted these statements to mean that it is the intention of Congress and the Department of the Interior to abandon Indian groups regardless of their ability to fend for themselves.

In my opinion, the stated intentions of the Congress to free Indian tribes from Federal supervision, and to eliminate the need for the special services rendered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs to Indian citizens, is more than adequately counterbalanced in the congressional resolution itself. I now refer you to such qualifying phrases as, and I quote, "at the earliest possible time," and "at the earliest practicable date." The intent is clear, I believe. What the Congress intended was to state an objective, not an immediate goal.

Just today I discussed that matter with Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, who tells me that his memory of the debate is very clear and that what I have said to you was, in his opinion, the intent of the Congress. If the resolution in any way lent itself to varied interpretation, and evidently it did in the minds of some people, the subsequently expressed policies of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, as well as the actions of Congress itself since 1953, should place the national policy statement on Indian affairs in a clear perspective.

To be specific, my own position is this: no Indian tribe or group should end its relationship with the Federal Government unless such tribe or group has clearly demonstrated—first, that it understands the plan under which such a program would go forward, and second, that the tribe or group affected concurs in and supports the plan proposed.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, it is absolutely unthinkable to me as your Secretary of the Interior that consideration would be given to forcing upon an Indian tribe a so-called termination plan which did not have the understanding and acceptance of a clear majority of the members affected. Those tribes which have thus far sought to end their Federal wardship status have, in each instance, demonstrated their acceptance of the plan prior to action by the Congress. I shall continue to insist this be the case and I hope and believe that Congress and its leaders will pursue the same course. To make my position perfectly clear, as long as I am Secretary of the Interior, I shall be dedicated to preserving the principle which I have just enunciated.

I further believe the Commissioner of Indian Affairs tried to make the position of the Congress and the Department of the Interior clear when in the fall of 1953, he stated, and I quote, "We want to give the Indians the same opportunities for advancement—the same freedom and responsibility for the management of their properties—as have other American citizens." Then Mr. Emmons continued, "I know that there are some tribes which are ready and anxious to take over

full responsibility for their own affairs at the earliest possible time, and that others will have to move along toward that objective much more slowly and gradually." He then added he recognized that in many areas there is a real need for a continuation of the trusteeship and will be for a span of years. And so it seems to me the intent has never been one of precipitating Indian groups into a position for which they were unprepared.

True enough, Indian groups can continue to exist as cultural islands in the midst of our national populations, isolated from the main group by language and custom, and living at standards far below those of the average American citizen. They can do this. In fact, many of them have done so for many years. But let me put this question to you: "Does the majority of the population of such tribes prefer to live in that manner, or does it do so because there seems to be no other choice? Or, does it do so because there is no general awareness of the alternatives?" I believe the majority of our Indian citizens are as desirous and capable of exercising all of the duties and responsibilities of citizenship as are the rest of us, provided they have equal opportunities with their fellow citizens. And having said that, I want to add this: under no circumstances could I bring myself to recommend the termination of the Federal relationship with any Indian tribe in this country until the members of that tribe have been given the opportunity of a sound and effective education. To me it would be incredible, even criminal, to send any Indian tribe out into the stream of American life until and unless the educational level of that tribe was one which was equal to the responsibilities which it was shouldering.

My recent visit to the Navajo tribal fair at Window Rock, and to the Navajo Reservation, and to other Indian reservations in these 2 years I have been Secretary, confirms my long-held conviction that all our Indian citizens are fully capable of eventually attaining a position of parity with other Americans, socially and economically.

A few short years ago the Navajo were described by many observers as one of the most underprivileged, backward Indian groups in the Nation. Actually, living standards on the reservation stood in such sharp contrast with standards outside the Navajo country that comparison was really difficult to make. True, the people in the main were uneducated, unable for the most part even to speak and understand the English language. Health and sanitation conditions were far below the minimum levels to be found elsewhere in the Nation. I am proud to say that since 1953, when Dwight D. Eisenhower became President of the United States and directed his attention to this problem, a great deal of progress has been made. The Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior has done its best to analyze the basic needs of the Navajo people. The Congress of the United States has made the essential opportunities available and I can assure you that the Navajo Tribe has taken advantage of those opportunities. Illiteracy is declining rapidly on their reservation today, with more than 90 percent of their school-age children enrolled in school. Nearly a third are attending public schools on and near the reservation area.

I wish you all could see the Navajo Reservation today. It is a scene of great activity, largely as a result of the planning of the Navajo themselves and their determination to achieve a position of equality with fellow Americans everywhere. They are investing their own tribal money in long-term programs for the development and conservation of their reservation resources, the creation of industrial job opportunities for their people, and in their training of their young men and women to enable them to play a leading role in resource development. Many of their

plans and aspirations transcend the boundaries of the reservation and promise to contribute to the development of large portions of the surrounding States whether inhabited by Indian or non-Indian population.

They, as well as we, recognize the continued need of the Navajo Tribe for appropriate Federal aid if they are to finally attain the objectives toward which we are co-operatively striving. They are moving ahead rapidly and are assuming additional responsibilities. In the field of health, the transfer of responsibility for the provision of Indian health services to the U.S. Public Health Service has made available for the solution of Indian health problems the vast and highly specialized experience and resources of that Federal agency. In the few years that have elapsed since that transfer was effected, tuberculosis and other diseases high in incidence among Indian groups, but of lower incidence among non-Indians, have declined and, I'm happy to say, have declined significantly.

The attainment by Indians of a position of equality in health and education is, of course, a matter of primary importance, and one to which the Government of the United States has paid particular attention since 1953. Not only has Government assistance been extended to finance the formal education of Indian boys and girls throughout the Nation, but it also has been directed toward the support of programs aimed at the education of Indian adults. This latter effort includes both the project developed to assist those adults who have never attended school and the program designed to provide adult Indians between the ages of 18 to 35 with salable work skills, thus to free them of dependency on reservation resources.

Throughout the Nation, in the past, Indians all too often have been the victims of a set of vicious circumstances that has prevented them from forging a new life for themselves and for their children. The reservation areas are, in many instances, lacking in the resources necessary to support the populations dependent upon them. At the same time, the Indian people in all too many cases lack the training necessary to make their livelihood independently of those inadequate resources.

I believe the recent progress of groups such as the Navajo, the Utes, the Pueblos, the Apaches, and other tribes here in the Southwest, is a valid measure of the capacity and desire of Indian groups to take advantage of opportunities offered for social and economic development. Above all, that progress demonstrates their desire and capacity for the management of their own affairs.

Because we are here in the Southwest, much I have said today has been concerned with the Navajo and other Indian tribes of this area. Nevertheless, what I have said, as to the overall policy of the Department of the Interior, applies to Indian tribes wherever they may live in this land of ours.

What I have tried to make clear is simply this: It is the intention of the Federal Government to fulfill its complete responsibility toward the Indian people throughout the Nation.

No Indian, of whatever tribe, need have any fear about that.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Legal Aspects of Indian Affairs From 1887 to 1957," which appeared in the May 1957, issue of the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. The article was written by Theodore H. Haas, president of the District of Columbia chapter of the Federal Bar Association who was chief counsel of the Bureau of Indian Affairs from 1944 to 1950, and chief collaborator of Felix S. Cohen in

the writing of "Handbook of Federal Indian Law" (1941).

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

THE LEGAL ASPECTS OF INDIAN AFFAIRS FROM 1887 TO 1957

(By Theodore H. Haas)

(Abstract: As the westward movement of the population proceeded, the demand for the Indians' land increased. Cultural assimilation became the slogan. "Americanized" Indians would be transformed from hunters and fishermen to farmers and cattlemen, communal ownership would yield to individual ownership, plenty of the tribal lands would be freed for white settlement. The culmination of this policy was the General Allotment Act of 1887. Another step toward integration was the Citizenship Act of 1924. The character and the effects of these policies are detailed by the author.—EDITOR.)

Hunger for Indian land and other resources has been the most important cause of many early conflicts between Indians and whites and Federal and State Governments.¹ Congress enacted the Indian Removal Act of 1830² under pressure from the States and with the active support of Andrew Jackson, the first President elected by popular vote and the first from the West. The removal policy was justified on the grounds that segregation would end the conflict between the races and that land would be provided for white settlement in the East. In exchange the Indians would be provided with land in the western territory where they would not be disturbed.

The land hunger was appeased but not satiated. As the settlement and development of the West gathered momentum in the 1880's, the remaining Indian lands were demanded. They consisted in 1887 of some 139 million acres of land west of the Mississippi River, where virtually all Indian tribes under the Government's protection lived on some diminished areas called "reservations."³

As with the removal policy, ethical justification was soon found for the enactment of laws which would reduce the Indian land holdings and also achieve the new objective of the rapid assimilation of the Indian. A popular theme, the white man's burden to uplift native people, was given a theoretical base by interpretations of Darwin's view of the evolution of man and Spencer's of the evolution of society. Soon additional arguments would come from the advocacy of the submersion of the varied cultures of immigrants into an American way of life. To attain this conformity, it was, of course, necessary to destroy Indian cultures, which rested not only on different religions and languages, but also on tribal organizations with their indigenous systems of communal ownership of land. All that was necessary to assimilate and make self-supporting quickly the slightly more than a quarter of a million Indians was to transform them from hunters and fishermen into farmers and cattlemen. By dividing the tribal estate among the members, they could gain the benefits of private or individual prop-

erty.⁴ Since the new way of life would not require the use of as much land as the savage economy did, unneeded or surplus land would be available for white purchase and occupancy.

THE DAWES ACT

The policy found its expression in the General Allotment Act of 1887,⁵ sometimes called the Dawes Act, which became the keystone of Federal Indian policy until the 1920's.⁶ Its momentum was largely lost by 1922 as a result of two unsuccessful attempts to expedite the fragmentation and alienation of Indian lands.⁷ The first was a campaign launched in 1917 to force the fee patenting of allotments, a method which was declared illegal by the courts. The second was an attempt of the Secretary of the Interior to secure the enactment of the Bursum Pueblo bill which would transfer the Pueblo land titles to white squatters, and of the Indian omnibus bill of 1923, which would provide for the loss of all Indian property with a special status.

The Dawes Act authorized the individualization of the reservation lands to the tribal members whenever the President believed that the land might be utilized advantageously for agricultural and grazing purposes. The head of a family was to be allotted 80 acres of agricultural land or 160 acres of grazing land; and a single person over 18 or an orphan child under 18 one-half of this amount. The United States retained title to the land until the expiration of a trust period of 25 years, or longer, if the President deemed an extension desirable. Then the allottee was to secure a patent in fee; to be able to dispose of the land as he wished; and to be subject to the laws of the State or Territory where he resided. The proceeds of the sale of surplus or land not needed for allotment were to be covered into the U.S. Treasury for the sole use of the tribe which had owned the land, and, together with interest at 3 percent per annum, were to be subject to appropriation by Congress for the education and civilization of the membership.

Citizenship was granted to any Indian who had voluntarily taken up residence within the territorial limits of the United States apart from his tribe and adopted the habits of civilized life and to an allottee as soon as he received a paper, improperly called a patent, showing that at a future time he would secure a regular patent conveying the fee or full title.⁸ Among the various amendments which were subsequently made to the Dawes Act were the following: citizenship was deferred until the expiration of the trust period; provisions were made for the lease, sale, and condemnation of allotments under administrative supervision; for the issuance by the Secretary of the Interior of a certificate of competency to an Indian which would permit him to dispose of trust or restricted property; and for the protection of allotted lands from any charge or encumbrance because of any debt of the allottee. Supple-

⁴ Thus the Indian like the successful homesteader would attain economic independence and the ideal of a family farm.

⁵ Act of Feb. 8, 1887, 24 Stat. 388. For the act's background see Felix S. Cohen, *Handbook of Federal Indian Law* (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1945), pp. 206 ff.

⁶ Laurence F. Schmeckebier, *The Office of Indian Affairs: Its History, Activities, and Organization* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1927), pp. 78-90. Some tribes were excepted from the Dawes Act, but most of them were covered by similar special laws.

⁷ Joseph B. Gittler (Ed.), *Understanding Minority Groups* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1956), pp. 42-43.

⁸ See *United States v. Rickert* (188 U.S. 432 (1903)); *Monson v. Simonson* (231 U.S. 341, 345 (1913)).

¹ "From the first discovery of America to the present time, one master passion common to all mankind, that of acquiring land, has driven, in ceaseless succession, the white man on the Indian." Statement by James Barbour, Secretary of War in 1826, to chairman, House Committee on Indian Affairs (19th Cong., 1st sess. (1825)), H. Doc. 102, p. 5.

² Act of May 28, 1830, 4 Stat. 411.

³ Indian lands reached a peak of 150 million acres in 1873. Oliver La Farge, *As Long as the Grass Shall Grow* (New York: Alliance Book Co., 1940), p. 30.

mentary legislation provided for the apportionment of tribal funds among the members.

TAXATION

The General Allotment Act also had a marked effect on taxation. The original tribal land was exempt from State property taxation, and allotted land became subject to such tax when the patent in the fee was granted. As in all other important questions of Indian law, much litigation has been necessary to interpret treaty and statutory provisions related to taxes. In 1956 a decision of the Supreme Court held that income derived from the sale by the Federal Government of standing timber on allotted lands was exempt from the Federal capital-gains tax.⁹ Chief Justice Warren stated that the purpose of the allotment was to protect the Indians' interest and to prepare the Indians to take their place as independent, qualified members of the modern body politic, and to this end it is necessary to preserve the trust land and income derived directly therefrom. The Chief Justice concluded that it would be unreasonable to infer that Congress intended by enacting the income tax law to destroy the tax exemption afforded by the General Allotment Act, since such action would be a sorry breach of faith with the Indians. The importance of this decision is demonstrated by the fact that there are more than 100,000 tracts of individually owned Indian land totaling about 13 million acres held in trust by the Government, most of which were allotted under the 1887 statute.

The widespread belief that Indians pay no taxes is one of the many myths concerning Indians.¹⁰ The area of Indian tax exemption has been confined by legislation and litigation to a narrow range. With a few exceptions Indians are now subject to the same taxes as non-Indians. The most important exception is the exemption from real property taxes of Indian land, which is protected by an express exemption in a Federal treaty or statute, or by the taking of legal title to the land in the United States, as in the case of allotted land.¹¹

The members of certain tribes, including the Five Civilized Tribes, which were excluded from the General Allotment Act, were granted title to much of their lands in fee simple, subject to a restriction on alienation without the consent of the Secretary of the Interior. The purpose of keeping the land in a restricted status was the same as the retention in trust of lands divided under the General Allotment Act—the protection of the Indian from the loss or unwise use of his property. The sale or lease of these lands was also restricted. The Indians and the Government officials concerned thought that these purchased tracts had the same status as Indian lands in which title remained in the Federal Government, and that tax exemption always accompanied restricted property, but the Supreme Court held the land and its income taxable because of the absence of an express tax exemption.¹²

One of the two references to Indians in the Constitution has become obsolete. Article 1, section 2, requires the exclusion of "Indians not taxed" from the decennial population count used in apportioning the number of Representatives for a State. Beginning in 1940, the Census Bureau no longer follows its prior hoary custom, at least

sixty years old, of computing by guesswork or divination the "Indians not taxed."

Allotment process

Reservations were allotted in Oklahoma, the Lake States, the Plains States, the Pacific Coast States, in fact in varying degrees almost all Indian reservations were allotted, except those in Alaska and most of those in the Southwest. Yet, despite its protective features the General Allotment Act did not fulfill the expectations of sponsors who considered the welfare of Indians. Indian men of many tribes, such as the Sioux, considered farming to be woman's work. The original acreage was usually insufficient for an economic unit, and fractionalization, due to division after the death of the allottee, usually to heirs intestate, added to the difficulty. As Senator Henry M. Teller of Colorado, a former Secretary of the Interior (1882-85), its leading opponent, predicted, most allottees soon lost their lands at bargain prices. By 1933, 91 million acres or two-thirds of the Indian land base of 1887, and generally the most productive, was lost and some 90,000 Indians were landless.¹³ In the words of the task force investigating Indians for the first Hoover Commission,¹⁴ "If the 90 million acres lost through the [allotment] process had remained in Indian ownership, the problem of poverty among most tribes could be solved with less difficulty and with more certainty today; and assimilation would take place at a satisfactory level with a minimum of public expense." The report also refers to—

"The mistaken belief that the destruction of tribal organization and culture would bring about or at least hasten the acquisition of white civilization." * * * People move from one base to another, and move slowly. The loss of an existing base, before the new base has been consolidated, means simply frustration and degeneration. The destruction of Indian tribal government, the liquidation of tribal organization and tribal property, and the hostility to all Indian ways and culture that characterized so much of governmental policy now appear to have been a mistake which defeated rather than furthered the Government's ultimate objectives."

Effects of General Allotment Act

The significance of the General Allotment Act extends beyond its impact on Indian land. The law was passed over the strenuous objections of most Indians. Hence, it disregarded the principle of bilateralism or mutual agreement which had been followed in treaty making until 1871, and subsequently in the formulation of statutes. Moreover, prior laws had considered cultural differences among the numerous Indian groups, but the Dawes Act set an important precedent by imposing a uniform legal pattern for Indians generally.¹⁵ Following the new pattern of some provisions of a few prior treaties and statutes, the Government henceforth bypassed to a large extent tribal organizations and Indian leaders and dealt directly with individual Indians. To fill the vacuum caused by the law's weakening of

¹³ "Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs," Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior, 1933 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office), p. 68.

¹⁴ "Report of the Committee on Indian Affairs to the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government," Charles J. Rhodes, John R. Nichols, Gilbert Darlington, George A. Graham, Chairman, October 1948 (unpublished manuscript), pp. 15-16.

¹⁵ In the 1880's a few other uniform laws of less importance were passed. While some important Indian groups, such as the Five Civilized Tribes, were excluded from the Dawes Act, most of them were soon subjected to somewhat similar laws.

the tribal governments, the authority of Federal administrators over Indians was greatly expanded. This growth is evidenced by the multiplication of laws and regulations relating to Indian affairs. By 1949, Indian statutes exceeded 4,000, and by 1957 climbed toward 6,000 in number. Regulations and manual or letter instructions grew proportionately. Another effect of the law was graphically described by Theodore Roosevelt in his Presidential message to Congress of December 3, 1901. He characterized the law as "a mighty pulverizing engine to break up the tribal mass" whereby "some 60,000 Indians have already become citizens of the United States."¹⁶

CITIZENSHIP

While prior to the Citizenship Act of 1924,¹⁷ the Dawes Act was the most important method of acquiring citizenship, there are several other general or special statutes and treaties which naturalized Indians. Indian women marrying citizens became citizens by an 1888 law,¹⁸ and a few Indian veterans in World War I were granted citizenship under a 1919 law.¹⁹ Some 125,000 native-born Indians who had not become citizens previously were made citizens in 1924. Although the contrary view was once held, it is now well settled that citizenship does not affect the authority of the Government over the Indians.²⁰

As a consequence of attaining national citizenship, the Indians automatically become citizens of the State where they reside. Yet, a 1938 survey by the Department of the Interior disclosed that seven States refused to let Indians vote. By 1947, largely through the efforts of the Federal Government, the attorneys general of several States, and the Indians themselves, all the States with large Indian populations conceded the right of Indians to suffrage on the same basis as non-Indians, except the States of Arizona and New Mexico. In 1948, as a result of judicial decisions, these States withdrew their prohibition on Indian voting.²¹ In 1950, the Indians of Maine were denied the franchise, but this problem was corrected by legislation. In the Presidential election of 1956, the Indians of Utah living on reservations were denied the franchise by a ruling of the State attorney general. The problem as of this writing is pending before the Supreme Court of the United States.

REPEAL OF DISCRIMINATORY LAWS

The enactment of the Indian Claims Commission Act of 1946 ended one discrimination against Indian groups, which originated almost a century earlier when the act permitting the Government to be sued on certain claims did not permit suits by Indian tribes.²² Unfair dealings in lands is the main source of such claims. Generally, judicial decisions have continued to strengthen early recognition of Indian land title by virtue of aboriginal occupancy.²³

¹⁶ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 35, pt. 1, p. 90 (57th Congress, 1st sess., 1901).

¹⁷ Act of June 2, 1924, 43 Stat. 253.

¹⁸ Sec. 2, act of Aug. 9, 1888, 25 Stat. 392.

¹⁹ Act of Nov. 6, 1919, 41 Stat. 350.

²⁰ *United States v. Nice*, 241 U.S. 591, 598 (1916) which overruled *Matter of Heff*, 197 U.S. 488 (1905).

²¹ *Harrison v. Laveen*, 67 Ariz. 337, 196 P. 2d 456 (1948); *Trujillo v. Garley*, D. Ct. New Mexico (1948), unreported. The Department of Justice filed briefs as amicus curiae in these suits. U.S. attorneys are required to render certain legal services to Indians by the act of March 3, 1893, 27 Stat. 612, 631, 25 U.S.C. 175.

²² For further discussion see "Indian Claims Commission Act" in this issue of "The Annals" by Nancy Oestreich Lurie.

²³ *Felix S. Cohen*, "Original Indian Title," *Minnesota Law Review*, vol. 32 (December 1947), p. 28.

⁹ *Squire v. Capoeman*, 351 U.S. 1 (1956).

¹⁰ The status of being an Indian does not create an immunity from the levy of the Federal income tax. *Choteau v. Burnet*, 283 U.S. 691 (1931).

¹¹ Land subsequently purchased by the tribe which is not taken by the United States in trust is taxable.

¹² *Oklahoma Tax Commission v. United States*, 319 U.S. 598 (1943).

It is now well established that individual Indians may sue and be sued, make contracts, and enjoy all the civil liberties guaranteed to their fellow citizens. There is one exception to this general principle; namely, for the protection of this dependent people, Congress can and has imposed limitations on their disposal of trust or restricted property. Administrative or congressional approval is required for the alienation of such property or the expenditure of certain trust funds. Moreover, until fairly recently, many discriminatory Federal laws hampered freedom of speech and sanctioned various measures of military and civil control within the reservation boundaries. Most of these laws were repealed by the act of May 21, 1934.²⁴ The most important and one of the oldest such laws was the Indian liquor law, the first prohibition law of our Nation. Many terms popular in the prohibition era, such as "bootlegger" and "whisky runner," originated in the illegal trade with Indians. President Thomas Jefferson, acting in response to a verbal plea by the Indian chief, Little Turtle, recommended this law to Congress in 1803, which forthwith authorized the President to regulate the selling and distribution of spirituous liquors among the Indian tribes.²⁵ Frequent amendments to this act broadened its scope and made its enforcement easier. The most important of these measures was the act of July 23, 1892, as amended in 1938, which prohibited the sale or gift of intoxicants to Indians and their introduction into Indian country.²⁶ In 1918, the possession of intoxicants in the Indian country was made a separate offense,²⁷ but a 1948 law allowed the introduction in Indian country of intoxicants for mechanical, scientific, and medicinal purposes.²⁸

The Supreme Court several times upheld the validity of the Indian liquor law as a measure to protect the Indians under the power of Congress to regulate commerce with Indian tribes.²⁹ In 1953, however, Indians were placed in the same status as non-Indians with respect to intoxicants when off the reservation, except in States which had an Indian liquor law, and the Indians were granted the right of local option with respect to their reservations.³⁰

STATE LAWS

Generally, an Indian while off the reservation is subject to State laws to the same extent as non-Indians. The United States, however, has plenary or full, though not absolute, authority over Indian affairs and has passed special laws, such as the Indian liquor law, applicable to Indians while off the reservation. Furthermore, State laws are not enforceable within the territory of an Indian tribe in matters affecting Indians un-

less and until the Federal Government consents thereto or unless the State law aids in effectuating Federal law and policy.

Since 1887, there has been a steady increase in the areas to which the Congress has granted its consent to the application of State laws to Indians. The first field in which State laws have been applied generally to Indians is inheritance. The General Allotment Act provided that after patents are issued to lands allotted to Indians, the lands shall be inherited by the heirs of a deceased Indian according to the laws of the State or territory where the land is located. State law was applied to such inheritance until 1910 when the Secretary of the Interior was granted full power to determine heirs and partition allotments, to administer the estates of the allottees, and to sell heirship lands. In 1913, the law was amended to permit an Indian to dispose of trust property, real and personal, by will or contract, approved by the Secretary of the Interior. Hence, a will, if approved by the Secretary, need not conform to State law.

By congressional statutes the States of New York, Kansas, and Iowa have acquired jurisdiction over crimes committed by Indians against Indians on Indian reservations. North Dakota acquired the same power over one reservation. In 1953, a law granted similar jurisdiction to California, Nebraska, Oregon (except the Warm Spring Reservation), Minnesota (except the Red Lake Reservation), and Wisconsin (except the Menominee Reservation) and authorized the various other States to assume criminal and civil jurisdiction over crimes and transactions involving Indians on Indian land whenever such States wished.³¹

The Federal jurisdiction over ten major crimes committed by Indians against Indians on Indian reservations, further complicates the administration of criminal law. The punishment of seven major crimes was assumed by the Federal Government 2 years after the Supreme Court held in *Ex Parte Crow Dog* that in the absence of Federal legislation granting jurisdiction to the Federal courts, they could not try and punish an Indian for the murder of another Indian on an Indian reservation. The tribal governments alone had this authority.³² Three other crimes were subsequently added to the original seven crimes.³³

State laws are very important for Indians in the criminal field. In 1893, the Federal Assimilative Crimes Act made offenses by non-Indians against Indians or their property, or vice versa, punishable by the Federal courts in accordance with State laws then in effect. Two of the major crimes, rape and burglary, committed by an Indian against another Indian on an Indian reservation are defined and punished in accordance with State laws. Eight other major crimes are subject to the same laws and penalties as if the offense were committed within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States.

FEDERAL-STATE COOPERATION

The Federal Government has authorized the enforcement of the following State laws on Indian reservations: (1) sanitary and quarantine laws, under rules prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior;³⁴ and (2) compulsory school laws, with tribal consent.³⁵ Federal laws have applied also a wide variety of State laws to particular tribes and areas. For example, Oklahoma has been authorized to tax oil and gas production from

Indian lands and mineral production from the Five Civilized Tribal lands.³⁶

The most important law which provides for Federal-State cooperation in Indian affairs is the so-called Johnson-O'Malley Act of April 16, 1934.³⁷ This law authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts with States, Territories and private institutions " * * * for the education, medical attention, agricultural assistance, and social welfare, including relief of distress of Indians in each State or Territory, through the qualified agencies of each State or Territory." With the increase of attendance of Indians at public schools, the Federal grants have increased considerably. State contracts for extension and social welfare services are also becoming more important. The Indian Bureau is in the process of transferring its extension work to the States and the Department of Agriculture. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare, to which were transferred, effective July 1, 1955, the Federal Government's Indian health services including authority previously exercised by the Department of the Interior,³⁸ has made several contracts with States and universities for medical attention, including health education. A 1952 law, which authorizes the transfer, with tribal consent, of Federal hospital patients to State and local Indian hospitals, illustrates the increasing importance of Federal and State cooperation in the rendering of Indian health services.³⁹ Contracts with universities for various research projects have been made by the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare and of Interior.

The most significant research project on Indian affairs was made by a private organization. In 1926, the Department of the Interior invited the Institute for Government Research to make a survey of the social and economic conditions of the Indians. The report of this study, which was published in 1928,⁴⁰ helped to inaugurate a new era in Indian administration. On December 4, 1929, President Herbert Hoover took steps to implement the report by stating in his first message to Congress that the Government had an obligation to raise the standard of living of Indians, to provide adequately for their health and education, and to advance their opportunity for profitable employment. There soon followed a substantial increase in appropriations for the Indian Bureau.

INDIAN REORGANIZATION ACT

Toward the beginning of the Franklin Roosevelt administration there was enacted the Indian Reorganization Act,⁴¹ the most comprehensive law relating to Indians since the General Allotment Act. The IRA, as it is sometimes called, laid the foundation for a new Indian policy and has been hailed as a landmark in social science "because it brought to Indian Affairs and to the U.S. Government for the first time, an explicit use of social science principles."⁴²

²⁴ See Cohen, op. cit. (note 5 supra), pp. 118-119.

²⁵ 48 Stat. 596.

²⁶ Act of August 5, 1954, 68 Stat. 674.

²⁷ Act of April 3, 1952, 66 Stat. 935.

²⁸ Lewis Meriam Associates, "Problem of Indian Administration" (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1928).

²⁹ Act of June 18, 1934, 48 Stat. 984, which with minor modifications was extended to Alaska by the act of May 1, 1936, 49 Stat. 1250, and Oklahoma by the act of June 28, 1936, 49 Stat. 1967.

³⁰ Clyde Kluckhohn and Robert Hackenberg, "Social Science Principles and the Indian Reorganization Act, Indian Affairs and the Indian Reorganization Act: The 20-Year Record," edited by William H. Kelly (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1954), p. 35.

³¹ Act of Mar. 3, 1802 (sec. 21, 2 Stat. 139). Cohen, op. cit. (note 5 supra), p. 352.

³² 27 Stat. 260, as amended by act of June 15, 1938 (52 Stat. 696).

³³ Act of May 25, 1918 (40 Stat. 561, 563).

³⁴ Act of June 25, 1948 (sec. 1154, 62 Stat. 683, 758).

³⁵ *United States v. Sandoval*, 231 U. S. 28 (1913), and cases cited therein.

³⁶ Act of Aug. 15, 1953, 67 Stat. 586. By June 30, 1956, 30 tribes had adopted resolutions for the purpose of legalizing intoxicants on the reservation. "Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs," annual report of the Secretary of the Interior, 1956 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office) p. 215.

³⁷ Act of Aug. 15, 1953, 67 Stat. 588.

³⁸ 109 U.S. 556 (1883).

³⁹ Act of Mar. 3, 1885, 23 Stat. 362, 385; amended by act of Mar. 4, 1909, sec. 328, 35 Stat. 1088, 1151; act of June 28, 1932, 47 Stat. 336, 337.

⁴⁰ Act of Feb. 15, 1929, 45 Stat. 1185.

⁴¹ Act of Aug. 9, 1946, 60 Stat. 962.

The IRA became operative through the majority vote by members of a tribe at a formal election.⁴³ It ended the allotting of tribal lands and the process of terminating trust periods or periods of restricted alienability, after a fixed period of years. It also placed severe limitations on the operation of allotment in other respects.⁴⁴ It recognized the inadequacy of the Indian land base, authorized the appropriation of \$2 million a year for the purchase of lands for tribes, and generally limited the disposition of restricted land to Indian tribes and their members. It also empowered tribes incorporated under the act to make consolidations of fractionated lands, with the owner's consent, and provided for the purchase and restoration of land to Indians.

During the ensuing 10 years Indian land was increased from about 52 million acres to more than 56 million acres by governmental and tribal land purchases and by the restoration of land to Indians under the act and by supplementary legislation.

Another important feature of the IRA is that it directed the Secretary of the Interior to promulgate conservation regulations to prevent the erosion, deforestation, and overgrazing of Indian lands.

Since 1948, however, there has been a resumption of the prior downward trend, accelerated by the issuance of patents in fee under the act of May 4, 1948,⁴⁵ which authorized the Secretary of the Interior to sell individual Indian lands, and by special enabling acts.

The act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 539) greatly increased the term for which Indian-owned land may be leased.

The IRA sought to reinvigorate and stabilize the powers and organization of Indian tribes. It gave the official governments standing by providing for the approval of constitutions and also of charters, if desired for business purposes. It vested also in tribes which adopted such constitutions the following new powers: approval or veto over the disposition of all tribal assets; the right to spend certain funds; to negotiate with the Federal, State, and local governments; to employ legal counsel, only the choice of counsel and the fixing of fees being subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior; and to see appropriation estimates for the tribe's benefit prior to their submission to the Budget Bureau and Congress. Some of these powers were subject to various degrees of supervision by the Secretary of the Interior.

The constitutions add to, but do not detract from, the powers of an Indian tribe. The laws, customs, and decisions of tribal government control large areas of civil and criminal law, including questions of tribal membership, property, taxation, the conservation, development and use of tribal resources, social welfare, domestic relations, health, housing, inheritance, and the form of tribal government. The courts have fairly consistently upheld the Indians' right to home rule. One of the most recent decisions in this field sustained the right of the Oglala Sioux Tribe to pass an ordinance taxing a non-Indian lessee of a grazing allotment and a criminal ordinance covering offenses by

Indians against Indians and enforced by the tribal court.⁴⁶

Program

The IRA authorized the establishment of a revolving credit fund which has enabled thousands of Indians to become rehabilitated by providing the means for them to apply modern technology in the use and development of their land and other resources. For the purpose of borrowing and lending money, many tribes adopted Federal corporate business charters under the act which enabled them to make contracts, to sue and be sued, and to relend to individual members.⁴⁷ Loans were also made to Indian credit associations and to individual Indians. While most loans have been made for agricultural, livestock, or fishing purposes, a variety of projects have been financed, including stores, salmon canneries, motels, and arts- and crafts-producing and selling organizations. In recent years, the number and amount of loans have decreased due in part to an increased availability of private credit.

The act of March 29, 1956 (70 Stat. 62) authorized the execution of mortgages and deeds of trust on individually owned trust or restricted land in order to stimulate an increase in such credit.

The IRA also authorized annual appropriations not exceeding \$250,000 for educational loans and directed the creation of an Indian civil service under which qualified Indians shall have the preference to appointment of vacancies in any position in the Indian Office.

The IRA encouraged cultural diversity, a part of the essence of democracy, in lieu of a pattern of Indian administration emphasizing undeviating conformity, the essence of the philosophy of communism. Each Indian group was able to administer its own assets, by leasing and conserving its land and spending some of its moneys, and to pass laws for local public services. As leases for oil, gas, uranium, and for other purposes have vastly increased the income of some tribes, several tribal councils have established revolving credit funds with their own moneys and set up trust funds to provide college scholarships for their younger members. The total amount of tribal funds used for credit purposes now exceed the amount of Federal funds so used.

Some of these functions have been performed in cooperation with Federal, State, and local governments. The Indian civil and criminal laws have been influenced by Federal and State laws; and their courts have granted bail, parole, probation, and suspended sentences and applied other features of modern laws. The Indians have gained experience in a transitional legal system between their unwritten laws and customs and the white man's more formalized system of justice. They have learned also of legislative and administrative procedures; written constitutions and laws; majority rule; budgets; accounting; public relations; and lobbying in the Congress, Indian Bureau, and Interior Department. They discovered, too, that despite differences in customs, histories, and organizations, many of the problems of one tribe are similar to those of other tribes, and that national, State, and local organizations are as necessary for Indians as for non-Indians. They gained some experience, also, in business organizations and methods by forming and dealing with corporations, cooperatives, and credit operations. They have been provided with stepping-stones toward more economic and governmental responsibilities

through their own or other local governments.

The IRA demonstrated anew that local groups' activities help fulfill the individual's need for creativity and a feeling of worth, and that democratic methods offer the soundest way to bring people into the economic and political life of our Nation of many diverse cultures and peoples. Some of the soundest ingredients of the IRA program have become a part of our foreign-aid program for underdeveloped areas. From Iran and Israel to India, Latin America, and the Philippines, former officials of the Indian Bureau are helping the people to achieve scientific and locally controlled programs. Exported technicians are thus working in some countries through IRA methods—not from the top down by bureaucratic coercion or paternalistic charity—but by a partnership with people, thus giving natives a sense of purpose, community cooperation, and human dignity.

A related law should be mentioned in passing—the act of August 27, 1935,⁴⁸ which established an Indian Arts and Crafts Board composed of five Commissioners appointed by the Secretary of the Interior. The Board's main function is to promote the economic welfare of Indians through developing arts and crafts.

TERMINATION

It is well established that Congress has the authority to determine when the Federal Government shall terminate its special relationship with an Indian group⁴⁹ and when to extinguish Indian title to lands.⁵⁰ A demand for expediting the termination process, which has often been linked with a demand for the liquidation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, was especially strong in some periods of history such as the last decade of the 19th century and the years 1917-18 and 1922-24. Sometimes the beneficiaries of Federal services to Indians have been limited. For example, the Appropriation Act of May 25, 1918, and subsequent laws in general restricted attendance at Federal schools to Indians of one-fourth or more Indian blood.⁵¹

The most recent expressions of this policy was the passage in 1953 of House Concurrent Resolution 108,⁵² which declared that Federal supervision should be ended as speedily as possible for the Indians of five named States and seven specified tribes located elsewhere. Subsequently, termination laws were enacted for two of these tribes, the Menominees of Wisconsin⁵³ and the Klamaths of Oregon,⁵⁴ the mixed-blood members of the Ute Tribe of Utah,⁵⁵ and a few other groups.

Contrariwise, Congress provided additional help for some Indian tribes. By the Navaho-Hopi Rehabilitation Act of 1950,⁵⁶ the appropriation of \$88,570,000 was authorized for a program to improve the educational and economic opportunities of these Indians, including relocation and resettlement, an activity which was subsequently extended to all Indians. While intensified or new functions may be assumed for tribes previously recognized, it is unlikely that new tribes will be recognized for the purposes of

⁴³ One hundred and eighty-one tribes accepted the act, 77 rejected it, and 14 came under it because of failure to vote. Alaskan and Oklahoma groups were covered into the act without a vote.

⁴⁴ Cohen, op. cit. (note 5 supra), p. 217.

⁴⁵ 62 Stat. 236. The General Services Administration in 1957 estimated that 53,100,000 acres of land was held in trust for Indians by the Federal Government. The Association on American Indian Affairs estimates that some 1,600,000 acres of Indian land have passed from Indian control in the last 4 years.

⁴⁶ *Iron Crow v. Oglala Sioux Tribe*, of Pine Ridge Reservation, 231 F. 2d 89, 8th Circuit (1956).

⁴⁷ The benefits of the revolving credit fund have been extended to groups which did not adopt the IRA.

⁴⁸ 49 Stat. 891; 25 U.S.C., 1952 ed., sec. 305 ff.

⁴⁹ *Tiger v. Western Investment Co.* (221 U.S. 286 (1911)).

⁵⁰ *United States v. Sante Fe Pacific R. Co.* (314 U.S. 339, 347 (1941)).

⁵¹ 40 Stat. 561, 564.

⁵² 83d Cong., 1st sess.

⁵³ Act of June 17, 1954, 68 Stat. 250; act of July 14, 1956, 70 Stat. 544; act of July 14, 1956, 70 Stat. 549.

⁵⁴ Act of Aug. 13, 1954, 68 Stat. 718.

⁵⁵ Act of Aug. 27, 1954, 68 Stat. 868.

⁵⁶ Act of Apr. 19, 1950, 64 Stat. 44. Several rehabilitation bills for other groups failed to pass.

the Federal Government rendering services to them.⁵⁷

It is now apparent that since Indian groups differ widely in the degrees of their acculturation and educational health and economic conditions, it would be folly for the Government to attempt to fit them into an identical pattern by a general law applicable to all Indian groups.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF DEVELOPMENT OF PETROLEUM AND COAL RESERVES—AMENDMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1157) to encourage the development of petroleum and coal reserves within the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

TAXATION OF INCOME OF LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. SMATHERS submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 4245) relating to the taxation of the income of life insurance companies, which were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROVISIONS OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] be added as a cosponsor to Senate bill 937, which I introduced on February 4, 1959, on behalf of myself and Senators CHAVEZ, LANGER, MAGNUSON, and PASTORE.

This bill would amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to eliminate certain inequities and restrictions, and permit a more effective distribution of Federal funds.

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

PREVENTION OF DISCRIMINATION BECAUSE OF AGE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] was inadvertently omitted from the list of cosponsors of the bill (S. 1172) to prohibit unreasonable discrimination because of age in the hiring and employment of persons by Government contractors which I introduced on February 26. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Washington—who joined with us in supporting similar legislation in the

last Congress—be added as a cosponsor of S. 1172.

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

AUTHORIZATION FOR VICE PRESIDENT OR PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN BILLS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the President of the Senate or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign bills during the recess or adjournment of the Senate.

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

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

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

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

Address delivered by him at Democratic victory dinner, Washington, D.C., February 28, 1959.

Address delivered by Senator ELLENDER before the annual meeting of the New York State Waterways Association in New York City on February 27, 1959.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Address delivered by him before Ohio Association of Retail Lumber Dealers, Columbus, Ohio, February 26, 1959.

Editorial entitled "Benson on Farm Surpluses," published in the Washington Evening Star of February 15, 1959.

By Mr. SCOTT:

Address on the subject "The Fight With Inflation," delivered by Senator BENNETT before the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association, at Philadelphia, Pa., on February 24, 1959.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Address delivered by him before Vanderbilt University Law School, Nashville, Tenn., February 25, 1959.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SENATE BILLS 442 AND 1005, BY ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on Thursday, March 5, at 10 a.m. in room 424 of the Senate Office Building, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold hearings on Senate bills 442 and 1005.

These bills would amend the Clayton Act by requiring prior notification of corporate mergers and acquisition. The subcommittee will hear from those witnesses who have requested to be heard on certain aspects of this legislation.

NATIONAL SECURITY—RESOLUTION OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from an old friend and fellow Montanan, the na-

tional commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, John W. Mahan, of Helena, Mont. In his letter, which is addressed to every Senator, Mr. Mahan sets forth his views on the need to maintain the defenses of our country. For example, he states that, according to present plans, our forces are going to be cut, insofar as the Marine Corps and the Army are concerned.

Mr. President, the Marine Corps, according to press reports, has been directed to reduce its strength to 175,000 men by the end of June 1959, even though last year the Congress appropriated funds to maintain the Marine Corps at a strength of 200,000 men. In addition, Mr. President, the Army has been given directions to reduce its strength, by the 30th of June 1959, to 870,000, rather than the 900,000 which was the intent of the Congress when additional funds were appropriated last year.

Mr. President, it is my hope that this matter will be given the most serious reconsideration by the administration, not only in view of the difficulties which have faced us in the past, but also in view of the difficulties which well may face us in the future.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my statement, a table from the February 16 issue of Newsweek, and an article by Hanson W. Baldwin, be printed in the RECORD, together with a copy of the letter from Mr. John W. Mahan, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

There being no objection, the tables, article, and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of the statement:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

The Marine Corps, according to press reports, has been directed to reduce its strength to 175,000 by the end of June 1959.

This is a drastic cut below the current actual strength of 190,000 and an even more sizable cut below the 200,000 strength for which Congress appropriated and directed the Marine Corps to maintain for the current year.

This reduction in the Marine Corps has serious implications, to which I will allude later, that go far beyond military matters. But first, there is the matter of our national requirement for a fully manned, adequate, combat-ready, versatile striking force of marines. Recent events underline with irrefutable logic this requirement.

The crises which have followed one upon the other—Suez, Lebanon, and the Formosa Straits—have demonstrated not only the need for our Marine national force in readiness but also the precise and effective manner in which the Marines fulfill that requirement. Lebanon and Formosa are by no means the last of our international difficulties. We are confronted with an international situation that exists now and will continue to exist well into the foreseeable future; a situation characterized by many potential Communist-sparked crises.

So, with the need for marines great or greater than ever before, our Marine Corps is being deliberately, arbitrarily, precipitately reduced. This Pentagon assault on the Marine Corps merits closest congressional and public scrutiny. It is no secret in official governmental circles that there has long been an effort within the Pentagon to reduce the

⁵⁷ Compare the limited recognition of the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina by the act of June 7, 1956, 70 Stat. 254, with prior recognition for the Catawba Indians of South Carolina by appropriations for Federal services during a period exceeding the last decade.

Marines to merely a ceremonial status. This currently directed cut is just another step in that direction.

"Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." With Santayana's warning in mind, let's examine the recent history of Marine Corps strength.

At the conclusion of World War II, during the congressional hearings incident to the passage of the National Security Act of 1947, it was apparent that determined efforts were being made to reduce the Marine Corps to a ceremonial organization. To assure its continued existence as a hard-hitting force in readiness, Congress spelled out, in detail, the roles and missions of the corps.

This action by the legislative branch was taken against concerted and vigorous opposition from certain factions in the Pentagon.

In spite of these elaborate precautions to assure that the Marine Corps would continue to exist to fill an obvious and vital requirement in our Nation's defense structure, the strength of the corps was reduced battalion by battalion until on the eve of the Korean war it had fallen to six infantry battalions. It is worth noting that although Congress had appropriated sufficient funds to support a measurably larger force in 1950-51, the then Secretary of Defense refused to permit the existence of more than six battalions.

The lightning suddenness of the Korean conflict revealed in stark detail the bankruptcy of those policies. The Pentagon had reduced our ready force to the point that invited a national disaster.

Working against overwhelming odds in matters of time and space, the Marine Corps was able to provide a brigade that turned the swelling Communist tide at Pusan and saved the perimeter. Then, at Inchon, a division of marines speedily assembled, literally from opposite sides of the earth, converted the battle for South Korea into a rout of the Communist hordes.

The vital importance of a strong force in readiness had been demonstrated once again with nerve shattering clarity. The lesson was not lost on Congress.

While the Korean war was still in progress, Congress went to great effort to assure that the Nation would not again find itself so nearly without such a force. In 1952 legislation was enacted to prescribe a Marine Corps of not less than three combat divisions and three air wings.

With such a firm and unambiguous requirement established in the law, Congress felt it had assured the existence of a constantly ready combat force of sufficient strength to serve as the first echelon of the Nation's limited war force.

However, in 1955, the Pentagon began a new round of reductions in the Marine Corps over vigorous congressional opposition. In the face of Pentagon plans to reduce the Marine Corps to 193,000, Congress appropriated sufficient funds to maintain the corps at 215,000 for fiscal year 1956. Over \$37 million of the funds thus appropriated were impounded by the then Secretary of Defense and the Marine Corps was maintained at 200,000.

Fiscal year 1958 brought a new attack on the strength of the corps. After Congress had appropriated funds to maintain the Marines at 200,000, the Pentagon refused to allocate funds for a strength beyond 190,000.

The budget for fiscal year 1959 revealed a new assault on Marine strength with a reduction from 190,000 to 175,000. Faced with this effort to reduce the corps by 12½ percent below that set by the legislative branch in its appropriations, Congress took new steps to make its position clear.

The House Appropriations Committee found that "a strong Marine Corps is essential to our national defense establishment. The striking power of the operating forces of

the Marine Corps consist primarily of three combat divisions and three air wings with supporting forces as provided by law. These forces deployed in this country, aboard ship, and in advance bases in the Pacific and the Far East, form a striking force immediately available and prepared to fight in a general war, a small war, or a limited war. The budget recommended by the President did not make adequate provision for these specifically authorized Marine Corps forces."

In support of this finding the committee recommended, and the House of Representatives approved, appropriations to maintain the Marines at a strength of 200,000.

The Appropriations Committee of the Senate did not rest content with a mere affirmation of the findings of its brethren in the House. It chose to make abundantly clear that this was not a hastily conceived sentimental salute to a particular service. The committee stated, "This decision to appropriate the funds necessary for a 200,000-man Marine Corps was made with full consideration of the fiscal and military implications. The committee desires that it be clearly understood by appropriate agencies in the executive branch of the Government that it is the clear-cut intent of the committee, and of the proposed appropriating legislation, that the Marine Corps be maintained at the strength of 200,000."

The Senate approved these conclusions and the action of the House of Representatives by appropriating the funds necessary to establish a Marine Corps of 200,000.

Although confronted by this clear and unmistakably congressional mandate, the Pentagon has nevertheless directed a reduction of the Marines to 175,000.

When placed in the perspective afforded by recent history, the current actions by the Pentagon fit the old discredited and disastrous pattern of a step by step gutting of the Marines to the status of a ceremonial outfit.

The lessons of history, recent and remote, are ignored. The blind unreasoning refusal to look at the world situation continues. The probability of new situations similar to those we were compelled to face in Korea, Indochina, Suez, and Lebanon is blandly rejected.

Can we attribute the Pentagon attitude solely to a desire for economy? The amount involved will not support this conclusion. Careful study by the Appropriations Committees established this amount at \$45,200,000; a small sum, indeed, to maintain the force-in-readiness tailored to provide the versatility and flexibility we need so desperately today.

The complete rejection by the executive branch of the most carefully formulated conclusions of the legislature on matters of military policy, such as Marine Corps strength, is not supported by history or by the current world situation. Nor is it sound governmental procedure.

I have watched with increasing concern and dismay the deterioration of the constitutionally established partnership between the executive and the legislative branches which is so vital to an effective military policy.

At the risk of belaboring the obvious, I feel compelled to state that a partnership cannot endure and prosper when the convictions of one partner are ignored, or arbitrarily rejected, by the other.

The vitality of the doctrine of separation of powers, the cornerstone of our form of government, rests upon the self-restraint of each of the three branches of our Government. In the absence of such self-restraint, characterized by the profound respect for the lawful areas of responsibility of each branch of our Government, a balance of power cannot exist.

As it has demonstrated in the past, Congress is not powerless to enforce its views in matters of military policy. A statutory floor has been placed on the strength of the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal 1959.

The Pentagon complains that such action is unduly restrictive upon the executive branch. I suggest to them that by their repeated high-handed rejections of the views of Congress, of which the Marine Corps reduction is a prime example, they compel resort to the rigid prescriptions of statutory law.

Marine Corps strength is the principal illustration. The views of Congress on this matter have been repeatedly expressed and repeatedly flouted or ignored by the Pentagon. A mandatory floor on the strength of the Marine Corps, set forth in the law, appears to be the only means for Congress to insure that its carefully considered judgment will not be thwarted by administrative action.

	Appropriated strength fiscal year 1958	Actual strength Dec. 31, 1957	Appropriated strength fiscal year 1959	Directed end strength, June 30, 1959
Army.....	1,000,000	918,111	900,000	870,000
Navy.....	675,000	629,566	630,000	630,000
Marine Corps.....	200,000	190,768	200,000	175,000
Air Force.....	925,000	878,657	850,000	850,000

From Public Law 85-724, 85th Congress (an act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959 and for other purposes):

From title III, Department of the Army, Military Personnel: "For pay, allowances, individual clothing, interest or deposits, and permanent change of station travel, for members of the Army on active duty (except those undergoing reserve training); expenses incident to movement of troop detachments, including rental of campsites and procurement of utility and other services; expenses of apprehension and delivery of deserters, prisoners, and soldiers absent without leave, including payment of rewards (not to exceed \$25 in any case), and costs of confinement of military prisoners in nonmilitary facilities; donations of not to exceed \$25 to each prisoner upon each release from confinement in an Army or contract prison (other than a disciplinary barracks) and to each person discharged for fraudulent enlistment; authorized issues of articles to prisoners other than those in disciplinary barracks, subsistence of enlisted personnel, selective service registrants called for induction and applicants for enlistment while held under observation, and prisoners (except those at disciplinary barracks), or reimbursement thereof while such personnel are sick in hospitals; and subsistence of supernumeraries necessitated by emergent military circumstances; \$3,175,961,000, and in addition, \$375 million, to be derived by transfer from the Army Stock Fund: *Provided*, That section 212 of the act of June 30, 1932 (5 U.S.C. 59a), shall not apply to retired military personnel on duty at the U.S. Soldiers' Home: *Provided further*, That the duties of the librarian at the U.S. Military Academy may be performed by a retired officer detailed on active duty."

RESERVE PERSONNEL

"For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, transportation, travel and related expenses, as authorized by law, for personnel of the Army Reserve while on active duty under section 265 of title 10, United States Code, or undergoing Reserve training or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Reserve Officers' Training

Corps; subsistence for members of the Army Reserve for drills of 8 or more hours' duration in any one calendar day; \$222,759,000: *Provided*, That the Army Reserve personnel paid from this appropriation shall be maintained at an end strength of not less than 300,000 for the fiscal year 1959."

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

"For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, transportation, and travel, as authorized by law, for personnel of the Army National Guard while on duty under section 265 of title 10, United States Code, while undergoing training or while performing drills or equivalent duties; expenses of training, organizing, and administering the Army National Guard, including maintenance, operation, and alterations to structures and facilities; hire of passenger motor vehicles; personal services in the National Guard Bureau and services of personnel of the National Guard employed as civilians without regard to their military rank, and the number of caretakers authorized to be employed under provisions of law (32 U.S.C. 709) may be such as is deemed necessary by the Secretary of the Army; subsistence for officers attending drills of 8 or more hours' duration in any 1 calendar day, travel expenses (other than mileage), as authorized by law for Army personnel on active duty, for Army National Guard division, regimental, and battalion commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; supplying and equipping the Army National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, as authorized by law; and expenses of repair, modification, maintenance, and issue of supplies and equipment (including aircraft); \$342,093,000: *Provided*, That obligations may be incurred under this appropriation for training of units designated for early deployment under mobilization plans and for installation, maintenance, and operation of facilities for antiaircraft defense without regard to section 107 of title 32, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the Army National Guard shall be maintained at an average strength of not less than 400,000 for the fiscal year 1959."

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

"For pay, allowances, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, clothing, permanent change of station travel (including expenses of temporary duty between permanent duty stations), and transportation of dependents, household effects (including storage thereof), and privately owned automobiles, as authorized by law, for Regular and Reserve personnel on active duty (except those on active duty while undergoing Reserve training), \$635,692,000, and, in addition, \$25 million to be derived by transfer from the Marine Corps stock fund."

From Senate Report No. 1937 (Department of Defense appropriation bill) 85th Congress, 2d session, page 8:

"The Senate committee has approved the action of the House in adding funds to maintain the Marine Corps strength at 200,000 in reducing the appropriation by \$1,200,000 in the permanent change-of-station travel account, and in utilizing \$25 million of revolving funds in lieu of appropriations."

"The events in the Middle East during the past months have established beyond question, in the considered judgment of the committee, that the security of our Nation demands that the Marine Corps be maintained at a minimum strength of 200,000."

"This decision to appropriate the funds necessary for a 200,000-man Marine Corps was made with full consideration of the fiscal and military implications. The committee desires that it be clearly understood by appropriate agencies in the executive branch of the Government that it is the clear-cut

intent of the committee, and of the proposed appropriating legislation, that the Marine Corps be maintained at the strength of 200,000."

From page 5, of the same report:

"Subsequent to the House action, additional budget estimates were submitted in Senate document 103, requesting consideration of an additional \$179,561,000 for increased pay costs. This, the Senate committee has approved. In addition, the committee has approved the action of the House in recommending an increase in the strength of the Regular Army from 870,000 to 900,000, and has agreed to the Department's request to restore to a direct appropriation, \$100 million, which the House had provided by transfer."

From House Report No. 1830 (Department of Defense appropriation bill) 85th Congress, 2d session, page 49:

"A strong Marine Corps is essential to our national defense establishment. The striking power of the operating forces of the Marine Corps consist primarily of three combat divisions and three air wings with supporting forces as provided by law. These forces deployed in this country, aboard ship, and in advance bases in the Pacific and the Far East, form a striking force immediately available and prepared to fight in a general war, a small war, or a limited war. The budget recommended by the President did not make adequate provision for these specifically authorized Marine Corps forces. It was based on a reduction in the fiscal year 1959 end strength to 175,000 men, 25,000 below the amount determined to be the minimum essential force level of the corps. Accordingly, the committee has provided funds for the maintenance of the Marine Corps which will enable them to reach a strength of 200,000 military personnel at the end of fiscal year 1959. The additional funds required for this personnel increase total \$45,200,000 and have been allocated to various appropriations items as follows:

"Military personnel, Marine Corps.....	\$36,650,000
"Marine Corps Troops and facilities.....	4,875,000
"Medical care, Navy.....	1,175,000
"Aircraft and facilities, Navy....	2,500,000

"The funds recommended by the committee will enable the Marine Corps to maintain itself at the minimum strength required and will enable the corps to fulfill its traditional role in the national defense posture of this country as the Nation's force in readiness."

From page 32 of the same report:

"In the light of all the facts, including the committee's decision to exceed the budget by increasing the strength of the Marine Corps, the Army Reserve, and the Army National Guard and make other improvements in the readiness of our defense such as additional Polaris submarines and acceleration of the Minuteman and Hound-dog missile programs, the committee has decided not to exceed the budget for the 870,000-man Army. However, it is the committee's desire that the Army be provided with the most modern equipment and weapons, and along these lines it was testified that much of the current available equipment does not meet the tactical requirements of the reorganized pentomic forces."

From conference report on Department of Defense appropriation bill (H. Rept. 2503) from page 5:

"Amendment Nos. 5, 6, and 7: Military personnel: Appropriate \$3,175,961,000 instead of \$2,946,400,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,225,961,000 as proposed by the Senate; provide for transfer from the Army Stock Fund of \$375 million instead of \$425 million as proposed by the House and \$325 million as proposed by the Senate; and delete the provision of the Senate that the Regular Army

shall be maintained at not less than 900,000 strength during fiscal year 1959. It is the belief of the committee of conference that the national defense requires the maintenance of a Regular Army of not less than 900,000 and it is the intent that the planned strength for fiscal year 1959 be maintained at that level in accordance with the funds provided."

From page 6 of the same report:

"Amendment Nos. 19 and 20, Military personnel, Marine Corps: Appropriate \$635,692,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$604,056,000 as proposed by the House, and delete provision of the Senate that the Marine Corps shall be maintained at not less than 200,000 strength during fiscal year 1959. As with the strength of the Regular Army it is the belief of the committee of conference that the national defense requires that the Marine Corps be maintained at a strength of not less than 200,000 and it is the intent that the planned strength for fiscal year 1959 be maintained at that level in accordance with the funds provided."

[From Newsweek, Feb. 16, 1959]

ADDING UP MILITARY POWER

MISSILE POWER

United States: ICBM's, none; IRBM's, 10.
U.S.S.R.: ICBM's, none; IRBM's, 500-1,000.

AIR POWER

United States: 850,000 men, 1,000 B-47 (medium) bombers, 500 B-52 (long-range) bombers, 35,500 other aircraft.
U.S.S.R.: 700,000 men, 350-850 medium bombers, 100-150 long-range bombers, 24,000 other aircraft.

SEA POWER

United States: 640,000 sailors, 189,000 marines, 15 attack carriers, no battleships, 11 antisub and other carriers, 14 cruisers, 240 destroyers, 112 submarines, 500 auxiliaries, 2,500 patrol vessels.
U.S.S.R.: 850,000 sailors, no carriers, 3 battleships, 27 cruisers, 150 destroyers, 200 attack submarines, 250 coast-defense submarines, 250 auxiliaries, 1,000 patrol vessels.

LAND POWER

United States: 870,000 men, 14 infantry divisions, 2 infantry brigades, 8 infantry battle groups, 6 armored regiments.
U.S.S.R.: 2.5 million men, 100 infantry divisions, 75 mechanized, and tank divisions.

THE NAVY BUDGET: FLEET WILL REMAIN AT CURRENT SIZE BUT AIRCRAFT INVENTORY WILL BE CUT

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The Navy's share of the administration's defense budget for the fiscal year 1960 will maintain a fleet of approximately the present size.

Some 864 ships, the same number as are now in service, are scheduled to be in commission in the next fiscal year; 389 will be warships and 475 will be supporting vessels, amphibious craft, and so on. The Navy's active aircraft inventory will drop to 9,117 by June 30, 1960, compared with 10,533 on June 30, 1958. Only some 7,200 of these will be operational. Forty-seven percent will be jet powered.

Fourteen attack aircraft carriers will be maintained instead of the 15 of last June, but new *Forrestal*-type carriers are replacing the old wartime *Essex* class.

SUBMARINE WAR STRESSED

The 1960 budget will maintain 16 carrier air groups—2 of them replacement groups—the same number as this year. More than 600 antisubmarine aircraft will be modified with new radar, and 2 new antisubmarine warfare task forces will be organized.

Patrol and warning squadrons will increase from 39 to 42 and the reorganization

of the Naval Air Reserve, to orient it toward an antisubmarine mission, will continue.

The manning level for the active fleet will average about 81 percent of normal war strength per ship and squadron, about the same as this year.

With new procurement funds the Navy will buy 668 aircraft, which is less than one-half of the annual procurement needed to maintain an active operating naval air arm of 7,200 planes.

AIR ARM SHRINKING

Officials believe that given the present rate of procurement of piloted aircraft, the naval air arm will decrease to 4,000 to 5,000 aircraft by 1963-64.

There is also considerable concern about the growing obsolescence of the fleet. The 1960 shipbuilding program provides for 18 new ships, including a conventional powered aircraft carrier of the *Forrestal* class, 6 guided-missile destroyers and frigates, 3 more nuclear-powered submarines, and 8 other vessels.

Nine Polaris missile-firing submarines had been provided prior to the 1960 budget, but the administration has withheld funds for some of them and has adopted a building program of about three a year and one aircraft carrier every other year.

The 1960 budget contains funds for long leadtime items for three more Polaris submarines, in addition to the nine already provided, but does not authorize or provide funds for the full costs of the three additional submarines.

The building program also includes the conversion and modernization of 13 old ships, including a cruiser, 8 destroyers, and 4 other vessels.

The present naval construction program of about 20 new ships a year is less than half the number needed to replace overage ships if the operating fleet's present size of 864 vessels is to be maintained.

The Marine Corps is already undergoing a reduction from an authorized strength of 200,000 to 175,000 during the current fiscal year; its strength is to remain at the 175,000 level in the fiscal year that begins next July 1.

President Eisenhower's budget message declares that "the Marine Corps will continue to support three divisions and three air wings in their traditional state of high combat readiness."

MARINES DEPLORE CUTS

The Marine Corps flatly disputes this. Gen. Randolph McC. Pate, the Commandant, has testified that the current reduction to 175,000 men will mean the elimination of 6 battalion landing teams out of the corps' current 27, and the elimination of 6 air squadrons.

The Marines will activate additional anti-aircraft battalions to operate the Army-developed Hawk missile, designed for use against low-flying aircraft.

During the next 18 months an old aircraft carrier—the *Princeton*—is earmarked for use as a Marine helicopter landing ship. The use of this carrier, which will be operated with no material physical alterations, will give the Marines three ships from which to practice the technique of helicopter assault. Two have already been specially converted.

The administration's 1960 budget provides funds for maintaining a total of 1,030,000 Reservists, both Army and Air National Guard, in a paid status, as compared with 1,082,000 this year.

The President's budget envisages funds during the fiscal year 1960 for 330,000 Army reservists, 360,000 in the Army National Guard, 75,000 in the Air National Guard, 145,000 in the Navy Reserves, 48,000 in the Marine Corps Reserve, and 72,000 in the Air Force Reserve.

The Army National Guard will man an increased number of Nike antiaircraft bat-

tallions, and the Naval Reserve will provide at least cadre crews for 48 destroyers or destroyer escorts by the end of 1960.

The Air National Guard, its aircraft already 90 percent jet-powered, will be furnished more modern types in 1960.

The average cost of maintaining a Regular serviceman in uniform increases from \$3,885 annually in 1958 to \$4,150 in 1959 and to a figure estimated at \$4,220 in 1960. This is chiefly due to pay increases and other added costs.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Kansas City, Mo., February 27, 1959.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: As commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I recently had an opportunity to meet with leaders from your State during our annual legislative conference in Washington, D.C. Since talking with your constituents, I thought it advisable to write you on a matter that concerns all of us—national security.

The VFW, by resolution and by unanimity of opinion, feels that our country is losing basic military strength through proposed plans to reduce our defense establishment. We believe, and we are on record, that our country should have a balanced defense which is ready to move at a moment's notice whether on the ground, on the seas, or in the air. We further believe that a reduction in our ground forces in the face of the Khrushchev challenge over Berlin is unthinkable. Even though the Berlin situation might be settled peaceably, there are still many trouble spots in the world where American support has already been committed.

It is our understanding that unless plans to reduce forces are halted, the Army will lose one division and the Marine Corps will suffer drastic cuts in its combat strength. Our military strength must be great enough to insure peace.

We are told that Russia has 27 divisions on the borders of Western Europe alone. Instead of a reduction of forces, the VFW knows that the American people are willing to pay more for defense, if necessary, and we should keep our ground forces at least at the level recommended by the Congress which was 900,000 in the Army and 200,000 in the Marine Corps.

We would appreciate hearing from you on this matter and if you agree with us, I sincerely hope that you will lend your influence and support toward maintaining our military and naval forces at the above strength.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MAHAN,
Commander in Chief.

CONTROL OF OIL IMPORTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on Saturday, President Eisenhower ordered a temporary, 10-day extension of voluntary controls of oil imports. The extension was made so the President could study new proposals which have been made to him for handling this basic problem.

The situation is serious. An industry that is vital to the security of our Nation is being threatened. It cannot long continue without firm action on the part of our Government.

It is my hope—and I believe the hope of all those who have made a thorough study of the situation—that the President will act firmly to prevent our domestic industry from being swamped by a flood of imports from countries where

living standards are so low that our own people cannot compete.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD the United Press story on the action recommended to the President and the comments from the White House in connection with it.

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

President Eisenhower today ordered a temporary, 10-day extension of the voluntary controls over oil imports while he studies new proposals for curbing them.

The White House said the extension until March 10 would give the President time to consider recommendations submitted yesterday by Leo Hoegh, Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

The present system of voluntary quotas was to have expired at midnight.

Informed sources said the Government is expected to apply mandatory controls soon. Domestic producers have complained that the voluntary program has failed because some producers have refused to cooperate.

Eisenhower asked Interior Secretary Seaton to take action necessary to continue the voluntary system through March 10.

Press Secretary Hagerty would not comment on whether mandatory controls were recommended.

"I'm not going to say anything about the recommendations," he said. "We'll have an announcement soon."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think I can fill in just a little at this point, by saying that the administration is aware of the importance of this matter. The former Governor of Iowa, Leo Hoegh, the Administrator of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, has concluded his hearings. I believe he has made his recommendations to the Cabinet committee. I apprehend that in this 10-day interim, the Cabinet committee will make an affirmative report; and I hope the report will be of such character and content as will be quite satisfactory.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Illinois. He has correctly stated the facts as I understand them to be. I appreciate his support in the matter; and I trust that the President will act promptly and decisively within the 10-day period.

A TRIUMPH OF CHARACTER— JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, an excellent editorial under the title "A Triumph of Character" was published on last Saturday in the U.S. News & World Report. The editorial constitutes a splendid statement regarding John Foster Dulles 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:

A TRIUMPH OF CHARACTER

(By David Lawrence)

They ridiculed his phrases, but now they are singing his praises.

Why is there today wide acclaim for John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, when only yesterday there was such bitter criticism? Americans have been told repeatedly by Democratic Party spokesmen for the last 2 or 3 years that the United States has no friends in Europe, that our allies have been alienated, that the administration really has had no foreign policy, and that Mr. Dulles is to blame.

Still more recently certain Members of Congress made the headlines by crying out that our policy is inflexible, that Mr. Dulles is too rigid, and that we should get off dead center.

The Kremlin, of course, has long been saying through its propaganda—over the radio and to newsmen through Soviet Ambassadors everywhere—that the main obstacle to the ending of the cold war is John Foster Dulles. If only he could be removed as Secretary of State, the Communists have said openly, everything would be rosy.

Plainly the Soviets do not like Mr. Dulles because he will not appease, he will not surrender, and he will not barter away the basic principles of international morality for the sake of expediency.

Events have proved Mr. Dulles was right in his stoical resistance to the insidious propaganda of those who sought peace at any price. That's why there has come, at last, a true appreciation of his services, just as he faces the tragic months ahead in fighting cancer.

There have been some occasions when Mr. Dulles has incurred the displeasure of our allies, especially in his stern stand against a punitive war over Suez. But what has happened since proves he was right.

Time and again Mr. Dulles has been assailed for views which were deliberately distorted in the press of the world. Even today, some critics still say he was wrong in espousing the cause of liberation for the peoples of the captive states of Eastern Europe. His plea for liberation was twisted to mean a threat to use military force.

The critics did not—or would not—perceive that moral force has always been the principal weapon in the arsenal of John Foster Dulles.

The Secretary is, however, no pacifist. His phrase "massive retaliation" has stood the test of time—the concept has proved a powerful deterrent of war. He has always been ready, as he once acknowledged, to go to "the brink of war" to show the sincerity of American purpose and a willingness to make every sacrifice for principle. The critics derided this as "brinkmanship," but they witnessed a successful manifestation of it recently in our decision to protect Quemoy and Matsu if it appeared that any military measures taken there by the Red Chinese were to be the forerunner of an invasion of Formosa itself.

Although Congress, by joint resolution in 1955, had given the President full power to deploy our military forces in defense of Formosa, there emerged in recent months some faint-hearted men in Congress and elsewhere who exhibited "peace at any price" weaknesses. They were inclined to a deal whereby Red China would be taken into the bosom of the free nations of the world and we would let bygones be bygones. But Mr. Dulles never forgot the sacrifices made by American boys in Korea—the many who died or suffered grievous wounds to repel the attack of the Communist Chinese, aided openly, as they were, by the Soviets. He could see no reason to reward an aggressor.

In its latest threat, the Kremlin startled the world by trying to detach Berlin from West Germany. The Moscow Government thought the time had come to test out the strength and determination of the West. This was promptly countered by the conference of Secretary Dulles with the heads of

the British, French, and West German Governments. Though suffering excruciating pain physically, Mr. Dulles, undaunted, continued to perform his great mission. He was able to bind together the members of the Western alliance. A demonstration of allied unity has in itself proved to be one of the best ways to prevent the Soviets from assuming that the West is weakening. A miscalculation on that point by Moscow could plunge us into war.

John Foster Dulles has steadfastly adhered to principle. He has tenaciously maintained the ideals of free peoples everywhere. He has refused to be bullied by the Communists abroad or disheartened by the snipings of the partisans at home. He has fought for the best interests of the United States just as bravely as if he were a soldier facing the fire of the enemy. The world has indeed witnessed in his skillful conduct of American policy a heroism which will be engraved on the pages of history.

While the years of life itself are numbered, the years of a man's fame are unnumbered. In the career of John Foster Dulles, we see a triumph of courage, a triumph of unselfish devotion to public service, and, above all, a triumph of character.

AGRICULTURAL HALL OF FAME— THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE CHRISTOPHER, OF MISSOURI

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Kansas was selected as the site of the home of the proposed Agricultural Hall of Fame.

It is truly fitting that this hall of fame should be located in Kansas, which is the geographical center of the contiguous land area of our Nation.

It is also fitting that the site selected is near Kansas City, which is the center of the great agricultural Midwest. Kansas City is truly the crossroad of our Nation—east and west, north and south. It is the home of the American Royal; it is the annual convention meeting place of thousands of Future Farmers of America. The location of the Agricultural Hall of Fame at Kansas City further closely associates agriculture and its allied interests with this great metropolitan center.

Many organizations and people in Kansas City worked diligently to secure the hall of fame for this area. After numerous proposed locations in both Missouri and Kansas were eliminated, Kansas City, Mo., and Kansas City, Kans., jointly sponsored the new location. Farm leaders, industrial leaders, and civic leaders of both Missouri and Kansas were united in support of this location.

One man I believe can be singled out for his untiring and unselfish interest in securing the location of the Agricultural Hall of Fame in Kansas and Kansas City, Kans., and that is Harry Darby, a former Member of this body.

The Kansas site is a tract of 365 acres of land, about 11 miles west and about 15 miles from the downtown area of Kansas City, Mo. It is near Bonner Springs interchange on Highway No. 70 which is a part of the Kansas Turnpike and on one of the main highways of the Interstate System.

Plans have already been completed for the construction of a \$5 million building program at the site selected.

At a meeting of the executive committee on January 30, 1959, some definite plans for the general layout of the structure were agreed upon. These plans fit well into the vision of Mr. Howard Cowden, who has spent much time in the promotion of the Agricultural Hall of Fame, when he stated at an earlier meeting of the board:

I hope that we can start planning in such a way that this country will some day have an appropriate shrine or memorial honoring those who have given America an agricultural industry that is the envy of the rest of the world.

He urged that the project be approached in the spirit of a motto which reads: "Make no little plans; they have not the power to stir men's souls."

The following units were recommended for inclusion in the Hall of Fame at the executive meeting:

An agricultural museum, a room where individuals who have contributed much to agriculture will be honored—including a shrine for farmers who have served in Congress; a children's unit designed to acquaint them with agriculture; a unit for young people and adults designed to show by exhibits the progress, achievements, and problems in agriculture; an historical library which will feature accomplishments of men honored; an old farm village, including a log cabin, sod hut, adobe house, and appropriate other buildings; an Indian village which will show agricultural practices and crops which we obtained from the Indians.

There will also be an outdoor amphitheater for use in telling in pageant form the history of agriculture, and for use on field days and for other special events; a small auditorium to be used for the presentation of a movie on agriculture; demonstrations on soil and water management, timber and wildlife conservation which are appropriate to the site and area; a room where donors to the Hall of Fame will be honored, and an international shrine.

At the same meeting of the board of governors, special mention was made of the death of Representative George H. Christopher, Congressman from the Fourth District of Missouri, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be made a part of these remarks.

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

The Agriculture Hall of Fame Association was saddened by the news of the unexpected death of Representative George H. Christopher, Congressman from the Fourth Missouri District, in Washington Saturday, January 24. Last year Representative Christopher introduced the resolution in the House of Representatives favoring the establishment of a hall of fame for agriculture and when it was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the committee recommended the resolution be specifically directed to this organization. The committee's statement said: "The purpose of this concurrent resolution is to encourage efforts which are being made by private citizens to establish a hall of fame for agriculture. Some of the most distinguished agricultural leaders of the country have been enlisted in the effort to establish an agricultural hall of fame to commemorate and keep alive the

great contributions which agriculture has made to the greatness and prosperity of the United States."

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, House Concurrent Resolution 295, relating to the late Representative Christopher, was approved by the Senate on March 10, 1958.

The concurrent resolution was a duplicate of the Senate Concurrent Resolution which I submitted on March 10, 1958, with 30 additional cosponsors, and I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution and the names of the sponsors be printed as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution and names of sponsors were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 70) favoring the establishment of a hall of fame for agriculture, submitted by Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Senators CASE of South Dakota, SCHOEPPEL, MURRAY, HOBLITZELL, YARBOROUGH, REVERCOMB, CHAVEZ, THYE, NEUBERGER, SCOTT, ALLOTT, CAPEHART, BARRETT, THURMOND, BENNETT, AIKEN, WATKINS, PROXMIER, HUMPHREY, HRUSKA, PAYNE, MUNDT, SPARKMAN, HILL, IVES, MARTIN of Pennsylvania, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, FLANDERS, SYMINGTON, COOPER, and MAGNUSON) was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

"Whereas many of our bravest men and most valiant soldiers were of an agricultural background;

"Whereas the Founding Fathers of this Republic and many of its most eminent leaders were farmers;

"Whereas agriculture has played a dominant role in the rise of our country to greatness;

"Whereas there now exists halls of fame recognizing the glorious past for the baseball player, the cowboy, and others;

"Whereas the ox yoke, the bull-tongue plow, the hand-forged iron kettle, and the sod house represent the evolution of agricultural technology in this country and the difficulties which a determined people faced and successfully overcame in improving their way of life; and

"Whereas our American heritage should be preserved and tribute should be paid to the great men and women who over the years have helped to make American agriculture the most productive in the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that there be established and maintained, as a memorial to the important role played by agriculture in the development of our Nation, a Hall of Fame for Agriculture, wherein there will be collected and preserved for posterity relics, artifacts, and other evidence and data relating to agriculture and the great contributions it has made and continues to make in the rise to greatness of our country; and the Congress does hereby commend, encourage, and sanction the efforts of any organization which undertakes to establish such a hall of fame."

PAYMENTS MADE UNDER FARM PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a few days ago the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a table showing large loans made under the farm price-support program to different farm-

ers and farms. One of these was the Hain farm of Sardis, Ala. The table showed that a loan of \$156,778 had been made to the Hains.

Following the insertion of that table and the publicity resulting from it, Mr. Val Hain, a member of the Alabama legislature and one of the owners of the Hain farm, gave an explanation which I think throws an entirely different light upon this particular loan. I believe it will be found of interest. Accordingly, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks a newspaper item from the Montgomery Advertiser of February 25, 1959.

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

DALLAS LEGISLATOR EXPLAINS \$156,778 FARM LOAN

SARDIS.—One of the owners of a large Alabama farm took issue Tuesday with criticism of his \$156,778 Federal farm price support loan of 1957.

Val Hain, a member of the Alabama legislature and one of the owners of the Hain farm near Selma, said four owners and 190 tenant farmers were involved in the loan.

He said the owners never participated in the soil bank cotton program and added:

"We, the owners, don't plant any cotton ourselves. It's allotted to 190 tenant farmers and when you break that figure of \$156,778 down it means each individual received only a small amount."

An equal division would give each of the 190 a payment of about \$824.

The criticism came from Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, who has sought repeal of current farm price-support laws.

He mentioned the Hain farm as one that received a Federal loan of more than \$100,000 in 1957.

WILLIAMS argued that the farm price-support law is "little more than a Government guarantee on the operations of corporate-type farming and actually encourages and underwrites absentee ownership to the detriment of the small farmers."

Hain said his farm was allotted 1,400 acres for cotton and the loan was for 750 bales.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, it is interesting to note from Mr. Hain's statement that not a dollar of this loan went to any owner of the farm, but, instead, that it went to 190 different tenant farmers. The entire farm had an overall cotton allotment of 1,400 acres, not an acre of which was planted by the owners of the farm. These 1,400 acres were distributed among 190 tenant farmers. The loan was likewise distributed among these 190 tenant farmers, and was made on a total production of 750 bales of cotton.

FORTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF REPUBLIC OF ESTONIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, belatedly, but most sincerely, I take this opportunity to add my voice to the many who have spoken out on the occasion of the 41st anniversary of the Republic of Estonia which was commemorated on February 24. Our Government has steadfastly refused to recognize the Soviet usurpation of the independent Republic of Estonia. We have not forgotten the Estonian people, who have strug-

gled so against the slavery imposed upon them; we have not forgotten their dream of freedom and independence; and we fervently hope that the day is not too far distant when self-government for their homeland will become a reality.

FINLAND'S KALEWALA DAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the people of Finland, like the people of the United States, share a common dream of abundance and happiness. This dream is the source of the traditional Finnish story about Kalewala, the mythical land of joy and plenty.

We in the United States take pride in the contributions to our country by Americans of Finnish descent who have helped to turn myth into reality. I hope we will see early action on reform in our immigration laws to encourage more Finns to come and add their talents to American life. My own State of Minnesota has reaped tremendous benefits in the fields of agriculture and industry from our citizens of Finnish descent.

In observing Kalewala Day, we join all friends of Finland in celebrating this traditional holiday, which reminds us of man's never-ending struggle for peace and prosperity.

AGRICULTURAL PRICE SUPPORT

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, last week the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] made a statement on the floor of the Senate in which he criticized the agricultural program and particularly that part of it which allows loans on agricultural products. I know that the distinguished Senator would want to be completely accurate in his remarks; therefore, I wish to invite to his attention, and to the attention of my other colleagues, the true situation relative to five cottongrowers who reside in Arizona and who were listed by the Senator in his statement.

The study shows that the cotton produced by these growers and placed in the cotton loan program was 93.16 percent redeemed prior to July 31, 1958. The remaining 6.94 percent remained in the stock of the Commodity Credit Corporation for sale to the highest bidder. I should like to invite attention to the fact that when a farmer redeems cotton he not only pays the original loan but he also pays storage fees and carrying charges, so actually the Government does not take any loss on redeemed cotton.

Mr. President, I am in no more sympathy with the Agricultural Act we are working under today than is the distinguished Senator from Delaware, but I would be remiss in my obligations to my constituents if I did not invite attention to the fact that those farmers in Arizona mentioned by the Senator have subsequently repaid the loans made, and I might say that this is consistent with their practices in the past. I do not think the Senator from Delaware should criticize individual farmers for taking advantage of an act which was passed by the Congress of the United States.

Rather, he should criticize the Congress if he feels that this action is not proper. I know these farmers personally. I know them to be solid citizens interested in good farming, and I would like the record to stand with no implication that they have acted in any way outside the law. Neither would I want this statement to be deemed critical of my very good friend from Delaware, for whom I have the utmost respect not only personally but for his efforts in calling atten-

tion to the ways in which our Government wastes money.

I ask unanimous consent that a table I have compiled be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with a letter written to the editor of the Arizona Republic by Mr. E. S. McSweeney, executive secretary of the Arizona Cotton Growers Association.

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

Grower	Bales in loan	Loan principal	Bales out of loan	Interest paid	Bales remaining in loan
Morrison Bros., Higley, Ariz.	3,040	\$481,465.32	2,712	\$5,279.46	328
Charles Urrea & Son, Mesa, Ariz.	2,673	304,380.65	2,459	4,142.48	214
W. R. Neely, Chandler, Ariz.	2,274	362,214.45	2,038	3,891.09	236
Hooper & Rugg, Casa Grande	2,145	325,279.72	1,946	3,562.37	199
Phillips & Ellsworth, Mesa	1,707	302,924.10	1,489	3,466.75	218

(Figures were provided by E. S. McSweeney of Arizona Cotton Growers Association. He got them from Calcot of California, the outfit which had taken the cotton.)

[From the Arizona Republic]

NEWS STORY UNFAIR TO COTTON FARMERS
EDITOR, THE ARIZONA REPUBLIC:

There appeared February 24 a news release from Washington which we believe is manifestly unfair to the cotton farmers of Arizona and of the United States.

The article quotes Senator WILLIAMS of Delaware as stating that certain farmers, including five Arizonians who are named, received rather large subsidy checks from the Government.

This is a case of taking certain facts to make a point while deliberately ignoring the full story.

Of the cotton produced by the five Arizona growers and placed in the cotton loan program, 93.16 percent was redeemed prior to July 31, 1958 and entered the channels of trade. The remaining 6.94 percent of the cotton concerned remained in the hands of Commodity Credit Corporation for sale to the highest bidder.

Senator WILLIAMS, for his own reasons, deliberately neglects to include in his statement for the record that such cotton is redeemed. When a farmer redeems his cotton, he not only repays the original loan made by Commodity Credit Corporation, but he must also pay storage fees and carrying charges so that the Federal Government does not take any loss whatever on the 93 percent of the loan which was repaid. And the farmer is not just given a U.S. Treasury check to do with as he saw fit.

The price support program was developed for the purpose of permitting a farmer to market his crop in an orderly manner. Rather than being forced to throw the whole crop on the market at harvest time when the market is flooded and the price is depressed, the farmer is allowed to borrow from Commodity Credit Corporation on his cotton, placing the actual cotton in a bonded warehouse for security. The farmer then has a period of time within which to repay the loan and redeem the cotton, paying the charges mentioned.

The farmers mentioned in the story merely took advantage of this opportunity to market their crop in a businesslike manner and to the best advantage. The implication credited to Senator WILLIAMS that they received a handout is incorrect and leads to the wrong conclusion by people reading such articles.

E. S. MCSWEENEY,
Executive Secretary,
Cotton Growers Association.

THE COMMUNIST ECONOMIC CHALLENGE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the past several years, but more especially after my recent trip to the Soviet Union, I have in my public speeches in various parts of the country pointed to the challenge of the Soviet economic offensive to the free world. In the near future I shall attempt to spell out some of the implications of the Communist economic challenge on the floor of the Senate.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent article by Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, "This Time We Might Get Licked," which was published in the New York Times magazine on March 1, 1959. I agree with Governor Stevenson that the very power and magnitude of the Soviet offensive will place us in great peril unless we respond with vigor and determination.

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

THIS TIME WE MIGHT GET LICKED (By Adlai E. Stevenson)

In 1926, as a young man, I traveled across the young Soviet Union from the Caucasus to Finland. Now, three decades later, I have traveled from Finland out to Central Asia and Siberia—including areas, closed to foreigners, which the Soviet Government kindly opened to me.

Like all Americans I am curious about Russia, which has contradicted our ideas, organized a vast empire, raised our taxes, and challenged the United States to political, economic, and military competition everywhere—all in 40 years. That is why I went back—to see the Russia of today and its leaders for myself.

The changes I saw in the Soviet Union after 30 years did not surprise me very much—except that the people were more friendly, their ignorance and anxiety about America greater, and the industrialization more spectacular than I had expected.

The journey confirmed my impression that no relaxation in the Communist offensive is imminent and that there are no visible signs of internal weakness or upheaval in the Soviet Union. On the contrary, the material achievements are profoundly impressive; the vast Russian land is beginning to yield up its wealth; and most Soviet citizens are proud and loyal, like most citizens everywhere.

Nor could I detect that our negative policy toward the Soviet Union was likely to induce the Soviet collapse which has been periodically foretold from official Washington in recent years, or even contain the expansion of Soviet influence.

But the Communist system has frailties. The imperial czars' successors were chosen by dynastic inheritance, but in the Soviet autocracy no system of orderly transfer of power without conspiracy, violence and exile has been evolved. The present massive stability of the U.S.S.R. obscures the insidious instability of a big, modern, industrial state ruled autocratically. When a system, like the Soviet, lacks a legalized opposition, it is inherently unstable. And I suspect the reason they have not solved the problem of orderly transfer of power is that it is insoluble in the dictatorial framework.

The Russian people have never known real democracy. They passed, by revolution, from czarism to Soviet communism with only moments of chaotic liberalism. But Russia has a long tradition, especially among the intelligentsia, of aspiration for individual freedom, and for the whole scale of humane and compassionate values.

It is a tradition so profound that no surface revolution can erase it. The very violence of the recent official outcry against Boris Pasternak, who has voiced in print the claims of the human spirit, testifies to the fear of its revival. Perhaps—who knows?—the drama of the lonely Pasternak is one of those portents of freedom in Russia of which he writes. And we can find some sober, long-range hope in history's lesson that dictatorship is never eternal.

But I came away from this vibrant country with a much clearer feeling for the people's hunger for peace and dread of another war. I felt that the Russian people are really more fearful of the United States than we are of them, which is not hard to understand in view of our ring of airbases and the incessant propaganda about the hostility of the ruling cliques of the imperialist-capitalist powers.

Assuming we do not invite Soviet military adventure by our weakness, I do not fear a third world war. They know the terrible consequences; the very words "world war" themselves are obsolete as a description of national suicide. But to avoid mutual suicide we are both piling up weapons to shoot at one another. It doesn't make sense, especially to the poor and fearful bystanders—a fact the Soviet peace propaganda skillfully exploits.

Moreover, large-scale war would interrupt the huge economic development program which has been rapidly transforming this backward agrarian system into a highly industrialized, modern state—by methods and at a price, to be sure, which no democratic people would long tolerate. The United States and the capitalists are still the deadly demons of Soviet propaganda. And one is amused by the spectacle of a whole nation damning capitalists and the United States, while at the same time busily trying to catch up with the United States and the hated capitalists.

The new 7-year play for industrial development, if achieved, will bring Russia close to American living standards in another decade. War could only further postpone the day when the long-suffering, hard-working Russian people begin to enjoy the fruits of their toil and relief from the grinding austerity of the past.

On the assumption that well-to-do people are more passive and peaceful than the envious and poor, the liberalizing tendencies in Russia should increase as prosperity increases. So why not trade with them? Why not help them improve living standards? Why not encourage the growth of material abundance and thereby make it harder to

preserve the secrecy, ignorance and tight controls of the Soviet system? Why not help the Soviet leaders subvert their own system of fear with the confidence bred of plenty? And especially why not when our refusal to trade with them has not stopped them from developing the Soviet economy at a spectacular pace?

The Soviet leaders attach topmost priority to the success of their new 7-year development plan. The goals are so ambitious, however, that there must be grave doubt whether they can be reached without reducing military expenditures. The strain will increase in 1960 when the Russian manpower shortage, resulting from the German invasion in the last war, will become most severe.

The foreseeable conflicting demands of heavy industry, consumer goods and military spending suggest that we may be fast approaching the time when the Russians may be more receptive to détente and to serious disarmament proposals—an opportunity we should not overlook. Already the Russians are asking quiet questions about the effect of reduced military spending on the American economy.

But there is risk as well as hope in Russia's economic forward surge. The relaxing, liberalizing effect of prosperity and equality which we can hope for is not as evident as Soviet scientific progress and military might. Probably a fourth of Russia's production goes into war potential, and in the new 7-year plan the military program still seems to get first priority. Then follow the development of China and the Communist bloc; the ambitious economic offensive using trade and aid as the major weapons of Soviet foreign policy; and, finally, the need to raise living standards.

Dominated by the pragmatic communism of Nikita Khrushchev's school of thought, the Soviet Union is seeking to insure its military power and security—and it is doing it. It is seeking to develop its limitless resources—and it is doing it. It is seeking to spread its influence far and wide in a world where chaos and misery abound, where new nations are beset with economic difficulties, and where Western democracy is in many places, alas, now on the retreat. And it is doing that, too.

The Russians' primary weapon is economic power. They say so themselves. And we should take them seriously. Congress generously supports our defense effort, but every year we have to fight the battle of trade and aid, as if the Russian economic offensive were something temporary and less dangerous or permanent than the military threat. Nor has the Western alliance faced the realities of the greatest threat of all and concerted its enormous economic power in a coherent counteroffensive.

Evidently the reality of our peril is the most difficult thing for us to accept. Just as I wish Mr. Khrushchev and thousands of Russians of all stations could come here and see what this peaceful, contented, free country is really like, so I wish countless Americans could go where I have gone around the world, see what I have seen, hear what I have heard.

They would see and hear, among other unpleasant things, that the rich nations are getting richer while the poor are getting poorer. This is a disaster for us, the rich, which the Russians are making the most of on a world scale. As a poor nation that has pulled itself up by its own bootstraps, as it were, Russia has a great attraction to other poor nations who are natively suspicious of the West, or have been disaffected by our military bargaining and self-righteous moralizing.

Americans abroad would also discover that the Russians conduct their economic offensive in these decisive population areas with

many techniques; they sell Russian products at cut prices to get foreign exchange and capture markets; they barter oil and machinery, for example, for South American coffee and wool; they buy commodities other countries desperately want to sell; they lend money at low interest rates, build industrial plants, and provide technicians who speak the languages and live humbly like the local people.

I think our inquiring travelers would come to the conclusion that Soviet economic-political penetration is formidable and succeeding. The extension of Communist control ultimately means strangulation or conformity for us. And it presents some questions that we Americans and our free friends must grapple with.

Can we, will we, take the bold and costly measures to avert disaster in this contest? Can we, will we, make the greater effort—now while there is still time—to arrest the fatal economic deterioration and provide an alternative to communism as a technique of change and growth in the poor, underdeveloped lands?

But these questions lead to others that we cannot avoid much longer.

In the first place, the political-economic contest with the Communist bloc is not a passing nuisance; it will last a long time; it is serious; and it is probably decisive. We in the West will have to learn to conduct it with the same sense of continuity and urgency that we apply to maintaining our military defenses.

It is a fair question whether we can compete with the Soviet state trading system with our free system of private foreign trade. To match their flexibility—their ability to buy, sell, and invest where, when, and how they please for political advantage—maybe we, too, will have to adopt new methods of state trading, and even combine with other free countries.

And I have saved the hardest questions for the last:

Can our American system prevail in competition with the central planning, control, and direction of the Soviet system?

Can we mobilize, organize, and utilize our human and natural resources as effectively as they can?

Can we do so without imposing controls that imperil the very freedom and values we in the United States are trying to preserve?

Are our institutions adequate to conduct foreign policy in competition with the speed, secrecy, and certainty of the Kremlin?

In a shooting war our system seems to perform more effectively than a dictatorship—or, at least, so the evidence of World Wars I and II suggests. Then everything was subordinated to the demands of victory, and the Government was able to make drastic and uncomfortable decisions, promptly and without fear of serious public protest. But in our present situation, the Government can rarely act promptly and decisively; often it cannot act at all, because domestic political considerations are not subordinated to the needs of an effective foreign policy.

For our Constitution and the unwritten rules of our political system were both designed for a different purpose. They were evolved at a time when we were committed to a policy of nonentanglement with foreign countries. So our Founding Fathers created a system that has proved extremely effective for composing internal differences, but it was not designed for coping with international problems. At the time this did not matter since the oceans provided wonderfully effective protection against all possible enemies.

Now the world is completely different, but our machinery remains the same. Congressmen are bound to be concerned pri-

marily with the demands of their constituents; the national interest is apt to be a secondary consideration. In addition, under our system, any foreign policy measure can be held up or killed by any sizable group in Congress.

Our wheatgrowers can strain our traditional relations with Canada, the textile interests can cause trouble with Japan and England; Zionists can complicate our relations in the Middle East. And a single Congressman in a strategic position can mess up our immigration laws or cripple our overseas propaganda operations.

In particular, it is immensely difficult for the executive agencies to plan and carry out a coherent, farsighted strategy of economic warfare, so long as imports, exports and overseas investments are subject to the whims and self-interest of every domestic pressure group. And, as I have said, it is likely that the economic battlefield will prove the decisive one.

Our traditions place us at a disadvantage in several other ways: for example, our habit of making appropriations on an annual basis only. How can India—or a dozen other countries to which American aid is crucial—make long-range economic plans when they may have to be changed or discarded at the next session of Congress? Or, for that matter, how can we plan a long-range, worldwide economic development program with our allies, or a defense program employing missiles and electronic systems which take decades to develop, on the basis of annual appropriations?

Again, how can we develop a Foreign Service that will attract our ablest talent so long as no pressure group of any consequence has any interest in supporting it? The Russians can order their ablest men into diplomacy or on a disagreeable overseas assignment. But the State Department has to compete against the far higher pay of, say, the advertising and television industries—and no Congressman can hope to win a single vote by fighting to get better pay and representation allowances for the men who are now, literally, the first line of our defense.

What troubles me even more is that the American people are not showing many signs that they are willing to do what is necessary to win the long contest with Russia.

They are frittering away talent, time, and resources on trivialities—ranging from quiz shows to Detroit's chromium creations—while the Russians are concentrating everything on their overriding goal. Again, this is partly due to lack of leadership; they have never been told, by the only men who can command continual national attention, what has to be done, and what sacrifices they must make to achieve it. (And if they are told in a political campaign there is, I think, some evidence at least that they don't like it.)

But I am not sure whether any President can persuade the country—without the stimulus of war—to do these things. Maybe our kind of democracy has a fatal addiction to short views rather than long; to present comforts rather than future safety; to private satisfactions rather than public necessities. Else why do we spend more money on advertising than on education—on tobacco than on books—on entertainment than on urban renewal?

The next 10 years, I would guess, will really prove whether this Nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure—and right now the prognosis is not good. We are losing ground nearly everywhere; we are not taking measures necessary to stop the loss; and hardly anybody seems to care.

In our fat, dumb, and happy fashion, we assume that we can't lose—that if we stand firm, persevere, and damn the Communists enough, right will surely prevail in the end. Well, it didn't once before, when Athenian democracy was involved in a similar long, tiresome struggle with Spartan tyranny. On that occasion an infinitely superior civilization went under, because it lacked the self-discipline to survive. One could cite other examples. Is it happening again, right here and right now?

My conclusion is that our Russian competitors are much tougher than most of us have yet realized—and that this time we might get licked, unless we are willing to change our habits, our political behavior and our complacent outlook on the world.

But the sky, to me, is not dark. I like to think of the great forward thrust of communism not as a threat but as a great chance to demonstrate again that only free institutions can achieve the right ends by the right methods, and thereby satisfy man's innermost urgings.

As Julian Huxley has said: "In lower organisms the only ultimate criterion is survival; but in man some experiences and actions, some objects and ideas are valued for their own sake."

I confess that whenever I hear talk about what we, the great, free Western democracies—we who value actions and ideas for their own sake—can and cannot do or afford to do, I am reminded of the imperial Manchus, who disdained the Western barbarians for inventing steamships. The Manchus were obsolete, and their glory and power have vanished long since.

Are we obsolete, too? Of course not. Our free economy has just survived the third recession since the war and again confounded communism's confident prediction of an inevitable and shattering capitalist depression. Western economic strength has never been greater. And it has expanded and multiplied production and human well-being largely by private investment.

Thus have the free institutions of the West disproved the Socialist doctrine that only government investment and ownership can insure economic growth. One by one the Socialist parties of Europe have abandoned the only basic idea they shared with communism—government ownership of the means of production. And, one by one, the Communist parties of Europe have lost strength.

We have the supreme advantage of living under the economic and political system that most people want, as history teaches us. Once we are fully aware that the system is in danger I have no doubt what we will do.

PROBLEMS OF FARMWORKERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my statement submitted to the public hearing held by the National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor in Washington a few days ago. Dr. Frank Porter Graham, former U.S. Senator and University of North Carolina president, is chairman of this committee which held hearings to determine what action might be taken to better the unhappy financial, social, and educational levels of this country's migrant agricultural workers. I was proud to present to this group my views on this subject.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA, FOR THE PUBLIC HEARING OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FARM LABOR

Because it is impossible for me to testify in person due to the pressure of Senate activity, I welcome this opportunity to set forth my views on the vital question you are considering in these hearings.

At the outset, let me say that commendation is due this body of prominent citizens for focusing the public conscience on the problem of this mass of workers and their families whose shocking conditions have been a festering sore in our social economy for many decades, and deeply trouble many of us.

The exploitation of these workers year after year by the large-scale corporate and other farm operators has undoubtedly been a considerable factor in accelerating the trend away from family-type farming, because of the competitive advantage it gives the big operators over the family farmer doing his own work with his own family.

Quite frankly, the position of the current administration on this problem perplexes me.

President Eisenhower, in his January 9, 1956, message to Congress, expressed concern about the trend I have mentioned when he said, "More than prices and incomes are involved. In America, agriculture is more than an industry; it is a way of life. Throughout our history, the family farm has given strength and vitality to our entire social order. We must keep it healthy and vigorous."

With that sentiment I heartily agree. Yet I fail to find that sentiment reflected in present public policy.

Only yesterday, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson sent a statement to this distinguished committee completely glossing over the human suffering from low wages and working conditions experienced by multitudes of farm workers in this country, especially the 900,000 migrants, offering as his only conclusion that "if agricultural employment were not available, some of them might be dependent on various types of welfare programs."

Secretary Benson said nothing about the disgracefully low wages which the 2 million farm workers are paid, nor about the shameful working conditions under which many of them are forced to labor. In effect, he admits that their employment in agriculture is a substitute for relief rolls. He apparently dismisses them from further concern on the grounds that in many cases, these people do not have the skills and training to secure nonagricultural employment.

I regret that Secretary Benson had no more constructive suggestions to offer to this group of prominent citizens so deeply troubled by this problem.

Fortunately, it was more encouraging to have Secretary of Labor James Mitchell, one of the speakers at last night's dinner of the National Advisory Committee headed by former Senator Frank P. Graham and including Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt and former Senator Herbert Lehman, declare that ideally there should be a minimum wage for farm workers.

Let us hope and pray that this idealism finds fruition soon in a minimum wage law for agricultural workers sponsored by the Department of Labor with full support of the administration.

It is also encouraging that the council of State governments committee on migratory labor is readying proposed legislation that will include a minimum wage for agricultural workers.

I share the view expressed by a group of 10 Congressmen, including 2 from my own State, in a joint statement issued a few days ago that Congress must meet the challenge of the National Advisory Committee's inquiry—that legislation must be considered and supported which will provide a concrete program to raise the living standards of this large segment of our population.

These farm workers, in combination with the three or more million of underemployed family-type small farmers in our Nation, represent a total population, with their families, of somewhere around 20 million. Aside from the humanitarian aspect of concern over their condition in the rural slums in our country, they represent a purchasing-power potential of importance to our national economy.

On the basis of such consideration, as one Senator who was formerly chairman of a Senate Labor and Public Welfare Subcommittee which conducted extensive hearings and made specific recommendations concerning the problems of farm labor, I urge my colleagues in the Senate and House to do something at this session of Congress to effectuate the findings of the National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor deriving from these hearings now in progress—and pledge my personal support to that end.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a news story written by Robert E. Hennessee, of the Tufts News bureau, be printed in the RECORD. This article not only reported on the public hearing of the National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor, but also caught the very spirit of the occasion.

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

WASHINGTON.—The Secretaries of Labor and Agriculture are at loggerheads over the no-good people.

And the do-gooders, who want to help the no-gooders, are happily cheering Labor Secretary Mitchell.

Mitchell has stuck his neck out inside the administration by endorsing a minimum wage standard for Americas 2½ million farm laborers.

Especially, he has incurred the wrath of Ezra Taft Benson, of Agriculture, who, along with most farmers, is against a minimum wage on the farm.

The do-gooders, or romantics, as they are disparagingly called by the realists, are essentially those who make up the National Advisory Council on Farm Labor. The only lobby the migratory worker has.

NACFL, which has been meeting in Washington and received the good news from Mitchell, has some strong supporters on Capitol Hill. And action on minimum wage may be pressed this session.

Mitchell, however, urges them to hold off until next year when he hopes to submit some specific recommendations. But he agrees with the do-gooders that migrant workers will "never be able to successfully resist exploitation" without a minimum wage.

A farm is not like a factory, say the realists of the Benson school, and migrant laborers are beyond the pale, lodged at the bottom of society by their own innate inertia.

But there are no innately incapable, congenitally inferior people, answers Dr. Frank Porter Graham, former University of North Carolina president and U.S. Senator, who is a member of the NACFL council. He urges that we give him "hope in the land of the Pilgrim's hope," this migratory farm laborer.

Who moves north with the sun and south with the birds; moving on, with wife and child, in crowded truck beds at 20 hours to

the clip, from the Florida, Texas, and California citrus groves to harvest sugar beets in Minnesota, beans in Michigan, and potatoes in Maine.

Living in shacks, or at the best barracks; often with one outhouse for 40 or more families; with part of his wages held back to insure the laborer will stick around when the work gets hard, or the sun hot.

They are Southern Negroes, Kentucky hillbillies, laid-off Pennsylvania coal workers, and families, Mexican wetbacks, and imports from the Caribbean.

They are the no-good people.

MILITARY AID WASTE CLAIMED

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I noticed in the Washington Post and Times Herald of this morning, as well as in the New York Times—and I am sure the article appeared throughout the press of the Nation—an article entitled "Military Aid Waste Claimed." According to the article, a House subcommittee lifted the secrecy veil from U.S. overseas arms aid by giving a report as to some of the maladministration of the program.

Mr. President, my comments will be brief and to the point. I have continuously, throughout my years in the Senate, supported our foreign aid program both in its economic and military aspects. I have voted against the proposals to reduce these programs, but, Mr. President, I believe a report such as that which now comes from the House of Representatives, from a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the other body, compels every one of us to carefully reexamine what has been going on in these programs.

I hope that the President of the United States will give his personal attention to this very, very shocking report which has come to our attention this morning. I have not been able to get a full copy of the report, but I have asked for it from the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Just this minute, Mr. President, the interim report has been placed on my desk.

I say, in the spirit of friendship and cooperation in the field of foreign affairs, that it is absolutely imperative that these programs be administered in a constructive and efficient manner. This is a business administration; and the least we can expect is businesslike direction of the greatest program of our Government in terms of economic assistance, namely, the foreign aid program.

I repeat my initial statement, that the President of the United States should give his personal attention to this particular report, and assign whatever personnel may be necessary to track down every claim and every criticism that has been made, so that when the mutual security program is presented to the Senate and the House, we shall have a program that can be justified, not only in terms of dollars, not only in terms of objectives, but also in terms of administration.

I say this as a friend of the program, one who wants to see it effectively administered, and to see its purposes fulfilled. We cannot go on like this. We cannot have the American people being

told by a responsible committee of the Congress that there is such an unbelievable waste of foreign aid material.

Some of the findings reported were as follows:

A foreign motor pool got enough tires out of U.S. aid in 1 year to put 44 tires on each truck.

American materials intended for military construction were used to build apartment houses for foreign civilians.

Poor recordkeeping by natives who knew little English produced stock-record cards which read "for so many cases of 'This side up.'"

One U.S.-aided installation had a 185-year supply of a single ammunition item. In another case there was only one 2½ ton truck engine carburetor in stock for an entire army.

This is not a foreign aid program. This is only mismanagement compounded and compounded. It cannot go on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator from Minnesota be granted 1 additional minute in order that he may yield to me.

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

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to remind my good friend from Minnesota that I have been preaching this gospel of economy in our foreign aid program for the past 6 years. I hope the Senator from Minnesota will examine the reports on the overseas operations of our Government that I have filed with the Senate Appropriation Committee for the past seven years. I particularly call to the attention of the Senator from Minnesota the report relating to South and Central America, which I filed on February 9 of this year. In this report he will find a number of items which require the close scrutiny of the executive department. Over the past number of years I have been a consistent opponent of waste in our foreign aid programs. For this stand I have received much abuse. I have been labeled as a person who is opposed to all foreign aid. This was not true then and it is not true today.

What I oppose is the vast, unforgivable waste which can be found in many of our foreign aid operations.

Through the past 3 years I have made formal reports—which have been printed—on my findings of waste in foreign aid operations. The record is replete with specific examples of waste that I have seen in the field.

Now, at long last, I am glad to see other voices raised with mine that this unconscionable waste be brought to an end.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As the Senator knows, I have not cheered him very much by my votes. I have voted against amendments which have been offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

I wish to see an adequate foreign aid program. I think we may need an even

bigger program than we have; but I cannot, in good conscience, vote for foreign aid measures when examples of maladministration are brought to our attention time after time. We need people to administer a program which is not a political program. We need people who understand the program, and know how to administer a vast overseas economic program. We have had far too many administrators who have not had the time, during their term of office, to carry on efficient and responsible operation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am glad to hear the Senator from Minnesota make the remarks he has made today. I have been talking along the same line for the past 10 or 12 years, trying to tell the Senate that the manner in which we administer the foreign aid program throughout the world is doing us more harm than good. I believe that if we dig a little deeper we shall find plenty more in Denmark that is rotten.

RELOCATION OF FAMILIES DISPLACED BY NEW FREEWAYS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Mayor Terry Schrunk of Portland, Oreg., has effectively pointed out a serious omission from the Federal Interstate Highway program. This is the problem of relocation of thousands of families who are being displaced by the new freeways. This problem is particularly acute in urban areas, and Mayor Schrunk estimates that in Portland alone, 5,000 households will be displaced during the next 11 years, and 250 families are about to be uprooted by the East Bank Freeway at the present time. Existing State and Federal agencies are unable to deal with this problem.

This problem is particularly acute for tenants who are not property owners and who are forced to move as a result of the highway program. Homeowners receive fair compensation for their property, tenants receive nothing. It is important to note that under the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, provision is made in section 106(2) of title 1 for the payment of up to \$100 to families and single individuals and up to \$2,500 to businesses for moving expenses and fair compensation for loss of property. Our Federal highway legislation contains no such provision and tenants, homeowners and businesses are completely on their own so far as moving costs are concerned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a letter I received from Mayor Schrunk, dated January 26, together with a copy of the mayor's press release on this problem.

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

CITY OF PORTLAND,

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,

Portland, Oreg., January 26, 1959.

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR RICHARD: I wish to call your attention to a serious situation which is developing in Oregon and which arises from the

accelerated, federally aided freeway program. The situation is the plight of the thousands of families who will be uprooted by the construction of these freeways. It has been estimated that in Portland alone some 5,000 households will be displaced during the next 11 years.

As you know, the Bureau of Public Roads is the agency through which the States receive 90 percent of the cost of these freeways. I can find no evidence that this agency assumes any responsibility for helping people displaced by freeways to find other places to live. Certainly, the Oregon State Highway Commission assumes none. Its representatives take the position that the Highway Commission is prevented by law from offering any type of relocation service and further that the commission is completely unable to deal with this problem.

It appears that Federal law is in strange contrast to Federal urban renewal law. Title 1 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended through 1957, provides in section 105(c) that in order to qualify for Federal loans or capital grants, a local urban renewal agency must show evidence that "there are or are being provided, in the urban renewal area or in other areas not generally less desirable in regard to public utilities and public and commercial facilities and at rents or prices within the financial means of the families displaced from the urban renewal area, decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings equal in number to the number of and available to such displaced families and reasonably accessible to their places of employment."

Section 106(2) of title 1 of the same act provides for the payment of up to \$100 to families and single individuals and up to \$2,500 to business establishments for moving expenses and actual, direct losses of property.

As you will note from the accompanying detailed statement, I feel strongly that both Federal and State highway laws should be amended to make at least some relocation service available to people displaced by highway and freeway construction.

I am asking the Oregon State Legislature to review Oregon's highway laws for the purpose of amending the law in recognition of this displacement problem. However, I also feel very strongly that the Federal highway program should be amended by inserting comparable wording as appears under the urban renewal law in order to assist displaced people and make Federal highway funds available for such a program.

While the physical construction of this magnificent national highway network is important to the economy and defense of this Nation, we must never forget that people are important too.

I am calling this problem to the attention of the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the American Municipal Association and requesting their assistance concerning this problem.

Would you please investigate this problem and discuss it with your colleagues; and then, if you believe this recommendation has merit, introduce and/or assist in sponsoring corrective legislation in this session of Congress.

Please feel free to call on me at any time for any other information that you may desire in this connection.

Yours truly,

TERRY, Mayor.

FAST FREEWAYS—FLEEING FAMILIES

We have been hearing a good deal of late about the federally aided freeway program now underway. The potential impact of this program on Oregon residents is staggering. In Portland alone, the city planning commission estimates that 5,000 households will be displaced during the next 11 years. A rough field check indicates that the people in at least 250 households are about to be uprooted by the tiny segment of the East

Bank Freeway alignment between the Steel Bridge and North Russell Street. Area-wide and in terms of the percentage of households displaced, smaller communities will be even more drastically affected by the freeway construction.

The Federal Government, through its Bureau of Public Roads, pays 90 percent of the cost of these freeways. Oddly enough, that arm of Government completely ignores the fact that its tremendous concrete swaths plow through the lives of people. True enough, homeowners are paid a fair price for their property. But neither the Bureau of Public Roads nor the Oregon State Highway Commission assumes any responsibility for where these people go next or for what happens to other displaced people who are not so fortunate as to own their living quarters.

Contrast this with the requirements of another arm of the Federal Government, the Housing and Home Finance Agency. This is the organization which administers the federally aided urban renewal program; it pays two-thirds of the net cost of any urban renewal project. HHFA will not enter into an urban renewal contract with a local public agency until that agency (1) has determined the number of families and individuals to be displaced and their economic circumstances, and (2) has developed a feasible plan for the relocation of these people in decent, safe, and sanitary quarters that are within their price range. This relocation plan must show either that the existing housing supply is adequate to take care of the needs of the displaced or that additional housing units are being programmed.

Once an urban renewal project gets out of the planning stages and into operation, the local public agency must set up a relocation office in the project area and must staff it with personnel to help occupants of the area find other places to live. Before sales or rental vacancies are referred to families or individuals, they must be inspected by a member of the relocation staff to be certain that they comply with local health, sanitation, and housing codes.

If minority groups, particularly nonwhite people, are represented to a substantial degree in the project area, HHFA requires evidence that consideration has been given to their special housing problems and that adequate quarters will be available to them.

Finally, the Congress of the United States has enacted legislation providing for the payment of moving costs to those displaced by urban renewal activities—up to \$100 in the case of residents, and up to \$2,500 in the case of businesses and institutions. These costs are paid entirely by Federal funds.

The urban renewal and redevelopment law of the State of Oregon provides that a redevelopment project may not be initiated until there is a plan for the relocation of persons living in the area and until there is a plan for providing, unless already available, decent, safe, and sanitary quarters substantially equal in number to the substandard quarters to be demolished, at rents within the means of those displaced from such substandard quarters as prescribed by Federal and State urban renewal regulations and statutes.

The problem of freeway displacement in its present and potential form has not existed previously. Until recently, those affected have been largely homeowners. Such people, after the highway department pays them for their property, have some means of taking care of themselves. However, in many cases the prices they receive are not sufficient to enable them to buy comparable homes without considerable difficulty. Too, the accelerated freeway program will result in a great increase in the number of displaced owners. Tenants are at an even greater disadvantage. They have no control over their quarters, and, since the highway department

rarely has any dealings with them, frequently they have little knowledge as to the timing of right-of-way acquisition.

While the highway department recognizes that a problem does exist in this connection, it emphasizes its lack of legal responsibility for, and its inability to deal with, relocation problems. If this is indeed the case, it would appear that our State and Federal highway legislation should be amended.

Freeway displacement in large volume is not peculiar to Oregon. Eastern and Middle Western States have long since become familiar with it and have dealt with the problems it brings in varying ways. The Illinois division of highways, for example, contracts with the tenants' relocation bureau of the city of Chicago for relocation services to people displaced by its activities. These services are available not only to families and single individuals but also to commercial and industrial establishments. Expenditures include the salaries of the personnel involved, telephone, light, and gas bills for offices on the right-of-way, bills for signs when necessary, transportation costs for personnel while on duty, bills for such incidentals as stationery and office supplies, and a portion of the overhead for the central office of the tenants' relocation bureau.

The Chicago district engineer for the Illinois division of highways has this to say about the relocation program:

"Before setting forth details of cost or contractual arrangements, I would like to state that the assistance rendered to us by the tenants' relocation bureau of the city of Chicago not only met a need but helped tremendously in good public relations in a situation which, at best, is always disagreeable to some."

We in Portland have tried to provide at least a minimal relocation service to freeway displaces through our development commission, which is our urban renewal agency. However, we have been advised by the city attorney that the development commission may not properly expend its own funds for relocation activities in any but urban renewal areas. Thus we are unable to make available any type of relocation service to what will be a very large group of people.

In view of all the foregoing, it is my strong feeling that the Oregon State highway law and the Federal highway law should be amended to provide for certain relocation services to persons uprooted by highway activities. In communities having urban renewal agencies or housing authorities, working arrangements with such agencies might well be the most efficient means of implementing such provisions.

I believe that relocation services should include:

1. Occupancy surveys in right-of-way areas. Such surveys are necessary in order to determine the volume and character of the displacement in each instance. If cities or counties wish to avail themselves of special Federal relocation aids (see item 3), this type of information must accompany the localities' requests for such aids.

2. Information as to available sales and rental housing.

3. Information as to special FHA mortgage insurance available to persons displaced as a result of Government action.

4. Such other aids as can be provided to minimize the difficulties of moving.

TERRY D. SCHRUNK,

Mayor.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Mayor Schunk's comments and recommendations on the problem of highway displaced persons have received many favorable comments and widespread attention in my State. I ask unanimous consent to place at this point in my remarks an editorial from the Oregon

Journal of January 29, 1959, entitled "Portland's Own DP Problem," and from the Oregonian of January 30, 1959, entitled "Freeway DP's" together with letters from George D. Dysart, president of the Urban League of Portland, Mary C. Rowland of the Stella Maris House, and Mr. L. B. Macnab, of Portland.

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

[From the Oregon Journal, Jan. 29, 1959]

PORTLAND'S OWN DP PROBLEM

Most of us share Mayor Schrunk's concern over the relocation problem posed by the gigantic new interstate highway building program now getting underway.

In Portland alone, he estimates 5,000 households will be displaced in the next decade, 250 of them in the East Bank Freeway area between the Steel Bridge and North Russell. This district is almost of immediate concern.

In terms of persons this involves between 15,000 and 20,000 men, women, and children who will have to find new homes in Portland alone. And additional thousands will be affected in the Portland metropolitan area, where the problem is gravest, and in the State of Oregon.

Some estimates of the total number of Oregon persons affected, that is, facing relocation problems or job changes made necessary by removal of commercial and industrial establishments, may run as high as 50,000.

But taking the Portland relocation problem alone and using the minimum relocation figures, we agree with Mayor Schrunk that some systematic attack on it is imperative.

Unfortunately, the laws dealing with the Federal-State interstate highway program make no provision for relocating displaced persons.

Unlike the laws governing the housing and home finance agency's urban renewal programs, which make proper relocation of displaced persons a condition of approval, laws governing the vast highway program (affecting many more people) leave these citizens to their own devices.

Homeowners and owners of commercial establishments or institutions who are forced to move when urban renewal areas are acquired and cleared for new development get not only technical help with their relocation problems, they also are entitled to monetary aid in making their moves—up to \$100 for residents and up to \$2,500 for businesses and institutions.

That's why Mayor Schrunk is making an appeal to the State legislature and to the Congress for amendments to State and Federal highway acts to provide necessary occupancy surveys and technical assistance for persons displaced by new highway programs.

Areas such as the East Bank Freeway route in Portland present special problems for renters and members of minority groups who will find it especially difficult to find suitable safe and sanitary housing within their means.

The relocation program of Portland's urban renewal project No. 1 in southwest Portland is moving along satisfactorily. It now appears that with expert UR staff aid and excellent cooperation from apartment house owners, FHA and the Small Business Administration, the 2,300 persons displaced by the project (470 families and 1,000 singles) will find suitable locations elsewhere.

But this merely emphasizes the necessity for doing a comparable relocation job on a much greater scale as new freeways slash through heavily populated areas.

We may even have to face up to the possibility that some additional public housing may be necessary eventually, especially for

minority groups and elderly renters of limited means. You can't continue to tear out housing by thousands of units without replacing it, either privately or publicly. Our vacancy rate simply isn't that high.

[From the Oregonian, Jan. 30, 1959]

FREEWAY DP'S

The problems raised by the projected replacement of thousands of Portland households by freeway development, cited by Mayor Terry Schrunk this week, are real and urgent. They cannot be ignored by Federal, State, or local government, if Portland is to accomplish this enormous relocation with justice to those affected.

Fortunately, there is at hand a model for local action. The Portland Development Commission has mapped an orderly procedure for the relocation of persons who live or do business in the south auditorium urban renewal site. First step is appraisal of all property twice, by independent teams of appraisers. The commission thus hopes to obtain reasonable market figures acceptable to owners. It purposes to buy all but a few of the buildings in the project area and will enter into agreements with owners of excepted property for use conforming to the redevelopment plan.

The policy is to arrive at a mutually agreeable price with the owner, based on the independent appraisals. The commission hopes to avoid condemnation proceedings whenever possible. After purchase, the occupants, both business and residential, will be tenants of the commission until relocated. A minimum of 90 days' notice of evacuation will be given.

Persons living in a building at the time of its acquisition by the commission will be eligible for relocation payments up to \$100 to cover moving costs. This aid is particularly important to renters who can count on no return from public purchase. Business concerns, churches, and other nonresidential establishments will be eligible for relocation payments up to \$2,500 to cover moving costs and direct loss on equipment, fixtures, machinery, supplies, etc. These relocation funds come entirely from Federal appropriations.

The catch, in applying this systematic plan to freeway relocations, is that the Portland Development Commission is limited by law to the service of authorized urban renewal projects. Highway legislation, both Federal and State, has more or less ignored the problem of urban relocation, on the assumption perhaps that it offers no more difficulty than have right-of-way displacements in the past. This is a myopic view. Individual landowners or householders in rural areas have had their problems of relocation to accommodate highways. But they do not match by any means the upheaval contemplated by the urban freeway program.

Relocation is as much a part of a complete freeway program as it is a part of the urban renewal program. Some large cities of the East have recognized this by the creation of agencies specifically assigned to easing the difficulties of population displacement. Chicago, for example, has a Tenants' Replacement Bureau.

The freeway DP's need counsel and friendly assistance with their problems as much or more than they need money to meet unbudgeted costs. If the Portland Development Commission cannot provide this service, the city should use the commission's experience to date as a guide in setting up a more inclusive relocation agency to seek the active cooperation and assistance of Federal and State highway officials. The latter must be brought to understand that—in an urban situation—the problems of population relocation are as much a part of roadbuilding as is the acquisition of right-of-way.

THE URBAN LEAGUE OF PORTLAND,
Portland, Oreg., February 10, 1959.

Hon. TERRY D. SCHRUNK,
Mayor of Portland,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR MAYOR SCHRUNK: I want to thank you for having Mr. Ivancie make available to us your letter concerning the need for legislation to provide relocation assistance to persons displaced by the Federal-State highway program. I heartily support your action in requesting such legislation.

You might be interested in two precedents in addition to those that you cited in your letter. By the act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 642), the military departments were given authority to reimburse landowners and tenants for moving expenses when acquiring lands for their public-works projects. This same authority was given to the Department of the Interior by Public Law 85-433, approved May 29, 1958. Under this legislation the Secretary is authorized to reimburse owners and tenants for lands acquired for the construction, operation, or maintenance of developments under his jurisdiction "for expenses and other losses and damages incurred by them in the process and as a direct result of such moving of themselves, their families, and their possessions as is occasioned by said acquisition, * * *." This reimbursement is in addition to any payments that may otherwise be authorized by law. The total of such reimbursement to the owners and tenants of any parcel of land may not exceed 25 percent of the parcel's value as determined by the Secretary. The Interior authority is retroactive to July 14, 1952, the date the authority was given to the military departments.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE D. DYSART,
President.

CAMPBELL & MACNAB,
Portland, Oreg., February 3, 1959.

The Honorable RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DICK: Enclosed is a letter I received in this morning's mail from Mary Rowland, of the Stella Maris House, concerning the relocation of the people who will be displaced because of the East Bank Freeway, a federally financed project.

Although the project itself will be of great benefit to the community, certain individuals will be grievously hurt and I appeal to you to do everything you possibly can to secure all possible aid in relieving the difficulties the project creates.

In many instances, I believe the amount offered these good people for their homes is perhaps as much as the home and property is worth, but certainly not enough to relocate them in accommodations as adequate as those they are giving up without causing them to spend considerable money they do not have. Any help you can give to these people will be more than appreciated.

It is good to know your health has improved and hope you will have no further difficulties. Frankly, you had us worried, we just can't afford to lose a guy like you.

Katie joins me in wishing you everything that is good during the coming session and our kindest regards to both you and your good wife.

Sincerely yours,

L. B. MACNAB.

STELLA MARIS HOUSE,
Portland, Oreg., January 28, 1959.

Mr. BARNEY MACNAB,
Campbell & Macnab,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR BARNEY: The situation concerning housing has come to my attention within the last few months in which I think you would

be interested. The East Bank Freeway is coming through our Albina neighborhood displacing an estimated 250 families. This is part of the federally financed highway project which will continue for the next 11 years displacing an estimated 5,000 households.

Under this project the Federal Government supplies 90 percent of the funds and the State the rest. Due to some oversight, I am sure, the Federal highway laws make no provision for relocation. I am sure this is an oversight as the urban renewal laws bend over backward in helping relocate those who are forced to move.

The people in our Albina area are having two difficulties in relocation, one economic and the second that of their race. Many of the older people have difficulties tearing out their roots to move. These groups seem to need added help and encouragement in relocating which under the present laws is not provided for them.

The city of Portland has under consideration some stopgap measures to assist the people in the Albina area. However, to me, getting at the root cause seems most important in the light of the extended project and 5,000 households to be moved and this root cause is apparently the Federal highway laws. What can we do to get these changed?

Any ideas or suggestions you might have will be greatly appreciated.

Yours truly,

MARY C. ROWLAND.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as a member of the Public Roads Subcommittee of the Senate Public Works Committee, I feel that this problem deserves the most careful consideration. I am pleased to report that the distinguished Senators from New York State [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING] have introduced legislation, S. 117, to include in the definition of construction costs the cost of relocation of building tenants. I understand that the New York Senators have previously sponsored such proposals.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, as originally passed by the House of Representatives back in 1956 provided that the cost of relocating building tenants is recognized as part of the costs of construction. This provision was not in the legislation as enacted into law.

I realize that including in the Federal interstate highway program the cost of relocation of tenants would add materially to the expense of the highway program. While it is true that the Federal Government is paying up to 90 percent of the cost of the program, purchase of highway rights-of-way is done by the respective State highway commissions and the land belongs to the States. It seems only fair to me that relocation costs for tenants should be included in the highway program. There is ample precedent for this. The cost of relocation of utilities is included in the highway program, and certainly people are more important than telephone poles and powerlines.

JEAN TSCHETTER, SOUTH DAKOTA'S WINNER OF VOICE OF DEMOCRACY ESSAY CONTEST

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the National Voice of Democracy contest was held in Washington this past week. Participating in the events was the South Dakota winner of the contest sponsored

in our State by the South Dakota Broadcasters Association.

After listening to these fine essays written by outstanding high school students from all parts of the Nation, I am convinced we should more often bend an ear to listen to the voice of Young America.

One such voice is that of Miss Jean Tschetter, South Dakota's winner. What she thinks is important, I believe, because it is a reflection upon the heritage that is being given to the younger generation. Perhaps we have abused this rich heritage of America, and in our turning over responsibilities to the young people, we give them stronger and more difficult challenges to meet.

But we need not be dismayed, for the Jean Tschetter and others like her are ready to assume their responsibilities with the same spirit that has guided the destinies of this Nation for nearly two centuries.

Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD at this point a portion of my weekly newsletter "Your Washington and You" which refers to Miss Tschetter's visit, and following this article, I ask permission to have Miss Tschetter's excellent essay included in the RECORD.

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

JEAN SPEAKS FOR DEMOCRACY

South Dakota's winner of the Voice of Democracy contest, Miss Jean Tschetter, of Arlington, was in Washington this week along with 49 other State champions. Her essay which earned her the trip to Washington was an excellent expression of Americanism. Jean's brilliant exposition on the meaning of democracy is a credit to South Dakota, and to all young people. Her words demonstrate that our confidence and reliance can continue to rest upon the aspirations of America's youth. Jean Tschetter not only speaks for democracy, but speaks for America.

Read what this fine young American thinks: "I am a young American who values and believes in democracy. Fortune smiled on me when I was born, for it bequeathed to me a most priceless heritage, citizenship in our democracy. * * * What I am or what I shall make of my life is up to me. * * * I believe in democracy because of what it means to me and my fellow Americans. It is a way of life, a good and meaningful way of life."

Jean, a sophomore in Arlington High School, is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Amos Tschetter. Mr. Tschetter is superintendent of schools, and well known in the educational circles of South Dakota.

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Miss Jean Tschetter)

I speak for democracy. Why? Because I am a young American who values and believes in democracy. Fortune smiled on me when I was born, for it bequeathed to me a most priceless heritage—citizenship in our democracy. I might have been born behind the Iron Curtain, or in some other totalitarian state. Thus, the greatest break of my life came at my birth.

I might have been born a descendant of John Adams, or the daughter of an indentured servant. It wouldn't make any difference. What I am or what I shall make of my life is up to me.

In a democracy, we are, as Henley so well says, the masters of our fate and the cap-

tains of our souls. I believe in democracy because of what it means to me and my fellow Americans. By democracy, we ordinarily mean a form of government. But it is more, much more.

It is a way of life, a good and meaningful way of life. It grants that voice in our soul an opportunity for expression, individual expression. It gives us opportunity, too, to think and speak and write and do as our better self dictates.

As Americans, we often fail to value our freedoms, and even fail to recognize them. As a youth, I, too, had such inclinations, until 2 years ago it was my privilege to visit our Nation's Capital. I had an awakening and was alerted to the meaning of democracy.

Nowhere else in the world can one sense freedom so strongly as here. My family and I stood in awe at the shrines of democracy there. Our minds and hearts were deeply impressed as we were hoisted to the top of the Washington Memorial and viewed all the symbols that proclaim to the world that ours is a nation that honors, guards, and sponsors freedom for all.

Most impressive was the experience mounting the steps of the magnificent Lincoln Memorial. As you enter the front opening, there before you sits the huge figure of Lincoln as sculptured by Daniel Chester French. It seems as if he says, "I was a common man, common in ancestry, common in appearance, common in every way, but democracy made it possible for me to sit here. I gave my life to bring a more fuller democracy to my country and a segment of my people."

I bow in gratitude to men like him. Then I looked to the right and to the left, and on the walls I noticed inscriptions. On the left, I read these memorable words, "With malice toward none, with charity for all, let us bind up the Nation's wounds."

What nobler words could a human utter? Have you ever heard words which better typify the true spirit of democracy?

On the right were inscribed the famous words uttered in Gettysburg, "Fourscore and seven years ago, our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

Did anyone ever speak more clearly and more profoundly for democracy?

Lincoln promoted democracy. Yea, more, he lived it, and gave democracy its greatest boost.

Another grand symbol of democracy in our Nation's Capital is a building, an impressive front, with Ionic Greek pillars, the figures of nine men carved on the top, and above them the significant inscription "Equal justice under law."

That's democracy, my fellow Americans. It behooves us all to cherish it. Therefore, I am happy to speak for democracy.

NEED FOR MORE SUPPORT FOR EDUCATION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, every citizen of the United States must be educated to the limit of his capacity if this Nation is to survive as a democracy in the nuclear age.

This is not my conclusion alone. It is the belief of Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, former president of the University of Chicago, and one of our Nation's outstanding leaders in the field of education.

In a recent speech, Dr. Hutchins said that educators and the people were united only in wanting education "without pain, either intellectually or financially. History will smile at the spectacle of this great country's getting more

interested in education because of the technical achievements of Russia, and then being able to act as a nation only by assimilating education to the cold war and calling an education bill a defense act."

Unfortunately, in my opinion, Dr. Hutchins is absolutely right in this statement. When the ultimate happiness, progress, and security of free men so clearly depends on their educational attainments, it is indeed incredible that as a people we are so reticent to make vitally needed improvements.

The current administration can be held responsible for its failure to plan and present a bold and dynamic program of school construction and instruction improvement. Instead, it comes to the American people with the attitude that this is "the most we can afford," or that we "can't afford anything at this time." This "can't afford it" view is reflected not only in the administration's proposed budget, but also in the President's Economic Report.

There was a time not too far back in our governmental history when the word "can't" was hardly a part of the national vocabulary. From the very beginning of American history, our colonists did not say "We can't" when they faced the terrible winters and the Indians; Washington and his men did not say "We can't" at Valley Forge; and President Roosevelt and the American people did not say "We can't" in the hard depression days.

Mr. President, if I may be permitted a reference to my home State, I should like to observe that this is the anniversary of the Declaration of Texas Independence, on March 2, 1836. On that day a band of Texans was gathered in a blacksmith shop at Old Washington on the Brazos in Texas.

Mr. President, also on that day 182 men were being besieged in the Alamo by 5,000 soldiers under Santa Ana. Those Texans at Old Washington, on the Brazos, although knowing that it was impossible to go to the aid of the Texans in the Alamo, nevertheless declared for independence. They did not say, "We can't."

Our leaders and the American people in all cases have risen to the challenge because of their deep belief in a dream—in their dedication to the idea of human liberty and freedom.

In all cases they had the courage and vision to set their goals out ahead, and then they reached them at all costs. They never took the position "We can't afford it." It is time the administration understood that we cannot meet the challenge of communism around the world with a "we can't afford it" philosophy.

Whether it is in the field of education or military preparedness, or rivers and harbors development, we need to set our goals and accomplish them. This Nation can afford to pay for anything that is worth the money to the American people and to all free men. The only thing we can't afford is the administration's "we can't afford it" philosophy.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York

Times of January 22, 1959, under the heading: "Hutchins Says Survival of the United States Hinges on Maximum Education."

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

[From the New York Times, Jan. 22, 1959]

HUTCHINS SAYS SURVIVAL OF UNITED STATES HINGES ON MAXIMUM EDUCATION—WARNS THAT ONLY MEN ABLE TO MAKE DECISIONS CAN GIVE REALITY TO DEMOCRACY

Every citizen of the United States must be educated to the limit of his capacity if this Nation is to survive as a democracy in the nuclear age, Dr. Robert M. Hutchins said last night.

Dr. Hutchins, who is the president of the Fund for the Republic, warned that throughout the world there was an antidemocratic trend that had little or nothing to do with the Kremlin, but rather with a belief that democracy was an illusion in both old and new states.

To meet this challenge and preserve the democratic faith, he said, men must be sufficiently educated and informed to take part in making decisions in a free society.

"I don't mean trained, amused, exercised, accommodated or adjusted," he said. "I mean that his intellectual power must be developed."

Dr. Hutchins, a former president of the University of Chicago, gave his opinions in a speech prepared for a dinner at the Commodore Hotel at which he received the \$1,000 Sidney Hillman Foundation Award. The citation, for meritorious public service, is presented annually in memory of the late president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

Dr. Hutchins said that history would have trouble assessing American education in the 20th century.

UNWILLING TO PAY

"It will see a people, who say they are dedicated to education and who are the richest in the world, indifferent to education and unwilling to pay for it," he said. "It will see an educational system that delivers less education per dollar than almost any other saying that all it needs is more money."

Dr. Hutchins said that educators and the people were united only in wanting education without pain, either intellectually or financially.

"History will smile sardonically," he continued, "at the spectacle of this great country's getting interested, slightly and temporarily, in education only because of the technical achievements of Russia, and then being able to act as a nation only by assimilating education to the cold war and calling an education bill a defense bill."

The educator, who recently observed his 60th birthday, said that the way to find money was to remove from education those subjects, those activities, and those people that make no contribution to the development of intellectual power.

The money thus saved and additional funds that may be needed should be applied, he said, first to doubling teachers' salaries, not because all the teachers we have deserve twice as much as they are getting, but because we want to attract the ablest people into the profession. The money should be used to establish a national system of scholarships to enable education on the basis of mental, rather than financial, capacity.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I also request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January

23, 1959, under the heading "Slowdown on Education."

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

SLOWDOWN ON EDUCATION

President Eisenhower wants to spend only half of the \$222 million authorized by Congress for fiscal 1960 under the National Defense Education Act. This law was passed under the goad of the sputniks. How can the race with the Russians be won by slowing down?

In view of the President's reduced recommendations for other educational items, it seems that budgetary considerations have at least as much to do with the matter as his expressed desire to hold up aid to scientific education pending further experience with the program. There has been little time to gain experience.

The impression that the size of the budget influenced Mr. Eisenhower is heightened by his refusal to recommend funds for school construction, and by his desire for a cut-back in aid to schools overcrowded with the children of Federal workers.

This approach does not make sense in the face of reports such as that of Loren B. Pope, of the New York Times, that "despite a near record of 70,000 classrooms built (in the last year), the deficit apparently is as large this winter as it was last. Figures soon to be published by the Office of Education will show a deficit of about 140,000 classrooms."

Bills providing aid to education on all levels will be introduced in Congress. Some of them already have been influenced by the administration's reluctance. One measure, for example, would be tied to the debt service of school districts instead of providing grants before construction begins. Many districts would encounter legal difficulties in accepting such aid. It would cost more in the long run, but in the short run it would not be reflected in the Federal budget.

Surely this is pennywise and pound-foolish.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 25, 1959, under the heading, "No Time for Shoehorn Budget."

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

NO TIME FOR A SHOEHORN BUDGET

The debate over the Eisenhower budget will not be disposed of by calling the President's message propaganda or a fraud. The Democratic leaders who toss these terms around so freely should keep in mind that they not only have the right to criticize but bear the responsibility for presenting, in effect, a carefully thought out budget of their own.

The Eisenhower budget can be called balanced only by courtesy. The balance depends not only upon holding expenditures down to a \$77 billion level which already seems unrealistic, but upon making certain adjustments on the revenue side which already seem unlikely—increasing gasoline taxes 50 percent, raising postal rates yet again, increasing taxes on airplane fuel, and so on. Furthermore, the balance depends upon business recovery from the recession proceeding at such a rate as to increase Treasury revenues \$9 billion in a single year. We are told that the administration is counting on a rate of recovery slower than that which followed the 1954 recession. Yet revenues did not rebound by 9 billion in a single year then; how can we count on their doing so now?

It seems highly unlikely, then, that the administration, even if it goes its way on every bill in Congress, could produce a surplus in 1959-60 immediately following a year in which it is producing the biggest deficit (nearly 13 billions) of the postwar period.

But if the administration's own budget bids fair to turn out unbalanced, and if defense, education, foreign aid and other urgent needs require expenditures that will unbalance it still further, the urgent problem for the Democratic leaders is how to make sure that another substantial deficit will not set off another round of inflationary wage and price increases.

One of the strongest criticisms of the Eisenhower budget is that it appears to be based upon calculating a certain rate of business recovery, deducing therefrom a certain level of receipts, and then shoe-horning expenditures into the resulting budget total.

This method of budgeting is called "sound" by some, but it ignores the urgent needs of today's world. We simply cannot afford to spend only as much for defense as we think we can afford; we must spend as much as is needed for security, and then devise ways to afford it.

The same principle holds for the great economic, scientific and diplomatic contest on which we are embarked. It holds also for meeting the expanding needs of an exploding and increasingly urbanized society.

To measure the national effort by what the present growth rate of the economy and present tax structure can support is to risk losing a race we dare not lose. The process must be turned the other way around: the growth rate, the budget and the tax structure must be planned to support such a level of national effort as is required by our situation.

It is the Democratic responsibility—specifically, the responsibility of Speaker RAYBURN and Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON—to muster the best economic brains for this kind of economic planning. It is the Democratic responsibility to give the country a congressional budget that meets the national needs and at the same time protects the people from a disastrous inflation.

TWO-PRICE PLAN FOR WHEAT MEANS AID FOR OREGON'S POULTRY AND LIVESTOCK INDUSTRIES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am very pleased that my warm friend the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] introduced on February 19, 1959, a comprehensive wheat stabilization program. I feel privileged to be a cosponsor of the distinguished Senator's bill, S. 1140, which is a broader and improved version of his domestic parity measure, S. 774, which I also cosponsored in the last Congress.

This proposal not only will reduce greatly the drain on the Federal Treasury for wheat price supports—which certainly should contribute to a balanced budget or to freeing Federal funds for worthy social purposes such as medical research or Federal aid to schools—while more effectively aiding wheat-growers, but will also help channel wheat into feed uses in the Pacific Northwest. This result would be of major importance to the poultry and livestock industries in my State.

In the Oregonian of Portland for January 18, 1959, there appeared an excellent article on wheat as a source of animal feed. The story was written by that daily newspaper's capable agriculture editor, Joe Bianco. Because Mr.

Bianco's informative report is so timely in view of Senator CARLSON's introduction of S. 1140, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Survey Concludes Oregon Wheat Supply Holds Key to Livestock and Packing Industries," be printed in the body of the RECORD for the information of the Senate.

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

SURVEY CONCLUDES OREGON WHEAT SUPPLY HOLDS KEY TO LIVESTOCK, PACKING INDUSTRIES

(By Joe Bianco)

Wheat is feed.

This represents the key to the future growth of the livestock and meat packing industries in Oregon.

The conclusion was reached by a team of Portland college professors and business executives in a comprehensive agricultural economy study released Saturday.

The findings of this group parallel the policies and opinions of some of the State's leading agricultural commodity groups.

The research project was sponsored by Lewis and Clark College and Reed College and financially assisted by a grant-in-aid from the Committee for Economic Development, and the Fund for Adult Education, established by the Ford Foundation.

SHIFT IN INDUSTRY

The business executives' research committee of which the businessmen and college personnel are members conducted the program and published its report in a 39-page booklet.

In 1954 and 1956, the committee published a study of the forest products industries of Oregon. The present study was of the livestock and meat packing industries and in its conclusion explained the growth of the commodity group depended more upon a shift of the industry to Oregon than upon a national growth of the industry.

Favorable to such development will be the improvements in transportation and refrigeration which will tend to shift meatpacking and cattle feeding closer to the basic resources—rangeland and feed, the committee said.

STATE WELL FAVORED

Additional factors favoring such development are:

1. The resources of Oregon are well adapted for large scale grain production, especially wheat production.
2. The Oregon range will not limit growth of these industries, if presently known improved management methods are adopted.
3. The population growth of California, will create an expanding market for Oregon production.

A hindering factor in the growth of the industries is the present price supports which make wheat too expensive to feed in competition with midwest corn, according to the group. This applies particularly to the advancement of the Oregon hog industry which is steadily increasing its production and last year produced the biggest pig crop in 15 years.

DOUBLE PARITY URGED

The committee said it has estimated that with wheat at \$1.78 per bushel midwest corn prices would have to be about \$1.28 per bushel to permit a competitive hog industry in Oregon based on feeding wheat. Adequate supplies of competitively priced feed grain are also vital to the growth of the Oregon cattle-feed industry.

The group explained in its report that its task was not that of investigating the general problem of price supports. "Therefore," the report continued, "without endorsing or condemning the philosophy of price supports, the committee recommends adoption of the plan for wheat."

The committee also recommended greater experimentation in the development and use of feed rations for hog raising in Oregon. The objective is to make greater use of available pasture and other forage crops, as well as byproducts, as a means of reducing the percentage of grain input and thus reducing the cost of the whole ration, they explained.

PROMOTION STRESSED

The recommendations of the committee also included range management procedures. Although Oregon ranges are now fully stocked, range capacity need not limit the growth of the State's livestock business, it maintained. Expansion depends upon range management improvements.

Provided the feed grain and range problems can be solved, the group said, the next step would be more aggressive promotion of Oregon meat products. Such promotion should be undertaken by a voluntary association of meat producers and packers.

A major problem in the promotion of a product such as Oregon meat is that of regionally differentiating the product, they added. The committee proposed that the campaign be aimed at the promotion of wheat-fed meat. Wheat will produce beef equal to that fed on corn.

The livestock and meatpacking industries are important contributors to Oregon economy, they said. In 1954, it was estimated that value added in the vertically integrated industrial complex was nearly \$37 million. Looking to the future, the committee said that further expansion of the industries is assured, provided certain problems presented in its report can be resolved.

Following is a résumé of five chapters of the report:

Meatpacking is the final stage of a series of vertically integrated economic activities, and the value added by the total of these activities is much greater than that added in packing alone.

If all the inputs to the meatpacking and processing industries were produced within the State, the committee said, the income contribution of the whole vertical industry complex from livestock breeding and feed growing to the final meat preparation would equal the total sales of meat and other packinghouse products—about \$77 million.

However, not all the inputs to the meat industry are produced within the State. Oregon imports finished cattle and large numbers of hogs for slaughter, and also her production of cattle and sheep is in excess of Oregon slaughter. Consequently, value added in the entire industry cannot be inferred simply from the gross output of its final stage, the committee explained. The value of livestock production in 1954 was \$75 million plus \$11,600,000 in meatpacking and processing yields an estimated \$86,600,000 value.

POTENTIAL DEMAND

The growth of the livestock and meatpacking industries will depend, in part, upon growth in the demand for meat products in markets accessible to Oregon producers. It will also depend upon the ability of Oregon producers to satisfy larger proportions (in competition with out-of-State producers) of such market demand.

It was estimated the population of the State by 1975 will be 2,344,000.

In addition to home market possibilities nearby out-of-State markets such as California may afford a basis for future expansion, they said. However, a number of factors will constitute whether California will be an important export market. Among these are relative freight rates, feed availability, prices in Oregon, and the possible future expansion in the California livestock and meatpacking industries. Washington also may provide future possibilities for Oregon producers.

FEED SUPPLY

Oregon has an available supply of wheat, oats and barley. Although wheat is Oregon's principal grain, barley is its principal feed grain. Though it is not often classed as a feed grain, there is no technical obstacle to the extensive use of wheat as a feed, the committee pointed out.

The fundamental obstacle to increased use of wheat for feed is price, they said. Wheat is substantially priced out of the feed market owing to the 1958 support levels.

A proposed plan endorsed by the wheat industry in Oregon is the domestic party plan or two-price wheat.

INFLUENCE ON CROPS

The committee reported that advocates of a two-price plan for wheat stress that substantial amounts of wheat would move into feed markets. This might take place by a substitution of wheat for other Oregon-produced feed grains, such as oats and barley, or the substitution of wheat for feed grains currently shipped in from out of State. Approximately 2 to 3 million bushels of corn have been shipped into Oregon each year as feed.

Another possibility would be the considerable expansion of feeding operations in the State. Such a development would greatly assist the State's hog industry, they reported. The feeding of cattle is another potential use for Oregon wheat.

Another factor in the development of the meat industry is proper utilization of the rangelands.

Most authorities are in agreement, the committee said, that, under current management practices, the ranges of Oregon are fully stocked. However, they point out that an increase in range capacity can be achieved through better management practices alone.

By better range management the committee means: Rotation of the stock from area to area within the range, in order to permit recovery of the rangeland; use of particular portions of the range during proper season; and avoidance of overstocking particular range areas at a given time.

The subcommittees that worked on the study were the feed resources and supply subcommittee and demand and marketing subcommittee under chairmen Eugene P. Carpenter, Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., and William R. Morrish, assistant to the publisher of the Oregonian, respectively. The faculty advisers were from Lewis and Clark College and Reed College. The research coordinator was Carl M. Stevens, associate professor at Reed College.

Other members of the feed resources and supply subcommittee were James P. Brattain, the Oregon Journal; Lucien G. Alexander, Mason, Bruce & Girard; Robert Vail, General Petroleum Corp.; Lyman Seely, First National Bank of Oregon; John Elorriaga, U.S. National Bank; Richard L. Wells, Bank of California and A. D. Venator, Swift & Co.

Other members of the demand and marketing subcommittee were William Rohlfis, Standard Insurance Co.; David P. Landry, Pacific Power & Light Co.; Robert Fitzgerald, Tektronix, Inc.; Kramer Adams, Weyerhaeuser Timber Co.; Jack Brady, Swift & Co.; and Glenn Gillespie, Crown Zellerbach Corp.

The faculty advisers were Raymond L. McIlvenna, associate professor, of Lewis and Clark College; Arthur H. Leigh, professor and George A. Hay, associate professor, both of Reed College.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). Is there further morning business?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

CV—198

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.

Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ORDER TO DISPENSE WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

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

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

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

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

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is now nearly 5 years since the Supreme Court, by unanimous opinion, issued its historic school integration decisions. Since that time, the executive branch has done little, and the Congress has done nothing, to assist in implementing those decisions, which called for integration of public schools with due deliberate speed.

Instead, in the opinion of many, by agreeing to the striking of part III from the Civil Rights Act of 1957, an action taken under the threat of filibuster, the 85th Congress—specifically, the Senate of the 85th Congress—gave encouragement to those opposing integration at any speed whatever.

It is for these reasons that I feel that the Douglas-Javits-Celler civil rights bill of 1959, of which I am 1 of 17 cosponsors, is as important as any bill to come before this Congress. It is a matter of deep satisfaction to know that this and other bills on the same subject have been scheduled for early hearings in both Houses of the 86th Congress, beginning March 4 before a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee headed by Chairman Celler, and beginning March 18 before the Senate Judiciary Committee's Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, headed by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGSEN].

These hearings will, I presume, consider three sets of proposals, namely, the comprehensive Douglas-Javits-Celler bill (S. 810), the Johnson bill (S. 499) dealing principally with so-called conciliation procedures, and certain of a group of seven bills constituting the administration's civil rights legislative proposals.

On the eve of these hearings, consideration of these bills has been helped, I believe, by publication of a summary comparison of them, prepared and issued by the executive committee of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, consisting of 53 national religious, interracial, civic, welfare, fraternal, labor, and vet-

erans organizations who share a long, deep, and sincere interest in the establishment of civil rights for all Americans. Among these 53 national organizations are the NAACP, the American Jewish Congress, the International Union of Electrical Workers, the United Automobile Workers, the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, other labor organizations, the Americans for Democratic Action, the American Veterans Committee, the American Civil Liberties Union, the Improved Benevolent Order of Elks, the American Council on Human Rights, the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice, and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. Roy Wilkins is chairman and Arnold Aronson is secretary of this conference. I ask unanimous consent that this comparative analysis, as published on March 2, be printed at this point in the RECORD; and I urge my colleagues to give it the careful attention and consideration which I believe it merits.

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

LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON CIVIL RIGHTS—SUMMARY COMPARISON OF THE THREE MOST WIDELY DISCUSSED CIVIL RIGHTS BILLS

Attached hereto are a number of sheets comparing in as simple a manner as possible the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill (No. S. 810 in the Senate and H.R. 3147 in the House), the administration bills (S. 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960 and 942 in the Senate and H.R. 4557 in the House), and the Johnson bill (S. 499 in the Senate).

The summary comparison would appear to justify the following conclusions:

1. The Douglas-Javits-Celler bill, providing support for the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions and technical and financial assistance to assist the process of school desegregation and including an improved version of the old part III stricken from the 1957 bill, is essential to the accomplishment of school desegregation within a reasonable period and to the maintenance of the equal protection of the laws in other fields; it is certainly the No. 1 civil rights bill. The Javits bill, S. 456 (see also Celler bill, H.R. 3148), which is not included in the summary comparison, also contains an improved version of the old part III of the 1957 bill, but the Javits bill does not contain the remainder of the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill. The old part III contained in both bills authorizes the Attorney General to bring injunction actions against those denying equal protection of the laws to anyone because of their race, color, religion, or national origin, and is the single most essential part of any civil rights legislation.

2. The administration school bills omit part III completely and contain an inadequate version of the remainder of the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill. Other administration bills, and particularly S. 957 authorizing inspection of voting records, make advances in the area of civil rights which deserve the support of civil rights organizations, to the extent that support for the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill is in no way reduced.

3. The Johnson bill, by failing to support the school desegregation decisions and by conciliation provisions that may result in civil rights being bargained away rather than enforced, appears to be a step backward. It seeks to relegate the assertion of rights to equal protection by citizens and defiance of the law by States to the status of a neighborhood quarrel to be resolved only by an ill-defined conciliation procedure. Its other provisions would seem to be better dealt with in the administration and other bills.

DOUGLAS-JAVITS-CELLER BILL

Title I contains findings approving the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions as expressing "the moral ideals of the Nation," recognizing that "the Constitution, as declared by the antisegregation decisions, is the supreme law of the land" and declaring the intention of Congress "that the right to the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Constitution against deprivation by reason of race, color, religion or national origin and affirmed by the antisegregation decisions of the Supreme Court, shall be protected by all due and reasonable means."

Title II authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to render technical assistance, through the compilation and distribution of information, making and distributing surveys of progress and of successful case histories, arrangement of conferences, appointment of advisory councils, provision of specialist services, and reimbursement of State and local expenses in cooperating in these activities, to State and local governments in bringing about desegregation of the public school systems (appropriations up to \$2½ million a year for 5 years).

Title III authorizes Secretary to make grants to States and local governmental units for additional school facilities, additional teachers, in-service teacher training, employment of specialists in developing community understanding and other phases of desegregation, short-term training courses and other additional educational measures undertaken to eliminate segregation while at the same time assuring that existing educational standards will not be lowered—also provides grants to local communities eliminating segregation where State threatens to cut off school payments (appropriations up to \$40 million a year for 5 years).

Title IV authorizes the Secretary, when other methods fail, to assume responsibility for initiating the development of desegregation plans, with fullest possible local consultation and participation.

Title V authorizes the Attorney General to file compliance actions in connection with desegregation plans approved under title IV, when the Secretary certifies that all efforts to secure compliance by persuasion and technical and financial assistance have failed.

Titles VI and VII (improved version of pt. III of 1957 bill) authorizes Attorney General to bring injunction actions against those denying equal protection of the laws to anyone, by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin, when there is a signed complaint and when aggrieved person is unable to seek effective legal protection for himself; also authorizes Attorney General to protect local officials trying to comply with desegregation decisions from those who would hinder their actions (Hoxie situation); also authorizes Attorney General to protect those who defend civil rights of others; also permits Attorney General to intervene in equal protection cases brought by others; also provides that any action brought under the bill may be brought without the necessity of exhausting administrative remedies.

Title VI (see above) authorizes injunctions against conduct covered by S. 955 which can be enforced by contempt proceedings. This is far more effective than the limited usefulness of criminal action.

No provision.

[DOUGLAS is cosponsor of preferred Kennedy-Ervin bill which makes it a crime to possess or transport in interstate commerce explosives for the purpose of destroying any religious, school, or business (but not specifically residential) property and contains a rebuttable presumption that explosives were transported in interstate commerce, thus bringing FBI in on all bombings of religious, school, or business property. Also has fugitive felon provision. Should be

ADMINISTRATION BILLS

S. 958 contains limited version of Douglas bill findings, including that "the Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court * * * is the supreme law of the land," but not including the Douglas bill findings approving the antisegregation decisions or pledging Congress to support those decisions "by all due and reasonable means."

S. 958 contains limited version of titles II and III of Douglas bill on reduced scale both as to extent of program and amount of aid to be given—provides assistance for "pupil placement" which has been utilized against desegregation—(estimated expenditure of \$4½ million on 2-year program as compared to Douglas title II (\$2½ million a year) and title III (40 million a year) for 5 years.)

See previous paragraph.

No provision.

No provision.

No provision.

S. 955 makes it a criminal offense to use force or threats to interfere with court orders in school desegregation cases.

S. 956 makes it a criminal offense to travel in interstate commerce to avoid prosecution or punishment for damage or destruction by fire or explosion of religious or school (but not business or residential) property. May not be adequate to bring the FBI in on all bombings of even religious and school property although the administration believes it is adequate in this respect (Kennedy-Ervin preferable).

JOHNSON BILL

No provision

[Does not support Supreme Court's desegregation decisions; on the contrary notes that constitutional requirements give rise to "disagreements" which disrupt peace and states an intent to "conciliate" these disagreements rather than enforce constitutional rights.]

No provision.

No provision.

No provision.

No provision.

No provision.

No provision.

Title IV makes interstate transportation of explosives or possession of interstate-transported explosives a crime if transportation or possession is with the knowledge or intent that they be used to damage religious, school or business (but not specifically residential) property. Absence of presumption of interstate transportation changes little the existing involvement of the FBI in this type of case, but fugitive felon provision may help this (Kennedy-Ervin preferable).

DOUGLAS-JAVITS-CELLER BILL

amended to include homes as does the Keating-Javits bill, S. 73.]

No provision.

Titles II and III of Douglas bill are far preferable to inadequate S. 958.

Title III deals with closed schools by offering Federal funds to local communities where State has withdrawn school payments.

No provision.

No provision.

No provision.

[Titles II, III, and IV provide for technical assistance and persuasion in the framework of ultimate enforcement of the school desegregation decisions. Thus, for example, title IV provides that "the Secretary shall make every effort to persuade States, municipalities, school districts, and other local governmental units to make a start toward eliminating segregation in public education and to carry out in full such programs as they may start, and to this end he shall utilize the authority" for technical assistance and grants-in-aid provided in titles II and III. Persuasion where the objective is to bring about compliance with law and where all parties know that the failure of persuasion will result in enforcement action will strengthen constitutional rights; the Johnson conciliation provision without ultimate enforcement can only result in the bargaining away of constitutional rights.]

No provision.

No provision.

No provision [Kennedy-Ervin bill discussed above].

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CHURCH obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CHURCH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

ADMINISTRATION BILLS

S. 957 requires election officials to preserve Federal election records for 3 years, makes such records subject to examination by the Attorney General and authorizes district courts to compel production for such examination. Department of Justice feels that this provision will assist in voting cases because of inadequacy of subpoena power through grand jury process or through institution of civil suits.

S. 958 is bill for technical assistance for school desegregation discussed below.

S. 959 authorizes Commissioner of Education to operate schools for children of members of the armed services where local schools are closed; with respect to future schools constructed under the impacted areas program, authorizes repossession where closed. (Should be strengthened to deal with other Federal employees and to authorize repossession of closed schools previously built under impacted areas programs.) Does nothing about desegregating impacted area schools.

S. 960 extends Civil Rights Commission for 2 years. Danger is that this will be used to avoid meaningful civil rights legislation with no real civil rights action flowing from the Commission. (Should be strengthened by authorizing Commission to investigate all denials of civil rights because of race, color, religion, or national origin.)

S. 942 gives statutory basis to the President's Committee on Government Contracts (should be strengthened with provision, now omitted, that Commission may hold full dress hearings with subpoena power and may direct any Government contracting agency to terminate a contract or to refrain from making a new contract where, after reasonable warning, the Commission finds that discrimination has continued).

No provision.

[Limited version of Douglas bill in this regard.]

S. 960, extension of Civil Rights Commission discussed above.

S. 957, subpoena in voting rights cases discussed above.

S. 956, bombing bill discussed above.

JOHNSON BILL

Title III grants subpoena power to Department of Justice in voting rights cases, but provides it may be used only if the Governor of the State has failed to order the election official to surrender the documents. This loophole would, at the least, permit long delays and, at the most, permit collusion to avoid any subpoena. Furthermore, requirement of demand for records before subpoena and absence of penalty for destruction adds another possible loophole. (Justice provision greatly preferable.)

No provision.

No provision.

Title II extends Civil Rights Commission until 60 days after January 31, 1961. Although not quite as long an extension as S. 960, has same danger of avoiding meaningful legislation. (Should be strengthened by authorizing Commission to investigate all denials of civil rights because of race, color, religion, or national origin.)

No provision.

Title I establishes a Community Relations Service to conciliate "disagreements or difficulties regarding the laws or Constitution of the United States" and disagreements affecting interstate commerce. Far from supporting the Supreme Court's decisions, the sentence in the bill that "use of force in any manner * * * tends to aggravate the disagreements" seems to imply no enforcement of desegregation decisions. This title seeks to relegate the assertion of rights to equal protection by citizens and defiance of the law by States to the status of neighborhood quarrels to be resolved only by an ill-defined conciliation procedure. Furthermore, the procedure may actually hamper enforcement action in the courts which may hold the Johnson bill's conciliation procedures to be a necessary prerequisite of judicial action.

Title II, extension of Civil Rights Commission discussed above.

Title III, subpoena in voting rights cases discussed above.

Title IV, bombing bill discussed above.

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.

THE GENEVA CONFERENCE: A PROPOSAL FOR THE 11TH HOUR

PART I. THE PSYCHOSIS OF CRISIS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the 2 years I have served in the Senate are but a brief interlude in the life of a na-

tion. Yet these years seem a very long time, perhaps because they have been burdened with unrelenting crises. I came here in the wake of the Suez crisis. It was only being laid to rest, when revolt in Budapest turned our minds to Hungary. We were still tormented by the anguish there, when sudden eruption in Iraq spurred us to dispatch our troops to Lebanon, and once again to switch our attention to another crisis in the Middle East. Then, hard upon this anxiety, we were suddenly confronted with a

grave new crisis in the Orient, as the Chinese Communists commenced to cannon the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu, and the issue of war or peace hung in breathless balance over the Formosan Straits.

This afternoon, Mr. President, we are fixed upon the latest crisis to be provoked by the Communists, one that seems now to involve the fate of Berlin. We stare in cold fascination at the swinging pendulum of the clock that ticks off the hours, moving us ever closer to the 27th day of May, the deadline of the Soviet ultimatum.

Will there be war, we ask. Is this not the same question we asked ourselves, again and again, in regard to Suez, Lebanon, and the Straits of Formosa?

Will there be war at Berlin? Only the men in the Kremlin hold the answer. Thus far, they have been content with their war of nerves. The instigation of crises has been their method, as we have been catapulted from one to another, around the periphery of the free world. To be sure, 9 years ago the fighting came in Korea; but it was precipitated by Communist China, not by the Soviet Union. Russia has not yet ventured a shooting war.

And there is good reason to doubt that Russia intends a shooting war over Berlin. It is much more likely, Mr. President, that somehow the Berlin crisis will abate, and a few months from now our concentration will have been shifted to a newly contrived crisis, possibly in Finland or Iran.

The mischief is that we may become, in our frantic ride from brink to brink, transfixed upon the chasms below, and unmindful of the road ahead. So I fear we are about to forsake the conference at Geneva, now approaching its 11th hour. We seem to view Geneva as through the wrong end of a telescope, even as we magnify Berlin. One would think that the cessation of nuclear tests, properly policed, was a matter of distant interest and little consequence to the people of the world.

It is not so.

The conference at Geneva is engaged upon what could easily be the most important work occurring anywhere in the world today or tomorrow.

PART II. GENEVA, THE REASONS FOR HOPE

Last October we went to Geneva in good faith and with stout hope. The prayers of the peaceful have attended our deliberations there, ever since. We went to Geneva to seek an end to all further nuclear tests, through an agreement among the three nuclear powers—the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union. The treaty sought had two objectives, tied inseparably together: First, all signatories would agree to suspend further nuclear tests, within the framework of, and, second, a trustworthy international system of inspection and control to safeguard each party against any violation by another.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it correct to say that at the present time the so-called

nuclear club is composed only of these three nations?

Mr. CHURCH. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it a reasonable assumption to make that if, in some way or fashion, some method is not found to bring about an end to the testing of atomic and nuclear devices, the nuclear club itself is bound to expand and the danger to become that much greater?

Mr. CHURCH. I should say that not only is it an altogether reasonable assumption, but it is an altogether probable assumption, for even now we know France is soon likely to develop a nuclear capacity of her own, and there are other countries very likely to follow in due time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Has there been talk about the Swedes and the Chinese developing a nuclear capacity?

Mr. CHURCH. There has been. I certainly know of no reason to suspect they do not have the capacity to develop a nuclear technology of their own.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator agree that if we do not arrive at an agreement within a relatively short time the club is very likely to expand, the dangers to increase, and the possibilities of agreement to become less and less?

Mr. CHURCH. That is so. That is why the present negotiations at Geneva are so fateful, because this may prove to be the last time when agreement is in fact reachable. If we could reach agreement now, it would provide the basis to extend the agreement to include new nations as they develop nuclear capacity of their own. This may be the last best opportunity. Another comparable opportunity may not come in our time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I could not agree with the Senator more. The mere fact that the conference is in session, even though the surprise-attack conference in Geneva is in suspension, gives us an opportunity, slim as it is—the Senator has said this is the 11th hour—for possibly some agreement covering regulation of nuclear activity in this particular field to come about.

I think the distinguished Senator from Idaho, who is one of the outstanding members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is this afternoon, on the floor of the Senate, performing a distinguished service. I hope the message which he is giving in this speech will be considered not only in downtown Washington, but throughout the world as well.

I hope sincerely it will reach the ears, as I am sure it will, and the eyes, as well, of the delegates in Geneva. I am sure, so far as our delegates are concerned, they are interested in what the distinguished Senator has to say. I express the hope that the Soviet delegates will pay the same attention to what the Senator is saying.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Montana for his helpful questions and the contribution he has made to the discussion this afternoon.

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

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

Mr. CLARK. I have listened with interest to the colloquy between the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Montana, who is still present on the floor. I wonder if they would not both agree that the wisest thing we could do would be to make the atomic club the most exclusive club in the world, even though some Members of this distinguished body might be a little jealous as a result.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, we should be interested, not in restricting the membership of the atomic club, for this is outside our power, but the objective sought at Geneva was, and is, a method of control and inspection, internationally managed, into which we could bring not only the existing nuclear powers, but other powers as they develop their capacity in this critical field.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Idaho appreciates I was speaking in a somewhat light vein a moment ago; but I think he will agree that time is of the essence in getting a workable international agreement to eliminate further nuclear testing, and that part of the job will be not only to prohibit, by international agreement, testing among the powers who now have the capability of testing nuclear weapons, but also to discourage and prevent the testing of atomic weapons by those nations which are in the process of acquiring that ability.

Mr. CHURCH. The larger objective is one we have been mindful of at Geneva. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania in pointing up the timeliness of the present negotiations at Geneva, because I am about to address myself now to the reasons that gave us cause to have hope for success when we went to Geneva 4 months ago.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator yield one additional moment? Then I shall not detain him further.

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Idaho has been kind enough to give me an advance copy of the splendid talk I know he will shortly make on what seems to be a practical suggestion with respect to how the difficulty regarding inspection, which seems to be the problem on which the conferees are now bogged down, can be avoided. I share with my friend from Montana the hope that this concrete and helpful suggestion will be given serious consideration by our State Department.

I wish to observe also that the Senator from Idaho is making a distinct contribution by virtue of the vigor and imagination with which he is attacking his new duties as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, on which committee I am sure the Senator is going to render distinguished service for a long time.

I thank my friend for yielding to me.

Mr. CHURCH. I am very grateful for the kind remarks of my distinguished friend.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he proceeds on part II?

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in late weeks some of us have been advocating that we keep our eyes on Berlin and Germany. The impression may have gone abroad that we were advocating such a course of action exclusively. I am therefore glad to note that in the statesmanlike speech of the distinguished Senator from Idaho he points out, at the top of page 2, that perhaps a few months from now our concentration will have been shifted to a newly contrived crisis, possibly in Finland or Iran—or, I might add, in the Far East or elsewhere. I am happy that this word of warning is being issued at this time in connection with the speech.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator.

There were reasons, Mr. President, why we could hold stout hope for success at Geneva. In the first place, the formula for a technically sufficient inspection and control system had been given us. At an earlier conference in Geneva last summer, the scientists and technicians of all three countries had agreed upon the structure of the technical system required. Thus a single blueprint had been furnished in advance.

In the second place, there seemed to be at least one fundamental interest held in common. Americans, Englishmen, and Russians all breathe the same air. Radioactive fallout in the earth's atmosphere is poison for us all. If nuclear tests go on unchecked, the dose will gradually become more lethal. We shared a mutual interest in suspending further national tests, while the establishment of international controls afforded us at once a method for confining nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes within safe limits, and a functioning apparatus within which to harness other countries, as they developed nuclear capacities of their own.

Finally, we had reason to hope for success at Geneva, because the suspension of nuclear tests appeared to be compatible, if action were taken now, with the national security interests of each of the negotiating powers. The agreement sought would not restrict the continued manufacture or stockpiling of atomic weapons by either side. Since the technology of nuclear weaponry in the United States and the United Kingdom on the one hand, and in the Soviet Union on the other, had reached a state of relative balance, the agreement sought would not jeopardize the military position vis a vis nuclear weapons of any of the signatories, with respect to one another.

These were the compelling reasons, Mr. President, why it looked as though we had at last found common ground, making agreement possible. So we went to Geneva with our hearts full of hope.

PART III. GENEVA, THE REASONS FOR THREATENED FAILURE

Four months have passed. The Geneva conference is deadlocked. The British Prime Minister, Mr. Macmillan, has gone to the Soviet Union, there to plead with Mr. Khrushchev to end the

Russian intransigence which now threatens the conference with impending failure. Our bleak situation, as of now, is well summarized by Mr. Chalmers M. Roberts, in an excellent article that appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, February 22, 1959. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

GENEVA TALKS HINGE ON MACMILLAN'S BID (By Chalmers M. Roberts)

The Geneva nuclear test ban negotiations with the Russians are expected to collapse unless British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan can talk Nikita Khrushchev into modifying his demand for a veto.

Philip J. Farley, special assistant to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles for disarmament and atomic energy, flew to Geneva over the weekend to see whether there was any purpose of keeping the talks going. Macmillan reached Moscow yesterday for his talks with Soviet Premier Khrushchev.

It is not clear whether President Eisenhower personally has agreed to break off the talks unless there is a last-minute switch in the Soviet position. But those who should know indicated yesterday the United States is ready to recess the talks. For all practical purposes that would kill the test ban negotiations.

PUT ONUS ON SOVIETS

American officials have publicly put the onus for the Geneva deadlock on the Soviet Union. In turn, Khrushchev has charged that the United States and Britain want such a free-wheeling inspection and control system that it amounts to espionage inside Russia.

The test ban talks began October 31 and have been going on ever since except for a Christmas holiday break.

The United States and Britain have made a number of concessions to the Russians but they have insisted that inspection teams in each nation be composed almost entirely of nationals of other nations. The Russians have offered to have four or five foreign nationals at each station inside the Soviet Union. But they also have demanded what amounts to a veto over the movement of inspection teams which might want to investigate any suspicious activity which could be a clandestine test.

On Friday the chief Soviet delegate at the Geneva meeting, now in its 14th week, charged the West with misrepresenting Russia's position. The West believes the four or five foreigners proposed by the Russians would be without real authority and could not keep adequate check on the 30 or so Soviet technicians expected to man each control post in the Soviet Union.

UNDER RENEWED ATTACK

The American test ban offer recently has been under renewed attack within the Eisenhower administration by both Pentagon and Atomic Energy Commission officials. The offer was made by the President over AEC objections last summer on Dulles' advice.

Dulles and the President took the position that, all political and military factors considered, the United States had to make the offer in part because of the worldwide fear of radioactive fallout. This view has had strong, but not unanimous, support from scientists who believe a test ban actually would be more favorable to the United States because of an American lead in many nuclear weapons developments.

Dulles rebuffed the renewed AEC attacks prior to his illness. It is widely believed in

Washington that with the Secretary out of action there is no powerful figure in the administration to advise the President to keep on negotiating at Geneva. Some officials are worried that a collapse of the talks will enable the Russians to claim, and with considerable success around the world, that the United States was responsible for the failure.

GORE'S PROPOSAL

Senator ALBERT GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee, told Mr. Eisenhower last November that U.S. prestige and responsibility were involved and there was no way that the United States can be disassociated from either the success or failure of the conference. GORE suggested that instead of trying to negotiate a control system, the President announce the unconditional and unilateral cessation of all nuclear tests in the earth's atmosphere for a specified period, say 3 years, and ask other powers to do so. This would permit underground, underwater and outerspace testing.

Dulles said at that time that the GORE proposal might be taken up if the Geneva negotiations failed. The GORE proposal was criticized, however, on the grounds that it would lack the political effect of an inspection agreement which would help break down the Iron Curtain.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, when our representatives gathered at Geneva with those of the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union, they had before them the blueprint for what could readily be made a technically sufficient system for the detection of nuclear explosions.

With this formula on the table before them, their task was to fill in the technical framework with a reliable management to operate the system, so that each party could be adequately safeguarded against covert violations of the suspension agreement.

Any trustworthy system for the detection and control of nuclear tests must meet certain elementary standards. It must be operated by an international commission, that is, by an authority apart from the direction of any one participant. The commission must have the power to man and operate the requisite control stations with qualified personnel who are not subservient to the country within which they may be located, but are accountable only to the commission for which they work. And the inspection teams must have the latitude needed to accomplish their purpose, to monitor the atmosphere and report upon any evidence of nuclear activity, and to move promptly, when directed by the commission to do so, to the site of any seismic disturbance, reasonably suspected of being nuclear in origin.

These are the minimum prerequisites of any trustworthy system for the detection and control of nuclear tests. Without accepting these minimums, there is no control system, not even a shadow of one.

It is because the Soviet Union has thus far indicated an inflexible unwillingness to accept these minimums that the Geneva conference is now threatened with imminent collapse. The Russian delegation has adamantly persisted in the following three positions:

First. They demand a veto power over the operations of the proposed international control commission.

Second. They insist that the requisite control posts be self-operated, that is, dominated by nationals of the countries within which the posts are located.

Third. They call for complicated procedures which would easily frustrate prompt action by the commission in dispatching inspection teams to make necessary on-the-spot investigations of subterranean disturbances suspected of being nuclear in nature, or of preventing these essential at-site investigations from occurring at all.

Obviously, Mr. President, these conditions are as unacceptable as the proffered arguments in defense of them are untenable. One of our negotiators at Geneva, Assistant Secretary of State Philip J. Farley, succinctly outlined the reasonableness of the American position at Geneva, when he testified before the Disarmament Subcommittee of the Senate on January 28, as follows:

The United States believes that any control system which could be frustrated in its day-to-day operations by the veto power in the hands of a single party would be worse than useless.

The Soviet position [to man control posts by nationals of the government on whose territory the control posts are located] would amount to self-inspection and as such cannot be the basis for an agreement in which all parties can have confidence.

Will international inspection groups be organized and ready to move quickly to the site of an event which could be suspected of being an explosion? Or will sending of such a group be subject to weeks of debate and a veto? The Soviet approach would entangle this key provision in miles of redtape.

As to these issues, Mr. President, there can be no compromise. Suspension of all further nuclear tests, in the air, underground, underwater, and in space, must rest upon a workable system of detection and control in which responsible men, mindful of the mortal stakes, can repose confidence.

Unless the Russians recede, the original purpose of the Geneva Conference that of ending all types of further nuclear weapons tests, would not now seem to be attainable.

PART IV. GENEVA, A PROPOSAL FOR THE 11TH HOUR

As it has become apparent that the Russians are likely to hold fast to their three tenets at Geneva, it has seemed to many that the conference may be doomed. Predictions are that it will break up soon, accomplishing nothing. If this should happen, our last best hope for progress in this critical field might well be foreclosed. We may now be in the 11th hour at Geneva, a fateful moment for the human race.

Mr. President, even though I share the pessimism that the conference is unlikely to achieve its original objective, I do not believe it necessarily follows that the conference must, therefore, break up, accomplishing nothing. If we cannot achieve all of our goal, it may still be possible to obtain a part of it.

If Geneva is to fail in its objective of creating a broad international control system that could adequately police the suspension of all further nuclear weapons tests, the responsibility for that failure will be clearly Russian. But if such

an eventuality cannot be avoided, I would earnestly hope that my country would make one final effort to salvage something of value, for humanity's sake, from the long labors that have brought us to this conference table.

As a last resort, to attempt the avoidance of a total failure, I strongly urge that the United States make this final proposal: An agreement to suspend further nuclear weapons tests in the earth's atmosphere, within the framework of a trustworthy and sufficient international control system, adequate to reliably detect and report any violation. Such a proposal would exclude for the present any agreement involving suspension or control of nuclear tests occurring underground, underwater, or in outer space, none of which contribute to the pollution of the air, the grave cause of so much world concern.

Mr. President, last week I discussed this proposal with Mr. William B. Macomber, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, and Mr. Ronald Spiers, officer in charge of disarmament affairs, who is involved with the Geneva negotiations. At their suggestion, I submitted the proposal, in letter form, to our Acting Secretary of State, Christian Herter, and they were, at that time, informed of my intention to call the proposal to the attention of the Senate from the floor today. I ask unanimous consent that the letter, dated February 25, 1959, be printed in the Record following the conclusion of my address.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I anticipate that certain objections will at once be raised to my proposal. However, within the context in which I have offered it I believe them to be answerable.

For example, the scientific fact may be that American, English, and Russian technicians, functioning at home, now are able to detect the fact of nuclear explosion anywhere in the atmosphere and determine much concerning it. Nevertheless, we must remember that the commencement of an international control system is the sine qua non of man's progress toward any feasible disarmament. Broadened nuclear testing controls, which we might seek in the future, and eventual inspection for prevention of the surprise attack are but milestones on the road to this goal. It is altogether probable that advancement here will come, if at all, only a step at a time. My proposal would be a first step, and the Geneva Conference may yet constitute the best opportunity left to take it. An international control system which functions, however limited its initial scope might be, is the urgent need.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I was very much interested in what the Senator from Idaho had to say in the paragraph relating to broadened nuclear testing controls. The Senator said:

Broadened nuclear testing controls, which we might seek in the future, and eventual

inspection for prevention of surprise attack are but milestones on the road to this goal. It is altogether probable that advancement here will come, if at all, only a step at a time.

The Senator from Idaho may recall that in speeches which I delivered on the 12th and 26th of last month on the question of Berlin and Germany I called the attention of the Senate to a number of possibilities. They numbered nine. The ninth possibility is as follows:

Point 9: It is essential that our policy, NATO's policies, do not exclude a careful consideration—may I repeat that word, "consideration"—of the Rapacki plan, the Eden plan for a demilitarized zone in middle Europe, or similar proposals in connection with the unification of Germany, predicated—may I repeat that word, "predicated"—or contingent upon the outcome of the conferences on surprise attack, and suspension of nuclear tests now going on in Geneva.

What I had in mind, and what I stated on February 12 and February 26, was that if we could achieve reasonable agreements among the powers holding these two conferences in Geneva we might consider, on that basis, the Rapacki plan, the Eden plan, or other plans which seek to bring about a denuclearization of both Germany and Czechoslovakia, as well as Poland, and eventually, and in due course, and under the right conditions, a withdrawal, or at least a thinning out, of troops eastward and westward.

So I am interested in what the distinguished Senator from Idaho has to say, because I believe that very likely he is talking along comparable lines.

The point is that if we are to consider proposals such as the Rapacki plan, the Eden plan, or other plans, there must be a quid pro quo. In my opinion the best quid pro quo we could achieve would be reasonable agreements in the conferences on atomic testing and on surprise attack.

So I hope that this statesmanlike effort by the Senator from Idaho will be heeded, and that from it will come, before it is too late, a reasonable solution to the difficulty in this particular area, which confronts not only the members of the "Nuclear Club," but, in their entirety, the peoples of the world as a whole.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank my good friend from Montana. By now we should be fully disenchanted with an approach to foreign policy which is founded upon some grand design. Progress in this difficult field will not come through the superimposition of one grandiloquent formula upon all the countries of the world. Progress will come fitfully, in little steps. We remember, Mr. President, not so many years ago, when the grand design was the liberation of the peoples of Eastern Europe, and our foreign policy of containment was criticized because it was not sufficiently vigorous or dynamic. That design of liberation was buried with a great many heroic Hungarians in the streets of Budapest.

Then we remember how it became the official doctrine in the State Department to base our foreign policy upon a principle called massive retaliation. That

principle was buried with many French troops at Dien Bien Phu.

Mr. President, there is just one way in which progress will be made in world affairs toward the goals that we would like to realize for the benefit of our children or our grandchildren, and that is by taking little steps. Right now the one place where it may be possible, in this bifurcated world, to take a step on which all can agree and which will serve the common interest of humanity, is at the conference table at Geneva.

Another objection to be anticipated is that this proposal is a futile one, in that the Russian behavior at Geneva makes it apparent that the Soviet Union does not really intend to agree to anything acceptable to the United States and Great Britain. It may be urged that the same considerations, which have prevented agreement within the framework of existing negotiations, would apply equally to my proposal. This may prove to be the case. Indeed, the evidence points very strongly in that direction. But we cannot know that the Russians will reject the proposal, unless and until it is offered and refused.

Throughout the negotiations to date, it is worthwhile to remember that Soviet spokesmen, from Khrushchev down, have repeatedly expressed their fears and suspicions concerning the movement of foreign inspection personnel within Russia. Their characterization of our position, as amounting to a thinly disguised attempt to gain military reconnaissance of their country, is based upon their propaganda specter of teams of technicians scurrying into every corner of their country in the guise of checking seismic disturbances, earthquakes, to see if they are nuclear in origin. This is why they say they want the veto; this is why they say they want the control stations manned with their own people; this is why they say they want our agreement to miles of redtape before inspection teams can move at all.

Under the control system I propose, the necessity for this movement should be largely, if not entirely, eliminated. Fewer control stations would be required, and fewer foreign nationals would need to be stationed in the countries involved.

If the Russians are negotiating in good faith, the lesser control system required to police a suspension of nuclear tests in the atmosphere only, would constitute a refutation of most of the objections they have voiced, since the conference began. It might even serve to allay the unreasoning fears that seem to lurk in the Soviet mind. The Russians were suspicious people long before the Communists achieved ascendancy. The czars maintained their own Iron Curtain.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have been listening with rapt attention to the speech of the Senator from Idaho. He had started his speech before it was possible for me to come to the floor, and I have been reading the text of his speech from the beginning. I wish to compliment the

Senator on his presentation of this very serious question. Because he has just now said "if the Soviet leaders are negotiating in good faith," I should like to ask him if he really sees any evidence that there is the slightest bit of good faith in the approach of the Soviets to any of the questions involving the freedom of people throughout the world?

Mr. CHURCH. I should like to say, in reply to my good friend from Wyoming, that I am very skeptical as to whether the Russians are in fact negotiating in good faith at Geneva. I believe the evidence all points to the contrary. The burden of my talk today is twofold. I make a proposal which I believe is in the interest of the United States and the free world and, indeed, in the interest of humanity everywhere. If the Russians are negotiating in good faith, which I doubt, then this proposal has the merit of undercutting the position they have heretofore taken at Geneva, and thus making it very difficult indeed for them to continue to maintain their objections which now make agreement impossible.

If, on the other hand, the Russians are, as I suspect, not negotiating in good faith, what better way is there to dramatically expose that fact to the world than to submit this proposal to them? It is a proposal which involves a minimal inspection system which could not possibly do any internal mischief inside Russia. If they reject it, it will be exceedingly difficult, even for those artful propagandists, to blame the failure at Geneva upon the United States and our allies.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am grateful to the Senator for his response, because it is important for us to realize that the aim and purpose of the Communist command is to do away with government by the people. They believe in government by dictatorship. They take this attitude, fundamentally, because they have no faith in the relationship between man and God. They do not believe that man is capable of improving himself. They are committed to establishing a world dictatorship which will make all people toe the line the Communists lay down. We must keep that thought definitely in mind in all our approaches to this problem.

Mr. CHURCH. I agree wholeheartedly with what the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming has said. If I felt for a moment that the present negotiations at Geneva constituted a hazard to the free world or to the relative position of strength held by the free world vis-a-vis Russia and her allies, I would be the first to take the floor and urge us to terminate those discussions forthwith. I believe, as I have explained in my address, that we went to Geneva with an objective that would serve our interest and the interest of our allies, and yet one, owing to the peculiar nature of the problem, which gave us common ground to seek an agreement with the Soviet Union with respect to banning nuclear tests.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator from Idaho permit me to add that we went to Geneva with the interests of the people of Russia at heart?

Mr. CHURCH. Indeed, we did.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The dictatorship of the Kremlin is not serving the welfare of the people of Russia—or of Siberia.

Mr. CHURCH. I agree wholeheartedly with that statement.

Mr. President, as I indicated in the course of my colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, if the Russians are not negotiating in good faith at Geneva, as I strongly suspect may be the case, then what better way to expose their game than by offering them an international inspection and control system which can safely end the slow pollution of the atmosphere, without possibly doing them any internal mischief? By forcing the Russian hand, refusal to accept such a proposal would reveal their hypocrisy before the world.

But it may be urged, Mr. President, that the Russians might seize upon such a proposal as evidence to bolster the charge that the United States did not really support the ending of all nuclear tests, but always has wanted tests to continue, thus somehow absolving Russia from blame for the failure to reach agreement. I would give little credence to this argument. As I have already stated, it seems to me that the proposal I suggest would weaken, not strengthen, Communist propaganda. In any case, we know that the Russians will contrive to blame the United States for a break-up of the conference. Whatever occurs, their indictment of us will be artfully drawn and made to sound plausible. In some quarters, the Communist story will be believed, regardless of what the truth may be or what we may say about it. But this prospect should not be permitted to govern our decisions. As to these, we are, in the last analysis, accountable only to the trust we hold.

Mr. President, I have made this proposal, not in the spirit of criticism of the course we have heretofore taken in Geneva, but in support of it.

I believe that all nuclear weapons testing should be stopped, subject to a trustworthy control and inspection system, and that we should persist in our striving for this goal at Geneva. It is meant to be a constructive proposal which cannot jeopardize our present negotiations, but might possibly salvage something of value should their failure, as presently cast, become inevitable, and we are faced with the gloomy prospect of leaving the conference table empty-handed.

If there are cogent reasons rendering my proposal inadvisable, then I shall want to know what they are. The people, too, are entitled to know what they are. For we may still possess a momentous opportunity at Geneva, fast slipping from our grasp. It may not come again in our time.

Good conscience commands that we do our utmost there.

This is an anxious hour.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from

Idaho. He has evidenced in the hearings before the committee a great interest in and an understanding of the matters he is discussing, but I think the address he is making sums up his views on this subject in a remarkably clear and convincing manner.

I think the Senator's suggestion is an excellent example of constructive statesmanship. I sincerely hope the Department of State and our representatives in Geneva will consider the suggestion seriously and will endeavor to do everything they can to persuade the Russians to agree to it.

I for one, wish to encourage the Senator from Idaho and all other Senators to analyze our problems in such a constructive manner, and to make constructive proposals. I particularly wish to emphasize this because I think there has been some misunderstanding of a remark or a short statement I made over the weekend. I certainly in no way intended to discourage any Senator from speaking upon matters of this kind on the floor of the Senate.

Again I compliment the Senator from Idaho for his most excellent statement.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Arkansas. I appreciate immensely what he has said, because I value his judgment so highly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. One thing which the Senator is doing that I particularly like is his drawing attention to some fundamental facts which many persons overlook. He mentioned that the Russians had certain characteristics of suspicion toward foreigners and a kind of Iron Curtain long before the Soviets came to power. An understanding of that type of situation puts the matter in better perspective and, I think, gives us more hope for the future than if we attribute all the difficulties simply to the present regime.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

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

Mr. CHURCH. Before I yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, I wish to say, in reference to whatever remarks he may make, and regardless of how he may feel about the proposal I have offered, that my proposal was largely a result of the original thinking which was done by the junior Senator from Tennessee when he made his proposal a few months ago that the United States should unilaterally terminate atmospheric nuclear tests while retaining the right to continue weapons tests underground and in outer space. That proposal led me to the thinking which, today, I have attempted to outline on the floor of the Senate. I think the Senator from Tennessee knows this. I simply wanted to make it a part of the RECORD this afternoon. His proposal has been very seriously considered and, I understand, continues to be considered at the State Department in the highest councils of the Executive Government.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I had not asked the distinguished Senator from Idaho to yield with the hope of hearing his very generous remarks. I thank him genuinely.

I arose to compliment the Senator for a concise and able summary of the circumstances surrounding the Geneva Conference and an eloquent presentation of his views and concern.

As the Senator from Idaho has pointed out, the proposal which I made earlier and the proposal which he makes now are not dissimilar in character. There are some differences.

I should like, first, to express full agreement with the able junior Senator from Idaho with respect to the importance of taking the first step, as he refers to his proposal on page 7.

Many persons say that all that is needed is mutual confidence between the United States and Russia. I do not deny that confidence is needed. But confidence does not come merely by wishing for it. Confidence does not come because we acknowledge the need for it or because we deplore the lack of it. Confidence between the United States and Russia, between the people of the East and the West, in the context of the present world turmoil, must come step by step upon successive manifestations of fidelity to trust and the honoring of agreements.

In this regard, does not the able junior Senator from Idaho think that a fundamental characteristic of U.S. foreign policy in a conference such as that which is under way at Geneva must be goals which appear reasonable and attainable?

Mr. CHURCH. I do, indeed.

Mr. GORE. The goals set may not have been attainable from the beginning. The able Senator, in a statement on page 4 of his text, refers to certain minimum prerequisites.

Now the able Senator from Idaho lists a control system international in character. Would not he agree that an additional necessary prerequisite, according to the experts who early last year reached agreement in Geneva, would be a worldwide system of control and detection posts?

Mr. CHURCH. Since I cannot presume to know what may be technically required, I would say that the blueprint generally laid down last summer by the experts was one which, upon examination, it was felt would be sufficient to give us the necessary safeguards to enforce a suspension of nuclear testing. I believe it was upon that assumption that we went to Geneva in October.

Mr. GORE. As the able Senator from Idaho knows, at the Geneva conference, it was my privilege and honor to be one of the representatives of the U.S. Senate. As such, I studied in considerable detail the report of the conference of experts and some of the minutes of their proceedings; and I talked at considerable length with some participants in the conference. Upon those bases, I can assure the able Senator from Idaho that the system recommended by the experts was, in fact, a worldwide network of control stations, posts, and teams.

I should like to point out to the Senator from Idaho that neither side at Geneva, during the time I was at the conference, nor, to my knowledge, since my return, suggested the establishment

in Red China of controls posts and inspection teams. As the able Senator will recall, the testimony before the Disarmament Committee demonstrates the necessity for the establishment in Red China of such inspection teams for adequate detection of underground tests. I take it that the Senator from Idaho recalls that.

Mr. CHURCH. I do, indeed, recall it; and I also recall participating with the Senator from Tennessee in the questioning.

Let me simply say that, although we may have been fully justified, all things considered, in taking at Geneva the position that the technical system contemplated was a sufficient one to justify the suspension of all nuclear tests, I submit as an added argument in support of the proposal I have made this afternoon that, whatever doubts there might have been with respect to the inspection system which was to be meant as a reliable detection safeguard against all types of nuclear tests, if the agreement actually arrived at were restricted to atmospheric tests only, then the possible gap which would be presented by Red China in such a system no longer would have the importance it might otherwise have had. I believe this is another argument for the general feasibility of the proposal I have made this afternoon.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, again I find myself in agreement with the able junior Senator from Idaho.

I should like to characterize the proposal he makes as one for an attainable goal for the accomplishment of which we can have reasonable expectation.

Earlier I said there were differences between the proposal I had earlier made and the one the able junior Senator from Idaho now makes. If he will be so kind as to permit me to summarize briefly the proposal I made, the differences will readily be apparent.

Mr. CHURCH. I ask the Senator from Tennessee to do so, please.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, after sitting at the table at Geneva, I found myself in such full agreement with some of the conclusions which the able Senator from Idaho now states—particularly his conclusions as to the intransigence of the Soviets and as to the necessity for the United States to improve, strengthen, and establish beyond peradventure of doubt its correct moral and political position in this important matter—that I suggested that the President of the United States save the conference at Geneva from the failure which I fear now impends, by announcing to the world that the United States of America, which constantly is blamed by the Soviets for contaminating the world's atmosphere and radioactive fallout, had stopped all atmospheric tests for a given period—say, 3 years; and then for our country to propose to negotiate at the Geneva Conference a permanent stoppage of such tests by all nuclear powers.

The able junior Senator from Idaho has omitted from his suggestion the unilateral action. I still think it would be a dramatic way for the United States to seize the initiative and to manifest to the world its good faith.

By his suggestion, the able Senator from Idaho has emphasized the importance of establishing an international control system. He has given more emphasis to it than I did in my proposal; and in that respect I believe he is correct. It would be an important first step. If we were to take this important first step, the conference might be saved from failure, and other steps might become feasible.

I think it will be easier, here in the United States, to place on the Russians the blame for failure of the conference, than it will be to fix that blame upon the Russians in the minds of the people of New Delhi, Bangkok, Indonesia and Africa.

Humanity the world over is watching the United States. The United States was the first to use the atom for destruction. So I believe it imperative that the United States be first and foremost in the use of the atom for the benefit of man, and also be first and foremost in curbing the contamination of the world's atmosphere which all mankind must breathe, and thus be first and foremost in seeking effective international control of nuclear weapons.

Mr. CHURCH. I could not agree more.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. I have found his able remarks provocative and stimulating. I congratulate him, and wish to concur in all that he has said, with the addition of the prerequisite to which I have referred, and also to urge him again to consider the advantages to our country for the President of the United States, to dramatize if he so chooses, our position before the world, strengthening our moral and political position thereby, by taking a unilateral action for a given period as a manifestation of our good faith to all who might unfortunately doubt it, and then offer an agreement for permanent stoppage by all nuclear powers.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I am pleased to yield to my esteemed friend the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I commend the able junior Senator from Idaho for commenting as earnestly and as clearly as he has on the problem he has been discussing. I think we all recognize that the Geneva conference is in grave peril, if not in the utmost period of decay. I can only say I hope the President of the United States and others may follow along with the proposals similar to those the Senator from Idaho has made, and similar to the proposals of the very able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], that we do not just give up because we encounter disagreement, but that we continue to try to find places and bases upon which we may agree, and try at least to arrive at a proposal which can be acceptable, even if all the things which men might like to include in the proposal may not be included. This is a most difficult situation, and I think people may subsequently blame both sides for intolerance.

Certainly the shift which took place when it was learned our detection devices were not as good as we thought

they were might have had some bearing on the outcome of the conference.

Without trying to prejudge what the verdict of history may be, I am glad the Senator from Idaho, as is true of the Senator from Tennessee, continues to hope that out of these negotiations there may be some benefit to mankind resulting from the search for an eventual solution.

I am glad the Senator from Idaho has taken this opportunity to discuss the problem very frankly on the floor of the Senate.

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

Mr. CHURCH. Yes.

Mr. GORE. The able Senator from New Mexico, who is Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, has emphasized that which I was remiss in not emphasizing—the good to come to the world's humanity in reaching agreement upon curtailing further radioactive fallout. I had emphasized earlier the importance of squaring ourselves with world public opinion. The more important objective is that to which the able Senator from New Mexico has just referred.

I shall not undertake here to discuss the hazard of radioactive fallout. I do not know whether it is as serious as some suggest, or less serious. Suffice it to say that world public opinion is concerned about it and that the United States of America is held in major part responsible for the contamination which now exists.

Mr. CHURCH. Would not the Senator agree that the very fact that there is disagreement in this field by the experts themselves is ominous in itself? Regardless of the qualitative appraisal we make, the fact that the experts themselves disagree is enough to alarm the world, and rightly so.

Mr. GORE. I agree. The potential of the hazard is recognized by all. The degree of the hazard is where the disagreement occurs.

Mr. CHURCH. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. So here is a hazard to all mankind for generations to come; and it was the United States that used the first atomic weapon. It is the United States that has exploded most of the nuclear weapons. It is the United States that has released into the world's atmosphere the largest amount of radioactive material.

Therefore, as I said earlier, I think it is imperative that the United States be first and foremost in curbing this hazard.

The Senator from Idaho has, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Tennessee, performed a signal service by bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate.

I was pleased to hear the junior Senator from Arkansas make the statement which he made in correcting the misinterpretation which some persons had placed on his own remarks, because I believe that a Member of the United States Senate owes it to his country to communicate to his country sentiments and views which he regards as vital to its security. That must be one of his foremost considerations.

Mr. CHURCH. If I may interrupt, it is, is it not, the constitutional function

of the Senate of the United States to advise and consent in the field of foreign policy—consent to the ratification of treaties, and advise with respect to all aspects of foreign policy? So it is, I should think, incumbent upon the Senate generally and upon each individual Senator individually to do as the Senator from Tennessee has suggested.

Mr. GORE. I agree; and I should like to conclude my overextended trespass upon the time of the able Senator, by referring to his statement that the proposal I had earlier made has received consideration and is still receiving consideration. I can certainly vouch for its having received consideration, for which I am grateful, and I am sure it is still being considered.

In that regard I should like to say that in the conference which I was privileged to have with President Eisenhower on this subject I found him to be generous, patient, understanding, and concerned. I do not think he could have been more concerned about a problem than he appeared to be with regard to this problem. I am grateful for the opportunity to undertake to make a contribution.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much for his valuable contribution to the discussion of this important subject this afternoon.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I now yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. The distinguished Senator from Idaho has made a most useful and important contribution toward solution of the impasse in which we as representatives of the free world, and representing ourselves in our negotiations with Russia, find ourselves. The Senator's proposal is so logical and so sound and in its very nature so minimal that it seems difficult to realize there could be any belief that the other party to the negotiation, our opponent in the cold war, will be able to reject it. As the Senator stated, if our opponent continues to be evasive—as the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming pointed out, there seems to be little reason to expect or hope that the Russians will negotiate in good faith—and if the Russians reject the proposal, it will be a demonstration to the entire free world that we in the United States at least are trying to achieve progress, that we will not desist from our efforts but will continue to try to negotiate, reducing our proposals to the absolute minimum of what seem to be attainable in the hope of achieving some small progress.

I want to further express my great agreement with the comments of the distinguished Senator from Idaho that our gains in this field, with the ultimate objective of world peace, will not be made along the lines of a grand design, which during the last 6 years has proved demonstrably so futile, but will be achieved in a series of small gains here, there, and everywhere, advancing by inches, trying to establish a new forward position on a great variety of fronts.

As the able Senator from Tennessee has pointed out, we in the United States

took the lead, rightly or wrongly, in projecting nuclear warfare upon this world and that we have therefore a special responsibility for trying to end it. If this proposal of the Senator from Idaho is not accepted first by our own State Department and later by our opponents I hope we may have an opportunity to experiment for a time, at least, with the unilateral cessation of nuclear tests and the pollution of the atmosphere, with a clear understanding that if this shining example, which would do us so much credit in the world, is not followed, we will be free to resume tests, a calamity which I hope will not be necessary.

The able and distinguished Senator from Idaho has made a most useful and constructive proposal in a field which overshadows and supersedes all other in importance—the problem of survival.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank my good friend the Senator from Alaska very much for the remarks he has made.

I should like to conclude, Mr. President, by explaining why the approach which I have taken differs from the approach suggested by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. It seemed to me that, in what may now be the death agonies of the conference at Geneva, there was an urgent opportunity, which was quite possibly slipping away from us, to achieve a breakthrough at the conference table which would establish an essential first step toward international controls, which must in the future constitute the basis of any progress we can possibly make toward the great goals of prevention of surprise attack and general disarmament.

Therefore, I have made this suggestion within the context of the deliberations now going on at Geneva, which are possibly in their closing hours. In doing so, I do not mean that I disagree with the proposition put forward by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. As the Senator knows, that proposition has my sympathy and my support.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. I congratulate the Senator on his informative and eloquent statement. I find myself in complete agreement with it. I think this discussion helps all of us. I know it helps me.

I recall a similar suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee some time ago. I remember reading it with great interest.

What is particularly appealing to many of us, I think, is the idea that perhaps in these ways we can begin to achieve an understanding with our opponents in the world. What is proposed seems to me to be such a way. I think the Russians will find it very difficult to offer a logical and sensible reason for opposing the suggestion the Senator from Idaho has made.

I wish to compliment the Senator for having made a real contribution to a better understanding of the problems which face us in the world.

Mr. CHURCH. I am very grateful to the Senator for his statement. I will say to the Senator at this time publicly, as I have tried to say to him personally, I read his stirring and powerful statement in defense of the official position that we are taking with respect to Berlin, and found it as moving a statement as any I had heard delivered on the floor of the Senate in my time here.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

U. S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
February 25, 1959.

HON. CHRISTIAN HERTER,
Acting Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The fateful negotiations now in progress in Geneva are being watched by an anxious world. The United States is once again demonstrating its good faith. We properly seek the suspension of all types of nuclear tests under a trustworthy international system of inspection and control.

I address this letter to you out of grave concern that Russia's continued intransigence may soon stalemate the negotiations at Geneva, causing our best efforts there to come to naught.

It is my understanding that the current difficulty at Geneva centers upon the following aspects of the Russian position:

(1) The Soviet demand for reserving a veto power over the operations of the proposed international control commission.

(2) The Soviet insistence that control posts be self-operated, that is, managed by nationals of the governments within whose territories the posts are located.

(3) The Soviet advocacy of procedures that would easily frustrate prompt action by the commission in dispatching inspection teams to make necessary on-the-spot investigations of subterranean disturbances suspected of being nuclear in nature, or of preventing these essential at-site investigations from occurring at all.

Obviously, unless the Russian attitude toward these matters changes, no reliable inspection and control system, capable of policing the suspension of all types of nuclear tests, is possible. Thus the Geneva negotiations are threatened with impending failure, one that might well foreclose our last hope for progress in this critical field.

If the conference fails in its objective to establish a workable international control system that could end all further nuclear tests, the responsibility for that failure will be clearly Russian. But if such an eventuality cannot be avoided, I would hope that the United States might make one final effort to salvage something, for humanity's sake, from the long labors that have brought us to this conference table.

As a last resort, in order that the conference might not break up accomplishing nothing, I would strongly urge that the United States make this final proposal: An agreement to suspend all further nuclear tests in the earth's atmosphere, enforced through an international control system sufficient to detect any violations. Such a proposal would exclude, for the present, any agreement involving suspension or control of subterranean or extra-atmospheric nuclear explosions, neither of which contribute to the pollution of the air, the principal cause of so much world concern.

I would anticipate that certain questions will be raised as to this proposal. Within the context in which I make it, I believe them to be answerable.

For example, it may be urged that, technically speaking, no international control system is required for the detection of atmospheric nuclear explosions. American, Eng-

lish, and Soviet technicians, all functioning at home, may now be able to detect the fact of nuclear explosion anywhere in the atmosphere, and determine much concerning it. Nevertheless, the commencement of an international control system to accomplish this objective is the sine qua non of man's progress toward any feasible disarmament. Broadened nuclear testing controls, to be sought in the future, and eventual inspection for prevention of surprise attack, are but milestones on the road to this goal. It is altogether probable that advancement here will come, if at all, only a step at a time. My proposal would be the first step, and the Geneva conference may yet constitute the best opportunity left to take it. An international control system which functions, however limited its initial scope might be, is the urgent need.

Another objection to be anticipated is that this proposal is a futile one, in that the Russian behavior at Geneva makes it apparent that the Soviet Union does not really intend to agree to anything acceptable to the United States and Great Britain. It may be urged that the same considerations which have prevented agreement within the framework of existing negotiations, would apply equally to my proposal.

This may prove to be the case, but not necessarily so. Soviet spokesmen, from Khrushchev down, have repeatedly expressed their fears and suspicions concerning the movement of foreign inspection personnel within Russia. Under the control system I propose, the necessity for this movement should be largely, if not entirely, eliminated. Fewer control stations would be required, and fewer foreign nationals would need to be stationed in the countries involved. In any event, it would seem that we ought not anticipate failure as a reason for abandonment of new proposals, even before making them.

Finally, it may be urged that the Russians might seize upon such a proposal as evidence to bolster the charge that the United States did not really support an ending of all nuclear tests, and so, somehow, to absolve Russia from their blame for failure to reach agreement. The answer to this, I think, is that the Russians, in any case, will contrive to blame the United States for a breakup of the conference. Whatever occurs, their indictment of us will be artfully drawn and made to sound plausible. In some quarters, they will be believed, regardless of what the truth may be, or what we may say about it. But this prospect should not be permitted to govern our decisions as to the course we must take.

In making these decisions, Mr. Secretary, I am sure you would be the first to agree that we are accountable, in the last analysis, to the trust we hold. It will be upon our conscience always, if we do less than the utmost in our quest to salvage something of value from the conference table at Geneva.

Sincerely,

FRANK CHURCH,
U. S. Senator.

ANNIVERSARY OF NEBRASKA'S ADMISSION TO THE UNION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, March 1, 1959, is the 92d anniversary of the admission of the State of Nebraska as one of the United States of America. We Nebraskans call this important day in our State's history Founders Day.

At this point, I should like to stress the fact that the word "founders" has a large "S" in the minds of my fellow Nebraskans. "Founders," to us, is definitely plural. No single individual, no small group of individuals, made possible our statehood. That attainment was made possible by the mutual effort, the com-

mon sacrifice, of every man, woman, and child who had lived in what is now the State of Nebraska up until the time we entered the Union.

We have been called the Cornhusker State. That is true. We are a large corn producer. We have been called the Beef State. That, also, is true. Our cattle contribute to the lives of Americans and to people in the far corners of this earth. We have been called the Tree-Planter State. That is true, too. From a relatively treeless prairie, we have become a State of trees. The very institution of Arbor Day sprang from a Nebraskan's heart and mind.

Yet, I have still another name for Nebraska.

My name for it is, "The Neighbor State."

In 1832 the first artist to interest himself in the Nebraska region, George Catlin, wrote:

There is no more beautiful prairie country in the world than that which is to be seen here. In looking back from this bluff toward the west, there is one of the most beautiful scenes imaginable. The surface of the country is gracefully undulating, like the swells of the ocean after a heavy storm, and everywhere covered with beautiful green turf. . . . The soil in this region is also rich and capable of making one of the most productive countries in the world.

Catlin, the artist, saw beauty. Other Nebraska pioneers—men and women who wanted to make homes in Nebraska—had different viewpoints. They saw these same beautiful prairies ablaze with destroying fire. They heard the war cries of Poncas, Omahas, Pawnees, Otoes, Sioux, and Cheyennes. They cowered in their sod houses while the white terror of the blizzard roared outside. They felt the heat that withered their first crops. They saw clouds of grasshoppers fall upon them, clouds that shut out the sun.

Yet these pioneers loved the soil on which they built their homes. In spite of suffering, anguish, even the death of their dear ones, they stayed. No quick riches came. There was no gold, no silver. These pioneers had faith in Nebraska soil and in its power to produce.

One of the favorite subjects of frontier art has been the protecting ring of buffalo bulls—and, within that ring, the cows and the calves. Not even the most savage of prairie wolves could break through that formation.

Nebraska pioneers learned by observation. They built their own protective ring. They relied on instant and complete community cooperation. And such reliance paid off. Without it, they would have perished. With it, they survived.

The more than 100,000 Nebraska pioneers who homesteaded their land since 1862 lived that way.

Times changed. Farm-to-market roads, a Nebraska first, penetrated remote rural regions. The crossroads settlement became a town; the town became a city; the city became a metropolis. Blizzards, prairie fires, hostile Indians, lost their immediate and terrible danger.

Still, the feeling of interdependence—of neighborliness, if you will—remained with the sons and daughters of Ne-

braska's pioneers. People who could trace their ancestry to the Deep South lived side by side with neighbors whose forefathers came from the bleak and rock-bound coast of New England. Nebraskans of French origin lived next door to Nebraskans of German origin. What is more, they liked it. There are neither Swedes, Danes, Norwegians, Irish, nor Czechoslovaks in Nebraska. There are some 1,414,000 neighborly Nebraskan Americans.

That is why, to me, Nebraska will always be the Neighbor State.

We Nebraskans are justly proud of the products of our soil and our toil. But it is one product—definitely in the singular—of which I, as a Nebraskan, am most proud.

Alexander Pope, the English poet who lived and wrote more than two centuries ago, left us a deathless line.

He wrote:

The proper study of mankind is man.

In that same vein, I say today—in Nebraska's Founders Day, 1959,

The greatest, the noblest, product of my native State, my home, is—Nebraskans.

VIRGINIA'S STAND AFFIRMED

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter written to the New York Times by Mrs. Genevieve Clark Thomson, daughter of the late Champ Clark, one of the greatest Americans to serve as Speaker of the House of Representatives.

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

VIRGINIA'S STAND AFFIRMED—HERITAGE OF HER HISTORY LINKED TO VIEWS ON CONSTITUTION

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your distinguished Washington correspondent Arthur Krock recently referred to Virginia as "the proudest State in the Union."

Certainly a Virginian with an inferiority complex is a rarity, but Virginia's pride and freedom from a feeling of inferiority are not without foundation. Hers is the oldest civilization in North America.

Our Declaration of Independence was written by a Virginian, Thomas Jefferson. Our victorious Revolutionary armies were captained by a Virginian, George Washington. Our Federal Constitution was fathered by a Virginian, James Madison.

Virginia refused to ratify the Constitution until assured that a Bill of Rights would be added. And the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, now popularly known as the Bill of Rights, were largely the handiwork of Virginians James Madison, George Mason, and Richard Henry Lee.

It is not surprising, therefore, that Virginians should feel that they have as much understanding of and respect for constitutional government as Chief Justice Warren, a second-generation American, or Justice Frankfurter, a naturalized citizen.

And certainly they have as much as Gunnar Myrdal, the Swedish sociologist upon whose views Chief Justice Warren so heavily leaned in composing his fateful opinion of 1954 on desegregation.

Nor would Virginians agree with another of Dr. Myrdal's opinions contained in the same volume to the effect that the United States Constitution is outmoded and should be junked. In fairness, let us assume that the

Chief Justice doesn't agree with this opinion, but that he is merely a superficial reader.

It was kind of the Times to commend Virginia for its good manners in a time of deep distress. Most Virginians would, I think, echo the words of Daniel Webster when told of a eulogy passed upon him: "It does me but simple justice."

Now as one citizen of Virginia, if I may do so without discourtesy, I say to the Times: "Look Homeward Angel" to New York, the stench of whose race relations now pervades even the provinces. We have nothing like it in Virginia.

GENEVIEVE CLARK THOMSON.

GATLORD, VA., February 5, 1959.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN PAYROLL

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement prepared by me regarding the Federal civilian payroll.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The regular Federal civilian payroll for the first time in history is now running in excess of a billion dollars a month as a constant average.

Payroll for Federal civilian employees in the first 6 months of the current fiscal year (July-December 1958) totaled \$6,219,196,000. This would be an annual rate approaching \$12.5 billion.

The number of employees changed very little in the first half of this year as compared with the same period last year, running at approximately 2,361,000; but payroll costs, reflecting recent pay raises, were up nearly 11 percent.

The all-time Federal civilian employment peak was reached in the last year of World War II, 1945. In that year employment averaged more than 3.5 million and the payroll totaled a little under \$8 billion.

As compared with 1945, civilian employment by Federal agencies is down approximately 33 percent; the payroll is up more than 56 percent; and the per capita average pay has been increased 133 percent.

These figures are taken from records compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

For the coming fiscal year the budget contemplates an increase of more than 72,000 over last year in employment by Federal civilian agencies, exclusive of civilian employment by the military departments, which has been gradually declining.

I recommend reduction in current civilian employment by Federal agencies of a minimum of 150,000. This would be little more than 6 percent. It could be accomplished without impairment of a single essential function.

UNSUNG PUBLIC SERVANTS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on February 26, 1959, Dr. F. W. Reichelderfer, Chief of the Weather Bureau, issued a press release and accompanying citation commending 21 of our voluntary weather observers who have assisted the Weather Bureau in observing and reporting weather conditions for more than 50 years. Two of the persons so commended are residents of North Carolina, one of them being Mrs. Charles Edward Taylor, of Southport, and the other Mr. Barry C. Hawkins, of Highlands. These 21 faithful, unsung, and uncompensated public servants merit the thanks of the Nation.

On behalf of the Honorable ALTON A. LENNON, who represents the district in which Mrs. Taylor resides, and on behalf of the Honorable DAVID M. HALL, who represents the district in which Mr. Hawkins resides, and myself, I ask unanimous consent that the release and accompanying commendation be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

VOLUNTARY WEATHER OBSERVERS PRAISED

Dr. F. W. Reichelderfer, Chief of the Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce, today reported that the Weather Bureau now has 21 cooperative observers who have taken weather observations daily for more than 50 years. Three of these 21 voluntary—and unsalaried—weather observers have taken daily observations for more than 60 years.

A special citation edition of the Weather Bureau's daily weather map (published on Thursday, February 26) has been issued in honor of these 21 veterans of the nationwide corps of 7,000 cooperative weather observers who take and record weather observations every day of the year—including Sundays and holidays—without any compensation whatsoever. On the back of the regular daily weather map of this date are printed brief service highlights of these remarkable senior citizens.

Dr. Reichelderfer said that without the daily records of these cooperative observers our knowledge of the climate of the United States would be meager.

The Chief of the Weather Bureau added that this weather observing work is an outstanding example of people serving their Government without pay, and he thought their daily but unsung efforts merited the applause of their fellow citizens.

Weather Bureau meteorologists said that these daily weather records made through the years are in constant use in many ways. Such reports are, and will continue to be, important in helping solve weather related problems concerning industry, commerce, and agriculture.

The dean of the Weather Bureau's voluntary weather observer corps is Mr. Barry C. Hawkins, of Highlands, N.C., who has taken daily observations for more than 67 years. His period of personal service is only 5 months shorter than the entire history of the Weather Bureau as a civilian agency. Mr. Hawkins was born in Ohio in 1874, came to North Carolina in 1883, and took his first weather observation there on November 1, 1891. Weather Bureau climatology officials say that throughout Mr. Hawkins' entire period of service his weather records have maintained an exceptionally high standard of accuracy and dependability. For many years Mr. Hawkins walked 10 miles to mail his observation reports to the Weather Bureau.

The cooperative weather observer with the second longest service record is Father Adelhelm Hess, of the Benedictine Abbey at Conception, Mo., whose observations date back to 1894. Father Hess, a former professor of Greek and Latin, received a special letter of commendation from President Eisenhower in October 1954.

The third longest service record of the entire country is Mr. F. O. Alin, of Fullerton, N. Dak., who began his observations on January 1, 1898. During Mr. Alin's 60 years of weather observing, he never missed an observation. He has recorded temperatures from 113° above to 44° below zero. Mr. Alin has been honored by Meritorious Service Medals and by special letters of citation from the Chief of the Weather Bureau and the Secretary of Commerce. The entire town of Fullerton, N. Dak., held a community

celebration in March 1957 to honor Mr. Alin's outstanding service record.

The dean of women observers is Mrs. Charles E. Taylor, who has been a cooperative observer in Southport, N.C., since March 1900. She also has the fourth longest service record of all observers. Mrs. Taylor earned the nickname "Hurricane Hazel Heroine" because of her valiant all night efforts to warn her neighbors before Hurricane Hazel struck Southport at dawn on October 15, 1954. In February 1955 she was presented a 50-year award as a weather observer by the Secretary of Commerce, and given a special citation by the Chief of the Weather Bureau.

Shortly after April 9, 1955, Mrs. Taylor was surprised to receive a letter from the White House, in Washington, and which read:

"DEAR MRS. TAYLOR: I have learned from Secretary Weeks of your long and devoted service as a cooperative observer for the Weather Bureau. In providing regular reports during the past 55 years on the weather conditions in your locality, you have made an important contribution to the work of the Bureau and to the welfare of your fellow Americans.

"Along with congratulations on your outstanding record, I send my thanks for your very unselfish service.

"With best wishes,

"Sincerely,

"DWIGHT EISENHOWER."

The help of cooperative weather observers to record the Nation's climate was started early in the last century even before the Weather Bureau was established in 1891. Dozens of individuals who had been taking observations at scattered locations were urged by the new Weather Bureau to continue, and hundreds of additional citizens in all parts of the country and from all walks of life soon volunteered to make local weather observations and keep records of climatological data. More than 7,000 citizens now are taking weather observations without pay. The Weather Bureau furnishes observation instruments such as rain gages and thermometers, and also supplies the record forms on which the observations are logged at least once daily. Observers are drawn from all ranks of life, and by their constant and faithful service have made available to all users an invaluable storehouse of weather data.

Each observer gives an average of about 15 minutes a day to take and record the observations, to answer numerous questions from neighbors in the community about the local weather, and to complete and mail the regular monthly reports. It is estimated that the total time contributed by each observer to the Government over a 50-year period amounts to about 600 eight-hour workdays. The daily services of the thousands of voluntary observers would add up to about 80,000 full 8-hour days of work each year provided our citizens without cost.

In some cases observers from a single family have continued an unbroken series of daily observations for extraordinary long periods of time—the observer work being passed on from one generation to the next. For example, members of the Stern family at Logan, Iowa, have been taking weather readings for 77 years. Miss Amy Stern, present observer, is the granddaughter of the first weather observer at Logan. Carlos Call, present dean of California cooperative observers, has taken daily observations at Fort Ross, Calif., for 52 years and his father (George W. Call) recorded rainfall at the same place from 1874 to 1907. The combined family observation record is now 85 years.

At Rome, Ga., four generations of the Tower family have taken weather observations for nearly 100 years.

Mrs. Jessie T. White, of San Jon, N. Mex., on February 1, 1959 joined the ranks of those

who have completed 50 years of daily observations. She graduated from college at the age of 57, and has been a schoolteacher, newspaper editor and rancher. She rides horseback each month to mail her monthly weather reports.

When Walter Eckert, dean of the cooperative observers in the State of Washington, arrived from New York 69 years ago the town of Grapeview in Mason County was called Detroit. Mr. Eckert selected the name "Grapeview" after noting "that all of our mail kept going to Michigan." He was also Grapeview's postmaster for 35 years.

Mr. Irwin Draper, of Red Lodge, Mont., has measured more than 5,600 inches of snowfall in his entire observing career of 56 years. He figures that is enough snow to bury the tallest building in Montana.

Mr. Ralph E. Weber, cooperative observer at Oakland, Md., since September 1903, read the lowest surface temperature ever recorded south of the Mason-Dixon line. It was a bitter cold 40° below zero, and occurred on January 13, 1912.

In addition to the basic job of weather reporting, cooperative observers are occasionally invited to perform a wide variety of special reporting jobs. Some of these jobs in recent years include: (a) reporting dates of the stages of development of various plants to assist in special agricultural studies; (b) telephoning special reports to designated collection centers to assist research work on the development and forecasting of tornadoes; and (c) reporting on the accuracy of weather forecasts.

NAMES, ADDRESSES, AND LENGTH OF OBSERVING RECORD OF THE WEATHER BUREAU'S 21 VOLUNTARY WEATHER OBSERVERS WHO HAVE TAKEN DAILY WEATHER OBSERVATIONS FOR MORE THAN 50 YEARS

F. O. Alin, Fullerton, N. Dak., 60 years.
J. M. Anderson, Manti, Utah, 56 years.
Charles E. Barret, Anchorage, Ky., 58 years.
Carlos A. Call, Fort Ross, Calif., 52 years.
Irwin A. Draper, Red Lodge, Mont., 57 years.
Walter O. Eckert, Grapeview, Wash., 52 years.
Dr. William B. Fulton, Dadeville, Ala., 52 years.
Louis Hardtla, Philo, Ohio, 58 years.
Barry C. Hawkins, Highlands, N.C., 68 years. (Mr. Hawkins is the dean of the entire observer corps.)
Father Adelhelm Hess, Conception, Mo., 65 years.
Plummer F. Jones, New Canton, Va., 54 years.
Michael Kangerga, Henderson, Tex., 51 years.
J. Smith Lanier, West Point, Ga., 53 years.
D. Paul Oswald, Hagerstown, Md., 57 years.
Mrs. Pearl Smith, Brownwood, Tex., 54 years.
Edward H. Stoll, Elwood, Nebr., 54 years.
Hugh A. Storer, Alton, Kans., 51 years.
Mrs. Charles E. Taylor, Southport, N.C., 59 years. (Mrs. Taylor is the dean of women observers.)
Ralph E. Weber, Oakland, Md., 56 years.
Mrs. Jessie T. White, San Jon, N. Mex., 50 years.
Mrs. Gertrude M. Woods, Palmetto, Tenn., 54 years.

OUR VOLUNTARY WEATHER OBSERVERS—7,000 CITIZENS IN ALL PARTS OF THE COUNTRY MAINTAIN GOVERNMENT WEATHER RECORDS WITHOUT PAY

Keeping a record of the climate of the United States is a big job. The act which established the Weather Bureau went into effect July 1, 1891. This law said that the Weather Bureau, among other things, would take "such meteorological observations as may be necessary to establish and record climatic conditions in the United States." This was a large order for a small Bureau. At that time the Weather Bureau had very

few paid observers, and the daily weather map showed only sparse reports from any place west of the Mississippi River.

From 1870 to 1891 the weather service in the United States had been operated as a part of the Signal Corps of the U.S. Army, and this experience had demonstrated that it would require thousands of weather observers to keep an adequate record of the climate of a country as large as the United States. The Weather Bureau therefore followed the plan begun by the Signal Corps, and encouraged citizens in all parts of the country voluntarily to make local weather observations and keep records, and mail them regularly to the Bureau. Today there are over 7,000 citizens taking observations without pay. The Weather Bureau furnishes the rain gages and thermometers and the record forms on which the observations are entered. Observers are drawn from all ranks of life, and by their constant and faithful service have made available an invaluable treasure of data. These data are in constant use to help solve problems of industry, commerce, agriculture, and recreation, as well as to obtain answers to such far-reaching queries as, "Is the climate changing, and if so, how?"

It really is a remarkable service. So many people, in all parts of the country, freely give of their time to make the necessary observations and reports every day in the year, year after year, some of them for 40, 50, and even 60 years. This means that if each observer gives an average of 15 minutes a day to take and record the observations, answer numerous questions about local weather, and make the regular monthly reports, the total time contributed to the Government over a 50-year period amounts to over 570 workdays. On the same basis, the services of all these observers would amount to over 79,800 full 8-hour days of work each year. We know of no other cooperative enterprise that even remotely compares with the climatological service of the Weather Bureau; that is, where the time of those persons cooperating is required every day in the year including Sundays and holidays.

In some cases the observations have been continued for a long period of time in one family, the work being passed on from one generation to the next. For example, members of the Stern family at Logan, Iowa, have been taking weather readings for 77 years. Miss Amy Ann Stern, present observer, is the granddaughter of the first observer at Logan.

In addition to the basic job of weather reporting, cooperative observers are occasionally invited to perform special jobs. Some of these in recent years include: (a) Assisting in a phenological study in Western States by reporting dates of stages of development of various plants, (b) assisting in research on the development of tornadoes by telephoning a special report to a designated collection center under certain weather conditions, and (c) assisting the Bureau in a study of the verification of forecasts.

Cooperative observers are frequently known as the local weathermen, and their readings are used as checks for unofficial thermometers and rain gages. Observers have great pride in their work and take considerable pains to arrange for a substitute observer when they are ill or plan to be away, so as to maintain continuity of data. For example, before a 30-year observer in Kansas was recently hospitalized she arranged for a substitute observer. When the substitute also became ill, the observer arranged for a second substitute to take the observations and for a hospital nurse to phone the rainfall amounts to the proper Weather Bureau office. In another case, an observer in a Western State sold his mine and made plans to move away but when he found that this meant the weather station would be closed, he changed his plans and got a job with the new mine owner.

The survey made in 1958 shows that there are 21 cooperative weather observers who, in February 1959, will have served continuously 50 years or more. Notes regarding these observers follow:

F. O. Alin was cooperative observer at Fullerton, N. Dak., from January 1, 1898 until October 24, 1957 when he gave up the work temporarily after he fell and broke his hip. During his 60 years as weather observer he never missed an observation. He now has a substitute observer, but is looking forward to taking his own observations again. Mr. Alin was born in Sweden on September 18, 1869. He came to this country in 1887 and attended school in Duluth until 1889, when he filed a claim near Fullerton. In April 1957 he was honored for his outstanding accomplishment at the Fullerton Auditorium with a Meritorious Service Medal and letters from the Chief of the Weather Bureau and from the Secretary of Commerce.

J. M. Anderson is serving in his 51st year as cooperative observer at Manti, Utah, and is the oldest observer in point of service in Utah. He has lived his entire life at Manti, where he was born February 28, 1875. He was recently honored for completing 50 years of cooperative weather observing on June 8, 1958. His son Leslie, who lives on the adjoining property, now assists occasionally in the weather program.

Charles E. Barret has been taking weather observations officially at Anchorage, Ky., since September 1903. His father, John J. Barret, was appointed the observer at Anchorage in the fall of 1900, but almost immediately his duties were assumed by his son. In reality, therefore, Mr. Barret's weather service dates from the fall of 1900 to the present time, with the exception of two 9-month periods while he was away at college. Faithful weather service has been rendered by this family for over 58 years.

Carlos A. Call, now dean of California cooperative observers, began his observational program at Fort Ross, Calif., in March 1907. His father, George W. Call, had been recording rainfall there since 1874, which makes the combined family record now in its 84th years. Carlos Call was born in Fort Ross on June 2, 1890, and still lives in the family home. His rainfall records have long been in demand by the Fort Ross community, and the California Wool Growers Association of which he is a member.

Irwin A. Draper was born at Livingston, Mont., on July 8, 1883, and has served as cooperative observer at Red Lodge, Mont., since December 2, 1902. He recently estimated that the snow he has measured during his 56 years of observing, if piled in one heap, would bury the tallest building in Montana. A check of the record indicates he has measured around 5,600 inches of snowfall in his observing career. Mr. Draper is dean of Montana cooperative observers.

While still a youth, Walter O. Eckert's interest was aroused by wind shifts and changes in weather conditions, and this interest remains high. Born in Auburn, N.Y., in 1877, he moved to Washington State in 1890 and settled where he now lives. He became cooperative observer for Grapeview, Wash., in October 1907, and has the distinction of having served longer than any other currently active observer in his State.

Dr. William B. Fulton is the oldest observer in Alabama in years of service. He was born in Mobile, Ala., on October 24, 1869. He is a graduate of Howard College, Birmingham Dental College, and Birmingham Medical College—now the Medical Department of the University of Alabama. He moved to Dadeville, Ala., in 1906, and began as cooperative weather observer in October 1907. He has taught how to test seed for germination at various farmers' meetings.

Louis Hardtla became the official weather observer at Philo, Ohio, in October 1901,

having made unofficial weather readings since 1892. In the 1890's employment around Philo was very scarce during the winter months, and there was plenty of time for interesting discussions in the grocery stores and copper shops. Since there were many arguments as to who had the keenest razor, and the most dependable watch or thermometer, Mr. Hardtla decided to apply for appointment as cooperative weather observer so that he might settle all future arguments about the weather. His authority has not since been questioned. His neat handwriting is worthy of special mention.

Barry C. Hawkins, Highlands, N.C., has served more than 65 years at the station at Rock House (his home). He is the dean of the Cooperative Observer Corps, his period of service being almost as long as the history of the Weather Bureau as a civilian agency. Mr. Hawkins was born in Ohio in 1874, came to North Carolina in 1883, and has resided there ever since. His first weather observation was taken on November 1, 1891, and throughout his period of service his records have maintained an exceptionally high standard of excellence.

Father Adelhelm Hess' service as a cooperative weather observer dates back to November 1894. Father Hess was born in the mountains of Switzerland in 1874 and came to Conception, Mo., in 1897. Here he was ordained in 1897, and became a professor of Latin and Greek with the sidelines of a country pastor, electrician, and weather observer. Under date of October 30, 1954, Father Hess received the following letter from President Dwight D. Eisenhower:

"I have learned that on November 1 you will complete 60 years of unselfish, devoted service to our country as a cooperative observer for the Weather Bureau—that during this period, without compensation, you have faithfully provided information necessary to record climatic conditions. Such service is truly commendable. I am pleased to express to you my congratulations and gratitude for the service you have rendered our Nation."

Plummer F. Jones, who has been observing since March 1, 1905, is dean of Virginia's cooperative observers. He started at Arvonla, but in 1913 moved the weather station to its present location at New Canton, Va. A graduate and postgraduate of William and Mary College, and a graduate of Union Theological Seminary at Richmond, Mr. Jones is a retired Presbyterian minister.

Michael Kangerga has been keeping the rainfall records at Henderson, Tex., for a period of over 50 years, since the station there was established in July 1908. He has also kept the temperature records for the past 17 years. Mr. Kangerga was born October 4, 1873, in Croatia, then a province of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and now a part of Yugoslavia. He immigrated to Henderson at the age of 14, and has made his home there ever since. His brother joined him in Henderson, and they formed a business partnership which has lasted to the present time. Their first venture in business was a general mercantile store. Since their business was vitally dependent on the well-being of the farmer, and the farmer in turn was dependent on the weather, Mr. Kangerga requested an appointment and made his start as a rainfall observer.

J. Smith Lanier, who began his service as cooperative observer at West Point, Ga., in the early part of 1906, has made many outstanding contributions of service to his community. He has always lived in or near West Point, having been born just across the Alabama line in Chambers County.

D. Paul Oswald was born March 15, 1886, on the family farm in Chewsville, Md. In May of 1898 his father consented to the establishment of a weather station at his home as a hobby and education for his sons. D. Paul Oswald began sending in weather observations in February 1902. In January

1948 he moved to Hagerstown, Md., where he still makes his daily observations at the weather station called Chewsville-Bridgeport, a combined name of the two stations he has operated. He was recently on the science program closed circuit television for Washington County schools, and has for decades provided weather facts to local newspapers and radio stations.

Mrs. Pearl Smith has been taking weather observations at Brownwood, Tex., since July 1905. She was born in Waco, Tex., on April 9, 1880. Her adult life has been spent as a wife, mother, homemaker, and cooperative weather observer. She has also been active in church and Sunday school work throughout the years.

Edward H. Stoll began taking weather observations in October 1905. His weather station is located on his farm, 10 miles south-southwest of Elwood, Nebr., which has been his home since he came there from Kansas in 1888 at the age of 2 years.

Hugh A. Storer, cooperative observer at Alton, Kans., was born in 1889, and has lived his entire life on the farm homesteaded by his father. He has served as cooperative weather observer since March 1908. He has also served 21 years on the local school board, was secretary-treasurer of the Osborne County Farmers Union for 16 years, served in the Kansas Legislature from 1937 to 1945, and was county commissioner for the third district from 1953 to 1957.

Mrs. Charles Edward Taylor has been a cooperative observer in Southport, N.C., since March 1900, serving as Jessie M. Stevens previous to her marriage to Mr. Taylor in 1909. Mrs. Taylor was born in Chicago on September 22, 1879, moved to Southport in 1888, and is active in church and civic work. On February 23, 1955, in Washington, D.C., she received a 50-year award as a weather observer.

Ralph E. Weber, cooperative observer at Oakland, Md., since September 1903, has the second longest period of service of any present Maryland observer. He was born in March 1887 in Oakland, and has lived all his life on the family farm. Here he makes his daily weather observations, and here he read the lowest surface temperature ever recorded south of the Mason-Dixon line, 40° below zero, on January 13, 1912.

Mrs. Jessie T. White, cooperative weather observer at San Jon, N. Mex., is completing her 50th year of cooperation with the Weather Bureau, having taken over the weather station at San Jon on February 1, 1909. Born in Corydon, Iowa, in 1880, she moved to San Jon in 1905. She graduated from college at the age of 57, and has been a schoolteacher, newspaper owner, editor, and rancher.

Mrs. Gertrude M. Woods has been cooperative observer at Palmetto, Tenn., since August 1905, at which time she succeeded her father, R. S. Montgomery, who had been weather observer there since 1883. Her name appears in publications as "Mrs. Ross Woods." She has always been interested in her duties as an observer, and read a paper entitled "Duties and Experiences of a Cooperative Observer" before the American Meteorological Society meeting in Nashville in 1927. Reporting on this meeting, the New York Times carried a feature story on Mrs. Woods' work as a cooperative weather observer.

FARM SUBSIDIES

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on February 23 and 26, I placed in the Record two reports, each of which showed our present agriculture program was definitely not benefiting the small family-type farm, but rather benefiting

largely the corporate-type farm and underwriting absentee ownership.

I was not alone in those conclusions. I quote from the President's state of the Union message of this year, delivered to the Congress on January 9, 1959:

Outlays of the Department of Agriculture for the current fiscal year, for the support of farm prices on a very few farm products, will exceed \$5 billion. That is a sum equal to approximately two-fifths of the net income of all farm operators in the United States.

By the end of this fiscal year it is estimated that there will be in Government hands surplus farm products worth about \$9 billion. And by July 1, 1959, Government expenditures for storage, interest, and handling of its agricultural inventory will reach a rate of \$1 billion a year.

This level of expenditure for farm products could be made willingly for a temporary period if it were leading to a sound solution of the problem. But unfortunately this is not true. We need new legislation.

In a message sent to the Congress under date of January 29, 1959, the President emphasized this same point and again called to our attention the fact that under the existing law the major benefits of this program are going to the very large farmers. I quote from the President's message to the Congress on that date:

The price-support and production-control program has not worked.

1. Most of the dollars are spent on the production of a relatively few large producers: Nearly a million and a half farms produce wheat. Ninety percent of the expenditures for price support on wheat result from production of about half of these farms—the largest ones.

Nearly a million farms produce cotton. Seventy-five percent of the expenditures for cotton price support result from production of about one-fourth of these farms—the largest ones.

Since my remarks of last week, I have received a telegram from Mr. R. P. Parish, president of the Delta Council of Mississippi, claiming that my remarks were misleading and that actually the Government had made money on these price-support programs that I had criticized. I shall, upon Mr. Parish's request, place his telegram in the Record; however, at the same time I shall point out the full story and show the complete fallacy of his argument that this is a profitable program for the American taxpayers.

Last Thursday the chairman of the House Agricultural Committee also quoted the same cases as Mr. Parish and attempted to make the same claim; namely, that I was in error when I said that these programs were costing the taxpayers millions in subsidizing these large farm operations. I respect his opinion favoring these large subsidies to the large farmers, but I cannot let stand unchallenged his argument that the Government is making money on such a ridiculous operation.

I could not help but notice that the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee in attempting to defend these large subsidies was talking both ways at once. In one breath he launched into a tirade against the administration by charging that the Government had lost over \$900 million in supporting the cot-

ton program alone under this administration. I quote his statement:

We have lost in the last 6 years on the cotton program approximately \$900 million.

Then in the same speech he made the fantastic claim that on the individual farmers mentioned the Government in supporting their cotton crop was actually making a profit.

That is ridiculous, and I shall take the same cases which he and Mr. Parish mentioned and prove it.

First I shall read the telegram, and in each instance point out the rest of the story as it relates to each case mentioned in the wire. I will show the fallacy of any claim of a profit.

The telegram is as follows:

GREENVILLE, MISS., February 26, 1959.
Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Reference your statement that large corporate operators have received major benefits from farm program. Your source of information gave only part of story. Delta and Pine Land Company of Scott, Miss., cited as recipient of second largest farm subsidy in 1957, used price supports to promote orderly marketing. This company placed 7,919 bales of cotton in the CCC loan for which they received an advance of \$1,167,502.35. Every single bale of this cotton was withdrawn from the loan before end of marketing year and sold on market. Government collected \$17,370 interest payment plus carrying charges, thus making a profit. Interest was paid on every dollar for every day it was used.

I repeat one sentence of this claim. The "Government collected \$17,370 interest payment plus carrying charges, thus making a profit."

In the past 3 years the farmers of the country have produced a total of 35,737,000 bales of cotton. The national production figures are as follows: For 1956, 13,310,000 bales; for 1957, 11 million bales; for 1958, 11,427,000 bales, or a total of 35,737,000 bales.

During the same 3-year period the Government lost over \$800,000,000 in supporting the price of this cotton. That is an average cost to the taxpayer of \$22.30 per bale for every bale of cotton produced during the 3-year period.

No one will dispute the fact that the only reason that this corporation or any other individual was able to sell cotton in the open market and obtain prices whereby they could repay the loans was by virtue of the fact that the Federal Government, under Public Law 480 and other laws, was buying a large percentage of the cotton and subsidizing its export. This relieved the pressure upon the market, but at an \$800 million loss to the American taxpayers.

This subsidy operated as follows: In 1956 we exported 7,200,000 bales of cotton, at a loss of \$400 million to the taxpayers.

In 1957 we exported 5,700,000 bales, at a loss of \$281 million to the taxpayers.

In 1958 we exported 3,300,000 bales, at a loss of \$126 million to the taxpayers, or a total loss to the American taxpayers in the past 3 years of approximately \$807 million in supporting the prices of cotton.

Our total cotton production during the 3 years referred to was 35,737,000 bales.

That means that during the past 3 years the taxpayers have spent an average of \$22.30 a bale on every bale of cotton produced, in order to support the cotton market.

I may say in passing that this \$800 million item does not include soil bank payments, acreage reserve payments, or any other payments to the farmers.

Now, let us take the case of the Delta & Pine Land Co., of Scott, Miss., wherein it is claimed that the Government is making money. In 1957 that company placed under loan 7,919 bales and borrowed \$1,167,502.35. It repaid this loan with interest of \$17,370; but the Government, in order to support the market at a level whereby the company could profitably sell this cotton lost on this amount of cotton an average of \$22.30 a bale. This loss must be charged to all the cotton produced in the country. It would not be fair to charge it to a particular part of the production; namely, that cotton which is exported. This cotton support program is a program for all the farmers. Therefore, on the 7,919 bales which the Delta & Pine Land Co. produced in 1957, the loss to the American taxpayers was \$22.30 a bale, or \$176,593.70.

Giving them credit for the interest which was paid would reduce that amount to \$159,223.70. It is being rather charitable to give credit for the interest payments, because, after all, the Government borrowed the money which it loaned in this instance, and the Government was also paying interest at the same time.

Even overlooking that fact, we are still left with a figure of \$159,223.70 loss on this one company's operation in 1957.

In addition, the Government gave the same company a direct check of \$20,761.20 as a subsidy under the soil bank program. This was for acreage which it agreed not to plant. Thus the total cost to the American taxpayers of supporting prices with respect to this one farm, including their subsidy checks received during 1957, amounts to \$179,984.90.

The Delta & Pine Land Co. and others who are defending their operations try to show a much different picture. They claim that if the loans are paid we should consider that there is no loss, and I suppose by that line of reasoning if the loans are not repaid, they should be charged as total losses.

I do not think that is fair, but suppose momentarily we accept that argument and apply that argument solely to the Delta & Pine Land Co.

What is the story? In 1955, Delta put under loan 11,773 bales of cotton, for which they borrowed from the Federal Government \$1,974,356.12. They repaid the loans on 6,894 bales of cotton or a total of \$1,193,081.96, leaving a balance on their loan from the Federal Government of \$781,274.16. This they have not repaid. The Government took the cotton for payment and exported it at a loss of nearly \$50 per bale. What have they to say about this loss? My computation of \$22.30 is much more charitable than charging the whole cost to particular lots. I have here a memorandum which was received from the Department of Agri-

culture only a few moments ago, calling attention to the fact that the Delta & Pine Land Co., which has been paid so much out of our American agricultural program, is not even an American-owned company. It is a wholly owned English company. It is a U.S. corporation wholly owned by the Fine Cotton Spinners & Doublers, Ltd., Manchester, England. The American taxpayers have been subsidizing this British company on its farming operations here in America to the extent just outlined.

Therefore, I am not very much concerned about their criticism of our agricultural program. I am amazed to find Members of Congress defending the spending of the American taxpayers' money to support the farm operations in the United States of a large British corporation. This was a program which was intended for the benefit of the small American farmer. I would welcome yielding to anyone who would wish to defend such an operation, either on the floor of the Senate or anywhere else.

There are a lot of small American farmers, American taxpayers, and consumers who will be asking for an explanation. Yet this is the law and the administration has been unable to get Congress to correct it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am glad to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator state that point again? I did not hear him state the nature of the business carried on by the British company. Is it an agricultural company?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The memorandum I have shows that it is a wholly owned English company. It is owned by the Fine Cotton Spinners, Ltd., Manchester, England. It is a U.S. corporation, incorporated in the United States, but it is owned wholly in Great Britain.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What is its primary business? Is it primarily an agricultural corporation?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. All I know is that they borrowed money from the Federal Government under the loan program they placed under a guaranteed loan, 7,919 bales of cotton, for which we advanced \$1,167,502.35.

The report claims they own general stores, gins, elevators, and many other assets around Scott, Miss.

This is one of the small farms about which so many crocodile tears are being shed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The only reason I interrupted the Senator to make my inquiry was that earlier in the day, in a private conference with the Senator from Delaware, he showed me a list of corporations receiving payments under the Agricultural Act, and that list showed the Ford Motor Co. of Detroit, Mich., as one of the companies.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is a company which is not an agricultural company. It is an automobile manufacturing company. The Senator's list, as I recall,

shows that that company received more than \$13,000 for not engaging in raising corn and wheat upon a small acreage.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Ford Motor Co., of Dearborn, Mich., in 1957, was paid a subsidy check under the soil bank program in the amount of \$13,649.40 for agreeing not to raise wheat and corn on 309.8 acres.

I ask again what kind of agricultural program do we have if we can justify, in the name of the small American farmer, a payment to the Ford Motor Co. of any amount of money for agreeing not to farm?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I agree with the Senator. I am glad he brought up the matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Likewise we find that the Mississippi State Penitentiary received \$71,000 for agreeing not to raise cotton on a thousand acres. I did not know that a penitentiary fell into the classification of a small farmer. This story is full of similar illustrations of how the large operators and absentee owners are profiting under the existing law.

It is about time that we recognize this fact, and as the Secretary of Agriculture has told us in committee time and time again, the agricultural laws of the country need a general revision. Certainly by no stretch of the imagination can we let go unchallenged the ridiculous claim that the program is making a profit. It is clearly shown that in the case of the Delta transaction, the Government took over some of the cotton and that the taxpayers lost on the operation. I should like to continue reading from the telegram, which will be placed in the Record in its entirety at a later point:

Dan Seligman, Shaw, Miss., pledged 1,291 bales of cotton for which he received a loan of \$173,631.68. Mr. Seligman withdrew 1,205 bales of cotton and sold it on the market, leaving only 86 bales in the loan. He paid the Government \$2,111.50 in interest.

Again it is inferred that on that loan the Government made money; however, I say again that in 1957, in order to support the domestic market, the Government exported 3,300,000 bales, at a loss of \$126 million.

If we take the average cost of supporting all cotton we find that in the case of Mr. Seligman, a loss of \$22.30 for 1,291 bales of cotton gives a total of \$28,789.30, then subtract \$2,111.50 in interest paid and again I say that is being charitable, because the Government paid interest on the money that it loaned—we get a total net loss, as far as the taxpayers are concerned, of \$26,677.80.

That is still not the whole story on Mr. Seligman. He was also paid in 1957 by the U.S. Government \$59,992.80 under the soil bank program for cotton which he agreed not to grow on another 804.8 acres. From the standpoint of the American taxpayer, therefore, in 1957 Mr. Seligman's operations cost \$86,670.60, which it would not have cost the American taxpayers if that farm had been closed down.

I am not saying that the farm should be closed down, but let us admit the true cost of keeping it going. Let us not kid

ourselves about making money on this kind of operation. If our Government keeps on making money in that way under our agricultural program, we may very well wind up going bankrupt.

I challenge anyone to dispute my claim that in the past 3 years we have spent over \$800 million in supporting cotton prices in the United States.

That is a far cry from a profit.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Would the Senator like to have a colloquy on the whole subject? I feel, as he does, that something should be done about the matter. I wish I were wise enough to know exactly what it ought to be. The matter about which the Senator is speaking relates to the support prices paid by the Government on, I presume, the 12 basic commodities.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Today I am speaking primarily on cotton and rice.

Mr. CAPEHART. The purpose of the support-price program when it started 20 or 21 years ago was to reduce production; is not that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That was the intent. The program was supposed to reduce production, but it has resulted in the biggest surplus of commodities the Nation has ever known.

Mr. CAPEHART. The act is still in force. Under the act, we said to a farmer: "If you have been growing corn on 100 acres and will reduce your planting of corn to 80 acres, when you get ready to harvest your crop we will lend you the money at a parity price." In those days it was 90 percent. Then we said: "If, one year later, when you get ready to sell your corn, or if you want to sell it in the meantime, and the market price is more than the parity price, you can sell the corn in the open market and pay off your note at your local bank. If the price is less at the end of 12 months or whenever you get ready to sell the corn, you can come to us, we will cancel your note, and you can deliver the corn to us."

That kind of program has been in effect for many years. Big farmers and little farmers have been participating in it. The end result has been that surpluses of various products have been accumulated to the value of about \$9 billion.

The principle underlying the act was that reduced production would raise the general level of prices on all farm products. But the act has failed to do that, because farm prices today are very, very low.

The Senator from Delaware is objecting—and I think rightly so—to the fact that the big farmer has received considerable money from the Government. I am not trying to defend the big fellow, because I think he would have much preferred to be left alone. But if the big fellow does not participate in these programs, then certainly there will never be any reduction in production, because it is the big fellow who plants the bulk of the acreage and raises the bulk of the products.

If we eliminate the big farmer from participating, then, or course, there will be more production, and the prices will be lower, if the theory that reduced production will increase prices is correct.

So we come back, do we not, to the main point that the whole farm program, the whole idea of reduced production, was all wrong in principle in the first place?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We come back to the point that the law as it is presently written does not work in the best interest of the bona fide farmers. I think we had better recognize that fact. I stated in my remarks the other day that the fact that the large farmers are participating is certainly not illegal. The law reads that way. Congress wrote the law with the full intention and the full knowledge that the large farmers could participate. I, myself, think that is wrong, and I offered amendments to correct the situation at the time. The administration has also opposed this policy but, whether it is right or wrong, it is the law. The law needs to be changed. The only way it can be changed is to call the situation to the attention of the people, and let them tell Congress whether they like it or not.

Unquestionably, the major portion of the benefits of the present law are going to the large farmers. That condition will have to be changed. It cannot be justified in the interest of the small farmer.

I want to do something to help the small farmer, but this law is not the answer.

We cannot justify a program which will support a British-owned corporation in its farming operations in America to the amount of nearly \$6 million in just 3 years. To pay thousands of dollars to a foreign-owned corporation to grow farm products in America is ridiculous.

How can we justify a program which pays the Ford Motor Co. \$13,649.40 not to grow corn and wheat? That is just as ridiculous as a suggestion that we pay the farmers not to manufacture automobiles?

Is it not about time that some of those who are so vocal in defending this British corporation in its large subsidy begin thinking of some of the American farmers in their own districts?

Mr. CAPEHART. In order to enable the big fellow, about whom the Senator is speaking—the corporation—to participate requires the same compliance and accordingly requires him to make a sacrifice by reducing the number of acres which he had planted in cotton.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. He had to comply with the rules. That is not much of a sacrifice when you consider that the taxpayers guaranteed him a profit. Also on other acres they could grow other crops and even get them supported.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator agree that if he had previously planted a thousand acres of cotton he would have had to reduce the planted acreage to 800 in order to participate in the program? Will the Senator agree that that is so?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not know what the percentage of reduction was, but he had to comply with the quotas.

Mr. CAPEHART. I know a man who had a 640-acre farm, all of which he planted in corn. In order to participate in the program, he had to reduce the acreage planted in corn to 421 acres. That left some 220 acres which he could not plant to corn, because in order to participate in the program he had to plant only 421 acres. I do not know whether that was a sacrifice, but it did reduce his production acreage. It was necessary for the farmers to do something of that kind in order to be eligible to borrow money at a given price. Is not that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not know how much they cut acreage on cotton. Let me read the figures of what assistance this British-owned firm has received.

In 1954 they placed 7,054 bales of cotton under loan and received \$1,292,-472.25.

In 1955 they placed 11,773 bales under loan and received from the Government \$1,974,356.12. Of this amount only \$1,193,081.96 was repaid.

In 1956 they received a support loan of \$1,446,605.67 on 8,967 bales of cotton.

In 1957 they received a loan of \$1,167,-502.35 on 7,919 bales.

That is about \$6 million which the taxpayers have advanced in the form of loans on cotton produced to guarantee a profitable operation for a corporation which is not even owned by American citizens.

This is one of the so-called little farmers who are reaping the benefits under this program.

Mr. CAPEHART. I was trying to bring out the facts surrounding the situation. As the Senator said a moment ago, nothing illegal was done. I was trying to bring out the fact that Congress passed a law in 1938, in which we said to the cotton farmer—let us talk about cotton, since this case has to do with cotton—the big farmer, the little farmer, the middle-sized farmer, and the corporation farmer—if you will reduce your cotton acreage so much, we will guarantee you X cents a pound for the cotton. In order to get this guarantee, you must reduce your acreage.

The weakness of that plan has since proved, as the Senator's figures indicated in the case of the British company, that while the acreage was reduced, the production was not reduced necessarily. Even though the acreage planted may be reduced, the farmer may have used much more fertilizer and raised more of a crop on a fewer number of acres. Or he may have enjoyed exceptionally good weather which, plus the extra fertilizer, enabled him to raise a greater crop.

So the first mistake which was made in the Farm Act was in referring to acres and not units of production. Had we based the act upon units of production, then the farmer would have been paid for that production, regardless of the number of acres utilized in achieving such production.

That was the first mistake which was made. The Congress dealt in acres, notwithstanding the fact that production on acres varies considerably depending on the weather, the amount of fertilizer used, and the manner in which the ground is tilled and many other variable factors. In the case of corn, for example, the amount of production varies, depending on whether hybrid seed corn is grown.

Having made such a mistake, the Congress now comes to the question, What shall we do about it? Shall we eliminate the big farmer from the program? I think every big farmer would favor being eliminated from the program. But the farmer who plants a number of acres, and who would be called a large farmer does not know whether he should or should not comply. If the law says he should not, I think it will make every big farmer in the United States happy. Then the big farmer will proceed to grow more of his product. He will till every acre, fertilize to the greatest extent, and grow every conceivable bushel of corn or bale of cotton. The result will be an even greater production which will further glut the market, and will result in even lower prices for the little farmer.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Certainly we are not going to say that we are going to support his prices no matter how much he grows.

After all, the mandatory supports are provided by the Government for only the six basic crops. There are many other agricultural commodities for which there are no supports and on which there are no restrictions. The farmers who produce the unsupported crops are making out as well or better, and certainly the taxpayers are better off. The bulk of American agriculture is being produced without the benefit of any of these supports or restrictions.

Certainly we do not need an agricultural program which uses the taxpayers' dollars to support corporate-type farming or absentee-ownership farming. I own a farm, too; but I do not think either the Senator from Indiana, who also has some farmland, or I should be supported in our farm operations. We are not farmers.

The Senator from Indiana and I are absentee farmers. The program was not intended for our benefit or for the benefit of those in similar positions.

In the case of families who live on their own farms and engage in farming operations, I will go along with a program to help them. But in the case of absentee ownership and large corporations such as the ones I have pointed out today as benefiting under the program I will have no part.

This is especially indefensible when we consider that one operation had its ownership outside the United States. Likewise, I will not defend a program under which the Ford Motor Co. of Detroit, Mich., is paid not to grow corn and wheat. That is foolishness.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am in agreement with the able Senator from Delaware; I do not disagree at all as to all that.

I am trying to make a contribution, if I can, about the original purpose of the

Act and why it failed. I believe it failed because it dealt in acres, rather than in units of production.

Personally, I would be perfectly willing to vote tomorrow to freeze the \$9 billion surplus of agricultural commodities that we have, and to deny the Government the right to sell it, except in starvation cases. In fact, I would be willing to vote to repeal all farm parity price laws. I, myself, would be willing to do that; and I would have the courage to vote to do it, because I believe that in the long run the farmers would be much better off, providing, of course, that we adopt the same sensible, practical, conservative conservation reserve program now in operation.

But my point is that I do not think we should condemn one who has many acres for participating in a program in which he participated because he wanted to help reduce agricultural production in the United States, in order to raise the prices of all agricultural commodities—which was the purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am not condemning them. I have said that it is legal, but I am pointing out where the money is going, and I am condemning the law on which that authority is based. I propose that the law be changed. That is the reason why I am addressing the Senate today.

Mr. CAPEHART. How does the Senator from Delaware propose that it be changed?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. First, let us adopt the recommendations of the Secretary of Agriculture. They may not be the cure, but his proposals are certainly a step in the right direction.

The Senator from Indiana, I am sure, will agree that the Government is not making money from the support programs in the case of any of these commodities. Certainly when the Government has paid in the last 3-year period more than \$800 million to support the price of cotton alone, it is time to take inventory. Whether these payments are made under Public Law 480 or under the Commodity Credit Corporation, so far as the taxpayers are concerned the program makes no difference. It is costing them an average of \$22.30 a bale for every bale of cotton that has been produced in the last 3 years. That fact must be recognized, and it cannot be disputed. I am sure that the Senator from Indiana will agree with me that any claim that the Government is making money under this program either on cotton and rice or any other commodity, is not correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. I did not realize that anyone was claiming that the Government was making money on it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh, yes; that is the reason I am speaking here today.

Several parties are claiming that when the cotton was sold in the domestic market and the proceeds were used to pay off the loan with interest there is a profit for the Government. This claim is being made even in the face of the fact that millions of dollars are being lost.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, they say they had the cotton put under

seal, then borrowed the necessary money from the local bank, and later paid off the note, including the interest. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; and they say the Government is making money on that program when the loans are paid off. They conveniently try to ignore the fact that the Government is buying this cotton to support the market and by so doing has in the past 3 years alone lost over \$800 million on its cotton-support program.

Mr. CAPEHART. I presume that the Government might be making money on that specific transaction.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. On that specific transaction they collected a few thousand in interest, and at the same time they are losing millions in the other office on the same crops.

Mr. CAPEHART. But the way it works—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They boast that the Government collected a little interest and they ignore the real loss which runs into millions.

Mr. CAPEHART. But it works in this way: If a farmer produces a certain number of bales of cotton, and if he has complied with the acreage controls, then he goes to the local bank and borrows from it the money, in the normal way, and signs a note for the money he borrows. He can either pay off the note at any time he wishes, or, if the market price of the cotton on which he borrowed the money—I refer to the price per unit; for instance, the price of a bale of cotton—is lower than the support price, he can deliver the cotton—deliver it physically—to the Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is right.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then the Government steps in and pays the local banker the note. But these people claim, as I understand, that they paid off the note before it came due.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In one instance the Delta & Pine Land Co. paid it off; in another year they did not.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator from Delaware refer to the interest?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; they call the interest a profit.

It is my contention that the overall cost to the U.S. Government, in supporting the cotton crop under all programs combined must be averaged across the board. The net overall cost is the answer.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; I think that would be true, from the standpoint of the Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. From the standpoint of the Government and the taxpayers.

By the same token, in the case of a farmer who left his cotton under loan and did not pay off the note, it should not be said that the entire transaction represents a loss any more than it should be said that all of it represents a profit when it is paid off. The existence of either a loss or a profit must be determined on the basis of how much the Government pays out in support of that farm product under all programs. Only in that way can a correct determination be made as to the existence of either

a loss or a profit. On that basis the Government has sustained a loss of over \$800 million on cotton and it has sustained a loss on every cotton farmer. That is true because all farmers benefit from the program—both the farmers who sell their products on the domestic market and those who place them under Government loan.

I repeat again—it is perfectly ridiculous for anyone to maintain that the Government made money by supporting the cotton crop of a farmer solely on the premise he paid off his note. If anyone wishes to challenge that statement I would be glad to yield. Under most of these programs a large percentage of the loans might be repaid but the Government itself makes that possible by purchasing the cotton or other crops at artificially high prices in the open market. This boosts market prices and makes it possible for the borrowers then to sell their cotton and pay off their loans. But both transactions considered together represent an overall loss.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator from Delaware advocate that all farm programs be completely eliminated?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No; but I do not think the Government should subsidize the production of the large farms, and I think the existing law should be amended lowering the support prices and placing limits on the amount of assistance for any one operator.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, is the Senator from Delaware advocating that, in the case of any one farm—whether one owned by the Ford Motor Co., or one owned by a British company or one owned by an individual farmer—we permit the one who operates the farm to borrow not in excess of a certain number of dollars each year?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I would place a limit and restrict all benefits to bona fide family-type farmers.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does not the Senator from Delaware realize that if that were done, it would be better to have no program at all? And if that were the case, the little farmer would be subsidized 100 percent, because if we were to permit the large farmers to produce all that they could—in the case of either corn, wheat, or other crops—there would be even greater production than there is at the present time, and therefore the prices would be lower than they are today. In my opinion, the net result would be to accomplish nothing at all, other than to subsidize the small farmers.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Indiana has a right to his opinions; but I do not agree with him.

I do not believe it would be found that under such a program the large farmers would plant large acreage as freely as they are doing now, when they can place in the Government's storage bins all the crops they produce and can place them under loan at a high guaranteed price.

If it be true that the farmers would produce just as much, with low prices, then why did we establish during the war the agricultural program with high supports as an incentive?

Mr. CAPEHART. The Congress should not have done it; it was not necessary.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I believe that during World War II, when the country needed increased agricultural production, high supports were in order as incentive payments, and the record shows that the farmers responded. But today, long after the war is over, we are still making the high incentive payments, regardless of the size of the farms.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to disagree there with the able Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Indiana has a perfect right to do so.

Mr. CAPEHART. My best judgment is that, regardless of whether supports are paid or are not paid, the American farmers, particularly the large farmers who use power equipment and similar facilities and must operate their farms in any event, will till every available acre to the maximum extent and will grow every dollar's worth they can grow, on the theory that the lower the price, the more units they must produce in order to obtain more dollars with which to meet their expenses. For example, if corn is going to sell for \$1 a bushel, such a farmer will cultivate the corn and will fertilize it in such a way that he can obtain, let us say, 100 bushels an acre, because thereby he will obtain \$100 a year per acre.

If he can get \$1.50 for a bushel of corn if he grows 65 bushels per acre, he is getting the same number of dollars. That is where I disagree with Secretary Benson. If I understand Secretary Benson's philosophy—I think I understand it, and if I am wrong, I hope he or somebody else will correct me—it is that the lower the price, the more farmers will be forced out of farming, the marginal farmers will be forced out, the less the bigger farms will raise; therefore, production will be controlled. There will be less production on the market, and the price will go up.

I disagree in this respect with the philosophy of Secretary Benson and would say also that I am not an absentee farmer, as the Senator from Delaware has made reference to some of the farmers as being; I sign the checks and pay the bills and participate actively in the management and control of my farm.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Indiana lives in Washington and draws a salary, the same as I do. I call both of us absentee farmers.

Mr. CAPEHART. I understand.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am merely pointing out that neither the Senator from Indiana nor the Senator from Delaware needs the agricultural program.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree. I am trying to arrive at the best way to improve the program. I hope we can engage in a colloquy, and get into the Record how the whole program operates and how it works.

However, I disagree with the Senator, and I disagree with Secretary Benson that if the farmer who has the acreage is eliminated, production will be reduced. I say production will be increased. If I can give a personal example, I do not have a big farm, but I will say I am going

to till every acre every year regardless of price. I am going to use fertilizers and cultivation methods that will produce for me more units.

I am doing the same thing in cattle feeding and hog raising. I am feeding cattle on the basis that I can make \$30 a cow or \$30 a beef, whereas 20 years ago if a farmer who was feeding cattle did not make \$60 to \$75 a beef, he thought he could not stay in business. We are going to feed more cattle and try to make \$30 on each one, so we can get the same amount of dollars we used to get when we were making \$60 to \$75 on each beef.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator has just said that, as a farmer, he would cultivate all of his acreage, produce all of the crops he could, and use all the fertilizer possible to increase production, regardless of price. All I can say is that he would not make a success of farming by following such practices. I am sure that if the Senator in his manufacturing business increased his production to the maximum, whether such production could be sold or not, and marketed such production regardless of price, he or anybody else would soon end up in bankruptcy, just as the U.S. Government will by pursuing this policy.

Mr. CAPEHART. Since the Senator is getting personal—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am not getting personal.

Mr. CAPEHART. I may point out that I have been in the business of manufacturing radios and television sets.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am sure the Senator manufactured and sold them according to the market.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is right. Since the Senator is getting personal, let me say this. I think this is one of the problems involved in the Senate. I think it is one of the problems involved in the United States. The Senator from Delaware is a big chicken farmer. He raises chickens by the tens of thousands. He is interested in a high price for his chickens and a low price for feed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Would it interest the Senator from Indiana to know that I am not producing broilers? Furthermore, I have not accepted any subsidies from the Government under any of the farm programs. Now let us get back to the subject.

Mr. CAPEHART. Neither have I been connected with any manufacturing business for a long while.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Any man, whether he be a farmer or in business operates according to the margin of profit. The less the margin of profit, the less the incentive. I do not think we can get away from that principle.

I know we debated this question 2 or 3 years ago, when certain amendments were proposed. The Senator from Indiana took the other side of the question. He had a perfect right to his argument that this program should not be restricted to the small farmer. My own position is that we should not support these large types of operations. To support that position I am trying to point out that, with the administration of the law as it is written, the major part of the benefits are going to the large operators. One cannot get away

from that point statistically. Whether it is right or wrong is a question for Congress to decide.

I should like to continue reading the telegram and answer their claims. The wire next refers to the Woolfolk Farms, Tunica, Miss. This company in 1957 pledged 1,051 bales of cotton, for which they received a loan of \$155,787.12. Nine hundred and eighty-six bales of this cotton were withdrawn and sold, leaving 65 bales in the loan. Interest paid amounted to \$2,120.76—again the assumption is that this represented a profit to the Government because interest was paid on the loan.

In order to sell that cotton in the domestic market, the domestic market was supported by the U.S. Government and the American taxpayer. At the national average cost of the cotton support program, it cost a total of \$23,437.30 on those 1,051 bales of cotton. In addition, there was paid to this same Woolfolk Farms \$40,500 in the same year not to grow cotton on another 500 acres.

I just say there is not enough money in the Federal Treasury to be paying out \$40,500 to one farmer not to grow cotton on 500 acres, and then advancing another \$155,000 to guarantee profitable operations on the rest of his farm.

Members of Congress can defend that kind of operation all they please. The President has estimated that this year it is going to cost \$5 billion to underwrite the cost of our agriculture program unless the law is amended. We ought to recognize the problem we face and correct it. The fault is right here in the Congress.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am not defending it. I am against it. As I said, I would vote to repeal the existing parity price laws and freeze the surpluses tomorrow. I only raise the question to get into the RECORD what I thought was a constructive description of the operation of this program and to point out that we have a terrific problem before us, and to discuss the best way to handle it.

Others may disagree with me; the Senator from Delaware is one of them. He may well be right. I may well be wrong. I know Secretary Benson feels the same way, as do others who possibly are wiser than I am. My conclusions are based on my experience from being raised on a farm, as one who is engaged actively in farming, as one who has participated from time to time in the program. My best judgment is that the lower the price goes, the more acres are going to be tilled and the more production there will be. Of course, we can get to the point where all the farmers can be bankrupt. I am not talking about a price which will automatically bankrupt the farmers. I am talking about what might be considered low prices, such as exist at the moment, because the average farmer is getting about a dollar a bushel for his corn. This price may not necessarily bankrupt the farmer, but it is a low price.

My feeling is that the farmer is going to grow just as much, or maybe more, if the price is low.

I agree with the Senator 100 percent that the so-called support prices, when acreage rather than units are supported, have outlived their usefulness. That program has not worked. It has cost the American taxpayers billions of dollars. We now have surpluses amounting to \$9 billion. Therefore, we ought to do something about the problem. I, for one, am perfectly willing to join with the Senator from Delaware or any other Senator in repealing the parity price support law and that we freeze the surpluses.

I would not do that without freezing the surpluses. If we will freeze the surpluses and take them completely off the market, except for possible use in conditions of starvation, I think the American farmers and particularly the little farmers will be much better off than they are under the existing law. I know the taxpayers will be better off.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not think there is quite the difference of opinion between the Senator and me as might appear from the debate. We both agree that the present law is not working and that Congress should act promptly to correct these inequities.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is not working. I have said that for a long time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It would not be practical to repeal all the laws relating to surpluses and to dump all of these products on the market, but we can begin by taking certain necessary steps.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct. We would have to freeze the surpluses.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We are both in agreement that something should be done to work out a solution. I hope, even though we may not agree as to all of the details that as a result of the debate we can devise a more constructive agricultural law. We cannot afford to keep on paying \$4 billion to \$5 billion a year in this manner. These heavy expenditures are not of benefit to the small farmers. This program is not helping the family-type farmers. They do not receive the benefit from the huge amounts we spend on these operations.

I read again from the telegram wherein a claim is made with which I am in complete disagreement. I quote:

The CCC loan program is not a subsidy. It is designed to provide farmers with the opportunity to market crops in an orderly manner and thereby prevent seasonal gluts and sharp breaks in farm prices.

This program is a subsidy.

Mr. CAPEHART. That possibly is the best part of the program.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, but we cannot get away from the fact that the CCC loan program, Public Law 480, and all these programs, must be treated as a combination, and as a combination they are a subsidy program for agriculture.

I can agree fully with the theory that this is only one of many subsidy programs. I was in Delaware some time ago and made the statement that other segments of industry are subsidized to a comparable degree. I think the time has come, particularly in the light of our present budget condition, when we must recognize that these subsidies have gone too far. We must roll these programs

back in order to protect the American taxpayer as well as American industry. I am not referring only to this program. There are segments of the mining industry, the aviation industry, the merchant marine, and many others today which enjoy the benefit of checks for subsidies from the taxpayers, and I think this procedure should be reviewed and revised.

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe the Senator agrees with me on at least one item. I have proposed legislation, of course, with the purpose of making certain that the Federal Government will not loan money to anyone at an interest rate lesser than that which the Government pays on its borrowings. I think the Senator will agree that is one thing we ought to do.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That would be one phase of a subsidy program. But after all, let us be realistic. That is only a minor part of the overall problem with which we have to deal.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is a small part.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is a small part. The farm problem is a much greater problem.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

Mr. CAPEHART. What is the regular order?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have a perfect right to yield to the Senator from Indiana for a question.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I now yield to the acting majority leader.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to ask the Senator from Delaware a question, but I want to predicate it upon a brief statement.

First, I have greatly enjoyed the colloquy we have just heard. I certainly agree we are badly in need of new basic farm legislation. I think one of the best bills which has been introduced—I have not heard it mentioned in the discussion—is a bill introduced by the Senator from Indiana. I am a cosponsor of the bill, as are a good many other Members of the Senate. I refer to the bill which provides for adequate research into the use of farm products. It seems to me we are going to have to do a great deal of that before we succeed in getting rid of our surpluses.

I am in sympathy with what the Senator from Delaware is advocating, which is some control with reference to the payments to the big corporate concerns. However, I have seen efforts made repeatedly in the Senate to control that matter, and we have always had the greatest difficulty in drawing a clear line.

The Senator from Delaware was not present in the Chamber during the morning hour, when I made a very brief statement relating to one of the examples referred to in the table the Senator had printed in the RECORD the other day. I refer to a farm in a little place called Sardis, Ala., which was listed in the table offered by the Senator from

Delaware the other day as having received a loan of \$156,778, if I remember the figure correctly.

I noticed in the press report in the *Montgomery Advertiser*, following the publicity in connection with the matter, a statement that one of the owners of the farm brought out the fact that there are 190 tenant families on the farm and not a single dollar of the money went to any of the owners of the farm, but all of the money went to these 190 individual families.

The entire farm has a cotton allotment of some 1,400 acres, and the 190 tenant families grew 750 bales of cotton which were put into the loan program, but every dollar of the money went to them. I think I am correct in saying that the people who own the farm live on it, and are not what we might call absentee landlords. They simply do not grow cotton. The 190 families are dependent upon the program.

Instead of that case actually being what it appeared to be from the table, and instead of the money going into the hands of a big farm operator, the fact is the money went into the hands of 190 small individual farmers.

I do not know how one is going to make provision for that situation. If the Senator from Delaware has some suggestion as to taking care of a situation such as that, I should like to hear it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That sounds like a New Deal trickle-down theory. If there are over 100 families who have cotton acreage—

Mr. SPARKMAN. There are 190 families.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If there are 190 families who have the cotton acreage upon which the payments are being made, why were the checks not made out directly to those families? Why is this money siphoned through one man? One cannot get away from the fact that based upon the report furnished by the Department of Agriculture—I understand there is no question about it—Dr. J. B. Hain, of Sardis, Ala., put 906 bales under loan and received a check for \$156,778.95. Why should we have an agricultural program which has to brokerage down through any individual for 190 families in the hope that a part of the proceeds will trickle down to the real farmers.

Mr. SPARKMAN. My understanding of the matter is that the Department of Agriculture requires the owner of the farm to be tied in with the tenants on the farm, unless there is a clearly defined operation which gives complete control of the matter to the tenant himself. My understanding is that if there is anything like a percentage operation, sharecropping, or anything of that kind, with the owner retaining part control over the matter, the request has to go through the owner. Perhaps the Department of Agriculture can handle that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It has to be approved by both, but checks due the tenant can be paid to the tenant.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I certainly would agree that if it can be done safely and without too much trouble administratively, it would be better to have the payments made directly to the 190 ten-

ants on the farm. That would give a clearer picture of the operation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not know how the loan was handled, but as I understand the program, a large percentage of the loans on cotton were repaid, but they were repaid only because of the ability to sell the products in a domestic Government supported market. That domestic market is supported by taxpayers' money. It means not only higher taxes but also higher consumer prices for cotton goods.

The cost may or may not be justified, but at least let us recognize that there is a cost. There is no profit.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know what the figures are as of this date, but I do know that a year or so ago I saw the figures, and so far as cotton is concerned—and we are speaking of cotton in connection with these particular payments—the program had not cost the Government anything, but the Government had actually made a profit from its cotton operations.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No—

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know what the situation is today, but I know that a year or so ago that was the case.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. You are in error.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. To support my statement I quote no other authority than the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, Mr. COOLEY, who, even while taking exception to my statement, still called attention to the fact, rather critically, that in the past 5 years the support program on cotton alone had cost \$900 million. I quoted a figure of \$835 million for the past 3 years.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Was that for cotton?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. For cotton; yes. That is a matter of record.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It may very well be; but up until recent years the Government had actually made a profit on its operations in connection with cotton.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. First let me reply to the Senator from Alabama, and then I shall be glad to yield.

I quote the statement of Representative COOLEY last Thursday, in which he was referring to statements which I had made:

That under the present administration we have lost in the last 6 years on the cotton program approximately \$900 million.

The figures I placed in the record were approximately \$835 million, but the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture might have had an extra year or two in his calculations. I considered only the past 3 years. The major part of the losses occurred in 1954, 1955, 1956, and 1957.

Whether payments should be made without any regard to the size of operations is a point on which there may be a difference of opinion. But there can

be no difference of opinion on the fact that we are not making money on this program. We are not making money, and I have little patience for those who try to claim that we are.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say to the Senator from Delaware that I do not wish to be understood as arguing that present programs are adequate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I understand that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not believe they are. I think we should continue to work and search for some kind of program which will better the present condition of the farmer.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. On that point we are in complete agreement.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I agree that probably in the past few years we have lost a great deal on the price support program. We have been operating under what is called a flexible program.

I should like also to invite the attention of the Senator from Delaware to the fact that until 1953 cotton price supports were at 90 percent. The Government made money on its operations in that field. It made more than \$260 million on the cotton program in existence prior to 1953.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I should like to reply first to the reference of the Senator from South Carolina to the argument that the Government had been making money on cotton prior to 1953. I do not have the figures as to the exact operations at hand although I will say that we must not forget that in the early 1940's the Government was in a position with regard to excessive inventories similar to that in which it found itself 4 or 5 years ago. War broke out, and overnight the inventories became very valuable. As they were unloaded and paid for by other agencies for export to our allies and for other purposes naturally there was a profit on any inventory.

What we need is an agricultural program geared to benefit the small family-type farm and not to the theory that we must have war every 5 or 10 years to bail us out of our surpluses. We want a peacetime agriculture program. We are naturally concerned because we have a \$9-billion surplus of agricultural products; however, we all know that if we were to have war tomorrow those surpluses would be an asset, but we cannot maintain such a tremendous inventory waiting for a war. I think we should maintain a reasonable surplus. We do not want a war to come in order to make a profit on our agricultural products.

There is no disputing the fact that during the past 3 years our cotton program alone has cost the American taxpayers more than \$800 million, or an average of \$22.30 on every bale of cotton

produced in America in the past 3 years. In the face of that unchallenged fact and just because loans in connection with one particular program may have been paid back with interest it is absurd to say that we are making money on the operation. That repayment was made possible only by virtue of the fact that another agency put up the money to buy the cotton and then withdrew the cotton from the domestic market and exported it at a loss of over \$800 million to the taxpayers.

Furthermore, it is an unchallenged fact that the major percent of the price-support benefits of this cotton program went to the very large farmers.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think we have made a constructive contribution to the farm problem this afternoon. It is a serious problem.

In my opinion, unless we find some way to cure the situation, other than taxing the American people several billion dollars a year to support agriculture, we are going into a terrific economic tailspin one of these days. Perhaps it is not more than a couple of years away.

I, for one, am very desirous of avoiding such a situation. I am thinking very seriously at this moment of a program which would involve freezing our surpluses, doing away with our price support program, and appropriating perhaps a billion dollars a year, which is about 25 percent of what we are spending at the moment for so-called conservation controls, which means taking 100 million acres out of production, including entire farms. Then I would propose that we spend a reasonable sum—\$100 million or \$200 million—which is about one-fifth of what it costs each year to store our surpluses—to find new uses and new markets for farm products.

We are going to cure this situation in one of two ways—either by reducing production to the market level, or by finding new uses and new markets, so that our large production can be absorbed by the market.

As a businessman, I know that there are only two ways to increase business. One is to sell more to one's present customers. This seems to be impossible at the moment. The other is to find new customers.

We must find new uses for farm products. In the meantime we will have to show a great deal of courage in Congress in doing the thing that ought to be done, and I think that is the freezing of surpluses, except to people who are hungry. We must get away from the costly price support program about which the Senator has been talking. It has not only been costly, but it has not accomplished the purpose it was supposed to accomplish. It has been discriminatory, in that the big farmer has received a great deal of money and the little farmer has not received so much. The big farmers did not violate any law. The situation arose because of what is inherent in the law, inasmuch as we try to control acres instead of units of production.

Therefore I wish that the Senator from Delaware and others will give care-

ful consideration to the program of freezing surpluses and carrying perhaps \$9 billion in surpluses, and taking them off the market, just as we do in the case of strategic materials, which cannot be sold except by act of Congress.

I believe that if we do that we will be better off. I do not like this particularly, but we must be realistic. We find ourselves faced with facts. What are the facts? The facts are that we have followed a support program for 20 years, under which we have accumulated a \$9 billion surplus. Nevertheless we still have comparatively low farm prices. Something is wrong somewhere.

I believe we ought to have the courage to face the situation. We will have to take some drastic steps in respect to the farm problem. Otherwise we shall go into an economic tailspin. I remember that back in the 1920's—1925 and 1926 and so on—manufacturing and the general economy was pretty good. We were going big guns. However the farm prices were low for several years during that time. Finally we had a crash.

History may well repeat itself unless we in Congress have the courage to do what is necessary. The two things that are necessary are these. First, from the long-range point of view, we must find new uses for farm products. From the short-range point of view, we must freeze surpluses and go into some sort of conservation program under which we will take acres completely off the market, and take them out of cultivation for a given period of time.

If we have the courage to do that we can correct the situation the Senator from Delaware is talking about. It is not good. The big farmers do not like it. The little farmers do not like it. The big farmer is caught between the devil and the deep blue sea: "Shall I comply with the acreage restrictions and borrow on my crops and cooperate with the Government and other farmers, or shall I grow all I can and thereby contribute to the surpluses and thus further lower the prices of the little farmers?"

We cannot shoot the big fellow because he happens to own X number of acres. That is in accordance with the American system; there is no law against a corporation being in the farming business. There is no law against Henry Ford owning acres of land. He had the right to produce as much as he could or to put the acres into the acreage reserve and say, "We will not produce anything on those acres."

Therefore we have a very serious problem facing us. We ought to face the issues. The issues are very serious. The Senator from Delaware has been doing a good job in dramatizing the weaknesses and the ineffectiveness of the program. I hope that what we have said here today in our colloquy between the able Senator from Delaware and myself and other Senators will help dramatize the necessity for changing the law. After all, Congress passed the law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. We are sitting in the Chamber of one of the bodies of Congress that passed the law. Only we in Congress can change the law. The

Secretary of Agriculture cannot change the law. The President cannot change it. We and we alone are the only instrumentality in the world that can change the law. We ought to change it, in my opinion. We ought to dramatize all the weaknesses of the law, as the able Senator from Delaware is doing. That is the only way we are going to dramatize the law, by showing the country and the press and other Members of the Senate how serious the problem is, and what drastic steps we will have to take.

I again congratulate the able Senator for dramatizing the situation. I hope he will join with me and others—or I will join with him, it does not make any difference which way it is—in being courageous about this matter and in taking some very drastic steps, because it will take drastic steps, unless I am badly mistaken, to cure this whole problem.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate the contribution of the Senator from Indiana. Unquestionably he is entirely correct when he says that the solution of the problem lies in Congress. The Secretary of Agriculture, who has repeatedly recommended a change, has no alternative other than to administer the law as we write it. My criticism is not directed against what those people have done. We, in Congress, have made it possible for them to do it. The only way in which we can get the law changed is to show the people of America what this program is costing them. We must explode the theory: "Well, so what? It does not cost anything." Some even dare to claim that we are making a little money.

The fact is that we are not making money, and every Member of Congress knows it.

There is one other example of further interest to Senators, I am sure, which I should like to mention. First, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the entire telegram from which I have been reading.

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

GREENVILLE, MISS., February 26, 1959.

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Reference your statement that large corporate operators have received major benefits from farm program. Your source of information gave only part of story. Delta & Pine Land Co., of Scott, Miss., cited as recipient of second largest farm subsidy in 1957, used price supports to promote orderly marketing. This company placed 7,919 bales of cotton in the CCC loan for which they received an advance of \$1,167,502.35. Every single bale of this cotton was withdrawn from the loan before end of marketing year and sold on market. Government collected \$17,370 interest payment plus carrying charges, thus making a profit. Interest was paid on every dollar for every day it was used. Dan Seligman, Shaw, Miss., pledged 1,291 bales of cotton for which he received a loan of \$173,631.68. Mr. Seligman withdrew 1,205 bales of cotton and sold it on the market, leaving only 86 bales in the loan. He paid Government \$2,111.50 in interest. Woolfolk Farms, Tunica, Miss., pledged 1,051 bales of cotton for which they received a loan of \$155,787.12. Nine hundred and eighty-six bales of this cotton were withdrawn and sold, leaving 65 bales in the

loan. Interest paid amounted to \$2,120.76. M. S. Knowlton Co., Pertshire, Miss., pledged 1,075 bales for which they received a loan of \$155,438.80. Mr. Knowlton withdrew 1,008 bales, leaving 67 bales in the loan. He paid interest amounting to \$2,197.44. J. G. Adams & Son, Hughes, Ark., pledged 3,024 bales to the loan and received an advance of \$420,343.70. He withdrew all but 318 bales and sold it on the market. He paid \$2,871.82 interest. The producers rice mill of Stuttgart, Ark., cited by you as receiving largest 1957 subsidy, is a cooperative composed of 400 individual grower members. Price supports averaged less than \$4.00 per member. The CCC loan program is not a subsidy. It is designed to provide farmers with the opportunity to market crops in an orderly manner and thereby prevent seasonal gluts and sharp breaks in farm prices. Small farmers actually derive more benefit from the program since they are not in a position to protect themselves from price fluctuations. This information respectfully submitted in interest of full understanding. We hope you will see fit to include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

R. P. PARISH,
President, Delta Council.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I quote further from this telegram wherein I am criticized for what I said about the Producers' Rice Mill, Inc., Stuttgart, Ark. That corporation in 1957 borrowed \$1,460,902.11 on 254,075 hundredweight of rice.

The argument is made that this is a cooperative owned by the membership and therefore should be above criticism. If they wish to join in a cooperative that is their business, but that does not change the fact that the Government lost money. This program on rice is also costing a great deal of money. In 1957 the total production of rice in the country was 42,935,000 hundredweight. On that national production, in order to hold the prices at an artificially high level for the consumers and for the farmers of this country, we spent a total of nearly \$47 million. This was broken down as follows, \$1.9 million under Public Law 480, in donations to foreign governments, the Commodity Credit Corporation loss in 1958 was \$6.2 million. Under title I of Public Law 480, which are sales for foreign currency, we sold \$53.3 million worth of rice on which we recovered \$14.5 million. That left a loss under title I of Public Law 480 of \$38.8 million.

The total loss to the taxpayers was \$46.9 million. This averaged \$1.09 per hundredweight of rice for each hundredweight of rice that was produced in the United States in 1957. Therefore on the Producers Rice Mill, of Stuttgart, Ark., the Government lost a total of \$276,941.75 so far as their operations were concerned in supporting the rice grown by this organization.

We cannot escape the fact that the cost of the program, whether it is rice, cotton, corn, or any other commodity, must be assessed against the total amount of the commodities which have been produced in the calendar year. They must be averaged out. I think that this analysis clearly establishes that not by any stretch of the imagination can any of these programs be called profitable. If there be anyone who does

claim differently I would like to hear from them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a series of editorials supporting the criticism which I have made of the program.

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

[From the Washington Daily News,
Feb. 24, 1959]

IT HELPS WHAT FARMERS?

All that money you taxpayers have been pouring out in billion-dollar gobs to help the "little" farmers mainly is going to the big, corporation, factory-type farms. The little fellow just gets the hind end of it.

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS has nailed this fact again in a report to the Senate.

The biggest beneficiary of farm subsidies in 1957 was the Producer's Rice Mill, Inc., of Stuttgart, Ark. The Government gave this outfit \$1,460,902 to prop up the price of rice. (You taxpayers pay again in the higher cost of any rice you buy.)

This \$1,460,902 one company got, says Senator WILLIAMS, was double the subsidies the Government paid out to all the farmers for all their crops in the whole State of Pennsylvania. (The last farm census showed 128,876 farms in Pennsylvania.)

Just three of these big corporation farms (two in cotton and one in rice) among them got more than \$3.4 million in subsidies in 1957. This was more than all the subsidies paid on all crops to all the farmers of Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, and New Jersey. (The last farm census showed 190,359 farms in those four States.)

"The high rigid support program," said Senator WILLIAMS, "is little more than a Government guarantee on the operations of corporate-type farming and actually encourages and underwrites absentee ownership to the detriment of the small farmers."

To see how right the Senator is, take a look at Marshall McNeil's Washington dispatch on page 3 and see how only 54 of these big corporation farmers got nearly \$14 million in Government handouts in a single year.

[From the Washington Evening Star,
Feb. 24, 1959]

HELPING THOSE FARMERS

The biographical sketch on Senator WILLIAMS, Delaware Republican, in the Congressional Directory notes that he was "born on a farm" and that before entering politics he was in the "grain business." Now beginning his third successive term in the Senate, Mr. WILLIAMS has demonstrated on many occasions a high level of ability to get at the kernel of issues. He has done so again with a few facts and figures on how the whole "Rube Goldberg" structure of high, rigid farm price supports operates on behalf of the poor and the "little" farmers.

Mr. WILLIAMS has submitted to the Senate a Government report on where the really big crop subsidy money went in 1957. The biggest payment, of nearly \$1.5 million, went to a "farmer" named the Producer's Rice Mill, Inc., of Arkansas, to encourage the production and high price of rice. The next, of \$1.2 million, went to the Delta & Pine Land Co. of Mississippi for growing cotton, and the third, of \$854,000, to Westlake Farms of California, for some more cotton.

"The high rigid support program," Mr. WILLIAMS noted, "is little more than a Government guarantee on the operations of corporate type farming and actually encourages and underwrites absentee ownership to the detriment of the small farmers."

Mr. WILLIAMS' information and observations were inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with "no objections."

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer,
Feb. 25, 1959]

BIG FARMS REAP PRICE SUPPORT PLUMS

When Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Delaware Republican and one of the Nation's most articulate and courageous foes of governmental waste and extravagance, speaks out on the inequities of the present farm price support system his words merit close attention.

This goes, in particular, for his speech on the floor on Monday, when he demanded a change in the price support law on the ground, specifically, that it discriminates against the small farmer and in favor of the big grower.

His revelation that three big farm operators in Arkansas, California, and Mississippi received in 1957 support payments totaling \$3,400,000 is startling. But it is shocking to learn that these three payments to big growers exceeded the total paid in that year to all the farmers of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland.

We hear a great deal about the necessity of protecting the family-type farm and helping the small farmer to make ends meet at a time when prices of nearly everything the farmer must buy is increasing in price. But here is a situation in which not the small farmer, but the farmer with thousands of acres, is the chief beneficiary of Government largesse.

Furthermore, such huge payments to a few growers can scarcely help but encourage the consolidation of farmlands into bigger and bigger tracts and promote absentee ownership.

It seems to us that Senator WILLIAMS is right in saying that the "support program as the law is now written is definitely not in the best interests of the bona fide American farmer." In addition, of course, is the fact that under this system crop surpluses amounting to more than \$9 billion, a tax charge against the whole Nation, have been piled up in storage.

What is needed, at the very least, is a revision of the price support law to bring about fairness to the small farmer—and an end to the million-dollar favors handed out to a few owners of huge farm operations in the South, Midwest, and West.

[From the Delaware State News, Feb. 25,
1959]

CORPORATION FARMING

(By Jack Smith)

Our senior U.S. Senator from Delaware, JOHN J. WILLIAMS, is at it again.

And this time he has taken to task the policy of high rigid price supports for agriculture.

The other day Senator WILLIAMS read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some amazing facts—which indicate that the healthy hunk of tax dough we have been paying out, thinking we were helping farmers, has gone to big farm corporations.

There is a definite tendency toward the larger farm. The cost of investment in equipment is making the small farmer, the individual who really built this Nation, obsolete.

But this doesn't mean that all our farm land will be eventually owned or leased by huge corporations—along the lines of General Motors. Here in Delaware there are many fine examples of the medium size farm where the farmer, with adequate equipment, is able to till the soil and make a decent living for himself and his family.

And sure enough, in States like this where acreage is privately owned is where you find the greatest resistance to Government help and subsidy. Like the small businessman, which he is, the farmer would like to make his own way with a minimum of interference.

So it is from the extensive acreage of the Middle West where you get the demands for aid to agriculture. And it is a program that has seen great excesses and, getting beyond control, has cost the American taxpayer many billions in the past few years.

Senator WILLIAMS, in the report he had read into the Record this week, advocates that the high rigid price support program be repealed and that the Secretary of Agriculture "be given greater discretionary authority to lower support prices on basic crops."

The Williams report shows that just two operators received over 2½ million support on two basic crops produced in 1957. The first, the Producer's Rice Mill, Inc., Stuttgart, Ark., received Government support on rice produced in 1957 in the amount of \$1,460,902.11.

The second, the Delta & Pine Land Co., Scott, Miss., received \$1,157,502.35 government support on cotton which they produced in 1957.

"As a comparison," Senator WILLIAMS says, "I call attention to the fact that these two operators received from the Government in support of their 1957 crops over five times as much as the total amount of price support received by all the farmers of the State of Delaware on all the crops they produced in 2 years—1956 and 1957."

"These two companies alone in 1957 received more in price support for their crops than did all of the farmers in the State of Maryland combined."

"The \$1,460,000 which one of these companies received in support of their rice crops in 1957 represents an amount double that which was received by all the farmers in the State of Pennsylvania on all their crops for the same year," the Delaware Senator pointed out.

"As a further comparison there were three companies—one in Mississippi, one in Arkansas, and one in California—which received over \$3,400,000 in price support operations on the 1957 crops. That is greater than the total amount received on all the crops produced in 1957 by all the farmers in Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey."

"There were 18 large operations in the United States any one of which in 1957 received over four times as much as the total amount received on all the crops by all the farmers in our State of Delaware last year."

"I cite these figures with the comparisons to emphasize that the Government's price support program as the law is now written is definitely not in the best interests of the bona fide American farmer. Instead of being in the best interests of the family type operation, the Federal Government under the present law is with the taxpayers' money encouraging and financing the consolidation of the farms under absentee ownership," Senator WILLIAMS concluded.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Feb. 26, 1959]

THE POOR FARMERS

Going down the list of those poor farmers who were helped by the Government in 1957, Senator WILLIAMS of Delaware finds two who fared sumptuously. One was a firm in Arkansas that received \$1,460,902 on rice, and the other a firm in Mississippi that drew \$1,157,502 on cotton. The Senator read a long list of firms that were handed checks from the Treasury of over a million dollars.

There is no charge of fraud in these transactions. They are simply the result of the working of our price support and subsidy programs. The larger the firm the higher the payments.

The idea of a subsidized agriculture was born of the necessity to help out farmers who were going into bankruptcy. It has now grown to the point of aiding large corporate establishments. Programs that

have so far departed from their original objective call for a sharp revision.

The millions of dollars these firms receive from the Treasury are only one item in the general taxpayer burden. The housewife pays again in higher food prices when she goes to market.

[From the Washington Daily News, Feb. 27, 1959]

TAKE AND TAKE, YOU PUT

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS has put another silly face on the farm laws.

Earlier in the week he gave the Senate a list of 54 corporation-size farming outfits each of which—quite legally—had collected \$100,000 or more (up to nearly \$1.5 million) as price supports on crops grown in 1957.

Now he informs the Senate that 10 of these same corporations also had collected—quite legally—amounts ranging from \$20,761 to \$125,942 in the same year for taking land out of production.

In sum, 10 corporations got nearly \$3.5 million for growing crops and the same 10 got an additional \$557,000 for not growing crops.

Most of them got paid for not growing the same crops they got paid for growing. Four got checks from Uncle Sam for not growing different crops.

The corporations take their crops to Government storehouses and take home a check, charged to you taxpayers. The Government rents the storehouses, you taxpayers pay the rent. Corporations take some of their land out of production, you taxpayers pay them for that.

This is supposed to stabilize agriculture and save the family farm. But the big farms get the most subsidy because they raise the most crops. And they get the most from the soil bank because they have the most land to spare for it.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to ask the Senator one or two questions which have been raised in my mind by the Senator's very able presentation with respect to some of the oddities, what might be called the believe it or not, in our farm program. I should like to ask, first, how much the farm program has cost the American people, in the Senator's opinion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The estimate furnished by the President in his message to Congress is that in the current fiscal year it will cost about \$5 billion; and I have no reason to dispute the figure.

Mr. GRUENING. Does not the able Senator believe that the elimination or the reduction of that program would be a very helpful step toward balancing the budget?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Certainly. I think the time is long overdue when some recognition should be given to the extravagant cost of this program. As I have said before, I do not think the \$5 billion which is being spent is accruing to the benefit of bona fide American farmers. It is going largely to the very large farmers.

Then the Government offered the soil bank proposal to the farmer and said, in effect, "If you will cut back 20 percent or 30 percent, we will pay you so much an acre." The large farming operations can better afford to do that because all they need to do is to run a combine or a tractor into a shed and lay off two or

three men. But a small farmer, having one combine, one tractor, and one cornpicker, cannot, with any degree of efficiency, reduce his operations. If he does, his cost of production will increase. So he cannot take advantage of this program.

I grant that the law does not spell out that the program is for the benefit of the large farmers, but it just works out that way unless we enact limitations. The small family farmer cannot afford to participate in these programs because he cannot cut his acreage allotments. The Government is spending each year millions of dollars to support the big farm operations and thereby enables them to buy up the little farms with the taxpayers' money.

I have no objection to any individual or corporation buying and owning as much land as he or it can pay for and operate under our American economic system. I believe in that system. But I do not believe that the money of the taxpayers should be used to foster or to aid in the goal of absorbing neighboring farms. If a farm operator wants to do that, let him do it with his own money.

Mr. GRUENING. Does the Senator believe there is an economic or a moral justification for paying farmers or others for not growing a crop?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There is a legal obligation, and I am here advocating a change in the law.

Mr. GRUENING. Did I understand the Senator correctly to say that he thought there was something improper or not quite right about a person who was employed elsewhere, such as in Washington, drawing payments as an absentee landlord for not growing a crop on his farm?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I did not say it was improper or illegal. The law as written and as it was passed by Congress provides that absentee owners may collect the benefits just the same as bona fide family farmers. Amendments were offered on the floor of the Senate to correct that situation. Congress in its wisdom, or otherwise, rejected those amendments. No limitations were placed on the payments. That which those men are doing is 100 percent legitimate, and Congress is responsible.

The criticism should be against Congress. Having passed the law, then, if we do not like it, we have been negligent in not correcting it.

The Secretary of Agriculture before our committee has repeatedly called this situation to our attention and has urged the enactment of legislation which would correct it. He testified before the committee again the other day urging that we do something to change the law—at least to eliminate some of these abuses which I am mentioning today. When I say "abuses," I say it advisedly, because while I think the practice is wrong, even though Congress authorized it, I do not say it is immoral or illegal.

Mr. GRUENING. But the Senator would say it is undesirable.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Absolutely. I think the law should be corrected. I do not think the money of the taxpayers should be used to finance or

encourage absentee ownership. There is nothing wrong with absentee ownership. I defend it. I own a farm, and I defend the right to do so. But the Federal Government should not be called upon to help me operate the farm. I am not a farmer and do not claim to be. I do not think absentee owners should be defined as farmers. I do not think anyone who earns his living away from the farm should be defined as a farmer. I do not think a farm program of any description is needed to subsidize such persons.

Mr. GRUENING. Does the Senator mean that a person living away from the farm should forego the receipt of the taxpayers' money to pay him for not growing something?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do.

Mr. GRUENING. Would the Senator wish to comment upon the newspaper reports about the payments made to President Eisenhower for not growing corn or wheat on his farm at Gettysburg?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Such payments would have been eliminated by amendments which I offered in the Senate but which were rejected by Congress.

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. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

THE NECESSITY FOR A NATIONAL FUEL AND ENERGY POLICY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to state for the record a situation which seems to exist with respect to the effort the Government has made, through Congress and the executive branch, to prevent the domestic petroleum and coal industries from being undermined by the imports of crude petroleum and petroleum products.

FORMER EFFORTS TO CURB IMPORTS HAVE FAILED

Early last week I introduced a bill to provide that Congress should seek ways and means to stimulate the domestic production of petroleum and coal. The bill was sponsored by a large number of Senators and was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The reason for the introduction of the bill was that, although an effort has been made since 1955 to place restraints upon the importation of petroleum, including residual fuel, the effort has not been a success. Congress, in extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act in 1955, included a provision authorizing the President to establish restraints, provided it appeared to him that the national security was involved. As it happened, a finding to that effect was made. The Special Cabinet Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy, under the chairmanship of the then Director of Defense Mobilization, reported in that year as follows:

Since World War II importations of crude oil and residual fuel oil into the United

States have increased substantially, with the result that today these oils supply a significant part of the U.S. market for fuels.

The committee believes that if the imports of crude and residual oils should exceed significantly the respective proportions that these imports of oils bore to the production of domestic crude oil in 1954, the domestic fuels situation could be so impaired as to endanger the orderly industrial growth which assures the military and civilian supplies and reserves that are necessary to the national defense. There would be an inadequate incentive for exploration and the discovery of new sources of supply.

The purpose of the bill which my co-sponsors and I introduced was to do precisely what the report of the Director of Defense Mobilization advised, namely, to provide an adequate incentive for the exploration and the discovery of new sources of supply both of petroleum and of coal. That has not been done.

Two orders have been issued as a result of the provisions contained in the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Both of them have resulted in increasing supplies.

Perhaps it is proper to say that these orders restrained the rapid increase which previously was occurring. But there were substantial increases, so that today the position of the domestic petroleum and coal industry is far worse than its position was in 1955, when the action was taken.

ANOTHER FINDING REGARDING NATIONAL SECURITY REQUESTED BY OCDM

Recently, however, because the two previous orders were not adequate to do the job which the Congress and the Executive desired to do—because the President signed the bill Congress proposed—the Department of State and the Department of Defense called upon the Government agency which deals with the national security, the OCDM, to make another finding. Great secrecy has been thrown around the findings of that group. It was announced at the White House, last week—as I recall, it was either on Friday or on Saturday morning—that a report had been received from Governor Hoegh, who is the head of this agency. The newspapermen asked at the White House for the text; but they were not given the text. They asked whether Governor Hoegh had freedom to speak. The reply was that he has the freedom of speech, but that there was very much doubt as to whether he would answer any questions on this subject; I am told that was the response by Mr. Hagerty, the press representative of the President, to the press representatives of the public, when they sought the news and appeared at the White House.

COOPERATION OF CABINET COMMITTEE SOUGHT IN PRESERVING OIL AND COAL INDUSTRIES

On last Thursday, following the introduction of this bill, I submitted, for printing in the RECORD, a telegram which I had sent the previous day to the Chairman of the President's Cabinet Committee on Oil Imports. The chairman happens to be the Acting Secretary of Commerce, Adm. Lewis Strauss. My telegram was dated February 25, and I

shall now read it, as it appears on page 3032 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, February 26, 1959:

While Prime Minister Macmillan was sightseeing in Moscow yesterday the Soviet dictator shocked him and all the western allies by the restatement of Khrushchev's threat that any violation of the borders of East Germany would be regarded by the Soviet Union "as the beginning of war." The Soviet troops leave Berlin before the end of May. We must be ready for the consequences. If war comes we must have a self-sufficient supply of petroleum and coal in full development. Mandatory controls can be successfully imposed only by Congress.

Mr. President, I interrupt the reading of the telegram to say that that was an expression of my opinion. The controls which had been in existence were voluntary ones, and voluntary only. They were criticized by many very able lawyers, both in and out of the Government, on the ground that they would undoubtedly result in violations of the Sherman Antitrust Act, because voluntary agreements among alleged competitors cannot very successfully be made without resulting in violation of those laws, even though, when the voluntary agreement is made, the representatives of the President do not gather all the importers together in one room.

I return now to the telegram which I sent to Secretary of Commerce Strauss. After saying, in the telegram:

Mandatory controls can be successfully imposed only by Congress—

I went on to say:

I invite you, as Chairman of the President's Cabinet Committee dealing with this matter, to cooperate with the Members of Congress who sponsor the legislation introduced this week in both the Senate and the House "to encourage the development of petroleum and coal reserves within the United States."

CABINET COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN PREFERS TO HANDLE PROBLEM BY EXECUTIVE ORDER

Mr. President, yesterday there came to my office a letter from the Secretary of Commerce. The letter is dated February 27, 1959, and is addressed to me. It reads as follows:

I appreciated receiving your telegram of February 25, 1959, with reference to the necessity of adequate control of imports of petroleum and its products in the interest of national security. Your message reached my office during my absence from the city on yesterday, hence the delay in this acknowledgement.

As you are undoubtedly aware, the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization is about to submit to the President his most recent findings with reference to the impact of the present rate of importation of petroleum and petroleum products on the national security, as required by section 8 of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958.

The Special Committee To Investigate Crude Oil Imports, established by the President, is prepared to act promptly upon whatever findings are forthcoming and expects that such action will be recommended to the President very shortly after the submission of those findings. If mandatory controls appear to be indicated, it is my belief that they can best be instituted by Executive proclamation for the reason that they would be more flexible than legislation if changes as a result of experience with the

program later should appear desirable in the national interest.

With best regards,
Sincerely yours,

LEWIS STRAUSS,
Secretary of Commerce.

EXECUTIVE IS ASSUMING LEGISLATIVE POWER

Mr. President, I regard this letter as wholly in harmony with the developments which have been taking place in recent years, by which the executive branch of the Government tends to assume to itself the lawmaking power which is granted by the Constitution of the United States to the Congress. This letter is a polite and gentlemanly one, and it is very clear. I think the last paragraph deserves rereading—as follows:

The Special Committee To Investigate Crude Oil Imports, established by the President, is prepared to act promptly upon whatever findings are forthcoming and expects that such action will be recommended to the President very shortly after the submission of those findings. If mandatory controls appear to be indicated, it is my belief—

That is the expression of the opinion of Secretary Strauss—

that they can best be instituted by Executive proclamation for the reason that they would be more flexible than legislation if changes as a result of experience with the program later should appear desirable in the national interest.

Mr. President, I think Members of Congress will be interested to know what "flexibility" means in the mind of the Secretary of Commerce. How does it happen that in this hour of international turbulence, which perhaps threatens a third world war, the Secretary of Commerce addresses to a Member of the Senate of the United States a letter in which the Secretary expresses the opinion that executive action is preferable to legislative action because the former is more flexible.

IMPORTS PRODUCED BY AMERICAN CAPITAL SENT ABROAD AFFECT DOMESTIC PRODUCTION

Now, the history of this importation business, with which the domestic industry has been struggling shows a great reduction in the production of coal and petroleum within the continental borders of the United States. Because of that reduction, the producers of these commodities are finding themselves threatened by the increasing importation of these products made abroad by American capital, sent to foreign countries to seek out new petroleum fields, to build new refineries, to make petroleum products, and to export those products into the United States, where the market here will make profits for the importers.

Many years ago the Supreme Court of the United States, in the well known Standard Oil case, ordered the Standard Oil Co. to divide into its several units. It was regarded by the Supreme Court of the United States, in the decision handed down by Chief Justice White, as a combination in restraint of trade, which was forbidden by the Sherman Act, and so those companies had to divide. Within a very short time some of those units which had formerly been combined in

the original Standard Oil Company of New Jersey became more wealthy, from the production of petroleum in the United States, than the Standard Oil Co. itself had been before the decision.

These companies, units created as a result of the decision by the Supreme Court, have been combining abroad, have been uniting again abroad, to develop the petroleum which they import into the United States, and which the President's Committee on Energy Resources found are threatening the security of the United States. In spite of that finding, these imports are being brought into the country, inundating our own productive capacity.

I regard this letter which has been read as a challenge to the constitutional right of Congress to legislate. We do not yet know what former Governor Hoegh has reported to the President, but rumor has it that a new order has already been written, that it may be mandatory; but nobody knows what the limitation will be. We do know that the importation, for example, of residual fuel, to the detriment of the coal-producing States of the Union, has been rising under the voluntary program. But nobody knows, and it may be that even the President himself may not know, what the President's committee has recommended.

WE ARE FACED WITH SERIOUS THREAT OF WAR

Oh, the Secretary of Commerce says it is something more flexible than Congress could do. Mr. President, ever since the Deputy Premier of Soviet Russia was in the United States making his tour from State to State, and meeting the people here and meeting the people there, the United States has been concerned, and all of the free world has been concerned, with the Berlin threat. Khrushchev made the threat, and he set a deadline. He said that if the Western allies crossed the boundaries of East Germany to enter Berlin, where the Western allies have the right to be, it would be an act of war. I do not think the dictator of the Kremlin will go that far, but I call attention to the fact that if it be an act of war, and if the Soviet Union undertakes to use the superior manpower which it has available close to Berlin to resist the rightful entry of the Western allies into West Berlin, such entry will mean war.

MODERN WAR IS ECONOMIC WAR

Long before we began to talk about the cold war now going on between Soviet Russia and the United States, everybody knew that modern war is economic war. We know that when we reflect on the huge debt which this Nation carries.

The people of the United States contributed to the war effort by the purchase of savings bonds, by the purchase of long-term Treasury bonds, by complying with rigid regulations that denied them the use of commodities like gasoline. When we were engaged in war, the people were ready to pay all the sums necessary. They were ready to bear all the sacrifices necessary to fight for human freedom.

FAILURE OF OIL PROGRAM HAS ALLOWED INCREASED IMPORTS RATIO

Now we note that, by reason of the failure of the voluntary oil program, the production of these vital national security fuels—petroleum, petroleum products, and coal—in the United States has been seriously obstructed.

I have exact figures, Mr. President, which are perhaps worth reading into the RECORD at this point.

All efforts to limit crude oil imports in the interest of national security have so far depended upon voluntary compliance. Although this program succeeded in halting the rapid upward rise of such imports, nearly a million barrels still enter this country every day. This total is still far in excess of national security limits. Moreover, the increases in imports of other petroleum products, particularly finished and unfinished products other than residual oil, have more than offset this slight decline in crude oil imports.

During the last six months of 1958 these other petroleum products constituted about 17 percent of total petroleum imports. As a result, the ratio of total petroleum imports to domestic crude oil production has continued to rise since the attempted restrictions of 2 years ago. In 1957 imports were 22 percent of domestic production. In 1958 they were slightly in excess of 25 percent. In January 1959, total petroleum imports soared to nearly 2 million barrels daily, almost 30 percent of domestic crude oil production.

IMPORTERS OPPOSE ANY RESTRICTIONS

The showings which have been made in presentations to Governor Hoegh by some of these importers make it clear that they are absolutely opposed to any restriction whatsoever. Some of these companies have filed their briefs to say that the importations must not be limited and that we must continue without voluntary or mandatory controls. That is an argument which is good enough for days of peace, Mr. President, but it is not an argument which is good enough for days of threatened war.

FUEL IS NEEDED TO WAGE WAR

Everybody knows that fuel—coal, petroleum, gasoline, residual fuels, and all the rest of these products—is essential to the manipulation and the use of modern weapons of war, not only tanks and airplanes but also missiles, whether they be intercontinental ballistic missiles or intermediate range missiles. They all need fuel.

We now know, we cannot deny the fact, that Soviet Russia leads the United States in the production of intercontinental ballistic missiles, missiles which can be fired from Soviet territory to reach this territory of ours. But the Secretary of Commerce says he does not want Congress to have any part in determining the policy that the United States should follow. If Congress shall not have any part in it, how can the people of the United States be sure and certain that what is being done in their defense is proper? It is common knowledge in Washington that those who

would like to make huge profits in the American market and who want the imports to come in without any restraint whatsoever are concerned more with the private profits of their companies than they are concerned with the defense of the United States. We cannot prepare for a shooting war or carry on an economic war by allowing our domestic industries to be undermined and destroyed by imports from abroad. If we allow this decline in production to continue, as it has been, we will lose the required know-how.

OIL INDUSTRY FAR WEAKER THAN IN 1955

I should like to continue with a line or two from the statement.

During 1958 domestic petroleum demand was 2.8 percent above that for 1956. Despite this fact, domestic crude oil production dropped from 7,151,000 barrels per day in 1956 to 6,704,000 barrels per day in 1958. That was a decline of 6.3 percent. Exploration and discovery also declined during 1957 and 1958. Exploratory crew activity was 19 percent below the 1956 level, and even further below the 1953 peak. The number of exploratory wildcat wells drilled declined for the second consecutive year to a level 26 percent below that for 1956. Total well completions were 16 percent below 1956, representing more than 9,000 less completions than in the 1956 record year of 58,000. Total footage drilled was also 16 percent below the 1956 level, and the number of active rotary rigs was down more than 26 percent.

Because of our failure to curb excessive imports, the industry is far weaker now than it was when the President's Cabinet Committee made its recommendations in 1955.

FLEXIBLE PROGRAM OF EXECUTIVE HAS HURT THE COUNTRY

"Flexible" is the word the Secretary of Commerce uses, and the Secretary is Chairman of the President's committee. He says "flexible." Well, flexible though Executive action has been, it has been destructive of the vital needs of the United States of America domestically and internationally. Our industry and our Defense Establishment are both suffering. More than that, Mr. President, with the petroleum industry declining and the coal industry also declining, income by way of taxes to the Treasury of the United States is falling.

These two industries and all who are engaged in them are waiting with bated breath for the announcement from the White House as to what the oil import program will be—as to what will be this flexible program which can vary up and down. Unless it is very much more successful than the two orders heretofore issued, it will be flexible to the detriment of domestic industry.

CONGRESS, NOT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES, WAS GIVEN LEGISLATIVE POWER

Let the RECORD show that when the fathers of the Constitution established this Government they created the Congress in the very first article of that instrument, and declared in that instrument that all legislative power granted

therein was to be vested in a Congress of the United States—all legislative power, not a part of it, not even any small part to make it more flexible.

The theory of the founders of this Government was that the people, through their representatives, are the source of legislative power—not a couple of Presidential committees operating behind closed doors.

I have been told by some of the representatives of those who have been protesting against the failures of control that when they have gone to a high official in one of the departments and asked to know what was going on, they were told, "We cannot tell you, because that information must be released by the President."

When they asked, "Shall we make our presentation to the President?" they were told "No, no, no. Do nothing of the kind."

LEGISLATIVE POWER IS EXERCISED BEHIND CLOSED DOORS BY ANONYMOUS APPOINTEES

We are drifting into the delegation of legislative power into the hands of the Executive, to be exercised in the name of the Executive by persons whom no one knows. We know the names of the members of the President's Committee, but who are the experts who gather around and draw the flexible mandatory plan? And who will be favored in the flexible mandatory plan?

The only proper way is the American way. The American way is stated in the Constitution. It is a danger to the United States of America and the aspirations of all mankind for freedom and control over their own Government when a Cabinet officer writes to a Member of the U.S. Senate who, with colleagues, has introduced legislation to impose mandatory control, and says in that letter:

If mandatory controls appear to be indicated, it is my belief that they can best be instituted by Executive proclamation for the reason that they would be more flexible than legislation if changes as a result of experience with the program later should appear desirable in the national interest.

THE PEOPLE ELECTED CONGRESS TO MAKE THE LAWS

The Congress of the United States will be in session for a long time if the international crisis continues as it now exists. The Congress of the United States is composed of men and women elected by their people in their States and districts. They are trusted by the people in their States and districts to have a knowledge of the needs of the country and the ability, in open hearings, the record of which can be read by all, to define, among other matters, the pattern of restriction of oil imports.

If the United States wishes to have a program to stimulate and develop its fuel resources in this great period of threatened war, which may destroy the very freedom for which we all aspire, the Congress must not permit the Executive to assume legislative power on the basis of the argument that the Executive is more flexible. We can look to Nikita Khrushchev and realize that executive power is more flexible; but it is not more free.

OUR FORM OF GOVERNMENT MUST BE PRESERVED WITH ITS SEPARATION OF POWERS

If the system which our forefathers gave to the world—a government of the people with divided powers—is to be preserved, we must preserve it here, and we must preserve it against the claims of executive representatives who think they are better than the Congress elected by the people of the United States.

They are not better, Mr. President. There may be many more able men, perhaps, but that I doubt. For years I have been associated with Members of the Congress on the floor of the House and in the Senate. I have associated with men in the executive branch of the Government; and I know that in both branches of our Government there are many men of high ability and patriotism.

But we are drifting because we do not hold our minds and hearts steadfast upon the nature of government by the people. That is the sort of government which the Soviet dictators wish to destroy. We cannot successfully prevent its destruction if we imitate some of their policies by disregarding the open forums of the Senate and the House and allowing our policies to be determined behind the closed doors of any agency of the executive branch of Government.

As I say these words, the President has not yet issued the new order. It may be lying on his desk. I do not know. Some of the members of the press think it is, and some of them think it is not. But that is not the way to show the peoples of the world who aspire to free government that we want free government. We cannot show them that we want free government by allowing these policies to be determined behind closer doors by the Executive act of a President who is operating upon the advice, not of the Congress, elected by the people, but of private advisers whom he has selected, and who in many instances have never passed the test of the ballot.

If we stand before the aspiring peoples of the world as the leader of free government, we must make sure that we have a government in which the Congress and the Executive work together, and not a government in which spokesmen for the Executive say to the Senate and the House, "You are not flexible enough for us."

Mr. HRUSKA. 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. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a plan of treatment for persons over 65 years of age with reduced incomes and modest resources constitutes one of the Nation's most urgent health problems. This has become true because of the great number of such persons who are living longer, thanks to

medical advances. There are, in fact, 15 million persons who are over 65 years of age living in the Nation today. In Iowa there are approximately 300,000, the highest percentage—11 percent—of senior citizens per capita in the Nation.

On December 4, 1958, the house of delegates of the AMA passed the following resolution:

That the American Medical Association, the constituent and component medical societies, as well as physicians everywhere, expedite the development of an effective voluntary health insurance or prepayment program for the group over 65 with modest resources or low family income; that physicians agree to accept a level of compensation for medical services rendered to this group, which will permit the development of such insurance and prepayment plan at a reduced premium rate.

The Iowa State Medical Society, on February 22, made Iowa the first State to offer at reduced rates to its senior citizens medical and surgical insurance protection through its Blue Shield plan. Such coverage will be offered for an average charge of \$2.50 a month for each subscriber if he is in a low income bracket. Additionally, insured families with incomes up to \$5,400 will have the full cost of certain medical-surgical expenses reimbursed. Previously, this full-type protection was offered to families with incomes under \$3,600. A \$5,400 income in Iowa is almost the median family income. Therefore, it is expected that 50 percent of Iowans are presently eligible for full coverage under this plan. In the last few months commercial insurance companies have also brought onto the market new and exciting non-cancelable contracts to cover aged persons.

I congratulate the Iowa physicians for these progressive and positive actions. This is Iowa's second major positive step in solving the vexing problem of improved health services to all citizens of the State. Last summer, in cooperation with the Iowa Hospital Association, the Iowa Nursing Home Association, and the Iowa State Dental Society, the Iowa State Medical Society formed the Joint Council for Care of the Aged.

It is my view that local programs of this kind, wherein all medical groups participate, will prevent the growth of government-dominated medicine. A well-written editorial of the Des Moines Register corroborates and better states my views, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Des Moines Register, Feb. 27, 1959]

MEDICAL CARE FOR AGED

The Iowa State Medical Society deserves congratulations for its new program of low cost medical insurance for persons over 65 who find it a hardship to pay medical bills.

The society is taking the lead in attempting to solve one of the country's most vital health problems. The plan calls for some financial sacrifice on the part of doctors. It's an experiment which, if successful in Iowa, probably would be adopted in many other States.

The plan was approved Sunday at a special meeting of the house of delegates of

the medical society. Some details remain to be worked out, but the program is expected to be put into effect by April.

The insurance will be written by Blue Shield, the nonprofit insurance plan of the medical society, and will be available to persons over 65 years of age. If the combined income of a man and his wife is less than \$3,000 a year, the couple will be entitled to full-service coverage. An individual can qualify if his income is under \$2,000.

The cost to the insured will be about \$2.25 to \$2.75 per person per month. Income from insurance charges would not be sufficient to pay in full the medical fees which doctors ordinarily charge. So the doctors will accept lower fees to be set by Blue Shield. The fees are expected to cover only overhead costs.

Blue Shield is working with Blue Cross to provide insurance which will cover both hospital and doctor expenses for the elderly at a cost of \$6.50 to \$7 a person a month. Blue Cross insurance, sponsored by the Iowa Hospital Association, covers hospital costs.

The elderly, who have retired from jobs that paid them a regular income, have less ability to pay medical and hospital expenses than people of working age. But they are more likely to incur heavy medical expenses. It's tragic if they don't get medical care because they can't afford it or if they are forced to become charity patients.

It is estimated that 210,000 of the 300,000 Iowans over 65 years of age will be eligible to take part in the new Blue Shield program. A high percentage of them now have no protection against heavy medical and hospital costs that may come at any time. A 1957 survey made by the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Chicago showed that nationally five out of every eight persons 65 and over had no health insurance protection.

A nation as prosperous as the United States, with highly skilled medical doctors and splendid hospitals, will not just do nothing about the problem of health care for its senior citizens in low income brackets.

Unless programs of the kind the Iowa society plans can be made truly effective, the Government will sooner or later take over the problem in response to general public demand. This is what the American Medical Association fears and why it recommended last December that doctors reduce fees to persons over 65 who have low incomes.

The AMA is bitterly opposed to the Forand bill in Congress. This calls for the Government to provide free hospital, surgical and nursing home insurance for everyone eligible for social security benefits. It would cost \$835 million a year. The AMA fears it would lead to free health care for everyone and Government control of medicine.

The Iowa society is taking the best way to fight socialized medicine. It recognizes the gravity of the problem of providing health care to the elderly at costs they can afford and is attempting to do something about this.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the editorial estimates that the annual cost of the Forand bill will be \$835 million. The sponsor of the bill estimates a more realistic cost of \$2 billion a year.

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. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CAUSES OF INFLATION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I think I need not discuss the evils arising from the inflation with which the Nation is now confronted. We are all familiar with the distress that is being caused to persons having fixed incomes, especially to women who must leave their families and work in order to supplement the family income.

The fact that the United States is losing considerable of her foreign market, due to the fact that prices have risen so high that in some areas we have not been competing as successfully as we have in the past, is well known to Members of Congress, to the Executive, and to the public.

I have been heartened by the interest which Members of Congress, both in the Senate and the House, have shown in trying to deal with this problem. It has been encouraging to note so much interest shown and action indicated by the Chief Executive, even though it may come at a late time.

The chief commodity to be considered in determining whether or not there will be inflation is steel. One thing which is quite certain, and on which I think most economists agree at present, is that this is not a demand, cushion inflation. It is not being caused to any great extent by the existence of an amount of money in excess of the commodities which can be purchased. There is an ample supply of commodities of almost every kind.

Even though business has improved, many plants at present are not operating at full capacity. In other words, the business concerns could produce more. We know also that there is continuing large unemployment, about 5 million persons being out of work. So there is unused plant capacity and widespread unemployment.

Mr. President, this is not inflation of the classic pattern. What we have been seeing is a rise in prices. On the one hand, labor says that its wages have not increased to any great extent beyond the increase in productivity.

Business says that most of the price increases have been due to wage increases. But, Mr. President, whoever is to blame, whoever is responsible for bringing about the present situation, is a matter of history.

The important point is that we do something about it now. The important need is that in the Congress and in the executive branch of the Government, including the procurement agencies, and in business and in labor, the facts be obtained, and that then there be unity in an effort to prevent a continuation of the merry-go-round we have been on during the last few years.

We know that in 1957, when the price of steel rose substantially about the first of June, there was a round of inflation. We know that in the case of the prices of almost all other products, the price of steel is an important factor—for instance, in the case of the price of automobiles, farm machinery, tin cans, hairpins—almost all of which use substantial amounts of steel. Thus, when the price of steel rises to any extent, that price rise tends to pyramid as it is passed from

industry to industry. So, when the price of steel rose about \$6 a ton about the middle of August of last year, there was another round of inflation.

Mr. President, I think both business and labor should look at the situation in this way: It does not benefit labor a great deal to obtain a little larger wage increase than the increase in productivity if within a few months there is to be a general rise in prices, with the result that the dollar buys less, so that the wage increase which labor has secured is wiped out by an increase in the cost of the things that those who labor have to buy.

On the other side of the picture, it does not help business any to demand very large profits and to have profits set at high levels, and then to have the prices of all other commodities geared to that amount of profits, if in securing those profits, and thus in being able to pay larger dividends, the value of the profits and the dividends is reduced by means of a decline in the value of the dollar.

Furthermore, Mr. President, industry has another big stake in this matter, in that, somehow, it must keep down prices, in order to retain its foreign market and, if possible, to increase its foreign market.

So both industry and organized labor has a great stake in attempting to stabilize prices, in order to stop the leap-frog inflation we have been experiencing.

Of course, as I have previously indicated, the greatest sufferers from such inflation are those who are not in either industry or labor; the greatest sufferers are those on fixed incomes, pensions, and life insurance policies, who do not have the bargaining power of labor union members, and have not saved enough money to tide them over difficult times.

So, Mr. President, it is of tremendous importance to our economy that everyone do what he can to see to it that there is not an increase in the price of steel at the expiration of the steelworkers' contract the end of June of this year.

I have proposed that the steelworkers not request a wage increase larger than the increase in their productivity, with the increase in productivity to be determined, if necessary, by an impartial board. That would be step 1. I have proposed that the steelworkers not request more than that, provided the steel companies do not increase their price for steel. But if, notwithstanding that position, the steel companies nevertheless were to increase their price for steel, then of course the unions would be free to try to secure their share of such an increase.

Mr. President, I know this may not be satisfactory or agreeable to Mr. McDonald—in fact, he said it was not—and I know it may not be agreeable to Roger Blough, the chairman of the board of the United States Steel Corp., or to others in the steel industry. But I hope that before the time runs out they will give the matter further consideration and prayerful consideration, because it seems to me that this is a time when something must be done, and it is a time when something can be done. The uncontroverted record is that in the 1940's there was a

more-than-average increase in the price of unregulated products which are not produced by concentrated industries; there was an above-the-average increase in the price of textiles, lumber, and farm products, which are competitive, and the price of which is usually regulated by the demand. But since 1953 the situation has been the other way around; in other words, the large price increases have been in the case of the products of the concentrated industries and the administered industries—for instance, in the case of steel and products which use steel, rubber, copper, aluminum, and other industries in which there is concentration.

The prices of the products of the competitive industries have fallen below the average price. The prices of textiles, farm products, and other products are below the average price. Only the fact that the prices of farm products and textiles have been below the average price has kept the cost-of-living index from rising any more than it has. The one industry in which prices have shot away up above the average price is the steel industry, which is substantially responsible for the large price increases in the products of other administered industries.

Mr. President, this matter is not just the business of Mr. Blough or Mr. McDonald; it is the public's business. Whether there is another round of inflation will depend on what they do. Whether we shall have a sound economy will depend upon the statesmanship they exhibit in the coming few months.

It should also be pointed out that the U.S. Government is, of course, the largest customer of all lines of business. The Government is having trouble balancing the budget. We know that the cost of munitions is rising frightfully, and the cost of everything else the Department of Defense procures—whether oil, steel, tanks, or guns—has been rising. So today we have to spend much more for Department of Defense "hardware" than we have had to spend at any other time during peace. Therefore, if the present situation continues, it will mean higher taxes and a lower standard of living for everyone.

I think I should point out that whereas we have had an increase of approximately \$36 billion in the gross national product—according to the 1958 figures—as compared to the situation in 1955, if that increase is measured in terms of 1955 dollars we find that we have had an increase of only \$1 billion in the gross national product.

Today the average person receives, in terms of money, a little bit more than he was receiving in 1955—that is to say, if we make the measurement in terms of the 1958 dollar or in terms of the value of the dollar in recent times. But if we make the measurement in terms of the value of the dollar in 1955, then we find that every person in the United States is \$7 worse off today than he was in 1955. So it will not help business or labor or anyone else to have the present spiraling inflation continue.

I know that labor and business may not like to have Members of the Senate talk about this problem. We have given

this matter a great deal of study and consideration in the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, of which I have the privilege of being chairman, but I feel we must speak out, because I think this is the No. 1 issue before the American people today. I think we have a formula at the present time—at least, if the steel industry will hold down prices and if the workers will not ask for any wage increase over productivity increase—that will in the long run be more beneficial to management and to labor than if there were continued what has been happening in the past. I think the influence of public opinion must be brought to bear in this very important matter.

I know this may not happen, and I hope it will not happen, but we have been hearing more lately about wage and price controls that we have in some time. As a matter of fact, some people are advocating such controls as perhaps the only way by which we can control inflation. However, wage and price controls cannot be put into effect only in the steel business or as to workers in a particular industry, because wage and price controls would have to be put into effect for products which go into steel-making. I think the result of price and wage controls all through our economy would be a frightful thing. There would be regimentation which might have a tendency toward socializing our industries.

During a time of war we can, of course, take extreme measures of that kind; but we certainly do not want to take such a step now. If inflation continues on and on and on, and the demand for such controls becomes greater and greater, we may come to such controls one of these days. I think now is the time to do something about the problem.

I think I should point out that for 26 months before the entry of the United States into World War II we, of course, had the kind of demand pressure which makes for inflation—a scarcity of goods and a great deal of money. There was a tendency to inflation in such a condition. The President of the United States used the force of his office, by means of conferences, by public appeals, by appeals to the patriotism of business and labor. Without any sanction of law, for 26 months, before the OPA was actually put into law by statute, the price line was held without very many price increases at all. There was very little increase in ceiling prices during that time.

Leon Henderson, I believe, was the OPA Administrator, but there was no law establishing the Administration. The President of the United States and others used the force of their offices to try to hold down prices and to bring reason to business and labor. They were successful in doing it. I am encouraged by some of the statements showing the concern of the President over the problem of inflation. I hope President Eisenhower and the members of his administration will use their great influence and great effort in holding down, not merely wages, but prices, in an effort to stabilize economic conditions during these very precarious times.

Mr. President, in the New York Times of Friday, February 27, 1959, there was published a very good article on this subject, discussing the whole problem, written by that very able columnist, Arthur Krock, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks; and I yield the floor.

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

STEEL WAGES, PRICES, AND THE COST PLATEAU
(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 26.—A question asked of the President at his news conference yesterday, and his reply, lifted the curtain only briefly on the next great inflationary threat to the domestic economy. This threat will be resolved or will materialize in the outcome of the oncoming wage negotiations in the steel industry.

If, as Senator Kefauver proposed and the President accepted in principle, steel wage adjustments are made on the criterion of equivalent increases in productivity, no new and powerful inflationary pressure should be the consequence of the negotiations. But if wages are again increased in disregard of the productivity factor, on the cozy pay-and-pass-on-to-the-public technique which industry has often employed to avert a strike, the general price scale will make a jet takeoff from the plateau where for some time prices have been resting from their long and steady climb.

The last similar threat, was dispelled when, after a technical strike lasting only 6 hours, the Ford Motor Co., and the United Automobile Workers made a 3-year contract that became a pattern for the industry. The outcome was creditable to the company and Walter Reuther because, though it resulted in some automobile price increases, these were governed by the moderation and sense of responsibility for maintaining a stable economy that prevailed on both sides of the bargaining table.

In a recent speech John S. Bugas, the Ford official in charge of labor relations, reviewed the negotiations, and much of his comment is worth the serious attention of the steel industry and its unions. He explained there had been better communication and a better organized exchange of views among the major auto companies on industrywide issues raised by the UAW. And he said:

"In the no-contract period the union made every effort to see to it that no incident developed into a serious strike * * * the company was equally diligent to avoid incidents which would lend credence to a charge that it sought to provoke a strike. * * *

"If we had ignored the public interest * * * made unlimited concessions and raised wages or other labor costs beyond reasonable levels, we would have contributed to another cost-push inflationary surge, higher prices with consequent buyer resistance, lessening of production and * * * unemployment. On the other hand, if we resisted union demands just because they were union demands, and took an uncalled-for strike * * * it could contribute just as much to an economic slowdown."

Here is a responsible formula for the steel companies and their unions, an important part of which was the close liaison maintained between the three major automakers during the long negotiations in 1958. This—plus the tempering effect on the union of the recession and unemployment—helped greatly to produce a much more moderate settlement and price increase than for many years had resulted from similar negotiations. Moreover, if the steelmakers allow themselves to be pushed out of the same position to avoid a strike they will also put Reuther

on the defensive in his own union for making the reasonable settlement he did. And that could end in galloping inflation after violent strikes and a disastrous loss of essential production.

But if the steelmakers are to erect as firm and comprehensive an industry front as the three major auto companies did against the original excessive UAW demands (in 1956 Reuther set his immovable goal at something above an increase of 18½ cents an hour), they need to know in advance what the role of the Federal Government will be in event of a strike. Often in the past the Government, with factfinding boards, high-level conciliation and other activities for the purpose of reopening plants, has put heavy pressures on essential industry to yield to unreasonable and inflationary union demands. If the steelmakers are left to conclude that this would happen again they might well prefer the easier course of acceding to such union demands, and passing the costs on to the public, to being forced to do this very thing by Government pressure.

Also, if the steel unions come to this same conclusion, that a strike—perhaps even the imminence of a strike—will bring this Government pressure on the industry, they will be humanly tempted to get excess profit from it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I commend the senior Senator from Tennessee, who is leading the fight on inflation. I think he is doing an excellent job, not only in the instant case which he has just discussed with such persuasiveness, the battle to keep prices of steel from rising, but also he has done an outstanding job in focusing national attention on the peculiar nature of the present inflation. The present inflation is an administered price inflation, an inflation which is taking place in a few industries, a few industries in which a very few companies have the power and the discretion to increase prices, and have been doing so.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank my distinguished colleague for showing his interest in the subject and for the statement he has just made. I know he has studied this matter carefully, and he has given me and members of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee many worthwhile suggestions in connection with the whole problem. We are grateful to him.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

TAX EVASION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post carries a story by Philip Stoddard Brown entitled "Tax Audit Reveals Evasion Is Rife." This article discloses that our Federal Government is losing some \$2.6 billion yearly through tax evasion.

The article suggests to my mind that Congress would do well to explore the advantage to our Federal Government and to honest taxpayers of an investment in additional tax auditors. In my State of Wisconsin we have found that income tax auditors repay the Government \$20 for every dollar they cost by uncovering tax evasion and requiring delinquents to pay up. Of course, in addition, more vigorous enforcement puts

all tax evaders on notice that the Internal Revenue Bureau means business. At a time when our Government urgently needs more revenue to balance the budget, this may be an extremely helpful lead.

Mr. President, as a result of this excellent article, I am writing to the Internal Revenue Department to determine precisely what percentage of income tax returns are audited, the costs of auditing, the recoveries traceable to tax auditing, and the additional revenue that may be derived from doing a far more thorough income tax auditing job than is being done now.

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

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

TAX AUDIT REVEALS EVASION IS RIFE

(By Philip Stoddard Brown)

The cost of those great social events of Washington's winter season that get reported in the society pages of this newspaper are, I should guess, tax deductible in most cases—or paid for by governments out of tax revenue. Certainly in these days of steeply progressive income taxes few people can afford to spend \$5,000, or even \$1,000, of after-tax income for a single party.

But it piques my curiosity how some private hosts and hostesses justify such expenses as ordinary and necessary and directly related to their business or professional duties.

What a difficult task Internal Revenue has to determine the motives and circumstances of entertainment. Should 60 rather than 70 percent of the expenses of a dinner party 4 years ago be allowed as a deduction? Was business or pleasure the main purpose of a trip to New York or Paris?

MAZE OF DEDUCTIONS

The whole domain of tax deductions has become a weird maze. The taxpayer can't even be expected to produce receipts for contributions at church services, for taxi fares and gratuities, or for every meal, telephone call, business magazine, and postage stamp. How, then, can Internal Revenue decide, within wide limits, whether stated deductions were actual expenses? And even where receipts exist, are they valid and do they represent a business, rather than personal, expenditure?

Well, you can't run a tax-collecting outfit by simply accepting the word of each taxpayer. Yet, in many cases you have to do just this. You can't probe behind every figure.

Taxable income might be defined, I suppose, as income that is taxed. Often it is just a plausible figure. Sometimes it is a compromise suggested by the Internal Revenue examiner. The arithmetic must be accurate and the books should be in order, but there's lots of scope for doubt, argument, and estimation in the original entries for expenses, depreciation, and receipts. Was that \$5.27 for a business luncheon on April 16, 1956, with Joe Bloke, a lawyer and old friend, really to discuss tax problems or just social?

To be sure, there can be no question about many receipts and expenditures. But where expenses equal, say, 90 percent of receipts, taxable income can be cut in half by neglecting to count 3 percent of income and inflating expenses by slightly over 2 percent. Tax liability is reduced by more than 50 percent.

The amount of understatement of taxable income in the returns of business and professional people may surprise many salaried people whose returns are fairly straightforward.

TWO AND SEVEN-TENTHS BILLION DOLLARS MORE

Recently, the results of a very special audit by Internal Revenue of 36,000 representative returns for 1949 were published. The audit indicated that a similar examination of 6.7 million business and professional returns for that year would have increased net profits by 20 percent and yielded \$2.7 billion additional revenue.

Some indicated changes in net profit from that reported are as follows:

	Percent Increase
Manufacturing, total.....	17.5
Lumber and wood products, except furniture.....	39.4
Printing and publishing.....	13.5
Transportation, communication and utilities.....	25.9
Trade, total.....	26.4
Department stores, general merchandise and dry goods.....	36.5
Package liquor stores.....	37.4
Eating and drinking places.....	32.0
Automobile dealers.....	25.6
Lumber, building supplies and coal.....	11.5
Services, total.....	11.2
Hotels.....	36.7
Barber and beauty shops.....	8.9
Auto repair and garages.....	21.4
Amusement services.....	87.1
Professional and social services, total.....	7.1
Accountants.....	2.9
Physicians.....	7.0
Dentists.....	8.1
Legal services.....	4.3
Finance, insurance and real estate.....	10.9
Insurance agents.....	7.1
Real estate.....	21.0
Construction, total.....	18.5
Agriculture and related industries, total.....	23.1

If the average firm engaged in amusement services understates its taxable income by 46 percent, its perturbing to speculate how much understatement individual firms must get away with. Actually, evasion is greater even than the above figures indicate.

The understatement of profit indicated by this audit is only what fairly experienced examiners might uncover. As Marius Fariolletti, who prepared an excellent paper on this remarkable audit, makes clear: Additional errors would have been found if more time had been allowed for examination and if the examiners had been even more experienced. Also, it is likely that there are errors that even the most experienced examiners would not uncover.

CONSULTANTS SWELL GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

The income tax has become so complicated—as well as messy—that more and more small proprietors and professional people retain tax accountants. Last week, a friend told me that he pays \$1,500 a year to his tax consultant. "My business isn't very big, but there are a lot of tax angles. It's a case of either my attending to my business, or reading all those reports of a tax advisory service that I used to subscribe to, but not both."

Well, the hiring of tax consultants—like the hiring of anybody else—increases gross national product. So the more the better. Gross national product hasn't been rising so fast of late, despite all that research and development going on in Detroit to achieve a shatteringly new look for the 1961 and 1962 model cars.

One returning vacationer is reassuring. He tells me that Florida can be counted on to boost gross national product this year. One of many projects is the building of a mile-long sandy beach along the coral reef of Key West, by trucking sand from somewhere way off. So maybe we can keep ahead of the Russians, after all—provided they don't step up their hiring of accountants even faster and don't haul around even more sand.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY NEXT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), in accordance with the order previously entered, the Senate adjourned until Thursday, March 5, 1959, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 2, 1959:

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The following-named persons to be members of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for terms expiring March 31, 1965:

Glen R. Harris, of California.

J. Pittman Stone, of Mississippi.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Harold K. Wood, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, vice William H. Kirkpatrick, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 2, 1959:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Courtney Johnson, of Indiana, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations of Richard G. Ament and 393 other officers, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 12, 1959, and may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with name of Richard G. Ament, which is shown on page 2260, and ending with the name of Harold D. Zumbro, which appears on page 2262.

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The nominations of Louis R. Abraham and other officers for appointment in the Marine Corps and in the Navy, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 2, 1959, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Louis R. Abraham, which occurs on page 1585, and ending with the name of Toshiko Motomatsu, in the Navy, which occurs on page 1592.

IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The nominations of John W. Wichman and 198 other officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 12, 1959, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under the caption "Nominations,"

beginning with the name of John W. Wichman, which occurs on page 2262, and ending with the name of Larimer J. H. Lenhardt, which is shown on page 2263.

The following additional nominations for temporary appointment, in the Air Force as brigadier generals, were confirmed today.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the U.S. Air Force under the provisions of ch. 839, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be brigadier generals

Col. Benjamin G. Holzman, 1102A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Richard L. Bohannon, 19067A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Col. James G. Moore, 19074A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Col. Edward J. Hopkins, 1180A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Frank W. Gillespie, 1215A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Frederick R. Terrell, 1221A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Norman L. Peterson, 1291A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Charles E. Jung, 1037A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Richard P. Klocko, 1327A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Nell D. Van Sickle, 1442A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert F. Worden, 1510A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert G. Ruegg, 1620A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Loren G. McCollom, 1632A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert H. Curtin, 1643A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Joseph T. Kingsley, Jr., 1702A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William E. Creer, 1742A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Joseph H. Moore, 1836A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Eugene B. LeBailly, 1920A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Jerry D. Page, 2052A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Stephen D. McElroy, 2058A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Ariel W. Nielsen, 2067A, Regular Air Force.

(NOTE.—The above appointments were made during the last recess of the Senate.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 2, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Wayne E. Scott, pastor, Hillcrest Baptist Church, Hillcrest Heights, Md., offered the following prayer:

Our dear Heavenly Father, we pause just now for divine power and divine guidance. We thank Thee for our great American heritage, but, most of all we thank Thee for our Christian heritage, made possible by Thy gift in Christ.

We are grateful for the privilege of making laws, but God help us to realize that the highest law is God's law. Might each law that is passed here today have as its purpose the purpose to bless people.

We pray for every single person that is here, for the people that they represent. Give to each Congressman and Congresswoman wisdom beyond all human degree. We pray, our dear Heavenly

Father, that each shall have the spirit of Christ as they participate in the discussion on the floor here and in smaller groups.

Help each of us to realize that the highest mandate is not the will of the people but the will of God. We pray for these and other leaders as they face the Berlin crisis and other crises in the future. God, give them the right answer. Help and teach us to realize that the ultimate purpose in life is to make preparation for the life to come.

These things we ask in Christ's name and for His sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 26, 1959, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

CREDIT ON FEDERAL INCOME TAXES FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO PUBLIC OR PRIVATE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. GRANT. 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation providing credit on Federal income taxes for contributions to public or private educational institutions.

This is a new approach not only to the educational problem but indirectly to the integration problem as well and if adopted will injure no one but would be helpful to all in that it will assure the operation of all schools, whether public or private and whether integrated or not.

We all realize that something must be done in this crisis. I am sure that the majority of this Congress does not want Federal control of education; however, there are danger signs along the road that we are traveling. Let us examine the problem and ascertain just what we are interested in. Is it to help the education of the youth of this land, or is it to take over both the minds and social life of the children of this Nation? If it is only to help education, then we should be willing to allow a credit against the tax. It is just that simple.

The proposed legislation would place a limitation upon such credits by providing that such credit for any 1 taxable year shall not exceed 30 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income for such year in the case of an individual or 15 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income for such year in the case of a corporation, or \$1,000, whichever is greater.

OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Annual Report of the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 2, 1959.

SUBMISSION OF BUDGET ESTIMATES

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced for appropriate reference legislation which would require the submission of budget estimates so as to separate operating expenses from capital investments. I am pleased to report that Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, is introducing an identical bill in the other body.

The legislation I am proposing underlines the current confusion which exists with regard to the annual budget. At the present time, both operating expenses and capital investments are intermingled and no distinction is made between the two. I think it is high time we organize our national budget in a more businesslike way.

Every private corporation operates with full knowledge of which outlays are made for current operating expenses and which are made for investments. Under the present budget system, we have no knowledge of such elementary facts.

It is the purpose of the bill which Senator MORSE has introduced in the other body and I have introduced here to provide such information. Let us see which expenditures will bring a definite repayment into the Federal Treasury and list them separately from those bringing no fixed return.

I want to point out that our legislation will in no way upset the present budgetary form. Rather, it will provide an additional statistical tool designed to aid in the evaluation of proposed expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, I am very hopeful that as the Joint Economic Committee carries on its valuable study of the problem of inflation, it will also focus attention on the value of establishing a capital budget. I think such a study would do much to clear up some popular misunderstandings about the budget, about its state of balance and about its effect on inflation.

OREGON'S MAJESTIC DOUGLAS-FIR

Mr. PORTER. 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 Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the State tree of Oregon is the majestic Douglas-fir. It is a prime factor in my State's economy. The Fourth Congressional District contains more Douglas-firs than any other part of the world. From the Douglas-fir comes such items as lumber, plywood, structural timbers, and other products vital to the Nation's housing industry.

In this Oregon centennial year it is possible for every interested person to have a Douglas-fir of his own.

The Blitz-Weinhard Co., of Portland—Oregon's only and largest brewery—has embarked on a modest international program. The company supplies without cost upon request an "Oregon Do-It-Yourself Kit." Each kit contains a Douglas-fir seedling about 2 years old. The fir is about a foot high.

Today it is my privilege to present to each Member of the House and to the Members of the other body a Douglas-fir. It is no good except for planting at this time. It needs water and tender loving care and will fit nicely in a flowerpot for a time. We Oregonians hope all of you will join us in this modest reforestation plan which has enlarged our "Keep Oregon Green" slogan to "Keep the World Green."

THE FLEMMING FORMULA

Mr. METCALF. 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 Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Flemming, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has brought to Congress a new proposal which he says will help meet the shortage of more than 140,000 classrooms. However, in order to build the 75,000 classrooms that Mr. Flemming says will be built under his formula for Federal aid, State constitutional and statutory debt limits will have to be revised, and basic tax concepts of many States will have to be changed.

Mr. Flemming's talents are being wasted by being confined to education. He should go to work for Clark Griffith. He could announce that the Senators will top the American League and win at least 110 games. This would be done by permitting the Senators to use a modified 37-millimeter gun instead of a pitcher at all home games and to field 11 men instead of the usual 9. Of course, such a procedure would require a change in the rules of baseball and consent from the other American League clubowners in addition to the perfection of a Flemming pitching machine. But those are minor problems. The question still arises, however, whether behind such pitching and fielding the Senators

would get enough runs to win half their games. Even the Flemming formula has not solved that problem yet.

CEREMONIES DEDICATING THE MODERNIZED WASHINGTON POST OFFICE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am calling the attention of Members of the House to the invitation of Postmaster General Summerfield to attend ceremonies dedicating the modernized Washington Post Office at 10 tomorrow, Tuesday. The post office building is located near the Union Station. This facility is the finest and most modern post office in the world. We hope you will take a few minutes' time to go down and inspect the building as well as attend the ceremony. Transportation will be provided. Buses will be located between the two office buildings ready for loading at 9:45. Postmaster General Summerfield is desirous that Members attend the ceremony and inspection of the building. The ceremony and inspection will last approximately 30 or 40 minutes. We hope you can be there. I know the Postmaster General will appreciate it.

TAXPAYERS' REVOLT AGAINST EXCESSIVE SPENDING

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have good news this morning for economy-minded Members of Congress. My news is that a grassroots revolt has started in the State of Washington against excessive and extravagant spending by the State and Federal Governments.

I received 344 letters this morning from citizens of my district urging less extravagant spending by Congress and demanding that no new State or Federal taxes be levied on taxpayers.

Press reports from my State report our Governor has received 10,000 of these taxpayers' revolt letters. Other Congressmen from my State have been flooded with these taxpayer revolt letters.

I hope this grassroots taxpayers' revolt will spread to other States. If it does, the prospects of a balanced budget will be vastly improved.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY JUNKETEERS

Mr. GROSS. 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 Iowa? There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, when it was announced last Wednesday that the Interparliamentary Union would hold a meeting, the minority leader [Mr. HALLECK] asked a few questions concerning the organization. It was my observation that he did not get very lucid answers, and I would like to report further to the minority leader.

The meeting was held, as scheduled, last Friday morning and a goodly crowd was there. At that time I attempted to ascertain whether the American delegation of House and Senate Members, who flew with the greatest of ease to the meeting in Rio de Janeiro last summer, voted for some of the resolutions which were adopted which would send more money abroad and saddle more obligations upon the already well-drained U.S. Treasury. Those present were either unwilling or unable to answer.

But there was no unwillingness on the part of many of those present to offer themselves as sacrifices to some nice fat junkets to foreign lands later this year—at the taxpayers' expense, of course.

Mr. Speaker, the Interparliamentary Union represents junketeering at its congressional best, and I will have more to say on the subject when the appropriation bill comes along—if the appropriation for that cause is not buried so deep that it cannot be found.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the minority leader, inquired about the Interparliamentary Union last week, I referred him to the remarks of the late Honorable Dan Reed of New York whose final report on the activities of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union was inserted in the RECORD on the day before he passed away. If the gentleman from Iowa or the minority leader or any other Member of Congress is interested in the affairs of the Interparliamentary Union, I commend Mr. Reed's remarks to your consideration. When the gentleman from Iowa made an inquiry at the group meeting last week, he was then advised by me that while I was not at the Rio meeting that I would obtain for him a copy of the minutes of the meeting showing exactly how the American delegation voted on all resolutions that were presented at that time, and I shall still be glad to comply with the gentleman's request.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is well aware that any number of people were present at that meeting who were at the Rio meeting and who could have answered the question.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman propounded his inquiry at or near the end of the meeting. I am sure nothing was done in secret. I am sure all information can be obtained.

Mr. GROSS. They had not even elected officers.

REPORT ON H.R. 1011

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight to file a report on the bill H.R. 1011.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL LAND ALONG MOUNT VERNON MEMORIAL HIGHWAY

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar, H.R. 2228, to provide for the acquisition of additional land along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway in exchange for certain dredging privileges, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

HANDLING OF STUDENT FUNDS IN INDIAN SCHOOLS OPERATED BY THE BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3648) to regulate the handling of student funds in Indian schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

There being 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 the Secretary of the Interior may authorize officials or employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to accept and to disburse deposits of funds of students and student activity associations in schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Such deposits shall be accounted for under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO REVISE, CODIFY, AND ENACT INTO LAW TITLE 39, UNITED STATES CODE, ENTITLED "THE POSTAL SERVICE"

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2339) to revise, codify, and enact into law title 39 of the United States Code entitled "The Postal Service."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, last week the members of the objectors' committee on both sides of the aisle had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement as to the rules which the members of the objectors' committee would endeavor to follow in this Congress in the consideration of bills placed on the Consent Calendar. If I read correctly the report of the bill now before the House it perhaps is unfortunate that the report bears certain language which would appear to cause the legislation to be ineligible for favorable consideration on the Consent Calendar. There appears in the report at page 2, the beginning of the last paragraph, the following statement:

Several of the Departments suggested a number of substantive changes to existing law. Many appear desirable to the Post Office Department. For the most part, however, they are not within the scope of legislation of this nature, but are more properly handled in legislation considered by the legislative committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS], if the Committee on the Judiciary made any changes in the substantive law in the measure which they now present to us.

Mr. WILLIS. I would say the policy of the committee is to deliberately avoid making changes in substantive law. In the passage which the gentleman read many changes are recommended, but a number of those changes we had to object to on the very basis of avoidance of making substantive changes. I would say to the gentleman that these bills are not brought out overnight. In some cases it takes years to codify a particular title. All Government agencies, in this instance particularly the Post Office Department, and even the Department of State, where foreign mail is involved, all interested department agencies collaborate in the preparation of these bills. The Bureau of the Budget must approve. The committee, in this instance the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, handling the legislation in point, collaborated with our committee, and the final work is an agreement all the way around to be sure that we try to carry out the very point that the gentleman is inquiring about.

Mr. ASPINALL. As I understand then, there are no real important changes made in the substantive law.

Mr. WILLIS. That is correct.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, in view of its length and, as usual, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be not printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

Page 52, in the chapter analysis strike out "3555. Reduction in salary step or level."

CV—200

and insert "3555. Reduction in salary step."

Page 102, strike out the catchline and the first sentence of section 3555 reading:

"§ 3555. Reduction in salary step or level

"The Postmaster General may reduce in salary step or salary level an employee whose efficiency falls below a fair standard or whenever it is necessary for purposes of discipline."

and insert:

"§ 3555. Reduction in salary step

"The Postmaster General may reduce in salary step clerks or carriers whose efficiency falls below a fair standard or whenever it is necessary for purposes of discipline."

Page 168, in the first lines of paragraphs (1) and (2) of § 6409, strike out the word "continental."

The purpose of the committee amendments is to insure that the existing law is restated without substantive changes.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESIGN OF THE U.S. FLAG

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 75) providing for the design of the flag of the United States.

There being 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 sections 1 and 2 of title 4, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"§ 1. Flag; design

"The flag of the United States shall have thirteen horizontal stripes of the same width, alternate red and white, with a union consisting of as many white stars on a field of blue as there are States in the Union.

"§ 2. Same; additional stars; dimensions

"(a) Whenever a new State is admitted to the Union the President shall cause a plan to be made setting forth the positions of the stars in the union of the flag. He shall also cause to be fixed the proportionate dimensions of the constituent parts of the flag.

"(b) The addition of each new star to the union of the flag shall take effect on the 4th day of July next succeeding the admission of a new State.

"(c) All flags of the United States on hand on the 4th day of July next succeeding the admission of a new State may be continued in use until unserviceable, but all flags manufactured for use after that date should conform to the design and specifications adopted pursuant to this section."

Sec. 2. Items 1 and 2 of the chapter analysis of chapter 1 of title 4 are amended to read as follows:

"Flag; design.

"Same; additional stars; dimensions."

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.

DEFINING THE TERM "ORGANIZE" AS USED IN THE SMITH ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2369) to amend section 2385, title 18, United States Code, to define the term "organize" as used in that section.

There being 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 section 2385 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"As used in this section the term 'organize,' with respect to any society, group, or assembly of persons, includes the recruiting of new members, the forming of new units, and the regrouping or expansion of existing clubs, classes, and other units of such society, group, or assembly of persons."

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.

EXTENSION OF ESPIONAGE LAWS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1992) to repeal section 791 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to extend the application of chapter 37 of title 18, relating to espionage and censorship.

There being 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 section 791 of title 18, United States Code, is repealed.

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 37 of such title is amended by deleting the following: "791. Scope of chapter."

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.

ADDITIONAL PEREMPTORY CHALLENGES IN CIVIL CASES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2978) to amend section 1870 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the district courts to allow additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs as well as multiple defendants.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a question of a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, this bill having come from that committee. I notice that this legislation, or legislation comparable to it was pocket vetoed by the President a year ago, primarily for the reason that section 2 was added by the other body. In my examination of H.R. 2978 I see no such provision at the present time.

Mr. WILLIS. That is correct. The pocket veto addressed itself to a non-germane section attached to the bill in the other body. That section is not in this bill.

Mr. FORD. This is the bill as it was approved by the House a year or two ago?

Mr. WILLIS. Yes. It is requested by the Department of Justice and approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

There being 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 section

1870 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 1870. Challenges

“In civil cases, each party shall be entitled to three peremptory challenges. Several defendants or several plaintiffs may be considered as a single party for the purposes of making challenges, or the court may allow additional peremptory challenges and permit them to be exercised separately or jointly.

“All challenges for cause or favor, whether to the array or panel or to individual jurors, shall be determined by the court.”

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.

COLORING MATURE ORANGES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 79) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to permit the temporary listing and certification of Citrus Red No. 2 for coloring mature oranges under tolerances found safe by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, so as to permit continuance of established coloring practice in the orange industry pending congressional consideration of general legislation for the listing and certification of food color additives under safe tolerances.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LIMITATION ON LIEUTENANT GENERALS IN THE MARINE CORPS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3323) to establish a peacetime limitation on the number of lieutenant generals in the Marine Corps.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have several questions I should like to ask concerning this bill. First of all, as I understand, this would give the rank of lieutenant general permanently to three officers of the Marine Corps.

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct, but will the gentleman allow me to explain the bill briefly?

Mr. GROSS. Certainly.

Mr. KILDAY. In the first place, in the Officer Personnel Act of August 1947, provision is made for two lieutenant generals in the Marine Corps. That same law, the Officer Personnel Act, contains a provision which suspends the number during periods of national emergency. The national emergency declared incident to Korea is still in effect, and the Marine Corps now has on active duty five lieutenant generals.

After the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 was passed Congress changed the authorized strength of the Marine Corps by which they were limited to two lieutenant generals. The total authorized strength of the Marine Corps was set at 7,000 officers and 100,000 enlisted men. Subsequent to that time the present law fixing the strength of the Marine Corps was passed placing the

strength at 400,000. That was after Congress had fixed the number of permanent lieutenant generals at two. The strength of the Marine Corps was increased very materially to consist of not less than three combat divisions and three air wings with a strength not to exceed 400,000, and, importantly, we changed the organization of the Marine Corps to require that they maintain three divisions and three combat wings.

So the bill would make provision for five permanent lieutenant generals. It would not increase the number of lieutenant generals now on duty in the Marine Corps nor, very importantly, would it change the total number of generals in the Marine Corps. These extra three would be charged to the total strength of the Marine Corps.

Mr. GROSS. You would make the three grades of lieutenant general permanent?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct; it would become permanent. It will increase the permanent lieutenant general strength in the Marine Corps from two to five.

Mr. GROSS. What is the present strength of the Marine Corps? It is about 185,000?

Mr. KILDAY. I think 188,000 or a little less.

Mr. GROSS. In 1942 they had 143,000 approximately?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. In 1942 there were 137 colonels and above in the Marine Corps; in 1959 there are 573 colonels and above in the Marine Corps.

Let me ask the gentleman why the number of colonels and generals has increased over three times the total Marine Corps growth?

Mr. KILDAY. First of all, may I say that while I do not have the figures before me as to the strength of the Marine Corps in 1942, for the purpose of this discussion I am willing to accept the figures that the gentleman from Iowa has mentioned.

There are a number of reasons for having more officers in these grades now than even during wartime, primarily because of the action of the Congress of the United States in passing the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. We were attempting at that time to prevent the loss of many highly trained and experienced officers.

We did a number of things to provide for that. The first thing we did was to increase the percentage of star ranks. We increased the percentage of generals and admirals from one-half of 1 percent to three-quarters of 1 percent of the total officer strength. In addition to that, we provided that men who had reached the grades of lieutenant colonel and colonel could remain on active duty for stated periods of 26 and 30 years total service. Those two things are material here.

In addition, there was at that time in the Marine Corps a situation as to colonels that the Commandant of the Marine Corps would not permit anyone to be appointed as a colonel who had less than 18 years of service. There were not enough available for that grade.

Mr. GROSS. By increasing the number of lieutenant generals from two to five does that mean a general increase in numbers of Marine Corps officers?

Mr. KILDAY. No. As I stated before, there is a provision in the Officer Personnel Act as to the total number of generals which the Marine Corps may have. That is not increased by this bill. So there can be no increase in the total number. There can only be the increase in the permanent law of the number of lieutenant generals now on active duty.

Mr. GROSS. Would there be increases in the grades of a number of officers if these lieutenant general grades are made permanent?

Mr. KILDAY. No; that would not be true. That is controlled not only by the percentage distribution of the Officer Personnel Act but by the Arends Act known as the Officer Grade Limitation Act.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman give me any idea of the ages of the officers that are here proposed to be promoted?

Mr. KILDAY. Offhand, I do not know. They are, of course, the most senior generals of the Armed Forces. I would say somewhere in their fifties.

Mr. GROSS. Somewhere in their fifties?

Mr. KILDAY. I think they are all in their fifties or thereabouts.

Mr. GROSS. Are any of these officers who would be given permanent rank drawing flight pay?

Mr. KILDAY. I think there is one.

Mr. GROSS. A newspaper account the other evening said two. I wonder if that figure is correct.

Mr. KILDAY. There may be two, I would not be certain about that, but, of course, this bill does not affect them.

Mr. GROSS. If this legislation is not passed these three lieutenant generals will eventually have to go back to major generals; will they not?

Mr. KILDAY. No. They will finally retire and they will retire in the highest grade satisfactorily held. So they would retire as lieutenant generals.

Mr. GROSS. The Navy has a habit of promoting its officers a grade just before they retire, is that not correct?

Mr. KILDAY. No; I do not think so. The Senate has control of confirmations, of course, and they have been riding pretty close herd on them with reference to that.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I doubt they are riding such close herd as the gentleman thinks.

Mr. KILDAY. I think what the gentleman has in mind is another provision of law that we repealed some time ago where men, because of a combat citation in their record in the past, were retired one grade higher than the grade which they actually held at the time of their retirement. But, in 1949 we repealed that as to any person for any commendation earned after December 31, 1946.

Mr. GROSS. But there is nothing to prevent promotion just before retirement, is there, in the law today? There is nothing to prevent promotion, so that these gentlemen, if given the permanent grade of lieutenant general, could be,

before retirement, promoted to full general and draw that retirement?

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman is confused. These men, having served a sufficient period of time already as lieutenant generals, no matter in what grade they may be serving at the time they retire, will retire as lieutenant generals, the highest rank satisfactorily held. That is true of every member of the military service, where he serves in a temporary grade higher than his permanent grade, if he serves satisfactorily in that grade, and that is usually defined to be 6 months of service in that grade, and then he retires in his temporary grade with the pay of his temporary grade, so this would not affect that at all.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that we should, under the circumstances that exist in this country, logically add three more permanent lieutenant generals to the Marine Corps?

Mr. KILDAY. We are not adding a thing to the Marine Corps, and under the conditions which exist in the country and in the world today, I do not believe we should take any action that would indicate any diminution in the power or striking ability of the Marine Corps. I do not think we can afford to do that.

Mr. GROSS. Why do you want to give them this permanent rank?

Mr. KILDAY. Well, I would say to the gentleman, why should we not? In 1947, with a total strength of 100,000, we limited them to two lieutenant generals. At that time the authorized strength was 100,000 enlisted men and 7,000 officers. We changed it materially here in the Congress. We provided that the Marine Corps shall at all times consist of three combat divisions and three combat wings, so that when you increase the organizational strength and the number of organizations, when you provide for the number of divisions, then you have got to have the higher ranking officers in order to command that organization. That would be true even though your total strength was less. If you have three divisions at half strength, you would still have to have three division commanders, just as you have to have three division commanders when you have three divisions at full combat strength.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman this question? If these three officers were to retire, would they retire as major generals or lieutenant generals?

Mr. KILDAY. Lieutenant generals.

Mr. GROSS. As lieutenant generals?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. They would be retired without any further action by Congress?

Mr. KILDAY. That is true under present law.

Mr. GROSS. I want to go back to this flight pay business for just a moment, because I think that very serious attention needs to be given by the Congress.

Mr. KILDAY. I do not understand why the gentleman refers to flight pay in connection with this.

Mr. GROSS. Because the whole cost is going to be greater. The gentleman knows if these three are elevated to lieutenant generals, they will retire under any condition, at least as lieutenant gen-

erals, and the cost to the taxpayers will be greater.

Mr. KILDAY. I believe the gentleman is thinking of an old law.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice so that I may have more time to study it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

MAINTENANCE AND TRAVEL EXPENSES OF JUDGES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2909) relating to the maintenance and travel expenses of judges.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. That is the last eligible bill on the Consent Calendar.

COLORING ORANGES

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 79) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to permit the temporary listing and certification of Citrus Red No. 2 for coloring mature oranges under tolerances found safe by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, so as to permit continuance of established coloring practice in the orange industry pending congressional consideration of general legislation for the listing and certification of food color additives under safe tolerances, be recommitted to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the bill, S. 79, which passed the Senate unanimously, was reported favorably and unanimously by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on February 23, 1959.

Through inadvertence, the calendar bill print of S. 79, as reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—Union Calendar No. 13—is incorrect. The print set forth the bill as it was introduced in the Senate rather than the bill as it was passed by the Senate. The bill as passed by the Senate contains a number of amendments which were requested by the Food and Drug Administration to make clear beyond any doubt that this legislation is temporary emergency legislation which will become inoperative with the enactment of general legislation concerning food color additives.

My request for recommitment of S. 79 is made for the purpose of having a corrected calendar bill prepared.

THE LATE HON. J. HARRY MCGREGOR

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hess].

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, all Members of the House and especially those of the Ohio delegation, I am sure join with me in the tribute of respect to the memory of our former colleague, J. HARRY MCGREGOR, who has been called from us.

HARRY MCGREGOR was born in Ohio, was educated in its public schools and colleges, and served in the First World War from Ohio. He was a member of the Ohio Legislature from 1935 through 1940. During his service, he was floor leader and Speaker pro tempore.

He came to the House of Representatives on February 27, 1940, to succeed our late colleague, the Honorable William Ashbrook; and served successively from the 77th Congress through the 85th Congress.

HARRY MCGREGOR's interest was the welfare of the people of the district he served so long. He was interested in the needs of the older people. He was interested in the farmers of Ohio and of the Nation. He was interested in the veterans of our wars; and through his own military service, was a member of all of the veterans' organizations of Ohio.

His was a long, active, and useful life. He gave unstintingly of his time and his enormous capacity for work, to the improvement of the condition of the people of his district and of the State and country.

Unsung work for public welfare and the common good may lack glamor; but what is lacked in glamor was filled for him with the affection, understanding, and good will of the people in whose causes and for whose welfare he labored so unselfishly.

We of the House of Representatives shall miss his calm, wise, and sober counsel, his willingness to give of himself; and his stanch and steadfast loyalty to the causes for which he stood.

Now he rests in his beloved State of Ohio in the midst of friends and family. We, his colleagues, share the void to which everyone feels at the passing of so fine a friend, so dedicated a public servant of us all.

To his children, we extend our deepest sympathy, confident that the memories HARRY MCGREGOR left will be a consolation to his bereaved and a warm and affectionate memory to the people whom he served. I have lost a friend and Ohio a loyal and courageous son.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the chairman of the Ohio delegation [Mr. Hess] in paying tribute to our former colleague, the late lamented J. HARRY MCGREGOR.

It was my high privilege to know HARRY MCGREGOR and his fine family; his wife, his son, and two daughters, throughout almost a lifetime.

I believe our first acquaintance, between Mr. MCGREGOR and myself, came about just after World War I had ended. He served the State of Ohio ably and well in the Legislature where his services were such that when the Congressman from the 17th Ohio district then sitting as a Member in this Chamber passed away, Mr. MCGREGOR was selected, and elected in a special election, to represent that great Ohio district here. He did so, for practically 20 years, in a way which won him great renown and high respect.

HARRY MCGREGOR in private life engaged in highway construction and other contracting work. That experience fitted him especially well to serve as a member of the House Committee on Public Works, where he was one of the real leaders in giving to America not only a splendid interstate highway system, many river and harbor improvements, the St. Lawrence Seaway, and numerous effective flood control projects in various States. The country as a whole is indebted to him for his service in these particular fields. In fact, these great public works, which have been made effective since HARRY MCGREGOR came to the Congress, stand as memorials to him today.

His sudden passing last October came as a shock to all of us who knew him, loved him, and served with him here in the House of Representatives. We have all suffered a great loss, but that loss is an especial one for the Ohio delegation, and for the people of our Ohio. To his two daughters, his son, and his grandchildren, we extend our deepest and most sincere sympathy in the great loss that has been theirs.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESS. I yield.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise with heavy heart to say a few words about my good friend, the late J. HARRY MCGREGOR, longtime Member of Congress from Ohio, who left us much too soon.

HARRY and I were close friends and legislative colleagues for almost a quarter of a century. We were both members of the Ohio House of Representatives from early 1935 until HARRY was elected to Congress in early 1940. During that time, he was minority whip and then majority leader. HARRY was an energetic whip and was a persuasive and effective majority leader. He seldom, if ever, failed in his goals as a majority leader.

During his service in the Ohio House of Representatives, he sponsored and was the leader who caused to be enacted into law, school and highway proposals of lasting benefit to Ohio.

His interest in the conservation of our natural resources and his tireless and effective work for flood control is well known to all leaders in this field.

Finally, those who served with him in the Congress well know his fine leadership in all public works, and particularly, in the field of public highways.

An enthusiastic and effective legislator and a great and good friend has left us. Thousands will knowingly and countless millions will unknowingly miss a legisla-

tor who has done so much for so many. His fine family has the sympathy of friends everywhere.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our dear lamented friend, HARRY MCGREGOR. He was a dedicated Congressman. He served his district, State, and Nation well.

I had the pleasure of having many contacts with him at various times. Although he was of a different political persuasion, he was always considerate, courteous, and gracious. He endeared himself to the Members of this House, on both sides of the aisle. We all mourn his loss which will be severely felt in this House.

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to place a wreath on the grave of our departed friend, HARRY MCGREGOR. I knew HARRY well. I saw him often in the course of his work, although my committee assignment was different from that of our departed friend. It was always a pleasure to work with him. He was kindly, friendly, always courteous, and he was most competent. I worked especially with him on the highway program to which he devoted many, many long, tireless hours of effort in most unselfish service to the country that he loved so well.

There is a saying asked in the form of a question to the effect "Where, oh where, are the snows of yesteryear?" The snows of yesteryear are gone. They are melted. They are in the streams and forests and farmlands and the richness of the Nation."

So likewise the ability, the sincere achievements, great energies of this great American HARRY MCGREGOR who has left us are to be found in the achievements that he supported and the accomplishments which he passed on to the people of America. Now our citizenry is richer and more capable and happier because of his having been a Member of this great body.

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HENDERSON].

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with his friends in paying tribute to HARRY MCGREGOR, for many years our colleague here in Congress.

Geographically, HARRY MCGREGOR was closer to me and my district than any other Member of Congress, because he lived in the extreme southern part of his district, just adjacent to my own district.

In many other respects HARRY MCGREGOR was closer to me than any other Member of Congress. When I first met him I formed an opinion that stayed with me throughout our association together, that here was a man, dedicated to his district and to his Nation, determined in the course that he would take. I liked him and his manner.

HARRY took great pleasure in life. One thing that set him apart was the jollity, the laughter, and the smile of HARRY MCGREGOR. We saw it on his face and we

knew it was in his heart. You could watch HARRY MCGREGOR come into a room with that smile as if by magic, it was imparted to all who watched his face. They became filled with the same sense of lightheartedness that so characterized HARRY MCGREGOR.

I watched his work on the floor and the dedication that he displayed. His words in debate carried an insistence that the truth be known. We felt impelled to follow what he demonstrated to be the best course for our Nation.

He was fair, he was able, in his efforts to be of service to his district.

His wife had come from Muskingum County of the 15th District, and Mrs. MCGREGOR and her Congressman husband were known, loved, and held in great esteem in that portion of my district. Whenever I traveled through that area I was constantly being asked: "How is HARRY MCGREGOR?" "How is Mrs. MCGREGOR?" And on many occasions his friends there told of the great work that HARRY had performed in behalf of the constituents of his district.

The service that he rendered for those of his district is just one part of HARRY MCGREGOR's life. Here on the floor of Congress, he worked for them. He also worked for all America. Many of the great public works and highways throughout the United States are monuments to the service and foresight of HARRY MCGREGOR.

But in his children and his grandchildren we have the living characterization of HARRY MCGREGOR's personality.

They miss him, but they are strengthened and comforted by the realization that he was a great man who served his Nation well. We miss him, too.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I join today in the eulogies for our late departed colleague, HARRY MCGREGOR, with whom I was privileged to serve as a member of the minority on the Public Works Committee, having been a member of that committee since I was elected to Congress some 5 years ago.

HARRY MCGREGOR was a great public servant; HARRY MCGREGOR was an outstanding American; HARRY MCGREGOR was the ranking minority member of the Roads Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee, and through his sponsorship of legislation the great interstate and other Federal-aid highway systems came closer to fruition than at any time previously. It was through his efforts and sponsorship of legislation that the forerunners of the great 1956 Interstate and Defense Highway Act came into being. It was his bill, his sponsorship of legislation in the Republican 83d Congress that resulted in the passage of the forerunner of the great Highway System Act in the 84th and the 85th Congresses. This great Interstate and Defense Highway System is a monument and a tribute to HARRY MCGREGOR. He was more interested and qualified in this subject, I venture to say, than any

other Member of the House has been in recent years.

It was indeed a pleasure to serve with him, and it was my great pleasure and privilege to come to know of his ability and dedication on the Public Works Committee. He succeeded as ranking Republican member the Honorable George Dondero who in his turn served with equal ability and distinction.

J. HARRY MCGREGOR was a man of deep conviction, he was a man of sound judgment. He was a man who did not hesitate to get up on the floor and present those principles in which he believed and to fight for them. He was a hard-working and aggressive man, and as a freshman and since I have deemed it a high privilege to serve with him. He gave the greatest leadership and encouragement to me as a member of the Public Works Committee. His understanding of the problems faced by new Members, and his helpfulness to them will linger long not only in my memory but also in the memory of many others in the Congress who came to know him and seek his wise counsel in recent years. It is a high honor for me to join in these eulogies of our departed colleague. He was a great man, an outstanding American J. HARRY MCGREGOR.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues who have paid tribute to the memory of J. HARRY MCGREGOR today. I extend my sympathy to the members of the Ohio delegation for the great loss which they have sustained in the passing of our departed colleague, for whom we had such great affection.

I was shocked and saddened last year when I learned of his untimely death, which was an irreparable loss to all of us who knew him.

HARRY MCGREGOR was a Member of the House when I came here and I soon recognized him as one of the outstanding Members of this body. He was an able, capable, and efficient legislator. He worked diligently and conscientiously upon all legislation before his committee, as others have mentioned here today. Whatever he did he did right.

I know that our former colleague, the Honorable William S. Hill, of Colorado, would join in these eulogies to HARRY MCGREGOR if he were here today, as they were very close friends over the years. It was through Mr. Hill that I learned to know HARRY MCGREGOR better and to more fully appreciate his sterling qualities.

HARRY was always congenial and affable. He spread good cheer wherever he happened to be and it was a real pleasure to visit with him.

Mr. Speaker, we can ill afford to lose men like HARRY MCGREGOR in these critical times. His passing was not only a great loss to his district, but to the State of Ohio and to the entire Nation. He was truly a great American, a fine public servant, and a Christian gentleman.

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, it is now my high honor to represent the good people of Ohio's 17th District, the district that was so well represented by the late J. HARRY MCGREGOR for some 18 years. I take this time to join with his other colleagues here in the House in paying tribute to his memory and to extend my sincere sympathy to the members of his family who survive him.

Many of you who have been here for a long time knew J. HARRY MCGREGOR more intimately than I and I know that you, too, can attest to his unfailing courtesy, generosity, and hard work. He faithfully reflected the views of his district, and was considered a stalwart for good government. The high caliber of his representation of the people in our district was reflected by the strong support he invariably received at the polls time and time again.

Although I was his political challenger for the past 10 years, I greatly admired and respected Congressman MCGREGOR personally and for his views on public problems.

Back home he was known personally to thousands of people. J. HARRY MCGREGOR was a people's Congressman. The people felt close to the late J. HARRY MCGREGOR. They felt at all times that they could sit down with him and talk over personal problems, their fears and their hopes for this great country.

I think his practice of going into the district and holding conferences, informal in nature, at the court houses and other places was a most commendable one. This is important if we are to have true representative government in America. It was being close to the people and learning what the people at the grassroots really thought of the issues, great and small, before this country.

The Ohio delegation in Congress, in my opinion, has indeed lost one of its most esteemed members, and the 17th District has lost an able and dedicated spokesman. His family, his two daughters, Mrs. Monroe Horst, Mrs. Warde Butler, and his son, Harry Laird MCGregor, have lost a devoted father.

I know that those of you who knew him best in the House of Representatives and in the Senate will join me in this tribute to his memory.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HESS. 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 life and character of the late J. HARRY MCGREGOR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I join with my good friend, the chairman of the Ohio Republican delegation, Mr. Hess, in paying tribute to a departed friend and colleague.

J. HARRY MCGREGOR was a warm and friendly man and a devoted public servant. Prior to his election as a Member

of Congress, he served with distinction in the Ohio Legislature. Here in Congress he made invaluable contributions to the legislation before the Public Works Committee. With all his work, however, he was never too busy to help others. Time and again I recall his assistance when I was new here, and I treasured his counsel. Those of us who knew him realized his great loss when his beloved wife, Twila, died earlier last year. The McGregors had always been a happy, loving couple. Now he has gone to join her, united again in God's love. To his daughters and son I want to extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. BAUMHART. Mr. Speaker, during the heat of the past congressional campaign, on October 7, 1958, I was deeply shocked to learn of the sudden passing of one of my best friends and colleagues in the House, J. HARRY MCGREGOR, of the 17th Ohio District. It was impossible to express my sadness to the House since we were in recess, but I and my fellow Members want to speak of him today, and to extend our heartfelt condolence to his daughters, his son, and their families.

HARRY was preceded in death by his beloved wife, Twila, by less than a year, and it was well known to his friends and family the deep burden of grief he carried.

HARRY was my predecessor as "Whip" of the Ohio delegation, and I will always cherish a photograph now hanging on the wall of my office in which he is pictured turning the symbolic whip over to me.

It was my privilege to serve with him in the Ohio State Legislature, where he served the State of Ohio in the house of representatives from 1935 through 1940. During that period of time he also served as minority whip and secretary of the finance committee, as well as majority floor leader and speaker pro tempore. HARRY's career in Washington in the U.S. House of Representatives was no less distinguished, he being elected at a special election in 1940, and reelected to the 77th on through the 85th Congresses. He proved his dedication to good government through all his outstanding public service. He will be a man long remembered not only for his personal warmth and sweetness of character, but for his complete honesty and integrity. I well remember how many of the staff people with whom he came in daily contact admired and respected him. This combination of personal warmth and dedication to the principles of good government is often difficult to attain, but we all will remember HARRY for these qualities.

He will be sorely missed by all his colleagues.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to adequately express one's feelings at the loss of a friend. J. HARRY MCGREGOR was my long-time personal friend. Our friendship began back in the Ohio General Assembly when we were both members of its house of representatives 20 years ago. Our close association over the years gave me ample opportunity to observe the character and ability of HARRY MCGREGOR. He was

a courageous statesman and met every issue openly and without flinching. His qualities as a leader were shown on many occasions but particularly as majority floor leader of the Ohio House of Representatives and the ranking Republican member of his committee in Congress.

HARRY MCGREGOR was respected and admired by his friends and associates both in and out of public life. An example of the esteem in which he was held was the honors which he received as a member of the Masonic Order.

But more significant than any of these accomplishments was the fact that he was in every sense of the word a family man. He and his wife were a devoted couple and with their three fine children made a typical American family. With his many friends and colleagues I share their sadness at his passing.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is a personal privilege to salute the memory of our late colleague, J. HARRY MCGREGOR.

He was more than an able Member of Congress—he was a trailblazer with the courage of his convictions. Future generations will thank HARRY MCGREGOR for his magnificent leadership which gives them the vast Interstate Highway System so essential to our Nation's commerce and defense. None of us who served with him in the 84th Congress will forget his brilliant fight to achieve this victory.

HARRY MCGREGOR will be remembered, too, as an outspoken opponent of sprawling bureaucracy, particularly in those areas where public power threatened the just and legitimate rights of private enterprise. His philosophy of Federal assistance was Lincolnian.

Long before it became popular and expedient, HARRY MCGREGOR fought communism. He waged a vigorous battle against senseless giveaways to the Soviet Union and its satellites. He was one of four Republican Members flown to China in 1952 for conferences with Chinese Nationalist officers and U.S. administrators of aid in Formosa.

HARRY MCGREGOR was Republican floor leader in the Ohio State Legislature when I served there nearly 20 years ago. When I came to Washington in 1955, his counsel was wise and generous and sparkling with the infectious good humor which made him liked by all—even those who disagreed with his public views. He was a warm and loyal friend, a valued adviser, and a tireless servant of the 17th District of Ohio.

Last fall, at the very height of a campaign for reelection, death overtook HARRY MCGREGOR unexpectedly at his home in Coshocton, Ohio. Just as he had lived all his life, HARRY MCGREGOR died a fighter.

Less than 2 years before, on Christmas Day 1956, he lost his beloved wife, Twila. To their three surviving children I extend my heartfelt sympathy.

I know they will remember the farewell of Mr. Valiant-for-truth in Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress." The words are particularly appropriate for HARRY MCGREGOR:

My sword I give to him that shall succeed me in my pilgrimage, and my courage and skill to him that can get it.

My marks and scars I carry with me, to be a witness for me, that I have fought His battle that now shall be my rewarder.

Mr. Hiestand. Mr. Speaker, in losing our beloved colleague, Congressman HARRY MCGREGOR, of Ohio, we here in Congress and the people of this Nation have lost a real statesman.

Ever attacking every problem from the viewpoint of "What's best for the people of America," HARRY MCGREGOR was one of the most conscientious and thorough Congressmen it has been my pleasure to know.

Ever maintaining an objective viewpoint, his was a truly selfless service.

Ever mindful of the varied viewpoints of many Members from both sides of the aisle, he won much support for measures he espoused.

HARRY MCGREGOR, to my knowledge, had no enemies. His colleagues mourned with him the loss a year before of his beloved wife and partner for many years. We really shared his grief.

Ever mindful, however, of his duty to his district and his country, he bore up bravely and worked hard and effectively despite his great loss.

We of California and I in particular who knew him well join his Ohio colleagues in paying the highest tribute to J. HARRY MCGREGOR, gentleman, scholar, indefatigable worker, delightful character, but above all, statesman.

Mr. Ayres. Mr. Speaker, when I first met Mr. and Mrs. McGregor, Harry and Twila, I had the feeling that I was in the company of a wonderful couple. There was a team spirit that existed between them that was difficult to explain. When they were separated HARRY's loss was great. He carried on but there was not the same will to win.

J. HARRY MCGREGOR's thoughtfulness, understanding, and dedication will never be forgotten by those who were fortunate enough to know him. I miss him.

Mrs. Bolton. Mr. Speaker, when one has served 18 years here in this great legislative body, the bonds welded are strong and they go deep. Between HARRY MCGREGOR and myself there was an even closer tie than most because we shared a special election on February 27, 1940.

A pleasant companion and a good friend—a hard-working Congressman and a loyal citizen—such was HARRY MCGREGOR. One could disagree with him as, I confess, I often did, but disagreement interfered not at all with our friendship. As Ohio whip he served the Republican Party and the Ohio Republican delegation well.

Tireless in his efforts to serve his constituents he gave himself with enthusiasm to work in their behalf, keeping in close touch with their hopes, their fears, their concrete desires, and their needs. The 17th District will miss his heartfelt service, Ohio will miss his constant watchful work in her interests and the United States a faithful worker in these Halls.

To his fine children and grandchildren I do extend my warmest sympathy and

the hope that they know with deep certainty that—

They have not died
They live and breathe with you
They walk now, here at your side
They tell you things are true.

They live, they know, they see
They shout with every breath
All is Eternal Life.
There is no death.

Mr. Mack of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it is most fitting that we who knew him best should gather here today to pay tribute to the worth and works of our friend and colleague, the Honorable HARRY MCGREGOR, of Ohio, who died during last year's fall recess of Congress.

I often think that the roadbuilder is among the greatest benefactors of mankind. The roads they build make it possible for people to get together easier and more frequently to exchange ideas and obtain inspiration from one another. Roads also facilitate the flow of commerce and the exchange of goods, thus promote prosperity and improve living standards.

Our friend HARRY MCGREGOR was a roadbuilder, one of the best and most effective of them, and therefore by his life and works one of the great benefactors of mankind. In private life he was a road contractor and during his 20 years in Congress he was a member of the Public Works Committee and its Subcommittee on Roads.

In the 83d Congress Mr. McGREGOR was chairman of the Roads Committee and was the author of the Highway Act of that year which paved the way for the greatest advance in roadbuilding this Nation had ever made to that time.

In the 84th and 85th Congresses HARRY MCGREGOR was ranking minority member of the Public Works Committee and along with the Honorable GEORGE FALLON of Maryland, they did more than anyone else to write the present expanded highway program into law. This law, in my opinion, is one of the greatest achievements of Congress in the past 25 years.

HARRY MCGREGOR by his tireless work in Congress for better roads has paved the way for a stronger, more prosperous and happier Nation for generations to come. His work has made all the tomorrows of our Nation better than its yesterdays. Such a life is most worth while.

HARRY MCGREGOR departed life carrying with him the affection of all of us who knew him for he had brought joy into our lives with his friendly and sunny disposition. He left us possessed of our admiration and gratitude because of his large contributions as a legislator to the strength and betterment of our Nation and its citizenry.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Selden. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, last week the house of delegates of the American Bar Association overwhelmingly adopted the report of its special committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives. This report was printed in full in the February 25 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is extremely interesting to note that this distinguished body of American lawyers, eminently qualified to examine judicial decisions, agrees with the fears voiced by various Members of this body that certain decisions of the Supreme Court have broadly and unnecessarily limited national and State efforts to protect our people and our Government against Communist activities.

While the bar association's recommendations will require careful study and preparation of legislative proposals in a number of areas, one subject on which this body is in a position to act promptly is that of passport security. The bar association committee's report singles out the Supreme Court's passport decisions of June 1958 as an example of the weakening of our security defenses and strongly recommends remedial legislation. It will be recalled that a divided Court ruled the Secretary of State had no authority in the absence of specific legislation to withhold passports from supporters of the international Communist movement.

Although the administration submitted legislative proposals to the last Congress, those proposals were considered too broad and sweeping by a majority of the committee that examined them. A shorter bill which I introduced at that time was passed by the House in the closing days of the session.

Several weeks ago I introduced a bill, H.R. 55, identical to that which was passed in the last Congress by this body. In the light of the determinations now reached by leading representatives of the American Bar after a detailed, objective study, I would urge that we proceed promptly to consideration and passage of legislation which would authorize the Secretary of State to deny passports to supporters of the international Communist movement and to close this gap in our defenses against those who would undermine this Nation.

JAMES A. GARFIELD NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. WHITENER. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today directing the Superintendent of the National Capital Parks to remove the James A. Garfield Monument from its present location at First Street and Maryland Avenue SW. to another suitable site on real property of the United States situate in or near the District of Columbia. Under the provisions of my bill the new location for the monument will be selected by the Commission of Fine Arts.

The measure I have introduced would also direct the Superintendent of the National Capital Parks to repave the site now occupied by the James A. Garfield Monument and otherwise redevelop it in cooperation with the Commission of Fine Arts.

My purpose in introducing this bill is to remove what I consider to be one of the greatest hazards to traffic existing today in Washington and at the same time to provide a more fitting site for the location of an outstanding memorial to a great American. As we all know, the monument is located at the foot of Capitol Hill in the center of one of the busiest and most heavily traversed streets in Washington.

In addition to the heavy automotive traffic, First Street SW. contains two lines of track of the D.C. Transit System, Inc. Trolley cars make frequent trips over this line.

First Street runs at the foot of Capitol Hill in a north and south direction. Southbound trolley cars, upon reaching the Garfield Monument, are forced to go around it on the left side in the face of traffic proceeding north. This results in a very hazardous situation for all types of vehicular traffic.

The James A. Garfield Monument was erected by the Society of the Army of the Cumberland with assistance from the Federal Government. It was dedicated on March 12, 1887, to the memory of President Garfield, whose death took place on September 19, 1881, after having been shot by a disappointed office-seeker in July of that year.

President Garfield was a brave soldier in the Union Army during the War Between the States, and his tragic death resulted in the creation of one of our most important Federal agencies, the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

By introducing a bill to remove his national monument to a more suitable location, I in no way intend to reflect upon this great American. President Garfield's place in American history is secure. He gave his life while serving in the highest office his country could offer.

The Garfield National Monument was erected before the day of modern vehicular traffic. When it was dedicated no one could foresee the day when First Street SW. would be the artery for heavy automotive and trolley traffic. Had such a situation been visualized I am sure that those patriotic and devoted Americans who erected the monument would have selected a more suitable site.

I doubt if there is a Member of this House who has not at some time or another had difficulty in getting around the Garfield Monument. Probably there are some in this House who have had near accidents at the monument.

I have utmost confidence in the work being performed by the National Capital Parks and the Commission of Fine Arts. I know that these splendid agencies, if authority is granted to them to do so, will find a suitable place for the location of this monument to a great American. I think it is fitting and proper that this memorial to our second martyred President should be placed in an area more in

keeping with its dignity and historic significance.

I hope that my colleagues in the House will support my bill to remove the monument.

HOW THE PEOPLE OF WISCONSIN FEEL ABOUT DICTATORS

Mr. REUSS. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, February 24, I addressed the House on "How the People of Wisconsin Feel About Dictators"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 24, 1959, pages 2901-2905. My point was that the people of Wisconsin dislike dictatorships, and therefore disagree with the views expressed in an address made early in February by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW] to a joint session of the Dominican Congress. I inserted in the RECORD a text of that address as printed in the English-language newspaper, Herald of the Dominican Republic, for February 7, 1959.

On Friday, February 20, 4 days before my February 24 speech, in order to check the accuracy of the text contained in the Herald of the Dominican Republic, my office called the office of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW] and asked for a copy of his remarks to the Dominican Congress. We were told that, unfortunately, his office had no further copies.

On Monday, February 23, at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, a member of my staff delivered to the office of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW] a copy of the text of the Herald of the Dominican Republic, accompanied by the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 23, 1959.
Hon. GARDNER R. WITHROW,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GARDNER: I am securing a special order to address the House tomorrow, Tuesday, February 24, 1959, on the problem of dictators.

In the course of this address, I shall have to refer to your recent remarks to the Dominican Congress as reported in the Herald of the Dominican Republic, dated Saturday, February 7, 1959. I enclose a copy of the text of your speech as it appeared in this newspaper. I intend to offer this text for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am writing this letter so that you may have prior notification of my subject.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

Some 23 hours later at around 3 o'clock Tuesday afternoon, February 24, during the course of my remarks on the floor, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW] indicated that the report of his address as contained in the Herald of the Dominican Republic was inaccurate, in that he had not in fact used the term "nitwit," as attributed to him in the text of the Herald of the Dominican Republic.

Last Thursday afternoon, February 26, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW] came to me and handed me a text of his address to the Dominican Congress which he stated to be completely accurate. It should be noted that Mr. WITHROW's text, unlike the text as printed in the *Herald of the Dominican Republic*, does not contain the word "nitwit," nor does it contain a reference to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. I include at this point Mr. WITHROW's text in its entirety:

Mr. President, distinguished guests, friends, I am a little surprised in finding myself here with you today. It was by invitation that I came to visit in the Dominican Republic this week. I was happy to accept the invitation, because I have long wanted to visit this home of Columbus, discoverer of America, and because I have been attracted by the unexcelled record of the Dominican Republic in our war against communism. I came as a friend, but you have now raised me to the level of an official visitor. You have bestowed upon me a privilege that is yours alone to give. I shall long remember this privilege.

The weather, the food, the hospitality of those in official position, and those good citizens whom I met on streets and in their offices and in their homes—all have impressed me greatly. I suppose I should confine myself here to political niceties, and spend my time recounting some of the details of my visit and my observations. I think I shall save this for a report on this trip, which I intend to make to the House of Representatives upon my return to Washington. I think more fact-interested people in the United States ought to have these observations.

And, I suppose I ought to speak in platitudes; but I am not going to do this. Let me talk with you on some events and matters which are of supreme importance to you, and to us in the United States, and to all of us in the Western Hemisphere. These are grave times.

What I am about to say might be called independence. It is. It is the same type of independence which you as a nation have displayed, and for which you must be respected and admired. I have developed the feeling that the Dominican Republic, by its nature, is willing to meet another country or another person more than half way. It is a feeling that you like, and you want to be liked. But, at the same time, it is also clear that you do not really need anyone to get along. I congratulate you on a real independence. Never surrender it.

I stand before you as a friend who defends you when I feel you are right and one who is absolutely certain that if the American States had followed the recommendations of the Dominican Republic first made at Caracas—had we followed them, communism would be a diminishing force in this hemisphere today. Instead, I fear communism grows more and more bold. You can no more compromise with communism than you can with crime. You simply erase it by outlawing it. That was your simple solution.

The world today trembles with rumors of war. We in the United States do not want war, we want only peace, and we will go to almost any lengths to maintain peace. I am no less concerned about war in another sense—revolution, rebellion, civil war. The success of communism lies not in armed conflict of nation against nation. Communism is something which divides a country within itself, and to me this is a far worse crime against Christianity than actual armed warfare when the causes are clear and sometimes just.

There are always small groups who covet war and who encourage rebellion. I think

we can identify most of them as Communists. The others would be those who just do not realize what they are doing, and some who seek personal gain. The U.S. foreign aid program has in some instances made international politics profitable, and in still other cases the necessities for U.S. loans is ample evidence that these revolutionaries cannot cope with the complexities of modern government. The administration of a government today is a delicate and difficult thing. The currency and economic crisis of many European countries is satisfactory evidence of the touch needed by a successful administrator. You here in the Dominican Republic have been fortunate in your government. It has brought you peace and prosperity. There are so few countries over the world who could even approach your achievements. I know you give full credit to the amazing abilities of Generalissimo Trujillo, and we do, too. If the generalissimo could be persuaded to turn author, and could be persuaded to write a book on government, the record he has established would make this book required reading in the governments throughout the world. I hope some good friend might prevail upon the generalissimo to write such a best seller.

Economists everywhere who have been unable to do anything write books on how to do it. Here, then, is an administrator who has done it, and who could write the first such authentic book.

We speak eloquently of a free world. Let me tell you very frankly that the United States, and the free nation bloc, is not free to make the decisions today that we might make under different circumstances. The foreign aid program, about which the American taxpayer complains so loudly and for which the President is so insistent and which Congress reluctantly approves—this foreign aid program is mute evidence that we are not free to decide a problem or an issue independently and as we might if the cold war was not with us. Success in the cold war requires us to be expedient, distasteful as it may be to those of us who devoutly believe in principles.

The last war fought upon American soil was the War Between the States in 1861. We called that our Civil War. Our President at that time was the brilliant Abraham Lincoln, who I am proud to say, was a Republican. It was his immortal words "this Nation cannot exist half slave and half free" which rang down through our internal war. Let us apply those immortal words of Lincoln to today. Can this world exist when the peoples of the world are half in slavery of communism and half free?

There are just four reasons for war. The first would be a war for land to live upon. War of this type went out in the early centuries, and except for the Peoples Republic of China, I cannot envision another nation starting a war of this kind and type. Secondly, a war for wealth. I think we can dismiss this one, since this would be a private war of kings. Third is a war for power. Therein lies the real danger of Russia starting war, for political power is the Communist tool and objective. Fourth is a war for security. I cannot by any stretch of the imagination conceive either the United States or the Dominican Republic participating in a war except for their security.

On the other hand, there are overtones in some of the reports of aggression upon the Dominican Republic which are reminiscent of the Communist programs. Always the Hitlers and the Stalins have precipitated wars on the ill-conceived grounds that it was to protect themselves and their country. We are hearing that propaganda now. Let me very bluntly advise you to beware, and to see it for what it is. Keep your peace by keeping your guard up.

I have constantly fought for a new and firm declaration in the foreign policy of the United States. I have pleaded for, I have insisted upon, a simple policy of cooperating with our friends and excluding our enemies. My task has not always been an easy one.

There were those in the United States who were overjoyed when rebellion took place in Cuba. Then, many of these same persons were horrified when blood ran in the streets in Roman circuses called trials, and when we were called gringos. In Venezuela we cheered a revolution that we knew absolutely nothing about—only to end up with our Vice President being spit upon, and now some are appalled that the new junta has levied another 10 percent upon our oil interests there. If we sometimes seem confusing I am afraid it is because we quickly bridge 180 years in our minds. We go into these things with the spirit of 1775, and then when the smoke has settled we think in terms of the U.S. Constitution and democracy of 1959. This is real easy for us, but difficult or impossible for anyone else. That is why I am again critical of our new drift in foreign policy and why I shall exert every effort to help to change it. If the world is expected to think as we do, we must realize there are other parts of the world and try to think as they do. Where is the common meeting ground for a world where one-third of the people eat with their fingers and another one-third eat with chopsticks. I hope we can meet and agree upon the single course of action which is immediate and compelling—a unity against communism. Anything else can be left aside, because until communism is defeated, and unless it is defeated, no other political philosophy has a chance to overtake the world.

The greatest fallacy anyone could assume is that strong personality governments are bad and that democracies are good. Each nation and each government has to stand on its own. Any snap decisions and assays, or quick slogan foreign policy is not a safe, long-range policy. If the United States foreign policy ever becomes one which would encourage rebellion and concurred with solidification of revolutionary governments in this hemisphere, I predict we would have succeeded in joining together a new political and economic force in this hemisphere whose course of action would clearly be against the best interests of the United States. I hazard the guess that it might become necessary for us to tear down the very house which we had watched being built as a matter of our own safety.

I hate revolutions anywhere, because internal war is nothing more than the pitting of father against brother, dividing son against son, the dividing of families. Of such was our Civil War. The Latin is foremost in dedication to his family, even unto second cousins. I can think of no greater crime against Christianity than to initiate civil war in which families are blown into hatreds of one another. The Spanish civil war is emerging in history as a monument to horror.

It must seem to you that I have spoken at some length upon war and more particularly upon revolutions. I have, because for more than a quarter of a century you in the Dominican Republic have lived in peace and security. I doubt that any other American state has achieved the prosperity you have right now. It is possible, however, that there are other states which might like to have yours, and might resort to armed invasion to try to get it. You can recall with me that in the Ukraine in Russia in World War II the Russians welcomed the Nazis. Disillusionment was quick and disastrous. I cannot imagine any invaders charging ashore with banners on which might be inscribed your secret ambitions or carrying an iron-clad, enforceable manifesto for your welfare. You get not what you want, but what they

are and what they want. Recognize them for the politically dissatisfied, the international brigands they probably will be, whose goal is personal power, personal wealth, not government for the people, and who play the stakes of today for international revolution and diplomatic plunder.

The United States has a possession—Puerto Rico—your neighbor. I suspect this possession has harbored political liabilities to the Western Hemisphere. Living there is one known to you who could not satisfy his political ambitions, but is trying to satisfy his hates. I refer, of course, to German Ormes. The Governor of this possession is Muñoz-Marín, who unlike Alaska and Hawaii does not seem to desire statehood. It was a curious thing to me that it was he who vouched for the purposes of the revolutionary leader of Cuba. It is far more strange that he should be on such familiar terms. If the United States foreign policy is to be firmly and clearly one of nonintervention, then it must apply to our possessions as well as to the continental United States. In the new Congress I asked for and got membership on the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This committee handles much of the legislation and affairs pertaining to Puerto Rico. It shall be my purpose to pursue some of these curiosities about Puerto Rico.

It has been my privilege and pleasure to meet with your President, the Honorable Hector Trujillo. His simplicity is warming; his programs sound and promising.

It was my very keen and personal pleasure to meet with Generalissimo Trujillo. The Dominican Ambassador to the United States the Honorable Manuel de Moya, had spoken so highly of the generalissimo that I was prepared for a monumental meeting. But, I was not prepared for this meeting and discussion at all. I say this candidly—you have to meet the generalissimo and speak with him before you actually meet up with the personality and the concept of the man who has given the Dominican Republic these great 27 years.

The Ambassador is easily one of the outstanding stars of the diplomatic corps in Washington. However, I remarked to the Ambassador earlier today on the telephone that if the Dominican Republic could persuade the generalissimo to come to Washington I would not be surprised but what there wouldn't be a whole new foreign policy concept given to the Western Hemisphere and the world. Manuel agreed with me that the generalissimo would make the better Ambassador, which is no depreciation of De Moya, but more an appreciation of the insight and organizational concepts needed in Washington in our foreign policies and our diplomatic corps.

I lack the time in residence here, the personal knowledge, and the full understanding of conditions of yesteryear to aggrandize the generalissimo honestly. In a brief 27 years—which is nothing in measuring history and government—the Dominican Republic has gone from rags and storm ruin to the position today where you are envied by all your neighbors. In moving that quickly, I think it only natural that the generalissimo might have stepped upon some toes and might have offended some too sensitive people. Teddy Roosevelt, a great President, stepped upon more touchy toes than any other American. The patient and brilliant Abraham Lincoln was charged with plunging us into civil war and was hated, and finally assassinated. The number of your enemies is sometimes a yardstick of your success.

I should suspect Generalissimo Trujillo's love for his country, his dedicated drive to raise its economy and international standing to its highest level before going to a Christian reward, might have caused some

loss of friends—particularly those who sought to interfere with the forward march of progress or who placed greed above service to their country. Our general and President, Dwight Eisenhower, is known to get impatient, also, with those whose views he regards as not in the national interests. I sometimes get impatient, and if you search your conscience, you have too, with members of your family or your employees. A chronic critic is a person who always complains because it isn't being done his way.

There is no one in the Congress of the United States who knows the generalissimo personally, or knows the Dominican Republic peoples, who is a critic. What is there to complain about? There is sanitary water, something you don't find elsewhere in the Latin Americas. There are courts of justice; crime is punished and eliminated where possible. There is law. There is Christianity. There is peace. You have prosperity. There is a public works program, the likes of which I never thought I would see, which improves your economy for all time, and your welfare not for years, not for life, but forever. No, I think the critics are made up of dissatisfied politicians, the ignorant, and those with such infertile minds they succumb to the suave chicaneries of exiles and so-called intellectuals.

I doubt that I would be standing here today if the Dominican Republic had any other but Trujillo at the helm. I came here because I wanted to see this man, this personality, and this country for myself. Would I be taking a liberty if I said this might have been just another Latin republic without the absolute genius and the forceful drive of the generalissimo? Nature gave you a great and fertile island, but your own blood gave you finally a man of devotion to duty and love of country who would convert these natural advantages into your good. I think you know this, too. The remarkable thing to me is that you have no external debts, and a ridiculously low internal debt. I said before if he would write a book on government, it would be a best seller among public administrators.

Your congress could achieve no greater help for the Dominican Republic than to begin now determining just how the progress of the era of Trujillo can be carried into perpetuity. You owe it to the Dominican Republic to seal in this financial prosperity, because you contribute not only to yourselves but to the Western Hemisphere. Now while you have the abilities at hand is the time to do it right and lastingly.

Always bear in mind the real struggle is against a Communist ideology which seeks world power. Do not sell this foe short.

Remember there is no government utopia. Your government and the benefits it can afford to bestow on its people depends on their own efforts and the ability of your governing officials.

I shall be everlastingly appreciative for the help given my country during World War II and for the positive position you have always taken opposing communism.

I am proud that I am an American citizen and know that the people of the Dominican Republic feel that same pride.

I have spoken sometimes frankly, and certainly too long. If I have, I apologize most sincerely to you one and all. Just as France has her Foreign Legion, so too does the Dominican Republic have a foreign legion—a legion of foreign friends, and I am happy to be called a soldier in those ranks.

I hope you will support your government, that you will defend your government from within and without, and I shall help you. You have been gracious; you have been most kind. Until we meet again.

The words in Mr. WITHROW's text will speak for themselves. From his praise of Trujillo and his dictatorship, and

from much of the rest of it, I continue to dissent. And so, I am sure, do the great majority of the people of Wisconsin.

SALMON FISHING IN THE PACIFIC OCEAN

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to lay before this body House Joint Memorial No. 1 enacted by the 50th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon meeting in regular session, respectfully urging the President of the United States to complete a treaty with Japan on maximum salmon fishing in the Pacific Ocean and institution of treaty negotiations with other nations of the north Pacific on the same subject. Under unanimous consent I include the text of the memorial at this point in the RECORD.

STATE OF OREGON,
HALL OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Salem, February 25, 1959.

The Honorable EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GREEN: I have the honor to transmit House Joint Memorial No. 1 respectfully urging the President of the United States to complete a treaty with Japan on maximum salmon fishing in the Pacific Ocean and institution of treaty negotiations with other nations of the north Pacific on the same subject.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT B. DUNCAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 1

TO HIS EXCELLENCY, THE HONORABLE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

We, your memorialists, the 50th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the percentage of the total number of salmon taken from the high seas of the North Pacific Ocean by the fisheries of Japan and other foreign countries has been increasing at an alarming rate in recent years; and

Whereas this trend can operate only to the detriment of the salmon fisheries of the State of Oregon and the United States and the economies of the State of Oregon and the United States as a whole: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That we urge the President of the United States to use every effort to complete a treaty with the Japanese Government prescribing the maximum amount of salmon which may be taken annually by the fisheries of the United States and Japan; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge that negotiations for such a treaty be commenced at the earliest possible date, and that all nations of the north Pacific Ocean area be urged to enter into such negotiations and to cooperate in the establishment of a treaty; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States,

all members of the Oregon congressional delegation, and the legislative assemblies of the States of Washington and California.

THE AMERICAN FARMER

Mr. MATTHEWS. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest problems facing the American farmer during this fiscal year 1959 is how to get a fair press and other publications media which will present the true facts to the American public. All of us received in the mail recently one of the most interesting computations of facts about the American farmer that I have ever read. The articles were prepared under the auspices of the National Grange, and were sent to Members of Congress under the signature of Jack Jackson, director of public relations. I want to give credit to the National Grange for the remarks that follow. Let us ask, in the first place, this question: Who gets Government subsidies?

Over and over again we read in the press of the terrific subsidies to the farmers of America, but we seldom read about the other subsidies that are granted to other segments of the American economy. Did you know, for example, that the following figures indicate the Bureau of the Budget's breakdown of current expenses and special services for a recent year as follows:

	Millions
Post Office Department in favor of business.....	\$670
Navigation aids.....	137
Air navigation aids.....	93
Ship operation subsidies.....	50
Other special aids to business.....	138
Total to business.....	1,041
To labor (grants to States for operating employment service and unemployment compensation programs).....	200

A report issued by the House Committee on Agriculture on June 25, 1958, states that farm price support losses from 1933 to 1958, a 25-year period, mind you, have cost taxpayers \$5,173,746,788. The House Committee on Appropriations, however, reports the following taxpayer subsidies:

	Millions
Mail subsidies (10-year period, 1946-56).....	\$5,968
Business reconversion payments.....	43,262
Subsidies to maritime organizations (1938-57).....	3,500
Subsidies to airlines (1938-57).....	614

The December 12, 1958, issue of the Wall Street Journal reports that subsidies to U.S. ship line operators run \$120 million annually, and that, if approved, requests now before the Maritime Board will bring the total to \$220 million. The U.S. News & World Report, in an August 8, 1958, issue, reports that the Government is building two new steamships for ship line operators. One, the *America*, is to cost taxpayers \$120 million—it will sell for \$47 million. The

other, the *President Washington*, is to cost Uncle Sam about \$80 million and it will sell for \$34 million.

Now, there are many other subsidies provided by the Federal Government, but, I shall not mention more of them, except to remind you that most of us who live in homes, and that includes many, many millions of Americans, buy our homes because Uncle Sam has agreed to bail out the lenders in case there is a default in payments. I would like to add this other thought, also; that when we criticize the farm program because of a tremendous payment to one farmer, let us remind ourselves that when we sit down to read a magazine we might well be reading an editorial in a magazine that receives a subsidy through the U.S. Post Office Department, and this subsidy has cut the annual cost of mailing that one publication by as much as \$3,604,000.

Now, of course, two wrongs do not make a right and it may be wrong to pay a tremendous subsidy to one farmer, but if that be a wrong I think it only fair to the farmers who, in a few instances, receive a large subsidy, for the American people to know that this subsidy is matched two or three times over by subsidies that go to certain magazines in this country.

Another grave problem that the American farmer has is the unfair press he receives, when over and over again we get the idea that all of the USDA appropriations represent subsidies to farmers. I have read editorials, Mr. Speaker, in some of our outstanding newspapers suggesting that the U.S. Department of Agriculture's proposed expenditures of \$6½ or \$7 billion this fiscal year represent a subsidy to farmers. I recently heard a popular television commentator very glibly emphasize this erroneous statement.

Now, let us examine in detail the proposed USDA appropriations. For example, the farm commodity export program in 1957 cost \$843 million—or about one-sixth of the total USDA appropriation for that year. Is this a subsidy to the farmer, or is it an effort to help win the cold war? Secretary Benson has said of this program, "It is helping keep the free world free. It is an ambassador of good will. Every American can be proud of the constructive use being made of the abundance of American agriculture." I, along with many of my colleagues, have constantly stressed the fact that we would make far greater progress in winning the cold war if we would make better use of our abundant food. Why not consider this program in its proper perspective, and that is, as a defense program. Surely when airplane manufacturers are granted the right to manufacture airplanes on a cost-plus basis—they and the many other large defense contractors who are guaranteed a profit every time they turn out an implement of war, would not deny the farmers of America a small percentage of the defense budget. From 1953 through the first half of fiscal 1959, \$1.2 billion worth of surplus foods has been distributed in foreign countries through U.S. voluntary agencies. This money should

not be considered as a subsidy to the farmer.

Always, in the total USDA appropriations, we consider the amount that is lent to our REA co-ops for loans. This will amount to about half a billion dollars annually. These loans are repaid with interest and repayments are over \$100 million ahead of schedule. Many more millions that are lent and repaid to the Farmers Home Administration are charged as a net cost in the USDA annual appropriation.

The market research program should not be charged totally to the farmers, since as a result of this program handling methods are now saving the grain trade over \$1 million annually; techniques which cut industry's cost of storing cotton have been developed and have amounted to a saving of about \$2 million per season; and processes reducing food handling have saved \$6 million annually in the city of Philadelphia alone.

The Federal meat inspection program, costing about \$19 million a year, the brucellosis eradication program, costing around \$22 million a year, have as their primary goal public-health protection, and this is an expense that should not be charged to the farmer.

The International Wheat Agreement, costing about \$20 million a year, helps provide the farmers a high price for wheat, but it also helps members of the grain trade expand their export business—and profits.

Surely, we would not count the universally popular school-lunch program as a subsidy solely for the farmers. The USDA contributed around \$284 million to this program last year. Millions of our schoolchildren shared the benefits of this program. From 1953 through the first half of fiscal 1959, approximately \$1.2 billion worth of surplus food has been given to our own people in the United States. Currently, 14 million schoolchildren, 1.4 million needy persons in institutions, and 5.2 million persons in family units are receiving this food. This program should be charged to welfare.

The supervision and operation of 181 million acres of national forests are maintained and managed by the Government for the production of timber, regulation of streamflow, flood control, water power, irrigation, navigation, and municipal water supply—all in the interest of the public. Many of the large business organizations of this country are absolutely dependent upon the national forests for their existence. In addition, 45 million citizens took advantage of the recreational facilities of our national forests last year. Yet the costs of the supervision and operation of our national forests are too often glibly charged as subsidies to the farmer.

Actually, it is my considered judgment that, generally, only about half of the USDA appropriations each year can be legitimately considered as expenses that should be charged to the farmer, and even of that amount, I think, the word "subsidy" should not be properly ascribed to but about 50 percent of the remaining appropriations—or a maximum total of from \$2 to \$3 billion. Now this is a

lot of money. It may be too much, but it is not as much as the \$6 to \$7 billion, we are told, are annual subsidies to farmers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the gravest errors perpetrated in the discussion of the farm problem is the error that pictures the price-support program as being responsible for a greater cost to the consumer. Now, of course, any program that costs money is paid for by the taxpayers of America. All of the services of government cost money. But, no less an authority than Secretary Benson himself has stated, in effect, that there is no noticeable correlation between price supports and the cost that the consumer pays in the marketplace. For example, in a peanut candy bar, I suppose the farmer would receive about one-half of 1 cent for the peanuts that would go into a 5-cent candy bar, if you can still find one. If the farmer gave the peanuts away, my guess is that the price of the candy bar would not be decreased to 4½ cents.

Let us take the cotton products and show the farm value and the retail price in a number of these products:

Cotton products	Farm value	Retail price	If farmers donated the cotton, the retail price would be—
Overalls.....	\$0.65	\$3.30	\$2.65
Pajamas.....	.35	3.00	2.65
Broadcloth shirt.....	.28	3.94	3.66
Work shirt.....	.26	1.61	1.35
Sox.....	.07	.50	.43
Work trousers.....	.51	3.58	3.07
Housedress.....	.33	3.34	3.01
Yard goods (percale) per yard.....	.09	.51	.42
Bedsread.....	1.45	6.31	4.86
Sheet.....	.74	2.35	1.61

Now, Mr. Speaker, these figures assume that the retail prices would remain the same if the farmer obtained his present value of the raw cotton, but experience has proved that this is not the case. When the farmer gets less, the retail prices do not evidence that loss of income to the farmer, but rather, the retail prices go up. My contention is that if the farmer gave his cotton away, that the other factors involved in the cotton economy would cost just that much more money and the consumer would not get the product a cent cheaper and, in fact, would probably pay more. Do you want proof? Well, in 1948, farmers were getting \$2.81 per bushel for wheat and consumers were paying 13.8 cents for a 1-pound loaf of bread. By 1955, the farmer's price had dropped to \$2.14 per bushel and the consumer's cost had climbed to 17.5 cents per loaf. By 1957, the farmer was getting only \$2 per bushel for wheat, and the consumer was paying 18.8 cents per loaf for bread. Thus, between 1948 and 1957 wheat prices dropped 29 percent to the farmer, but bread prices to the consumer increased 38 percent. In 1951, farmers received \$20.2 billion for producing food that cost consumers \$43 billion. In 1957, farmers received \$19.5 billion for producing about 11 percent more food that cost consumers \$50.4 bil-

lion. Thus, consumers paid \$7.4 billion more and farmers received \$700 million less for about 11 percent more food. Furthermore, in the food industry during that period, corporate profits increased \$0.7 billion, labor costs \$3.6 billion, transportation costs \$1 billion, and other business expenses \$2.8 billion.

In 1952, when producer prices were supported at 90 percent of parity, consumers were paying an average of 22.8 cents per quart for milk. By April 1958 price supports had been dropped to 75 percent of parity and consumer prices had advanced to 25.3 cents per quart. Furthermore, the April 1958 producer price was about the same as it had been a year earlier, but consumer prices had advanced from 24.6 to 25.3 cents per quart.

Between 1947 and 1957, the cost of the family food market basket increased \$243, and here is why:

First. The farm value of food involved increased \$3.

Second. Labor costs increased \$130.

Third. Transportation costs increased \$33.

Fourth. Other business expenses advanced \$73.

Fifth. Charges to pay Federal income taxes were up \$4.

The purpose of my talk is not to criticize other segments of the American economy, Mr. Speaker, but it is to speak for the American farmer as earnestly and as honestly as I can. I say that the price support program has very little relationship with the price that the consumer pays in the marketplace. It is estimated that farmers today receive only about 39 cents from each \$1.00 spent for food. I believe if it were not for the price support programs that he would even receive much less than that amount.

Another grave difficulty that the American farmer faces in the lack of proper and accurate presentation of the facts is the idea presented over and over again that the so-called farm subsidy program helps only one segment of the farm economy, and that is the six, so-called, basic crops. Why, I wonder, are we not told about section 32 funds, which are funds derived from 30 percent of the taxes on imports? This money, amounting to many hundreds of millions of dollars, is spent on the so-called perishable agricultural commodities, such as beef, pork, fruit, vegetables, etc. Proper use of these funds has meant much to the farmer who does not plant the basic crops. Why are we not told of all of the vast research programs—the Extension Service programs, the great marketing agreements which give the farmers, for example, engaged in vegetable or fruit production, the right to regulate the sales of a particular agricultural commodity?

What about the great soil conservation programs that help farmers plant their trees, and then in future years will help great business establishments that will be dependent upon these forests?

What about the great watershed programs and reclamation programs some of which are not sponsored by the Department of Agriculture, but represent an area of aid to farmers not engaged in the production of the basic commodities.

One great problem we have in trying to solve the farm problem is the fact that we have what we might call inter-necine jealousies among farmers themselves. These jealousies and misunderstandings arise not only among sections, but they arise among producers of various agricultural commodities. The American farmers must present a united front as they seek a solution to the many problems that face them.

It should be pointed out that farmers and ranchers are among the biggest customers of American industry. There are 12 million tractors, cars, and trucks on the U.S. farms, and agriculture buys more petroleum than any other industry. Farmers provide a market for 6½ million tons of finished steel annually. Rubber used on the farms of America would put tires on nearly 6 million automobiles annually. Sixteen percent of the gross freight revenue is from agricultural products. Agriculture consumes 50 million tons of chemicals each year. Agriculture uses more electric power than Chicago, Detroit, Houston, Baltimore, and Boston combined.

About 10 million persons actually work on the farms of America. In the total agricultural economy, about 25 million workers are gainfully employed, as follows: 6 million in manufacturing and selling farm production supplies, 10 million actually on the farm, 9 million processing and distributing farm commodities. Thus, approximately 25 million workers or 40 percent approximately of our gainfully employed are involved in the production and distribution of food and fiber from the farms of America. While the actual farm population has steadily declined, this total number engaged in the total agriculture economy has remained fairly stable over a long period of years.

What about the income of the American farmer? The \$13 billion net farm income for 1958 was 20 percent above that for 1957. However, this is 24 percent less than for 1947 and is also less than for any year between 1946 and 1954. In 1957, the per capita farm income was \$967, while per capita nonfarm income was \$2,082—\$309 of the farmers' \$967 was for work done off the farm. During that year, the hourly income for farm labor and management was 69 cents while workers in manufacturing industries received \$2.07 per hour. During 1956, farm families operating the Nation's 2,213,000 commercial farms received an average income of \$5,415 while all nonfarm families—including those living on skid row and public relief—received an income of \$6,900.

While the farmer's income has been declining, his efficiency has increased. For example: Between 1950 and 1958, output per farmworker increased 26 percent and during the same period, total per capita farm income dropped from \$983 to \$967. The number of persons supported by 1 farmworker was 6.9 in 1900, 10.6 in 1940, 15.9 in 1950 and 23.5 in 1958.

Where do we go from here? We are not going anywhere, Mr. Speaker, if first of all the farmers of America do not unite and present a solid front. We

cannot expect our friends who are anxious to help us to be impressed if there are internecine fights between sections of the farming community. In the second place, we must immediately concern ourselves with legislation to help agriculture commodities in greatest difficulty, such as wheat. We must take other commodities and devise legislation to help them. For example, in my Eighth District of Florida, our greatest cash crop which has a price support structure is flue-cure tobacco. One of the great problems facing our little farmer is the fact that his allotment has been decreased to such an extent that he does not have an acreage large enough to make it profitable for him to produce tobacco. I have introduced legislation which will enable him to lease allotments on a year-to-year basis, under the supervision of the county committee, and with appropriate safeguards for overall production. This would enable the little family-size farmer to have enough tobacco acreage allotment to make it profitable for him to farm and, at the same time, would safeguard production restraints.

Another thing that we must do is constantly to work for the family-size farmer. I have always believed, and still do, that the independent family-size farmer is of vital importance to the America that we know and love. I realize that the number of people living on the farm has rapidly diminished from the 84 percent of the total population in the time of Jefferson to, perhaps, not more than 16 percent at the present time; yet, this number is eminently worth saving. Where will the little farmer turn for employment if he is driven off the farm? The answer, of course, is in the crowded sections of the city in many instances, places where jobs are not available, and where present slums are crying for relief. I realize that I have only been on the Committee on Agriculture for 4 years, and certainly am not prepared to give the answers to the agricultural problem, but I do know that we cannot expect the farm economy to go it alone when other segments of the economy are subsidized by the Government. If we should all return to the laissez faire system, well and good. If no one received a subsidy or a Government program, the farmer could stand absolutely by himself. But his lot without the interest of the Government will be that of continuing to pay more and more for what he buys and receiving less and less for what he sells. Another thing, then, that we must constantly keep in mind is that until better programs are proposed for the welfare of the American farmer, we must live with the programs we have and attempt to purify and strengthen them wherever possible. Certainly we should consider more adequate production controls and other remedial techniques during this present session of Congress. However, we should never, in my opinion, barter away the basic right of the American farmer to receive some help from his Government, to assure for him some reasonable income for his toll when the other segments of the economy receive this largess.

We should always fight for the proposition that the farmer cannot go it alone, if other segments of the economy are the recipients of special subsidies from the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I want to pay tribute to the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, the Honorable HAROLD COOLEY and to my colleagues on the committee, many of whom have far more seniority than I, and who for years have worked diligently on the problems of the American farmer. I do not believe the situation is hopeless, but I do believe that it is incumbent upon every American to try to get the true facts about the farm problem, and when he does, I am sure that the people will vote on the side of the American farmer. I for one, am not pledged to any particular program or solution. I shall, however, resist to the utmost of my ability the taking away from the farmer the hard fought gains he has made, which I think are fair to the farmer and the consumer. All of us realize there are deficits in the present program, many of which could have been eliminated if Congress had passed the omnibus agricultural bill reported by our committee last year. The present need is to fan the issue, with resolution and courage, to give an adequate program to the farmers of America, for their benefit and for the benefit of every American, since we all depend for life itself upon the food and fiber from the American farm.

AIRBORNE ALERT A VITAL ELEMENT IN OUR DEFENSIVE POSTURE

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York.

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed recently, as a new member of the Committee on Armed Services, to learn from the Chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Nathan M. Twining, that the United States does not now maintain—and General Twining claimed, with some rare exceptions, had never before maintained—any round-the-clock, airborne alert, that is to say, armed bomber aircraft of the United States in the air constantly ready to react against any enemy surprise attack, and, being airborne, immune to any surprise destructive attack directed against our airbases.

General Twining said that such an alert was too expensive to maintain, except possibly in times of serious crisis. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly think that the Berlin crisis is just such a time. Many persons have already called for a mobilization of our forces to show the Soviets plainly we intend to stand firm at Berlin. Senator JACKSON of Washington called yesterday for the mobilization of four or five Reserve or National Guard divisions. I believe that in a time like this we also require an air-

borne alert, so that under no possible circumstances can we fall prey to another Pearl Harbor. The stakes are just too great.

In that connection I desire to call to the attention of my colleagues and our leaders in the military the fine column that appeared in the Washington Post this morning, written by Mr. Joseph Alsop. Under unanimous consent I insert it in the Record at this point:

ONLY 150

(By Joseph Alsop)

OFFUTT AIR FORCE BASE, OMAHA, NEBR.—If the national intelligence estimates are just no more than normally wrong, this country may soon be nakedly exposed to something infinitely worse than Pearl Harbor.

Only one immediate measure can be taken to reduce the risk. The Strategic Air Command can be ordered to mount an immediate maximum airborne alert.

SAC's brilliant commander, Gen. Thomas S. Power, has already begged the authorities in Washington to put SAC on an airborne alert status. But mounting a continuing airborne alert will cost money. Hence General Power has been turned down, for the usual budgetary reasons.

These are the terrible facts that have been all but burned into this reporter's mind, during his days here, in the headquarters of the great deterrent force that carries the main burden of guarding the United States and the free world. The grim mathematics that prove the facts are indeed that, and not mere figments from a nightmare, can be summarized as follows:

First, SAC is already maintaining a 15-minute ground alert of one-third of its aircraft. But the existing warning system does not see missiles. The new missile-seeing radars will not be in position until 1961, on present projections. Thus SAC now has zero warning against a Soviet surprise attack with ballistic missiles. In these circumstances, the whole SAC force can be surprised on the ground if the Soviet has the missiles to do the job.

Second, the Pentagon leaders have admitted in their recent testimony that the Soviets may well have enough medium range ballistic missiles to destroy all of SAC's overseas bases.

Third, only one question then remains: whether SAC's bases in this hemisphere are equally vulnerable. The number of Soviet ICBM's needed to strike at this hemisphere is proportional, of course, to the target system. Most probably the Soviets would wish their first strike to destroy all of SAC's 30-odd bases on this side of the Atlantic, plus the National Command Post in Washington, plus the main nodes of the communications net of the American Air Defense Command (in order to clear the way for a potential second strike with aircraft). This gives a total of approximately 50 targets, all of them completely "soft." Assuming 33 1/3 percent reliability for the Soviet ICBM, a stock of 150 missiles would be enough for the purpose.

On the basis of the national intelligence estimates, the President and the Pentagon leaders alike assert that the Soviets do not have this stock of ICBM's at the present time. On the face of the known facts, the arguments for this estimate appear less strong than the arguments against it. For example, the only sensible explanation for the shutdown of output of the Bison bomber is the conversion of the Soviet's heavy bomber factories to ICBM production. In addition, it is well to remember the persistent optimistic errors in previous national estimates.

In any case, the rightness or wrongness of the estimates does not need to be argued.

The whole American future is now being gambled on a guess that the Soviets do not have a few score weapons, which they have the means to produce and have been working desperately hard to produce. Whether the guess is good or bad, this is a criminal gamble. Only the same psychology that begot Pearl Harbor would permit such a gamble, and especially after this country has received the clearest kind of strategic warning at Berlin.

While we have zero tactical warning, and no missiles of our own in hand pads, there is only one way to reduce the gamble. The maximum feasible percentage of SAC's great force must be kept in the air, with targets assigned, bombs aboard, and ready to go. The word "maximum" needs to be emphasized, since the much easier and cheaper sort of air alert confined to SAC's B-52 squadrons will provide no more than minimum deterrence, which is not real deterrence.

The cost, though considerable, will be under \$1 billion a year; but intense efforts will also be needed to increase the flow to SAC of replacement parts, spare crews, jet tankers to improve the B-47 capability, and so forth.

It seems a small price to pay, when you remember General Power's remark that "Pearl Harbor, though a highly successful surprise, was really like stamping on a strong man's little finger." The surprise we are now risking would not just mean the beginning of an ultimately victorious war. It would mean the end of these United States.

BARTER COULD COUNTER SOVIET ECONOMIC OFFENSIVE

Mr. COOLEY. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, we all know that the Soviet bloc is mounting an economic offensive against the free world. Part of this campaign is to displace U.S. exports to other free world

countries. The Congress has handed our own Department of Agriculture an effective weapon to counterbalance and offset this Communist economic strategy. It is the barter program under Public Law 480.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to report to the House that this valuable use of our agricultural surpluses, in return for which we are able to accomplish a multiple purpose, by stockpiling vital raw materials, is not being employed as Congress directed it to be. Hostile forces within the administration arbitrarily curtailed the barter program in May of 1957, and they have failed to heed a very clear directive by the 85th Congress that the program should be resumed. As a result, our barter business in the last half of 1958 was only one-sixth of that conducted in the last half of 1956. This program has been put on a starvation diet, in the obvious hope that it will dry up and blow away.

Roadblocks of all kinds have been set up to prevent the restoration of an effective barter program. The biggest obstacle of all is the requirement of evidences of so-called additionality. No shipments can be made to the countries which have big commodity markets—called "A" countries in the Department's regulations—without special permission. Permission to do this is rarely granted, and that is why we do not have a significant barter program.

The purpose of all this administrative redtape is supposedly to protect U.S. cash markets; but the facts indicate that it has the opposite effect. The effect of these restrictions on barter, as the statistics show, has been not only to destroy the barter program but also to diminish the cash markets we had built up while barter was being carried on.

While the administration was prohibiting the barter of U.S. farm commodities to the so-called "A" countries in 1957, the Communists were shipping

\$89,927,000 worth of these identical commodities to these same countries during that year. Our Government held up the shipment of about a hundred million dollars worth of agricultural surpluses under the barter program, while the Communists filled the orders.

As an example of the continuing seriousness of this situation, during the past 2 months five barter proposals which would involve exports of surplus commodities to Belgium have been vetoed, although Belgium has entered agreements with Communist-bloc countries for the purchase during this year of 372,000 metric tons of these same farm commodities.

Whose cash markets are we protecting? While we continue to prevent the shipment of farm surpluses into "A" markets the Soviets are planning to ship 1½ million metric tons of the same farm products to these countries this year under trade agreements already entered into.

The barter program can help to prevent Soviet encroachment on Western markets. We must realize that the Soviets are in competition with us, and unless we get rid of the silly restrictions which surround some of our export programs, our friends in Western Europe and in other areas will be buying more and more agricultural commodities from the Soviet bloc.

The last thing we all want to do is to aid and abet Soviet economic imperialism. The first thing we all want to do is to find additional outlets for our farm surpluses. Let us hope for an awakening within the administration on this matter. Let us hope that they will institute a significant barter program, as the Congress has directed them to do.

The following tables show 1957 exports from the Soviet bloc to "A" countries, planned Soviet exports to Belgium in 1959, and dollar sales since 1953 compared to barter exports:

Value of selected exports from the Soviet bloc to selected A countries (modified barter program), January–December 1957

[In thousands of U.S. dollars]

	Wheat	Rice	Barley	Corn	Rye, other grains	Tobacco	Cotton		Wheat	Rice	Barley	Corn	Rye, other grains	Tobacco	Cotton
Austria.....						1,070	2,410	Norway.....	8,521		40		4,096		
Belg-Lux.....		139	3,320	129	527	723	952	Portugal.....						44	
Denmark.....	835		458		1,635			Sweden.....				37		42	
France.....					1,926	5,027		Switzerland.....	88	2,378	1,140	1,057	168		441
West Germany.....	2,250		7,490	1,693	2,746	11,031		United Kingdom.....	1,004		293	248	415		6,650
Italy.....			2,739	405	1,091	1,587	1,393	Total.....	12,742	341	23,219	5,318	10,702	8,380	29,225
Japan.....				1,070	265		1,174	Combined total.....				89,927	000		
Netherlands.....	132	114	6,501	596	1,616	74	147								

Source: Department of Commerce, Country-by-Commodity Series, January–December 1957.

Soviet planned exports to Belgium, 1959

Exporter	Commodity	Quantity (metric tons)	Exporter	Commodity	Quantity (metric tons)
Bulgaria.....	Feed grains.....	5,500	Rumania.....	Wheat, flour.....	85,000
	Tobacco.....	2,000		Feed grains.....	120,550
	Rice.....	2,500		Wheat.....	(1)
Czechoslovakia.....	Feed grains.....	15,000	U.S.S.R.....	Feed grains.....	45,000
Hungary.....	do.....	34,453		Tobacco.....	3,000
Poland.....	Tobacco.....	17,582	Total.....		371,615
	Feed grains.....	40,000			
	Tobacco.....	1,000			

¹ Amount unspecified.

U.S. Department of Agriculture—Export of agricultural commodities

[In millions of dollars]

Exports as a result of—	Calendar year 1953	Calendar year 1954	Calendar year 1955	Calendar year 1956	Calendar year 1957	January– March 1958	April–June 1958	July–Sep- tember 1958
I. Dollar sales:								
A. Other than CCC stocks.....	2,289.1	2,112.2	1,588.7	1,314.6	2,023.3	372.8	466.3	496.7
B. CCC stocks:								
1. Cash.....	147.9	344.2	349.1	1,071.7	555.7	221.8	35.6	64.9
2. Credit.....				4.0	18.2	1.0	.4	2.3
3. Payment in kind.....					82.9	19.2	16.4	12.1
Total dollar sales.....	2,437.0	2,456.4	1,937.8	2,390.3	2,680.1	614.8	513.7	575.0
II. Barter sales.....	14.0	29.9	224.1	349.6	269.0	8.6	19.1	15.8

PUBLIC HOUSING BONDS

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced H.R. 5096, a bill to close a glaring tax loophole in connection with future issues of public housing bonds. It will end Federal tax exemption for future issues of public housing bonds which are secured by pledge of Federal annual contribution contracts entered into after the date the bill becomes law.

My bill will end Federal tax exemption on public housing bonds which are to be secured by pledge of Federal contributions. They represent Federal credit. In an opinion rendered to the President of the United States on May 15, 1953, the U.S. Attorney General stated in part:

In summary, I am of the view that: * * * A contract to pay annual contributions entered into by the PHA (Public Housing Administration) in conformance with the provisions of the act (U.S. Housing Act of 1937, as amended) is valid and binding upon the United States, and that the faith of the United States has been solemnly pledged to the payment of such contributions in the same terms its faith has been pledged to the payment of its interest-bearing obligations.

Since the Federal Government by law cannot sell its own bonds on a tax-exempt basis it is just plain wrong to permit a public housing agency, in effect, to sell Federal credit on a tax-exempt basis.

Only last Thursday \$103 million of public housing bonds were sold to two bond underwriting groups at an average net interest cost of 3.40 percent. All of those bonds are secured by pledge of Federal contributions. Large investors through this financing device are, in effect, buying Federal credit on a tax-exempt basis. Contrast that with the small saver who buys U.S. savings bonds and gets 3½ percent interest but must pay Federal income tax on the interest he receives. It is a glaring injustice to the small saver to burden him with Federal taxes on his investment and at the same time set up additional tax loopholes for the large investor on his investment. Such discrimination in favor of the big investor over the small saver must end. My bill will do just that.

The Housing Act of 1959, as reported by the House committee, provides for approximately 190,000 additional public housing units. At an average cost of \$13,600 per unit that means \$2.6 billion total cost. That will be the principal amount of public housing bonds issued to finance that cost. Those bonds will be 100 percent secured by pledge of Federal contributions. Those bonds at an assumed average rate of interest of 3 percent will generate \$1.9 billion of interest payments over the 40-year life of those bonds. Those interest payments will be secured by 100 percent pledge of Federal contributions. The large investor will get that amount of interest on a tax-exempt basis. Assuming these wealthy investors are in the 60 percent income tax bracket, they would be getting a tax windfall of over \$1 billion. Such a tax-free windfall for the very wealthy cannot be justified.

When the housing bill reaches the floor of the House if any additional public housing authorization is approved, I intend to offer my bill as an amendment to the housing bill and thus plug this tax loophole. We should make the rules of the game that apply to the small saver no more burdensome than the rules that apply to the very wealthy.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. 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 Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly distressed about the recent ruling by the Federal Communications Commission that all candidates for public office must be given equal time on regular news broadcasts.

I do not believe anyone in the broadcasting industry or anyone running for office objects to the equal time provision when it concerns interview programs, panels, or advertising. This equal-time provision is a guarantee to all office-seekers that no station may provide an opponent with choice broadcast time in excessive amounts while refusing another candidate the same opportunity to take his message to the voters.

But to say that equal coverage must be given on news broadcasts to all opponents of an incumbent mayor when the mayor opens a fund campaign is carrying the principle too far. Yet that is what the FCC has ruled. The stations

which report such activities as opening of charity campaigns are performing a public service. They should not be told to give equal coverage to other candidates unless the candidate whose activities are covered makes a political comment during the course of the coverage.

Carrying out the decision of the FCC will result in a decided reduction in coverage of activities such as charity drives when part of the public service news coverage must of necessity show a person who is incidentally a candidate for election or reelection. The broadcasters in this country do a fine job of public service, and they should be encouraged in their efforts. I do not say that this decision will end such public service news coverage, but it will certainly reduce such coverage or cause it to be stilted in order to leave out a certain person who happens to be a candidate for public office but who also is the principal person involved in the charity campaign opening or in the dedication of a charity program or institution.

Certainly our broadcasters are mature enough to know when a candidate is seeking free publicity. Reporters and editors of our radio and TV stations are not naive. They will watch and catch the candidate who is looking for a chance to turn such coverage into personal gain.

But let us look into the matter further. What about the coverage of a city council or other legislative body which meets during a period when its members are candidates for reelection. Is a station to ignore the meeting of the legislative body? Is it to say that a bill or ordinance passed and no more? Is it to ignore the debate, which is often as important as the vote? I think we would have to answer "No" to these questions. Yet if the FCC ruling is carried out, the radio and TV stations that lead the way—those who do a good job of reporting government news and informing the people—will find it impossible to do a good job.

Such a station might have to report debate thusly: "A bill to increase the State gasoline tax passed the State senate today. The vote was 50 to 11. Somebody said the people do not want the increase. But somebody else said the people are willing to pay for better roads which will result. Another senator said people don't want better roads if it means more taxes."

Now what kind of a newscast would that be?

Or perhaps when a mayor who is a candidate for reelection greets the President of Argentina at the airport—as

happened in the case decided by the FCC—the newscaster in narrating film of the arrival of this foreign head of state—an honored visitor to our country—should say to the viewers: "Please don't pay any attention to the fellow shaking the President's hand and escorting the President to a car. He's a candidate for a political office and we aren't allowed to mention him unless we give 42 other candidates equal time to shake somebody's hand."

These are poor examples. At least I think they are poor examples. I imagine our talented reporters of our radio and TV stations can handle the situations better than this.

But there can be no doubt that strict enforcement of the equal time rule as it pertains to news coverage will cause less effective coverage of both public service activities and government news. And neither of these areas should suffer from reduced reporting coverage.

I am having a bill prepared which will amend the Federal Communications Act so that the FCC is instructed that it should not enforce the equal time rule in every news situation. The FCC would have rules of guidance which would allow a station to report the news as it happens. When one party has a rally, and the other party does nothing, the news reports should reflect this. But when one candidate buys time, the other candidates will continue to have the right to purchase equal time.

It does not take a Solomon to decide whether a station is giving slanted news coverage to one party or one candidate. Any radio or TV news editor has the good judgment to decide what is news and what is not.

The bill I am preparing will relax the equal time provision as it pertains to news coverage only. And it will spell out that the relaxation does not apply to coverage of individual candidates giving political talks, even when such political talks are part of the news coverage.

I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in sponsoring this bill or similar legislation.

BILL REGULATING NATIONAL HOLIDAYS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, during recent months some dramatic and far-reaching events have commanded our complete attention. The Russians have now launched a manmade planet and there has been a fresh spate of legislation directed at catching up technologically with the Soviets. In addition, thousands of bills have been tossed in the hopper dealing with a host of domestic and international issues which demonstrate conclusively our anxiety over meeting the challenge of our times and staking our claim in outer space. I submit, however, that we cannot permit our overriding

concern for maintaining either a military balance of power or a balanced fiscal budget to blind us to the need for achieving progress in other directions.

Today I am introducing a bill to designate the third Monday in February as a legal public holiday called Presidents Day and to provide for the observance of Memorial Day, Independence Day, and Thanksgiving on Friday, thus creating four additional 3-day holiday weekends.

The purpose of this measure is to give Americans at least five 3-day holiday weekends throughout the year, inclusive of Labor Day, and to minimize the number of midweek holiday observances with all their attendant inconvenience and inefficiency.

The advantages of this calendar adjustment both from the standpoint of workers and, indeed, employers, are, I believe, self-evident.

There is no need for me to cite here the infinitely greater pleasure and satisfaction of anticipating and planning a 3-day holiday weekend when by sheer happenstance these holidays occur on Friday or Monday. Quite on the other hand, the interruption of the normal work week for a 1-day holiday not only impairs the smoothness of operations of many industrial, professional, and business concerns, but the abnormal amount of absenteeism that invariably follows is acknowledged to be the bane of bosses and a pain to plant managers.

To those who are shocked by this proposed break with tradition, may I point out that the current fixed date observance of these holidays is not so worthy of veneration as may appear at a glance. Washington was, according to the Julian Calendar used in his day, actually born on February 11. Memorial Day did not become a legal holiday until 1910, and even today veterans are memorialized on four different dates in the United States. As for Thanksgiving, it is within the recollection of all of us that this observance has been shuffled on the calendar and, as a matter of fact, the first Thanksgiving of the Pilgrims was celebrated in October.

Therefore, I earnestly commend the attention of my colleagues to this meritorious resolution to make life more efficient, convenient, and more pleasurable for all Americans and I trust it will receive your thoughtful consideration.

BILL TO ALLOW TAX CREDIT FOR CHILD MAINTENANCE DURING INCAPACITY OF THE MOTHER

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for certain expenses incurred by a taxpayer for the care of his children while his wife is physically or mentally incapable of caring for such children. The bill would

provide that there shall be allowed as a deduction expenses paid during the taxable year by a taxpayer, who is a widower, for the care of one or more children or dependents as defined in subsection (c) and, second, by a taxpayer who is a married man for the care of one or more children as defined in subsection (c); while the wife of the taxpayer is physically or mentally incapable of caring for such children, but only if such care is for the purpose of enabling the taxpayer to be gainfully employed.

The bill further asks that subsection (b) of such section be amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph which shall define the term "married man"; a deduction under subsection (a) shall not be allowed unless he files a joint return with his wife for the taxable year; and further that this paragraph shall not apply if for the taxable year the taxpayer is entitled to an exemption for his wife under section 151(b).

The bill which I am proposing further defines child, dependent, and widower. The bill further provides that the determination of whether an individual is married shall be made as of the close of his taxable year, except that if his spouse dies during his taxable year, such determination shall be made as of the time of such death. An individual legally separated from his spouse under a decree of divorce or of separate maintenance shall not be considered as married.

I believe that the bill itself explains the intent behind its passage. The bill is designed to give relief to those men whose wife, by reason of illness, cannot care for their children and who must, in order to support his wife and family, be gainfully employed but in order to be gainfully employed must also make arrangement for child care.

Under the present law a deduction for child care expenses may be allowed only to a taxpayer who is a woman or a widower as defined in the law. A man therefore may be entitled to such a deduction only if his wife has died or he is legally separated from his wife under a decree of separate maintenance or divorce, and he has not remarried at the time the expenses are incurred by him. There is presently no provision in the code under which such a deduction may be allowed to a married man even though his wife is in a mental institution during the period in which child care expenses are incurred.

I believe this constitutes an inequity to the individual citizen and a deterrent to economic growth in our tax laws which should be corrected as soon as possible.

PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I have again introduced a bill, H.R. 4287, to provide for the payment of the balance of war damage claims awarded by the Philippine War Damage Commission prior to 1951. A measure to the

same purpose, H.R. 4311, has been introduced by Congressman CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, who made a thorough and forthright statement in its support.

I should not take the time of this body to add one word to the volumes which have been spoken, read, and written on the subject of our lasting friendship and cooperation with the Philippines in peace and war, their present and urgent need of assistance, and the moral justice of discharging the balance of an obligation which we entered into a decade ago, if it were not for the widespread publication of indiscriminate, misleading and often dishonest reports of the deterioration of our relationship with the Philippine Republic.

I am sure that no one in this House who is aware of even a small part of what I know for certain to be the situation in the Philippines and the long history of our connection will permit himself to be prejudiced against any action favorable to the Filipino people by reason of controversial pronouncements of officious spokesmen and by journalistic outbursts which regard drama more highly than fact.

There is no denying the economic plight of the Philippines resulting doubtlessly, in part at least, from errors in planning and administration. It is an accomplished fact in history that the Philippines with our blessings attained a position of independent statehood in 1946, a mere 12½ years ago. From the first situation stem the urgent petitions for help from the Philippines which upon rejection change to cries of disappointment and often resentment. From the second, the recently acquired independence of the Republic of the Philippines, follow the understandable gestures and official acts which accompany national consciousness even where a close friend and benefactor might be involved.

Moreover, in the matter of claims resulting from monetary measures of the United States in the thirties and from war losses later, there have been persistent demands by the Philippines which perhaps include a staggering number and amount of accounts which have little or no merit but represent either the misguided exaggeration of people who have lost something of indeterminate value or perhaps outright dishonesty which is a calculated risk in all claims procedures.

What we in the exercise of our experienced wisdom and cool judgment must do is discriminate between what is sound and permanent and what is momentary and tenuous. We must recognize that there are elements in suggested aid programs for the Philippines which are not only beyond the capacity of the United States to meet but which are not in a real sense salutary to the Philippines. As to claims we must not reject the entire portfolio because of the inadequacy of some, even the greater part, of its elements.

I strongly urge, Mr. Speaker, that we look through the reported antiforeign agitation against Americans in the Philippines and the political demagoguery which singles out the Yankee in Manila

as a convenient target, to the 25 million kindly Filipinos who are traditionally proud of their historical relationship with the United States which, to quote from a recent analysis appearing in the Washington Sunday Star, "has given them Anglo-Saxon political forms, the English language and a love for individuality and freedom matched by few nations anywhere." The article goes on to say "Things are askew in the Philippines today but the warm geniality of the Filipinos themselves and their emotional closeness to Americans are beyond cavil."

The Honorable Manuel P. Manahan, a stalwart lieutenant of the late and well-loved President Magsaysay who himself was a candidate for the presidency of the Philippines in the last election has denied that the Philippine people are unfriendly to the United States. He lays the blame for most of the anti-American agitation in the Philippines on a small, powerful, cohesive, and vocal group, stating:

It is just this group who for reasons of its own has created headlines here and has made the outside world feel that this Nation has turned against its oldest friend. This powerful group, which is headed by anti-Americans of long standing . . . is backed by millions of dollars and has raised a loud cry. . . . The Philippine people in general have nothing against the United States and still consider Americans their friends.

On our side, I respectfully submit that a fair investigation would disclose that articulate American voices which dwell on the widening breach between the Philippines and the United States are not only in the minority but are not remotely representative of the sentiments of 175 million Americans whose feelings for the Philippines based on more than half a century of close ties and nurtured by the simple and heart-warming stories of returning soldiers are filled with affection and a normal desire to be of help in time of need.

Specifically, there has been an unfortunate distortion of the various demands of the Philippines upon our Government for the payment of claims in a vast number and variety of categories. It appears to me to have been a mistake to put the single label on all of the claims or to have heaped them all into a totalizing hopper which would produce to a staggering figure close to a billion dollars. Through error or design this procedure resulted in prejudice which is not fair to many meritorious claims which form parts of the aggregate. Again the announcements of rejection of the total Philippine claims program reportedly emanating from our Government in the first instance seemed to have been colored by bureaucratic disfavor traditional in matters of this kind, and later appeared to have been officially repudiated since there has been no decision either for or against the claims.

In conclusion, may I point out that the war damage awards of the Philippine War Damage Commission forming the subject matter of the legislation now before this House resulted from studied legislative action directly after the end of the war; that, as has been frequently

reported, the legislative history behind this action indicates that our Congress had every intention of supplementing the emergency wartime measure with further legislation called for by circumstances which might develop; that even after the most conservative appraisal of properties lost and damaged during the war the amount paid upon the awards made by an agency of our Government, the Philippine War Damage Commission, aggregated only 52½ percent of the face amount of the awards.

The New York Times in an editorial prompted by the current agitation concerning Philippine relations touched on the work of the War Damage Commission in the following language:

The United States was able to do a good job on the settlement of claims. The administrative cost of making these settlements was remarkably low, the operation was sound from the outset, and it met an immediate need.

It is true that in a strict legal sense there is no enforceable claim against the United States resulting from Philippine war-damage awards. Nevertheless, I do not believe there is a man among us or among our constituents who will resort to legal technicalities to refute a moral obligation of such pronounced clarity as the war-damage awards which we have left unpaid.

In this particular, Mr. Speaker, there is an open Philippine claims adjustment with the United States which must be segregated from any generalities and must be dealt with by us in the light of the history of our legal and moral obligations and the requirements of this moment based upon the condition and economic needs of our friend and ally, the Republic of the Philippines.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from California for the statement he has just made, and for the bill he has again introduced. Let me add a point or two to underline and support what the gentleman has said. When the Philippines War Damage Act was being studied by the Congress at the end of the war, I was a member of the old Committee on Insular Affairs which handled that legislation under the chairmanship of our former colleague, Judge Bell of Missouri. The act established the War Damage Commission and provided that all claims that the Commission verified as legitimate and reasonable should be paid up to the first \$500, and that payment of the balance above \$500 should be prorated according to the amount of money available. We had no figures at that time on which to base a firm estimate of what the total of all valid claims would amount to. The figure of \$500 million was the first estimate agreed upon, but obviously was in some degree picked out of the air. We could be reasonably sure the total would be at least that. At one time I offered an amendment to authorize \$600 million. If the Commission found the justified claims came to less than that, no harm would be done. The money would not be spent. On the

other hand, it would be advantageous to move in quickly and help restore the damage that had been suffered in the Philippines during their valiant defense against Japan. We should remember that most of the damage was inflicted during their liberation—inflicted not by the Japanese forces, but by our American planes and artillery. Yet not a Filipino wavered even when his home or his family or his buffalo was being destroyed by our bombs or our war operations. They were as loyal as any people in history have ever been in their cooperation. I felt then that we should have adequate funds to do the job of restoration as quickly as possible. To get them on their feet rapidly would prove sound economy. A stitch in time would save nine later on.

In the negotiations before the bill finally passed the House and Senate and became law, the amount authorized was \$400 million. But, I recall distinctly that in the report and during the debates others besides myself stated that this figure was only a rough estimate and that we recognized our obligation to provide more later if the amount of valid claims required more. So I feel that while it is more than 10 years later, the moral obligation still stands.

At the time the War Damage Commission had disbursed the \$400 million we provided, a difference of opinion developed as to the better way to help the Philippine economy and people thereafter. Was it better to pay the balance of those larger approved claims which had been paid up to only about 52 percent of the balance above \$500? Or was it better to give aid by making loans or grants for the development of industries in the Philippines? Would the same amount of money do more good if put into building up the whole economy rather, or if given as compensation to individuals or firms or institutions that had suffered damage? This was an honest difference of opinion. I feel that we have a moral commitment to carry through what we said in 1946 we would do and which we have not done fully.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for a moment further, I would like to say a word about this recent talk that the Filipinos are becoming anti-American. Some of that comes from people who see the efforts of the Philippines to develop economic independence as, somehow meaning that they are pulling away from, even turning against, the United States. I cannot agree. The Filipinos would be remiss and would be doing less than they ought to for their own future if they did not make strong and persistent efforts to develop their own economy so that they can stand on their own feet and not be subject to or dependent upon the economy of the United States.

In 1946 we gave them political independence. In the Independence Act we stipulated that they were to move step by step toward full economic independence in 1974. Thereafter they would no longer have tariff preference in their dealings with the United States. Now, how can they develop economic independence by 1974 if they do not now

build up their own industries? When they establish their own industries they naturally are run by themselves, not by Americans. Some Americans who have had a privileged status in the past seem to regard that as anti-American. No, it is healthy self-reliance. Of course, there are irritations on both sides; but I have been there a good many times, as the gentleman has, and we have not seen any anti-American feeling among the rank and file of the Filipino people. In fact, there is overall a stronger pro-American feeling than I know of in any other country in the world.

They are short of foreign exchange now, but that is not wholly the result of bad developments. They have started seven or eight hundred new industries in the past few years. That required large investments to get machinery and sometimes supplies from abroad. They had to invest most of the precious foreign exchange they earned and of the loans and grants they were able to get from abroad. So they are short on dollars now, and the peso is weak. But these investments should pay off in the years ahead and give them a sounder and healthier, self-supporting economy. We ought to understand that this shortage of capital in the Philippines which we are hearing about and which this bill will help correct, is in some respects the result of the sound efforts they have been making to become economically independent by 1974. It is a problem to be solved, not something to be condemned.

The Philippines and the United States have a very close relationship, founded first on 50 years of relationship as trustee and ward. Then we had 4 years of the closest comradeship in fighting against a common enemy. We have now had more than a decade of partnership as equals—two sovereign States voluntarily choosing to walk together for common purposes, each helping the other. And, believe me, the Filipinos have been very helpful to us in interpreting us to their fellow Asians. I think it is mischievous for any Americans to misrepresent as anti-American the wholesome desire of the Filipinos to be independent, just as it is mischievous for some Filipinos to charge that the United States is trying to impose or reimpose outside controls on them.

Mr. Speaker, the relationship between these countries has been extraordinarily close. It is loyal friendship and far-sighted statesmanship for the United States to do what it properly can at this difficult period in the life of the Philippine Nation to help it through the problems with which its ablest leaders are struggling. We want to go ahead together in the years to come.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I thank the gentleman.

I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

UNITED STATES-PHILIPPINE ISLANDS RELATIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, what happens in the Philippines is of great concern to the people of America. The people of the Philippines are not only our friends but our allies.

We helped them to achieve their freedom. We led them, so to speak, by the

hand to reach their goal of sovereign nationhood.

Recently we read reports in the press that were somewhat disquieting. The newspapers made much of certain unresolved issues between our two countries. They were magnified beyond their just proportions. It is natural for two nations as closely linked by political and economic ties such as the United States and the Philippines to have some disagreements every now and then. In any family there are bound to be some differences, but, with very rare exceptions, they are adjusted.

The United States Ambassador to Manila and the Philippine Ambassador to Washington were recalled by their respective governments for consultations. This was a wise move for a briefing from each envoy was needed to help clear the atmosphere in both countries. It is evident each Ambassador did his share to pour oil on troubled waters. Each one gave his government and people the perspective necessary to view the situation without bias or passion or emotionalism.

We want to assure our friends in the Philippines that the true American sentiment is not only to be fair with them at all times, it is more than that: it is to be of help to them as much as we Americans can. The mills of the gods may grind slowly and in a democracy the wheels of government may not turn as fast as we would want them to. But this does not mean that if an injustice that should be righted has been allowed to go uncorrected that it is a deliberate one. The record of Philippine-American relations shows that whenever an injustice or an inequality has been called to our attention, we have always voluntarily made the correction. The most recent case was the Philippine Trade Act that we first extended and then modified in a manner satisfactory to the wishes of the people of the Philippines.

We are happy to note that Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, our esteemed former colleague in this House, whose unequalled service to his country has earned our admiration, has returned to his post as Philippine Ambassador to Washington. In an interview that he gave to the Manila Times on February 16, 1959, he emphasized that he found no anti-American sentiment in the Philippines, and there is no anti-Philippine sentiment in the United States. In order that in this country our people may know the present temper and attitude of the Filipino people, under unanimous consent I include the interview in my remarks:

CARLOS P. ROMULO SEES NEW PHILIPPINE ISLANDS ATTITUDE—SAYS FORGING OF TIES WITH SEA NATIONS NOT ANTI-AMERICANISM

(By Vicente J. Guzman)

"It is not anti-Americanism that I found in the Philippines."

This is not an off-hand diagnosis by Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo. It is the well-considered view of a man whose perceptions have been sharpened by years of involvement with the problems of the world.

What he found, our Ambassador to Washington said, is a people growing into maturity, seeking new values, in quest of new

goals, reassessing their standards and engaged in searching national introspection.

"Certainly, such a people, blazing a trail for themselves," Ambassador Romulo said, "cannot be accused of being anti this or anti that."

"It is the birth of a new soul, the product of a developing maturity and it is heart-warming and soul-stirring."

The Ambassador had just come home from a luncheon, one of the numerous parties his friends have lined up for him since his return home last January 26. He was in a cool "barong Tagalog" and was every inch the perfect host.

Dick, his third son, the only member of the family around and who acts as his secretary even while poring over his law review books (a Harvard law graduate, Dick is home to take the bar examinations) had gone to classes.

We started with the weather which the Ambassador finds very agreeable. Fifteen years in America have not reconciled him, he said, with the cold Washington climate this time of year.

Since 1935, the general said, Asians had begun to dream of getting together in close ties. This was not possible then because we were divided among ourselves.

India, Malaya, Ceylon, and Burma were under British rule. Indonesia was feeling the effect of ruthless Dutch colonial power, Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia had not yet freed themselves from the French.

The predominating policy of the colonizers was to divide and rule. The dream of Asians could not be realized in the face of these obstacles.

A quarter of a century has rolled by. Now, the atmosphere has changed, and the feeling of integration is nurtured in the natural development of our maturing nationhood.

"This does not mean," Ambassador Romulo said, "that we are veering away from the United States. This means that we want to update our relations in such a way that we form a close friendship with our neighbors without prejudice to our old ties with America."

He reminded me that the Filipino is a child of the East and the West.

"From 1946," he said, "we devoted ourselves to rehabilitation and reconstruction. We had to pay attention to the material side of our lives. We had to get rid of the scars of war."

"So now we have time," he went on to say, "to devote to the national soul. We are starting to get our bearings spiritually, hungry for reorientation."

"Add to this, the new existing problems that have suddenly cropped up as we enter the atomic age."

Now that our stand on communism has been taken, Ambassador Romulo sees that the Filipinos are realizing the existence of new conditions and new circumstances that they have to meet as a nation.

"We begin to ask questions because of these new conditions," he said.

"For example," he added, "we ask ourselves in our agonizing reappraisal, if and when the intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) has become operational and America will no longer need us as a base, what kind of relationship would we evolve with the United States?"

"When our usefulness with America expires, when American naval and air bases have become obsolete because of the ICBM, on what basis will Philippine-American relations be laid?"

Our inner tensions are not helped any, in his opinion, when we look around us and see the tremendous postwar industrial advance of Japan.

And there are the teeming millions in the Chinese mainland now under the lash of Red dictators.

"Should we not be thinking of ourselves, caught in competition as we are now in the industrial race between China and Japan?"

And there is India and her new 5-year plan. Romulo feels concerned about the possible effects of this upon the Philippines.

"All these revolutionary changing conditions," the Ambassador said, "impose new appraisals. They open up new horizons. And so we begin to plumb these heretofore unfathomed depths. This is because we as a nation must adapt ourselves to the transmutations imposed by the atomic age."

"Certainly, that is not anti-Americanism. As we delve further and further, we know that nationalism is an essential in internationalism. We can only have an international personality if we have something national to contribute to the world."

With respect to the new concept hereabouts in our foreign relations, Ambassador Romulo is wholly attuned to the idea of the Philippines integrating with the rest of the world and not merely with one nation.

"If the goal of humanity is integration and not fragmentation, should we not," he asked, "begin now preparing for this process even if it may be in the long tomorrow?"

"We cannot escape the evolution of mankind. America no doubt is our best friend but it is not because we love our old friends less when we have to prepare for an inevitable future because certainly we love our people more."

Romulo is of the belief that the closer we are to our Asian neighbors, the more the United States will realize the value that we are as allies in the cause of freedom and democracy.

The pariah, Romulo emphasized, is despised everywhere. "We do not want to be a pariah in Asia and no self-respecting nation wants a pariah for an ally," he said.

Speaking of Philippine-American relations, particularly, Ambassador Romulo affirmed there are irritations that have marred the cordial relations between the two countries. These irritations, he said, were the result of the accumulation of unattended claims of the Philippines dating back to 24 years ago.

In this connection, Romulo paid tribute to Filipino patience.

Philippine claims, he said, total \$942 million, broken up as follows:

1. \$24 million in gold devaluation funds.
2. \$130 million in additional war damage payments.
3. \$173 million in coconut oil processing tax.
4. \$75 million in sugar excise tax.
5. \$1 million in claims of Philippine customs duties of imports of the U.S. Army and Navy.
6. \$600 million in various military claims, known as the bulk claims.

Of these items, only the first has been attended to. Only last week President Eisenhower sought funds to meet this obligation, which dates back to 1935, in a recommendation to the U.S. Congress.

President Garcia in a summit conference in Baguio last Friday at which the Ambassador was present defined Philippine policy in respect to carrying out these negotiations. That is one of the reasons Ambassador Romulo was summoned to Manila—to help in the formulation of that policy.

I have talked to several officials and others who are keen observers of our foreign policy and I know that Ambassador Romulo, who because of the record of his achievements is considered our premier diplomat, will return to Washington with his hand considerably strengthened by solid support at home.

I also include an editorial that appeared in the Philippines Herald of February 20 about the work that Gen-

eral Romulo did while he was in Manila and an editorial of the Manila Times of February 21 on the same subject:

[From the Philippines Herald, Feb. 20, 1959]

AMBASSADOR ROMULO

Gen. Carlos P. Romulo returned to the United States the other day with the implied full support and confidence of the President, our Congress leaders, and the nation as a whole in his role as Philippine Ambassador to that country. There is no doubt that his brief stay here has been most fruitful, both in the sense of providing him an opportunity to brief the Filipino people and their leaders on vital aspects of the Philippine-American relationship and of getting briefed, in turn, on current trends in this country. But more than this, perhaps, he returns to Washington with his hand strengthened by his nation's confidence in his leadership and ability.

General Romulo is, no doubt, among the best men who can represent us in the United States. The record of his achievements shows this. That he is highly regarded by the American people is also unquestioned, and this, one must admit, is a distinct asset to one charged with the task of representing us in that country. In no better way did he show this competence than when he appeared before the house and senate foreign affairs committees, during which he answered questions put to him forthrightly, revealing a comprehensive grasp of the various aspects of the Philippine-American relationship.

He also made it a point to address various organizations, such as the veterans, the sugar men, the women's groups, the Boy Scouts, student associations, in each case presenting his views lucidly and effectively. That he made good use of every single day that he was here cannot be gainsaid. In his speeches he invariably managed to drive home a fresh perspective or a new point of view.

We are confident he will continue to represent us with the same loyalty and devotion and we wish him success in the difficult task that awaits him in Washington.

[From the Manila Times, Feb. 21, 1959]

THAW IN PROSPECT

Negotiations on outstanding Philippine-American issues enter a new stage as the two ambassadors—Gen. Carlos P. Romulo and Charles Bohlen—return to their respective posts. General Romulo is on his way back to Washington with specific instructions and assurances of full support from both the President and Congress, while Bohlen is returning with possibly a new set of instructions.

General Romulo's brief visit here has enabled both the foreign affairs department and Congress to have an idea of the progress of negotiations at the Washington end and the feeling in the U.S. capital on the various unresolved issues. In turn, it enabled General Romulo to gauge the intensity of the local temper and the seriousness with which national officials are trying to press for the early settlement of P.I.-U.S. issues.

The trips of the two ambassadors have provided the necessary opportunity for fresh consultations. A thaw is, we believe, in prospect.

I also wish to include in my remarks the following news item from the Philippines Herald of February 19 which shows that General Romulo returns to his post in Washington not only with the full confidence and support of President Garcia and of the leaders of the Congress

of the Philippines but also of the Filipino people:

ROMULO DEPARTS FOR WASHINGTON

(By Vic Villafranca)

Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo left unexpectedly last night for Washington armed with instructions from President Garcia on ways of pursuing Philippine omnibus money claims against the United States.

Early yesterday, Romulo was assured of congressional confidence and support during a call on legislative leaders.

Senate President Eulogio Rodriguez said that the Ambassador has "our confidence and we are behind him."

Regarding Romulo's work in Washington, Rodriguez said the Envoy was an able and worthy spokesman and has served the Philippines faithfully in the United States.

He also praised the Ambassador's presentation of the state of Philippine-American relations.

The Senate President said:

"Ambassador Romulo has done a remarkable job in the short time that he was in the Philippines by giving not only the members of both houses of our congress but also our people as a whole a clear picture of Philippine Islands-United States relations."

In his appearance before the house and senate foreign affairs committees, Romulo, according to the legislative leaders, acquitted himself not only creditably but in a superb manner.

The Ambassador called on Rodriguez, speaker Daniel Z. Romualdez, speaker pro tempore Constancio E. Castañeda, and other congress leaders yesterday morning.

During his call on the congress leaders, Romulo took time out to sit with the newspapermen in the senate press gallery, some of whom were his colleagues when he was a newsman.

Mr. Speaker, the day General Romulo returned to the United States after his successful visit to his homeland, he was conferred one of America's highest honors. Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, on the occasion of the 227th birthday of George Washington, singled out the Filipino Envoy for its highest award, the Freedom Leadership Award, so far given only to three heads of state, Winston Churchill, Konrad Adenauer, and the late Ramon Magsaysay. The selection is by unanimous vote for three successive years by a jury composed of 34 leading Americans who meet at Valley Forge for 2 weeks to deliberate and choose from among various nominees.

The citation engraved on a handsome plaque and presented to General Romulo in a ceremony in Valley Forge last February 22, which was nationally televised, follows:

FREEDOMS FOUNDATION AT VALLEY FORGE HONORS AMBASSADOR CARLOS P. ROMULO

For his spirited, practical leadership of man, for his unflinching devotion to his country, for his wise counsel and exemplary character, Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge bestows upon Carlos P. Romulo, a soldier of arms and ideas, its highest freedom leadership award.

His wisdom and courage in the quest to sustain and expand man's individual liberties have lifted the spirits of all who seek freedom.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein the articles referred to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I join the majority leader in welcoming back to Washington and hailing the return of General Romulo, who has done so much to cement relations between our two countries. I can think of no greater bond between two peoples than the blood of their common heroes.

A REAL AMERICAN—THOSE WHO ARE WILLING TO SACRIFICE AND SUFFER FOR AN IDEAL SEEM TO BE FEW IN NUMBER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, one such outstanding individual is Stanley Yankus on a farm near Dowagiac, Cass County, Mich.

Seeking freedom and opportunity, Stanley's parents left their homeland—Lithuania—to become citizens here. Stanley, born in this country, grew to young manhood, married, purchased a farm, has three children.

With the grain grown on his farm and some purchased poultry feed, he raised chickens, established a business where he sold 53,000 dozen eggs a year. His business was successful. He not only was able to provide for his family, but to accumulate a small bank account.

Then those who have comparatively little faith in the ability of the present day American to, shall we say, paddle his own canoe, began to enact and enforce what might be termed social legislation.

Through the expenditure of the tax payers' dollars, a vote-buying program was instituted. As Harry Hopkins said, "We will spend and spend, and tax and tax, and elect and elect." "Spend your dollars to elect me."

One of the provisions of the legislation—and regulations—is that no one, even though he owned his own land, could plant or harvest wheat from more than a fixed number of acres, determined by a governmental agency.

Firmly believing that a man had both the natural and constitutional right to use his own property in his own way when no one was injured. Stanley planted and harvested the wheat from a larger number of acres than that specified by the Government. He used the wheat to feed his chickens. No other purpose. He did not sell, trade or borrow a kernel. The result was that the Government came down on him, convicted him, fined him, has now forced him to sell his farm.

Under the Government regulations, he could not grow wheat, grind it in his own mill, let his wife bake the flour in his own oven, he and his family eat bread made from his own grain. If he did, he violated a Federal law, a Federal regulation.

Learning by experience that our constitutional guarantee of the right to own and use one's property was not true,

Stanley has regretfully decided that he will give up his citizenship and, with his family, move to Australia where he hopes his right to freedom will be respected.

An editorial from the News-Palladium of February 24, 1959, published at Benton Harbor, Mich., gives expression to the thought of many—which is that, notwithstanding all of the restrictions imposed upon the citizen and the denial of the freedom which we have all heretofore enjoyed, this is still the country where the individual enjoys greater opportunity, more freedom than in any other country. That editorial reads:

AUSTRALIA BECKONS

Stanley Yankus, rebel Cass County chicken farmer who has been battling the Federal Government for 4 years on the issue of crop controls, announces that his 100-acre farm is for sale, and that when and if he can pay what the Government claims he owes for refusing to comply with acreage quotas of wheat, he and his family will turn their backs on the United States, and emigrate to Australia where he intends to make a fresh start.

Yankus has contended all along that he grew wheat to feed his chickens, rather than for sale on the grain market. The Government, however, has kept after Yankus, impounded his bank account and levied penalties until he is ready to give up, a bitter and disillusioned man.

Yankus intends to get a job in Australia and work for hire until he can acquire land and resume farming "down under." He feels that opportunities for pioneering and freedom are greater there for himself and his children.

The choice Yankus is making is his own, and if it is really his wish to leave America, we hope him fortune and happiness. He is an individualist who, like probably millions of other Americans, chafes under growing bureaucracy and statism. Yet there are few, however great the provocation, who would voluntarily surrender their heritage. For with all its faults, its shortcomings and mistakes, nowhere in the world, not excluding Australia, do people enjoy as much freedom, security and opportunity.

In war and peace, the Western World, at least, looks to America for aid, leadership and inspiration. Our responsibilities, whether we enjoy them or not, are to create a better world, and the effort imposed heavy burdens, among them regulations and burdens we can't shirk.

We doubt that Mr. Yankus, whose antecedents came here from Eastern Europe to escape oppression and to carve out new lives, will find any utopia, or that life in Australia will be without problems and difficulties. He obviously feels, however, that he has reached the end of the line insofar as patience and struggling against interference are concerned. We hope he finds Australia his "promised land," but are not forgetful of the fact that tens of millions throughout the world would make any sacrifice to reach America and achieve U.S. citizenship.

A false rumor circulated in Poland last week, to the effect that the United States had removed restrictions on immigrants to America, caused Poles by the thousands to stampede the U.S. Embassy, seeking entry permits to these shores.

Regardless of whether or not we approve of Mr. Yankus' decision, he may have made an historic contribution to this Nation, by focusing so much attention on menacing growth of dictatorship here and alerting the people to the dangers to their freedom. Mr. Yankus' decision must have been an excruciating one, born of desperation he could not

longer endure. His sacrifice, we hope, will help awaken all America.

But one thing is true—that, for the good of all of us, Stanley is sacrificing his opportunity here and, by so doing, is bringing home to each of us a situation which, if not speedily cured, will destroy us as a free nation.

We recall the statement of Nathan Hale who, about to be hanged by the British, said:

I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country.

Stanley Yankus is bringing home to every thinking American the necessity of stopping in this country the trend toward tyranny.

He has but one farm to give to those who receive subsidies.

STATEMENT OF STANLEY YANKUS, BEFORE THE ALBERT SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, FEBRUARY 27, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, permit me to express my deep appreciation for the opportunity given me to very briefly call attention to one of the inevitable results which follow the enforcement of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The following is a very brief statement of what I would like to say and I hope that after it is read, I may be permitted to enlarge upon the present situation.

What will happen if the present trend in government continues, in my opinion, based upon my experience, is that the people of the United States of America will no longer be free and independent, nor will this be a free nation.

My name is Stanley Yankus. I have lived on my 100-acre farm since April 1943. I raise wheat and barley and feed it all to my chickens. I have never signed an agreement with the ASC. I have never accepted any subsidies. In the fall of 1953, an ASC agent said I could not raise wheat and feed it to my chickens. I thought this was contrary to everything American. I asked the ASC man how I would be able to make a living if I couldn't use my land? In 1954, my wheat fines equaled my entire net income. That particular year 1,100 chickens died in 10 days from a bad disease. Eggs were cheap and feed was high due to support prices. My wife and I made only \$1,000 that year.

In the year 1955 I was fined about \$1,034. The March issue of Readers Digest magazine has an article entitled "The Strange Crime of Stanley Yankus." What is my crime? A man does have to commit an offense to get fined or punished. I did not sell any wheat so my offense is not selling wheat. Then my offense had to be using land for producing crops.

Now, Congressmen, I would like to put the shoe on the other foot. You have passed laws permitting the Bureau of Reclamation to put new land into production. In the year 1955 alone, the Bureau of Reclamation added a 136,000 acres of land into production. So who is more guilty of the strange crime of producing crops? The Bureau of Census also states that 6 million bushels of wheat were imported in 1955. I did not add to the surplus of wheat, but you did since you have the power to regulate imports.

During the years 1954 to 1958, inclusive, I was fined \$4,562 plus interest and costs. Because many of the farmers in my situation had been through courts and received adverse decisions, I decided to appeal through the press to the American people. The Detroit Times was the first large newspaper in the Nation to champion my cause.

The division of power—legislative, executive, and judicial—has been a fundamental concept of English and American law.

The ASC has nullified this concept because a bureaucrat in the Department of Agriculture can write a regulation through the Federal Register which has the effect of law. The ASC can and does execute and administer these laws, and the ASC acts as judge and jury in determining a farmer's guilt. I am not fighting for the right to grow wheat. I am fighting for the right to own property. If I am forbidden the use of my land, then I do not own it. My rights do not extend much beyond the right to pay taxes. This is tyranny.

The fifth amendment of the Constitution says "no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law." The right to trial by jury is one of the due processes of law which has been denied to me.

My right to liberty should certainly be my right to earn my own living on my own farm.

Federal law should apply equally to all citizens. Yet in 36 States there are wheat restrictions, and in 12 States there are none. Thus, I am a second-class citizen because I live in a State where restrictions are imposed.

For 5 years my wheat allotment has been about 10 acres per year. Since I began to seek publicity, the ASC gave me an allotment of 28 acres for 1959. This is ample proof that allotments are established arbitrarily.

Not only have I fed all the grain I have raised but I have purchased \$12,000 worth of commercial chicken feed each year. This feed contains wheat and so I have been reducing the surplus of wheat.

I have not harmed any other farmers. I have earned my own living. I have paid my taxes. How can you Congressmen justify the laws which have destroyed my means of making a living?

Many people have told me that I would lose everything by opposing these wheat laws. What is everything? Money is of no value to a slave. I think freedom is everything.

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. PATMAN, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday and Thursday next, March 4 and 5, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, for 1 hour, on March 12 and March 16.

Mr. CRAMER, for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, March 3.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, March 3; for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, March 4; and for 2 hours, on Friday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PORTER in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SAYLOR and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REES of Kansas.

Mrs. BOLTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACK of Washington and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK and to include extraneous matter.

At the request of Mr. McCORMACK, the following Members:

Mr. RODINO and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LIBONATI.

Mr. ALGER.

(At the request of Mr. McCORMACK and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. DENT in three instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 3, 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:

637. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1959 in the amount of \$427,516,262 for the legislative branch, the judiciary, the District of Columbia, and various departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government (H. Doc. 90); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

638. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the report entitled "Third Progress Report of the Highway Cost Allocation Study", pursuant to section 210 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, approved June 29, 1956 (70 Stat. 387, 401), as amended by section 1 of the act approved August 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 983) (H. Doc. 91); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

639. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the third annual report on the financial condition and fiscal operations of the highway trust fund for the fiscal year 1958, pursuant to section 209(e)(1) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (H. Doc. 92); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

640. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the relocation of the National Training School for Boys, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

641. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report covering personal property made available for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations under section 203(j); and all real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions under section 203(k), pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

642. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report pertaining to the construction and operation of saline water demonstration plants, pursuant to Public Law 85-833; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

643. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide a headquarters site for Mount Rainier

National Park in the general vicinity of Ashford, Wash., and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

644. A letter from the Acting Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend Public Law 85-590 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

645. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 1915 of title 28, United States Code, relating to proceedings in forma pauperis"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

646. A letter from the national director, Boys' Clubs of America, transmitting the Third Annual Report of the Boys' Clubs of America, covering the period of 1958, pursuant to Public Law 988, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

647. A letter from the corporation agent, Army and Navy Legion of Valor, of the United States Army, Inc.; transmitting the audit report of the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc., for the period July 24, 1957 through July 17, 1958, pursuant to Public Law 224, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

648. A letter from the secretary and treasurer, Congressional Medal of Honor Society, transmitting the annual auditor's report for the calendar year 1958, pursuant to Public Law 642, 85th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

649. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, relative to a report concerning the establishment of positions in grades GS 16, 17, and 18 under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, including the annual report from the Commission on Civil Rights, and the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

650. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to define the term 'gross income from the property' for the purpose of computing percentage depletion in the case of oil and gas wells"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

651. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the report on the investigation and study made to determine what action can be taken by the Federal Government to promote the public welfare by increasing highway safety in the United States, pursuant to section 117 of the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1956, and under the general authority of section 307 of title 23 of the United States Code, entitled "Highways" (H. Doc. 93); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of February 26, 1959, the following bill was reported on February 27, 1959:

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 57. 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; with amendment (Rept. No. 86). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted March 2, 1959]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1776. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1958, entitled "An act to provide for a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, and for other purposes"; with amendment (Rept. No. 87). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROBERTS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 79. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to permit the temporary listing and certification of Citrus Red No. 2 for coloring mature oranges under tolerances found safe by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, so as to permit continuance of established coloring practice in the orange industry pending congressional consideration of general legislation for the listing and certification of food color additives under safe tolerances; without amendment (Rept. No. 88). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 3320. A bill to amend the act of June 21, 1950, relating to the appointment of boards of medical officers; without amendment (Rept. No. 89). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 3322. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, and certain other laws to authorize the payment of transportation and travel allowances to escorts of dependents of members of the uniformed services under certain conditions, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 90). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 3366. A bill to authorize the extension of loans of naval vessels to the Governments of Italy and Turkey; with amendment (Rept. No. 91). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 4068. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, by repealing section 7475, which restricts the increasing of forces at naval activities prior to national elections; without amendment (Rept. No. 92). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 1011. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 93). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 5096. A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to interest on certain governmental obligations, and section 10 of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937, relating to annual contributions in assistance of low-rent housing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 5097. A bill to amend part IV of subtitle C of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to take possession of the naval oil shale reserves, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5098. A bill to provide for the application and disposition of net revenues from the power development on the Grand Valley Fed-

eral reclamation project, Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 5099. A bill to improve the administration of overseas activities of the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 5100. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 5101. A bill to provide for the approval of the 1956 payment in lieu of taxes made to the city of Holyoke, Mass., under the U.S. Housing Act of 1937; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 5102. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for certain expenses incurred by a taxpayer for the care of his children while his wife is physically or mentally incapable of caring for such children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H.R. 5103. A bill to repeal the act requiring the filing of certain information with respect to trade between the United States and its noncontiguous territory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H.R. 5104. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H.R. 5105. A bill to amend Public Law 85-590 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. DURHAM (by request):

H.R. 5106. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H.R. 5107. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5108. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt a corporation from the corporate income tax where its operations are carried on in an economically depressed area and provide employment for a specified minimum number of persons in that area; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 5109. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 5110. A bill to amend section 4242 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the club dues tax certain charges made by nonprofit clubs for the use of facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5111. A bill granting to persons in the classified (competitive) civil service the right to a hearing before removal or suspension, and the right to a judicial review of a removal or suspension; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 5112. A bill to amend section 90, title 38, United States Code, so that burial allowances might be paid in cases where discharges were changed by competent authority after death of the veteran from dishonorable to conditions other than dishonorable; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5113. A bill to amend Public Law 85-422 so as to place all retired military personnel in one category as to retirement pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5114. A bill to provide for the construction of a new Federal building in Newnan, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 5115. A bill to guarantee the right of trial by jury in certain contempt cases in U.S. courts and to restrict citations for contempt to proceedings involving persons having actual notice of terms of writ, order, rule, decree, or command of the court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5116. A bill to amend sections 4081 and 4082 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include wholesale distributors within the definition of "producers" of gasoline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5117. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a wage credit of \$160 per month for active military or naval service during World War I; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H.R. 5118. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 5119. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall develop and carry out an emergency program for the eradication of starfish in Long Island Sound and adjacent waters; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GRANT:

H.R. 5120. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against income tax for contributions to educational institutions and taxes paid for school purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 5121. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by amending section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IKARD:

H.R. 5122. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain insurance agents shall be treated as outside salesmen for purposes of computing adjusted gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 5123. A bill to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 2 years, to provide additional factors to be considered in determining excessive profits, to permit appeals from decisions of the Tax Court in renegotiation cases, to provide for reports to Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOSER:

H.R. 5124. A bill to amend section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5125. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 5126. A bill to provide for the construction of a new Federal building in Gainesville, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 5127. A bill to provide for the construction of a new Federal post office building in Palatka, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 5128. A bill to amend section 27 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5129. A bill to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H.R. 5130. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by amending section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 5131. A bill to provide for the establishment by the Secretary of the Interior of a Pacific Northwest account, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 5132. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to active duty agreements for Reserve officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 5133. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to grant an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is 65 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON (by request):

H.R. 5134. A bill to authorize a per capita payment to enroll members of the confederated tribes and bands of the Yakima Indian Nation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 5135. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to establish policies with respect to productive capital investments of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 5136. A bill to provide for the supervision of deportable aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 5137. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code with respect to procurement procedures of the armed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 5138. A bill to extend the grounds of the Custis-Lee Mansion in Arlington National Cemetery; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 5139. A bill to express and effectuate the policy of Congress with respect to the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAWSON (by request):

H.R. 5140. A bill to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time in conformity with the provisions of the act; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 5141. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer who resides in an economically depressed area to deduct as a trade or business expense his traveling expenses incurred in seeking and performing employment or self-employment outside such area; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 5142. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce, without unduly burdening such commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 5143. A bill to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. METCALF:

H.R. 5144. A bill to provide for the construction of the Knowles Dam project on the

Flathead River in the State of Montana for the protection and development of the Flathead and Columbia River Basins; to promote the agricultural and industrial development primarily of the State of Montana, but also of downstream areas; to improve navigability and to assist flood control on the Flathead and Columbia Rivers; to provide for the national defense and welfare by advancing the integrated comprehensive development of the water resources of the Pacific Northwest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5145. A bill to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for Indian tribes on the Fort Belknap Reservation, and to provide that such lands shall become part of such reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H.R. 5146. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code in order to increase the amount authorized for bridges over Federal dams; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 5147. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Polish Legion of American Veterans by the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 5148. A bill to provide for the removal of the James A. Garfield Monument from its present location, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 5149. A bill to limit the size of payments to farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ALFORD:

H.J. Res. 274. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for reconfirmation by the Senate of certain appointments made by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.J. Res. 275. Joint resolution designating the third Monday in February of each year as a legal public holiday to be known as Presidents' Day, providing for the observance of certain other legal holidays on days other than those now fixed by law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H.J. Res. 276. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEYER:

H.J. Res. 277. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating 1959 for the observance of the 350th anniversary of the historic voyages of Hudson and Champlain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H.J. Res. 278. Joint resolution authorizing the President to take such steps as he deems necessary to carry out U.S. responsibilities for Berlin; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H. Con. Res. 92. Concurrent resolution that it is the sense of Congress that House Concurrent Resolution 108, dated August 1, 1953 (83d Cong.) shall be interpreted as stating an objective, not an immediate goal, as it pertains to Indian "termination" of relations with the Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. Con. Res. 93. Concurrent resolution to restate Federal responsibility toward Indians and the Federal Government's relations with Indian tribes and groups; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:
H. Res. 187. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 41, current session; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CLARK:
H. Res. 188. Resolution to postpone the consummation of a TVA contract to an English firm; to the Committee on Public Works.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN: Resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to enact legislation providing for a minimum wage of \$1.25 per hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish a national cemetery in New England; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States against granting concessions on textile imports from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. FOST: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Idaho with respect to the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization exercising the powers conferred upon him to enter into contracts with the producers of domestic cobalt at a rate per pound to compare with the rate paid for foreign producers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, relative to repealing House Concurrent Resolution 108, 83d Congress, and that a statement of policy be enacted regarding the Indian people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with respect to the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization exercising the powers conferred upon him to enter into contracts with the producers of domestic cobalt at a rate per pound to compare with the rate paid for foreign producers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting amendment to title IV, section 401, subsection (a) of Public Law 815, as amended, 81st Congress, concerning construction of adequate school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to prepare legislation that reports be made by the Office of the Comptroller General disclosing to the various States the amount of unclaimed money and other property held by the Federal Government and the persons to whom the same belong, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, opposing the enactment of H.R. 1929 because of its effect on the natural resources industries of the State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to repealing House Concurrent Resolution 108, 83d Congress and that a statement of policy be enacted regarding the Indian people and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to investigate and determine the causes of inflation and to enact remedial legislation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact and enforce legislation to implement the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States outlawing segregation in the public school system; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for a minimum wage of \$1.25 per hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to establish a national cemetery in New England; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States against granting concessions on textile imports from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting such remedial action as deemed necessary to preclude the closing of low power television booster stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the passing of legislation relating to the amendment of section 2(c) of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (41 Stat. 448, 30 U.S.C. 184), removing restriction on railroad companies in regard to the leasing of public lands for coal purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to proposing an amendment to the

Constitution of the United States concerning the abolishing of personal income, estate, and gift taxes and prohibiting the U.S. Government from engaging in business in competition with its citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 5150. A bill for the relief of Our Lady of the Lake Church; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H.R. 5151. A bill for the relief of Felicidad Caletena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 5152. A bill to provide for a posthumous cash award in recognition of the contribution made by the late Dr. Saul Hertz in the medical use of radioactive iodine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 5153. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of Roger W. Evans and Jamerson C. McCormack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 5154. A bill for the relief of Miss Anka Grahovac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 5155. A bill for the relief of Ralph H. Traher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 5156. A bill for the relief of the Collier Manufacturing Co., of Barnesville, Ga.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H.R. 5157. A bill for the relief of Alexandra Nicholas Karageorgiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.R. 5158. A bill for the relief of Shigeko Mizuta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 5159. A bill for the relief of Epifania Gitto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5160. A bill for the relief of William Joseph Vincent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H.R. 5161. A bill for the relief of Michael Podale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 5162. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Doumouliakas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WEIS:

H.R. 5163. A bill for the relief of the Rochester Iron & Metal Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. Res. 189. Resolution providing for sending the bill H.R. 5093 for the relief of North Counties Hydro-Electric Co. and accompanying papers to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TVA Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced a resolution calling upon the

TVA, the OMCD, and other departments and agencies of Government to reconsider the contract awarded to Parsons of England, for electrical equipment never before purchased outside the continental United States.

This order would have given much-needed labor to the many unemployed in my district, and other districts in western and eastern Pennsylvania.

In introducing this resolution I had the full support and cosponsorship of the fol-

lowing Members of Congress: Congressman ELMER HOLLAND, Congressman FRANK CLARK, Congressman MORGAN, Congressman MOORHEAD, and Congressman MILLIKEN, of Pennsylvania.

You will note, sir, that this effort is bipartisan. I have since been informed by the following Members of Congress of their full support in this endeavor: Congressman SAYLOR, Congressman VAN ZANDT, Congressman GAVIN, Congressman KEARNS, Congressman RICHARD

SIMPSON, and Congressman STANLEY PROKOP, of Pennsylvania.

I am sure that other Pennsylvania Members would join me if the opportunity presents itself to present a joint plea to bring this work to the workmen and industry of Pennsylvania.

Water Resources Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very worthwhile speech by the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

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

SPEECH DELIVERED BY SENATOR ALLEN J. ELLENDER BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NEW YORK STATE WATERWAYS ASSOCIATION IN NEW YORK CITY, ON FEBRUARY 27, 1959

Ladies and gentlemen, I am indebted to President Wright for inviting me to speak before your annual meeting of the New York State Waterways Association.

I prize this invitation, since it comes from an organization which, although far removed in miles from my home State of Louisiana, is shoulder to shoulder with us in purpose—the protection and development of one of our most precious resources, water.

My interest in water resources development goes back a long way. I was born at Montegut, La., a small village located about 30 miles from the Gulf of Mexico, and some 16 miles south of my present home at Houma.

Houma, a city of about 25,000 inhabitants, is located about 50 miles southwest of the great port at New Orleans, at the junction of Bayou Terrebonne, a navigable stream which carries a great deal of freight, and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, with which all of you are doubtless familiar. The great Mississippi is less than 20 miles away, as the crow flies.

Having been born and reared in this area, I know at first hand the hazards of uncontrolled water, and, conversely, the benefits of wise development of this resource. With such a background the importance of a well-regulated and maintained system of waterways was impressed upon me at an early age. Through the 22 years I have served in the U.S. Senate, that interest has not only been maintained, but it has grown.

In those years I have devoted much time and energy in helping formulate and develop a long-range, well-planned program of our water and land resources. In all humility, but with some pride, I feel that I have achieved some slight degree of success in these long-range plans.

With your indulgence, I would like to expand my remarks to include a birdseye view of the great Mississippi, with the city of New Orleans as the gateway between the Mississippi Valley and the fabulous riches to the south of us.

Some 41 percent of the area of the United States is drained through the Mississippi River. In the last major flood on the Mississippi—that of 1927—an area of 23,000 square miles was inundated. This is about

the combined area of the States of Vermont, New Hampshire, and Connecticut.

Cities, towns, and farms were flooded, destroying crops and paralyzing industry. Scores of lives were lost. Property damage ran into hundreds of millions of dollars; rail transportation suffered heavily, with only one rail line operating for a time east and west below Cairo, Ill.; highways and bridges were unstable for weeks; and thousands of people were left homeless and destitute.

The havoc that would result from a repetition of such a flood today, with the increase in population and the growth of industry in this area, is impossible to conceive. Fortunately, a comprehensive plan for the development of the Mississippi River and its tributaries was authorized in 1928, the year following this great flood. Since that time work has progressed steadily, although after 31 years this project is only 72 percent complete. Yet, the benefits from this project already exceed the costs by a benefit-to-cost ratio of 5 to 1.

One of the prime inland waterways of this area, the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway which passes Houma, was authorized on the basis of developing 400,000 tons of commerce a year, but the tonnage on that waterway now exceeds 13 million tons. More important, however, is the fact that the development of this waterway was a major factor in creating the vast industrial complex of the Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coastal area.

Thus my interest in the beneficial development of water resources of the Nation stems from a personal conviction that such developments were an important factor in achieving our present high standards of living, not only in the area of my home State but all across this great Nation of ours.

I believe that unless a well-planned and aggressive program of water resource development is carried forward, our children and grandchildren will not have an opportunity to enjoy the many advantages that today we take for granted.

My convictions in this have been strengthened by my recent travels through Europe and Asia. I believe that unless we protect our greatest resource, water, unless we keep it inland and do not let it flow to the sea unused, some day many parts of our great country may become as barren as the Gobi Desert, or as the lands which I have seen on my travels in old Persia. Our history books tell us that about 500 years before Christ, the entire area of Persia was capable of sustaining the livelihood of 115 million people. Now it adequately can care for less than 14 million.

Consider the great Valley of Mesopotamia between the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers. At one time that area could produce food and fiber for 15 million people. Today that great valley can hardly supply the needs of 2 million people. And why? Because of the neglect of a great natural resource—water. If it had been possible to retain the waters upstream on those great rivers, and not permit them to steal the rich topsoil and float it into the interior of the country and into the sea, the chances are that that great valley would still be very productive.

The fact is, that those rivers carried millions of tons of earth down the streams and clogged the small tributaries and rivers in Mesopotamia. Today that land is not suitable for much cultivation. It is sour. It cannot be farmed. Certainly we cannot afford to let that happen in our great country.

Two years ago I visited various portions of the Soviet Union for well over a month. This was my third trip to this country in as many years. I had the opportunity of

visiting cities never before seen by an American Government official; cities in the far reaches of Siberia, an area which had been pictured to me before my visit as wastelands of snow and ice—as a vast prison camp. But that was not what I found. To my great surprise, I saw a virgin land being awakened, a land that promises to make Siberia the granary of Russia. Industry was flourishing to a surprising degree. One of the principal tools the Russians were employing in this development was a well planned utilization of its waterways system, both for navigation and the development of power from falling water. I saw several hydroelectric power stations that were larger than our biggest and one that was almost twice as large as any we have in this country. I saw foundations poured for turbines and generators which will have a rated capacity of 300,000 kw. each—almost three times larger than anything we have. And these projects, gentlemen, were designed, constructed, and had all component parts built within the Soviet Union. In fact, much of the work on the large turbines was being done at Novosibirsk, a place which was a small trading post in 1905, but is now a city of almost 1 million.

As a result of my inspection of installations in Russia, I am convinced that in water transportation and hydroelectric power development the Russians are inching ahead of us.

In any comparison of time, money and effort expended on resource development in Soviet Russia and the United States, there is, of course, absolutely nothing that we can do about the rate of such developments in Russia. They are proceeding with their own resources to meet the needs of their own economy. We must direct our attention to what we can do to satisfy our own needs.

There have been many studies of resource developments by presidential committees. One of the most recent was the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, dated December 22, 1955. In that report it was stated that the estimated use of water in the United States in 1950 was 185 billion gallons per day and that, based on an estimated population of 200 million by 1975, the requirements would be 350 billion gallons per day.

However, the November 28, 1958, issue of the U.S. News & World Report contained a very penetrating article by Dr. Phillip M. Hauser on the so-called explosion of population in the United States, which sheds more light on this problem of expanding population.

Dr. Hauser is head of the Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago, and has been Deputy Director of U.S. Census. He points out that the newest projections of the Census Bureau place the population of the United States in 1975 at between 216 and 244 million.

That is an increase in the predictions of from 8 to 20 percent in the past 3 years.

Putting it another way, taking a mean of the projections, a population of 230 million by 1975 would mean a 30-percent increase in our population in the next 16 years. Think of the tremendous increase in demand on all elements of our resources, including water. In terms of water demand, we will require about 400 billion gallons per day. In other words, during the quarter century period from 1950 to 1975 we will more than double our water requirement.

Thus it should be apparent that plans must be made now to meet these increased needs.

When you consider the time required to develop a major project—3 years or more for planning, then 8 to 10 years for construction—it is evident that it is none too early to start projects needed and justified now.

They will become critically urgent long before they can be completed on an economical program. Crash programs should be avoided if at all possible, since they are always more expensive than necessary, and frequently do not provide for the optimum use of the site.

And yet, in the face of all this data, how is the present administration meeting the known demand for resource development? It has not only failed to recommend funds to start surveys, plans, or new projects that are needed now, but last year built into the budget a planned slowdown which would delay the benefits of the projects underway as well as increase their ultimate cost.

As you all know, last year when the Congress added some new starts for planning and construction, there was a terrific blast from the White House.

On September 2, 1958, the President reluctantly signed the public works appropriation bill. At that time he issued the following statement:

"In the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1959, the Congress has included approximately \$39 million in funds to initiate construction on 65 unbudgeted new project starts that will ultimately cost almost \$700 million. Adding nearly \$700 million to the already heavy future commitments for Federal water resource projects is but another instance of irresponsibility in the expenditure of public funds. I am compelled to approve the act, however, because it appropriates essential funds for continuing work on river and harbor, flood control, and reclamation projects that were started in previous years."

When you consider that the appropriation for construction in the 1959 act was approximately \$870 million, was it really an act of irresponsibility in the expenditure of public funds to start new projects which will ultimately cost nearly \$700 million? That is adding less than 1 year's future commitment at the present rate of construction.

Unless it is the desire of the administration that the water resource program wither and die on the vine—and that may be the underlying reason—a fair number of new starts should be added each year.

Perhaps those shortsighted planners in the Budget Bureau believe that the Federal Government is spending too large a portion of its budget in developing the water resources of this Nation. Let us examine the facts.

Between 1950 and 1956 our national population increased 11.2 percent. Between 1950 and 1956 the national income increased 42 percent. During the same period the expenditures for rivers and harbors and flood control decreased 14.9 percent.

I believe those figures are very significant. As all of you know, construction costs have increased on an average of 5 percent a year. If that average is applied to the 1950 expenditure of \$627 million, we should be spending about \$908 million in 1959 on the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers in order to maintain the same level of operations as in 1950. In contrast, the appropriation was just under \$814 million. This comparison disregards the increased need for these public works resulting from our expanding population.

What is the situation in your own backyard—the Middle Atlantic Division of the Corps of Engineers?

The 1960 budget requests \$37,448,000 for the continuation of construction on 13 projects. Of these 13 projects, 7 would be completed with the funds requested in 1960. If the budget were to follow its usual course, the 1961 request would be for approximately \$24,294,000 for the continuation of six projects, of which three would be completed with the funds requested. By 1962 the budget request would be \$21,511,000 for three proj-

ects, of which two would be completed with the funds requested. Thereafter you could expect about \$13.75 million for the next 2 years to complete the Delaware River Channel.

Had it not been for the new starts added by the Congress, or had the President been granted the item veto he requests, the picture would be even more bleak.

I believe that one of the most vital interests of your association is the improvement and betterment of the 525 miles of the New York State Barge Canal System. This is probably the largest State-owned canal system in the United States. The foresight of the people of the great State of New York in the early 1800's in building this canal has always had my admiration. The part it played in the development of your Empire State and the rest of the United States, particularly the Middle West, cannot be overestimated.

I am aware that efforts are being made to amend the constitution of New York State to permit the legislature to lease or transfer the barge canal to the Federal Government. As I understand the situation, legislation authorizing such transfer passed the legislature in 1958 and similar legislation, now pending, must be adopted this year in order that the proposal may be submitted to the voters in a referendum. Certainly there is a real need for a modern barge canal system, and I am pleased to note that the State legislators are studying the problem of the future of this waterway. It certainly demonstrates a healthy interest by the State of New York in waterway improvements.

The thought expressed in certain quarters as to the reduced future need or role of this system in the overall transportation requirements of the Middle West and Northeastern United States, in view of the early opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, may be giving some of you apprehension as to the continued interest of the United States in its improvement. While initially there may be some minor traffic for overseas destinations that will be diverted to the new seaway, the system will continue to be a vital artery of commerce to serve the large number of industrial centers which the existence of the barge canal itself helped to create and expand. The seaway will doubtless generate new enterprises and activities which may make your canal system even more vital to the continued growth of the State of New York and the Nation at large.

I can assure you that many Members of the Congress are aware of the continued importance of this system to the welfare of the Nation. This is evidenced by the Federal participation in its modernization as authorized in the River and Harbor Acts of 1935 and again in 1945. It is regretted that the national crisis of the Second World War and the Korean situation made necessary a slowdown of this improvement. I was pleased that last year, through the efforts of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, we were able to give this project a boost by providing an additional unbudgeted \$800,000 to the budget estimate of \$110,000 in order that a start could be made on replacing a pair of guard gates at Waterford.

In 1935 deepening between locks and the raising of bridges were authorized. Of the 65 bridges to be raised, 42 have been or are being raised and the deepening was completed in 1941 with only some widening at structures remaining to be done. The 1945 act approved deepening through the locks. The sills of 18 locks have been or are in the process of being lowered with 9 locks or structures still remaining to be done.

The Corps of Engineers has been directed to restudy the project with a view of eliminating the restriction in the 1935 act on overall expenditure by the Federal Govern-

ment and to determine what further improvement might be justified.

Under the present Federal project, the responsibility for preparing specifications and designs rests with the Department of Public Works of the State of New York. Such plans must then be approved by the Corps of Engineers. Contracts are then let by the Department of Public Works of New York and finally, disbursement of Federal funds is authorized by the Corps of Engineers when the work is completed to reimburse the State for expenditures under the contract. Due to the fact that the organization responsible for planning and construction of the project is not the agency that supports the budget request, I fear that the importance of early obligation and expenditure of funds is not fully appreciated.

I recall several occasions when it was impossible to obtain even the budget estimate for this project because funds for the previous year had not been obligated at the time of the hearings.

Your State officials have demonstrated their faith and confidence in the future of their canal system in proceeding with the improvement with State funds pending future appropriation by the Congress.

For years, New York Harbor has had two unique river and harbor activities: the supervision of New York Harbor function and the collection of drift, with which I have become familiar during appropriation hearings. The vast quantity of waste materials generated here surely needs adequate surveillance to insure its proper and legal disposal. The hazard of drift and its damaging effect on boat operation is known to me. I trust our appropriations for these activities have been adequate. If not—show us why.

You have many other interesting and important projects in this area, which are sometimes difficult to follow, since New York Harbor is not included as a whole in one Federal project, but is made up of about 35 projects. Your Kills, or New York and New Jersey Channels project, now nearing completion and again being studied for further improvement; the Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers area, largely completed except for the Hackensack, but needing further study due to your Port of New York Authority's development at Newark and Elizabeth; the Buttermilk Channel that needs completion; the Pierhead Channel in upper bay; and the many smaller channels and harbors. You are truly a series of ports within ports, any one of which in itself warrants the concern, interest and attention of the Federal Government. However, all of these features suffer by reason of the now-start policy of the administration.

Unless some of the review studies for modernization of these waterways are permitted to be started, you may have to wait 4 or 5 years before you can start some of the improvements that are needed today.

Another important project in this area is the deepening of the Hudson River, from 27 to 32 feet up to Albany, N.Y. Last year the Senate, following the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee, approved funds to initiate this important modernization of the Hudson River. Unfortunately, this appropriation did not survive the House-Senate conference. I am hopeful that this project can be started in fiscal year 1960.

There are many other projects I could discuss, but those mentioned are vastly important—important not only to the people of New York, but to those of the entire Nation as well.

To plagiarize a phrase often used, I believe that what is good for New York is good for the country, just as I also believe that what is good for Louisiana is also good for the country.

That is why my temper rises and my blood boils when I hear the all too familiar label

of "pork barrel" placed on public works projects. These shortsighted mudslingers have no conception of the good that flows to our entire Nation as a result of such programs.

A channel in New York is deepened, and as a result, increased trade pours into Pennsylvania. A harbor in Louisiana is completed and there is an increased demand for Iowa corn, Pittsburgh steel, and so on.

These are the true end results of public work programs—increased trade and activity which will continue to keep our country great and at the forefront of nations.

That is why I cannot understand the position of the present administration. It is not possible for me to accept the thesis that the American economy cannot afford the expenditure of funds for projects which will eventually produce more wealth for all of us.

Efforts to cut down our public works programs are merely shortsighted attempts to curtail spending that in the long run will just cost the American people more money. If the administration is so eager to cut down Federal spending I invite its attention to the trimming of our foreign aid program.

As you are aware, the Congress has been asked to cut back public works expenditures for next year, while in the next breath, the administration has requested a 26 percent increase in our foreign aid programs.

Perhaps one way to obtain adequate public works programs—and I might add, without the benefit of justification and the close watch of the Corps of Engineers over projects—is to secede from the Union and ask for foreign aid.

If this situation were not so serious it would be farcical. We have an administration that on the one hand is attempting to slowly stifle the progress made in recent years in the development of our waterways, and on the other hand, willingly pours money with both hands into foreign countries.

I repeat, our public works programs are investments in the future of America, and I for one, know of no better place to invest our money, our faith, and our efforts.

I believe the time has come for the Members of Congress—and the entire Nation as well—to stand up and demand that the administration take a new look at its public works policy—or else prepare for the entrance of a new administration that will.

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

BENSON ON FARM SURPLUSES

"The question of what to do about our farm surpluses is before Congress once more. This year the question pretty much gets down to what we do about wheat-support prices. The major part of our surplus is now concentrated in wheat. Certainly, if you add cotton and corn to wheat, you have represented 85 percent of the crops in Government hands or under loan, and they presently total above \$7.5 billion, and rising. Surpluses will soon cost us about \$1 billion annually in storage and interest charges alone.

"We had a great year for wheat in 1958, by far the biggest crop in history. It amounted to 1.2 billion bushels, yet we can consume at home and sell abroad only about 900 million bushels. The rest goes into expensive storage. This does not have a wide benefit for our farmers. As a matter of fact, the bulk of the payments go to less than 10 percent of those who grow wheat.

"Actually, farmers generally are doing fairly well. Farmownership is at the highest level in history, and so are net equities. The condition of life on the farm has improved immensely and there is no longer that old sharp economic, cultural and educational dividing line between life on the farm and life in the city. Transportation, television, electricity have worked wonders. True, there are hardship areas and the cost-price squeeze is especially harmful to farmers, but unrealistic wheat support prices offer no way to alleviate them. There are other means and we are now pursuing them.

"What we need now in the Department of Agriculture is congressional authority to set wheat supports at levels that will lead to sales, not storage bins. In this way, we can retain and build our foreign markets and still produce all that our domestic consumers care to buy. This would save us billions yearly, help to revitalize our agriculture at home and abroad."

The above is Secretary of Agriculture Benson's own condensation of his statement to the Senate Agriculture Committee. We thought it worthy of reproduction in this form. It makes a good editorial.

men are thinking of retiring, by winning his Navy wings at Pensacola in 1918. He then completed a successful experiment of picking up cargo from the water in a moving plane, much to the astonishment of authorities in the Navy Department who were less than enthusiastic, at that time, about aviation. Subsequently, Dr. Cabot has been president of the National Aeronautical Association; one of the original directors of the Aviation Research Foundation, and remains honorary president of the Federation Aeronautique Internationale (FAI) which keeps the official worldwide records for aviation achievements by all countries.

Dr. Cabot in his 90's retains a modern view of the great future possibilities for aviation and in a recent letter to Prof. Langdon P. Marvin, Jr., he made this prophecy:

I predict that the time will come when the freight traffic through the air will greatly exceed passenger traffic through the air, and the receipts for carrying their goods through the air will be greater than for carrying passengers through the air. I predict that the time will come when the passenger and freight traffic through the air will be to a great extent separated, and most of the freight carried by planes that are built specially for that purpose.

It is a source of inspiration to all of us to contemplate the active intelligence of Dr. Cabot, and his many friends join with me in wishing congratulations on his 98th birthday and best wishes for many more birthdays to come.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert a letter from the President to Dr. Cabot and join in the President's congratulations:

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 24, 1958.

DR. GODFREY L. CABOT,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR DR. CABOT: I am reminded that February 26 brings around your 97th birthday anniversary. I am sure that as you look back upon America's tremendous progress during your lifetime you have the same feeling of pride as do I, and I hope that you will share in the immense possibilities that seem to be just around the corner for us—and for all peoples.

From my friends I know that you are as keen an observer of the passing scene as ever, and I do hope that I shall have the privilege of sending you my warmest felicitations, as I do now, for many future years.

With best wishes and warm regard,
Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Statement of Secretary of Agriculture on Farm Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on February 15 there was published as an editorial in the Washington Evening Star Secretary Benson's own condensation of his statement made before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. President, there are some who dislike the Secretary, some who dislike his actions and doubt his sincerity. I am not one of those. I have the utmost respect for Mr. Benson. I consider him to be one of the finest men ever to occupy a position in public life at such a high level.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement, which was published as an editorial, be printed in the RECORD.

Dr. Godfrey Lowell Cabot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like publicly to congratulate Dr. Godfrey L. Cabot of 242 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass., on the occasion of his 98th birthday on February 26, 1959.

Dr. Cabot is a businessman, a philanthropist, and a citizen who all his life has devoted himself to public service and better government.

Graduating with high honors from Harvard in 1882, Dr. Cabot undertook graduate study in geology and then established the highly successful Godfrey L. Cabot, Inc., in Boston with branches in many parts of the country.

One of his lifetime special interests has been aviation. Dr. Cabot learned to fly at the age of 55, an age when many

Second Anniversary of Ghana Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following message which I recorded for the Voice of America extending congratulations to the peo-

ple of Ghana on the second anniversary of their independence:

My warmest congratulations to the people of Ghana on this, the second anniversary of your independence.

What a day it was in 1957. Indescribable heat that everyone ignored. Amazingly well-managed crowds—deeply interesting ceremonies culminating in that final midnight moment when the Prime Minister spoke from the little stand in the Polo Field and said: At long last we are free.

All this is in my mind today.

To Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, I extend my good wishes and friendly congratulations.

How proud all of you must be of the advances that have been made in your educational services in all fields of education. Such evidences of your recognition of the fundamental part education plays in all areas of freedom give confidence to all.

Last summer we here in the U.S. Congress of which I am a long-time Member welcomed your Prime Minister with sincere pleasure. He spoke to us of your country's need for American investment. He told us of your efforts to eradicate poverty, disease, and illiteracy, and to achieve the sustained economic development which will permit a reasonable standard of living.

We have been happy that a survey team has gone to you in preparation for a useful mission of technical cooperation. We are ready to serve with you in the program you are developing.

This is but a word, on this, the second anniversary of your freedom, to congratulate you and to wish for you all good things.

Heaven bless you, Mr. Prime Minister, and every man, woman, and child in Ghana.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of February 28, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER)

George Washington's Farewell Address, of September 17, 1796, is read yearly in the House and Senate on his birthday. Though his principles are timeless and enduring, it is ironic to recognize how we moderns seem determined to shut our eyes to the great abiding truths. His admonitions include:

1. The importance of the Federal union of States, and strict observance of the Constitution and its proper amendment process (no amendment by reinterpretation);

2. Government by separated divisions is good, each checking the other (no usurpation of power by one branch or of State powers by the Federal Government);

3. There can be no national morality if the sense of religious obligation and principle fails in us. (How do we measure up here?)

4. Preserve public credit, be selective in tax, avoid debt, do not burden posterity (and now even our Government bonds are considered less desirable as investments because Congress has depreciated the value of our money by profligate spending);

5. No entangling alliances or favored treatment of any nation, but rather commerce and enlightened self-interest (check

our foreign aid, trade programs, and alliances against this).

The payroll of a Representative is public information, and should be (although this is not so in practice in the Senate). Who is hired and what is paid, within limits, is left largely to the discretion of the individual Congressman. Some hire kinfolks, and some pay higher than others. The judgment of the Congressman is the deciding factor and is, of course, subject to approval or disapproval by the voters every 2 years. For my part, I believe in running my office like a business, with incentive pay the factor—pay well as it's earned but only for equivalent performance, value received. On this basis, my staff measures up. No secrets either; the pay records will always stand public scrutiny.

The criticism of the Senate leadership leveled by Wisconsin Democrat WILLIAM PROXMIRE points up a problem of concern to all Congressmen in both parties. Under our setup, Congressmen are elected to represent specific areas, not parties. But just as power has gravitated from the States and localities to Washington, power in the Congress has tended to concentrate in the hands of the majority party's leadership. When as at present a party's majority is somewhat lopsided, and there's even a modicum of party discipline, the power of the leadership can be rather considerable. Particularly is this so at present when Democrats in both Houses are led by men from the same area who have long worked in close cahoots. Representative government may not be very representative. A legislative program may depend on a party line and how that line is determined can be vitally important. If it's arrived at by political masterminding at the top rather than from the bottom up, defections are inevitable among Congressmen really trying to be representative of their States or districts, rather than just acquiescent cogs in a party machine over which they have no control.

Debt retirement by the Federal Government received some attention this week, with several Texans proposing that a yearly payment on our debt be included in the budget. Many, including myself, applaud the idea, and I want to help in such a worthy effort. But here's the rub: How can we retire the debt by any amount when the Congress continues to spend more than is taken in? We must cut waste and welfare programs so that there is a balance of cash on hand in the Treasury to pay down the debt. Isn't this so? The irony of this debt retirement proposal is that some of those sponsoring it are among those regularly voting for bigger Federal spending. For example, one gentleman now voicing support for debt reduction voted only 14 percent for economy and 86 percent for big spending last year; another voted 70 percent of the time for big spending last year. Perhaps this inconsistency was the reason for the exhortation of the public to request less of the Federal Government, and this certainly makes sense. However, I hold that a constitutional democracy in a republic demands that our representatives exercise judgment and self-discipline, be leaders, not followers. Therefore, it is up to Congress to vote "No" to big spending proposals and seek to eliminate waste, and to prevent raids on the Treasury by organized pressure groups.

The battle of the budget (and debt retirement) has become a battle of survival for our type of society and human freedom, as I see it. Surely, it is important for each Member to be more concerned with preserving the fiscal health of this great Nation (through the self-discipline of reduced spending) than with his seat in Congress. It's a simple matter of which comes first. Believing this, I intend to press this viewpoint, questioning no one's motives or integrity. If I must, disagree—but without being disagreeable, disliking only the ideas, not the people involved.

Democratic Victory Dinner Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I made at the Democratic victory dinner in Washington, D.C., on February 28.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD, DEMOCRAT, OF MONTANA, AT DEMOCRATIC VICTORY DINNER, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 28, 1959

The automobile industry is often described as the pace setter of American industry. In other words, it occupies a position in the American economy like the Democratic Party in American politics. There's one difference. Last year the American people didn't go too well for the new cars. Last November they went, with real enthusiasm, for the Democrats.

So, tonight, we are having a victory dinner. You know, there are some people who think you can have too much of a good thing. They say, for example, "There's too many Democrats in the Senate. What's LYNDON going to do with them all?" Well, so far as I know, we don't have any Democratic unemployment in the Senate. The distinguished majority leader has put all the Democratic Members to work, and they are beginning to produce. There's no such thing as an "acceptable" level of unemployment in the Democratic Senate, just as there oughtn't to be in the Nation.

Personally, I don't think you can ever have too many Democrats at work—in the Senate or anywhere else. As a matter of fact, there's a shortage of Democrats. The country could use a lot more of them over in the other branch of the Government. I don't know about the market for automobiles. But, as far as Democrats are concerned, it won't be until 1960 that the supply will begin to catch up with the demand.

In the last few weeks we've been seeing the new automobiles on the streets of this city. They have clean, fresh lines. Some of the cars are conservative looking. Others show liberal style changes. A few even have that futuristic look.

Not to be outdone by the automobile industry, we have our own display of 1959 Democratic models tonight. We've got four lines with us—not Fords, General Motors, Chryslers, and Ramblers. What we do have are Democratic Governors, Senators, Representatives, and Democratic presidential possibilities. We've even done something which Detroit hasn't been able to do for years. We've brought in a successful new producer—Alaska—with three new Democratic designs—all fully equipped with snowshoes.

Some of us have had an opportunity to preview the new 1959 Democratic models in the Senate. We've already looked under the hoods and tried the steering gear and the brakes. Take it from us, the new automobiles have nothing on them. These new Democratic models may not handle as easily—take, for example, the one produced in Wisconsin—but they all do have plenty of power. As a matter of fact, some of us older rattletraps, the model A's are beginning to wonder what the influx of these bright and shining new additions to the Senate is going to do to the used car market.

Nevertheless, we strongly commend them—all of them—to you. We urge you to take them to your hearts as we have done. They add luster drive, safety and countless new extras to the Democratic Party and to the Nation.

That is why I am delighted to participate in this victory dinner. It is true we are celebrating, in a general sense, the triumph of the Democratic Party in the 1958 elections. But in a special sense we are celebrating the victory of these new Senators, new Representatives and new Governors. It is they who add up to the difference between an ordinary election and the great Democratic victory at the polls last November. Through them, the Nation has made clear what it expects of all of us.

I am very glad that the great leader of the Senate, LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas, is here tonight to help us interpret the meaning of this victory. I can tell you that his reputation as a skilled craftsman and mechanic in this trade is fully warranted. He knows his political automobiles. And out of his warm and responsive heart and his clear-thinking head, he knows something much more important. He knows that the function of the Democratic Party is to go; not to seem to go. It is to go, not in starts and stops, not in bursts of power and sputtering stalls, but to go firmly and steadily in the direction which the American people, by giving us this great victory, have commanded us to go.

The late Senator Robert Taft said that the function of the opposition is to oppose. With all due respect to that great Republican leader, I want to say that for Democrats, opposition alone is not enough. We Democrats will oppose when it is necessary to oppose. But we shall oppose responsibly and we shall try to contribute constructively to the security and progress of the Nation whenever and wherever we can.

To do that, we have got to have clearly in mind what we cannot do, as well as what we can do, under our constitutional system. The administration, alone, can lead in this country. True, it is a fact that is going to change in 1960. It is going to change, however, only if we do what the American people have commanded us to do; it is going to change only if we do what we can do, not what each of us thinks he would like to do. What Democrats can do, what they must do, is to point out a constructive path for the Republican administration to follow. We have got to keep it working when it would prefer to relax. For the sake of the American people we must hold the hand of this Republican administration when it is perplexed. We must try to guide it when it loses the way. We owe that to the people who have entrusted us with a large share of the responsibility for running this Government.

In specifics, we have got to try, as we have been trying, to get it started on the road to policies which may lead to a more durable peace. We have got to improve the administration of foreign aid and restore the decent image of the United States in so many parts of the world. We have got to see to it that this Republican administration keeps its nose to the grindstone of the social and economic problems which plague large parts of the Nation. You know those problems—inadequate education and other unequal opportunities for millions, a disgracefully wasteful agricultural policy which sees mountains of decaying surpluses side by side with millions of people without enough to eat, high prices, millions of unemployed, the decay of urban centers, a lagging science, an antiquated and inequitable tax system and a neglect of our older citizens. These and similar matters are the problems which confront us. To boot, we have to try to deal with them within the framework of a sleight-of-hand budget from an administration which last year gave us

another such budget along with policies that helped to produce a \$12 billion deficit in it.

We Democrats have a duty to try to make this administration work, not for the benefit of one, but for all sections of the Nation and for peace. We have a duty to try to make this administration work, not for the benefit of the few but for the welfare of the many.

That is the meaning of November 1958. That is what the American people have asked the Democratic Party to try to do. I do not know whether we shall succeed. It is a monumental task to try to do anything with a Republican administration. Speaking for those of us who are in the Senate, however, I can assure you that we shall try our best.

The Massive Irresponsibility of the Spenders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that remarks I made before the Ohio Association of Retail Lumber Dealers on February 26, entitled "The Massive Irresponsibility of the Spenders," be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE MASSIVE IRRESPONSIBILITY OF THE SPENDERS

(Address by U.S. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, before the Ohio Association of Retail Lumber Dealers, Columbus, Ohio, February 26, 1959)

Just a few days ago we Americans observed the birthday of the Father of our Country, George Washington. I am frequently amazed at how the words of really great men ring true generations after their time. Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Thomas Jefferson—even today their philosophies serve us as a guiding light.

So it is with George Washington. I sometimes think that his Farewell Address should be framed and hung in the office of every Senator and Congressman in Washington, for it offers some very sound advice.

Among his words in that address were these: "As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit."

He admonished the Nation to use credit as sparingly as possible and to avoid the accumulation of debt not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in time of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear.

Now, that's a fairly simple formula. The following of it is what takes courage. Political courage.

I am sadly reminded of those words as I observe the spending orgy now under way in Congress. The budget busters are going at it hammer and tongs, determined to spend more and more of your tax dollars on the theory that a little bit of inflation is good for the country.

Some observers have expressed the opinion that Congress has reflected the views of the people by approving increased domestic expenditures. They believe the people generally have taken the attitude that if the United States can afford to spend billions for military and economic aid to foreign coun-

tries, then they, as taxpayers, want to get as many benefits as possible under domestic programs.

Whether this was a correct estimate of the opinion held by a majority of the people or not, one is entitled to suspect that it was the basis on which the 2d session of the Democratic-controlled 85th Congress permitted:

1. A deficit of \$12.9 billion;
2. The public debt limit to be raised from \$275 billion to \$288 billion temporarily and to \$283 billion permanently; and
3. Nondefense spending for fiscal 1959 to be increased by \$5.3 billion against an increase of \$2 billion for defense purposes.

The fact is that total national defense spending planned for fiscal 1959 will be \$4.3 billion under fiscal 1953's defense budget of \$52.6 billion. On the other hand, nondefense expenditures in 1959 are estimated at \$9.2 billion above the 1953 level of \$21.7 billion.

In the face of the growing public debt, such extravagance has no place in the budget of a prudent government any more than it would fit into the budget of a prudent family.

Let's consider the Federal budget in everyday terms.

A family budget, operated in the same manner as the Federal budget, would mean that the family started out fiscal 1959 with a debt of more than four times its annual income. Following the Federal trend that family would face its financial situation by obligating itself to spend more than \$1.08 for every \$1 income received during the year. No sound financial institution would accept a note signed by a member of a family in such a condition.

As a matter of fact no family and no business or industry could ever get into such a dire financial situation with private financing. They would be considered broke long before ever reaching such a status.

In the light of such a situation we currently have before us the even sorer spectacle of certain leaders in Congress practically hand tooling an economic disaster.

If the budget is unbalanced the result will be higher taxes for everyone. And if the revenues to balance the spending are not collected by the Government then the people of this country are in for a period of inflation that could push the cost of living upward and make your dollar worth less and less.

There are several bills coming up for consideration in Congress that involve spending more billions than the budget provides. Those behind this legislation seem to feel that the country doesn't care and the sky's the limit on public spending as long as you hang a "welfare" tag on it.

I can't think of many things that would please the Kremlin gang more than to see the economy of this country weakened from within by irresponsible fiscal policies. Deficit spending and lending, if continued, will lead us straight into the Russian trap envisaged by Lenin, who said: "We shall force the United States to spend itself to destruction."

A nation can hang itself on the gallows of excessive public debt—and we are no exception.

Some people would have us believe that the Federal Treasury is a bottomless grab-bag which never needs to be conserved or replenished. Because of this attitude we have seen the national debt soar to dizzying heights. The Federal debt in December 1958, was \$283 billion—about \$7,000 per family in the United States.

In about 25 years our expanding Federal Government has boosted the average family's tax bill from \$120 to \$1,600 a year.

We don't often hear these facts. As I mentioned earlier, this current fiscal year the Federal deficit is estimated at nearly \$13 billion—the Government is spending nearly \$13 billion more than its receipts. For the coming fiscal year the President has

presented a budget of \$77 billion. It is a balanced budget, even though it is the biggest peacetime budget in our history.

Yet some critics have called it a skinflint budget. Actually, as the President himself said, it will "help prevent further increases in the cost of living and the hidden and unfair tax that inflation imposes on personal savings and incomes."

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, an outstanding authority on fiscal policy, has said: "Our free-enterprise democracy is the greatest economic system the world has ever evolved. But there is one controlling requirement, and it must never be overlooked. The system is based on solvent government and sound money. It is in this requirement that we have allowed ourselves to become weak." To those words I say "Amen."

We cannot spend our way into prosperity. Nor can we preserve our prosperity and our free-enterprise system by following a reckless policy of spending beyond our income in peacetime.

The vital necessity of sound fiscal policy is illustrated by the constantly increasing prices of military equipment. Even allowing for the obvious fact that the new weapons and equipment are much more sensitive, powerful, effective, and, therefore, more expensive than the items they are replacing, the truth is that a good deal of inflation is already built into their extremely high costs.

Let me give you a few examples of the rising prices of what is known as military hardware. The B-29 heavy bomber at the end of World War II cost about \$600,000. The all-jet B-52 intercontinental bomber of today costs about \$8 million.

During World War II, a submarine cost about \$4.7 million. The Polaris submarine will cost about \$90 million.

Rockets and missiles are expensive, too. It is estimated that the cost of developing ballistic missiles to an operational state will be a good deal more than twice the cost of developing the first atom bomb.

Does this mean that unlimited Federal spending is inevitable? Should we just give up in our attempts to keep the budget within reasonable bounds? If that were so, then we would already have lost the battle to stay free.

But it is not so. Most of our problem thus far has been that the great majority of our people have not been aware of the dangers they face from even bigger Government and irresponsible fiscal planning.

We must wake up. We must alert the various forces in our citizenry to make sure of two things:

First, whatever funds are needed for defense, for space exploration, and for other essential military and civilian purposes must be provided, and provided soundly.

Second, waste, duplication, continuation of governmental services no longer needed must be eliminated and eliminated promptly.

We must live within our income. We must keep our economy sound. It cannot be done by going further into debt. We must maintain fiscal integrity.

This is the road to commonsense, the road to a sound defense—a sound defense against the enemies of freedom, both at home and abroad.

The Federal debt is only a part of the whole U.S. fiscal picture. When we add up our total debt—the net debt owed by Federal, State, and local governments, by business and by individuals—the sum is staggering—\$758 billion. It has almost doubled since the end of World War II.

Personal income after taxes is the highest it has ever been. Yet, both mortgage debt and consumer debt have been increasing. In 1958 alone, mortgage debt outstanding went up nearly \$15 billion.

At the end of 1958, consumer, or personal, debt totaled nearly \$45 billion—seven times what it was 20 years ago. A few years ago

only one family out of three had any consumer debt. Now more than half have such obligations.

Worse still, the majority of persons with such personal debt have no liquid assets to fall back on.

We can readily see what a terrible thing inflation is by what it has done to the people of France. In that country the cost of living today is 37 times what it was about 30 years ago.

A pound of butter that cost 10 francs in 1927 is 410 francs today.

Men who put aside savings for substantial annuities find that their pensions are worth only 15 percent of what they were in 1940.

The pensions of French veterans of World War I—pensions once considered adequate—have depreciated to a value of 70 cents a month.

Don't say it can't happen here. The people of France never thought it would happen there.

I do not mean to say that all debt is bad. Of course not. Sound business debt is one of the elements of growth. Sound mortgage credit is a real help to a family that must borrow for a farm or a home.

But is it not apparent that in the areas of both public and personal debt these limitations of soundness are being disregarded by all too many of our citizens?

This matter is of vital concern to all of us, but especially to our younger citizens. They will live under the hysteria of inflation throughout the rest of their lives—if it is not checked now.

They will carry the load of our rising debt, and its growing interest payments—if we go on spending beyond our income.

They and their children will pay the bill that will inevitably be rendered by a continuing fiscal irresponsibility—and it will, I fear, be a bill compounded in hardship and heartache.

Inflation has already robbed our dollar, savings, pensions, annuities, insurance policies, social security, etc., of more than one-half of their purchasing power and real value. It has increased the cost of Government more than 100 percent, thereby raising taxes more than 100 percent. As the dollar buys less and less each year, the cost of national defense rises more and more, thereby seriously crippling this country and the free world in their life-and-death struggle for survival against the disciplined forces of communism.

Since our Government has gone in debt more than all the other governments in the world and since Congress continues to spend more money than it takes in, the money obligations of our Government have been falling in value year by year for a long time.

If this keeps up for a few more years our money will be worthless and the savings of our people for old age, sickness and for their children will be wiped out. It is a certainty—if Congress continues its spending spree. If there is any doubt about this, I suggest reading the history of nations in ancient and modern times. The handwriting is on the wall for all to see but the blind.

This is a period in the early stages of inflation when the owners of equities such as stocks, land, and commodities appear to either hold their own or profit from inflation. This doesn't last long. As history shows, the owners of such equities are finally wiped out.

Under inflation, stocks earn less and less dividends and ultimately their value is based on dividends. Taxes on real property mount ever higher because of inflation until it makes ownership of real property unprofitable. In France and Germany, where inflation was unchecked, the people vainly sought refuge through every type of investment. They all came to the same end—bankruptcy.

Our country is at peace. The economists predict one of the best business years ever.

We're all going to make more money, there will be longer fishtails on our automobiles, bigger screens on our television sets, and more chrome-plated gadgets in the kitchen for the little woman.

It sounds just dandy, but I think it would be wise in these times to take a hard look at just where we're headed and see if we are not living in some sort of fool's paradise. Perhaps, as the Chinese say, it is only temporary.

I do know one thing for sure—the massive irresponsibility now being displayed in Congress is definitely not the answer. I think it's about time those elected to high office thought less about winning popularity contests back home and faced up to the responsibility of doing—and voting for—what is best for the country as a whole.

This country faces a challenge greater than any it has ever known. For a nation with so marvelous a heritage to destroy itself by robbing Peter to pay Paul is unthinkable.

We must keep America free and strong—economically, socially, and spiritually—so that our way of life may endure. There is no other way. This is your challenge and mine—a challenge to every American no matter who or what he may be.

Curtailing Foreign Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, as usual, opposition to the present administration on reciprocal trades and the Buy American Act, draws editorial comment, as well as a batch of misinformation, which serves to further confuse the minds of the public as to the realities of the situation. I am submitting for the RECORD today two editorials appearing in local papers which would appear to cover the subject to the uninformed, but to those of us who have made a thorough study of the situation the answer is not so simple. I submit, therefore, Mr. Speaker, my reply to these editors and their editorials:

OPEN LETTER TO THE PITTSBURGH POST-GAZETTE

FEBRUARY 27, 1959.

To the Editor.

DEAR SIR: I don't write Letters to the Editor very often. When I do, it's because either the information is in error, or I am badly informed.

On Wednesday, February 25, your editorial appears to put my fight for the awarding of large contracts to foreign governments in a bad light.

Personally, I've been an advocate for liberal trade policies. However, I always felt that the promises of every President, every Secretary of State, and every Secretary of Commerce—since the passage of the original reciprocal trade bills and the foreign aid legislation—were being kept.

Every assurance was and is still being given that no arguments on trade would be made that would prove to be injurious to any American industry.

The facts do not bear out these assurances:

Most of our troubles are of recent vintage, the Buy American Act has been openly and flagrantly abused since the Presidential order of December 1954, decreasing the American

differential allowance from 25 percent to 6 percent.

The escape clause has been invoked 60 times by industry and minor relief has been granted only 19 times and no relief in the other 41 cases.

This record was compiled in spite of the fact that in 31 cases the Tariff Commission ruled unanimously in favor of tariff relief for the injured industries.

Two classic examples are the binocular and watch industries. After many protests against the competition from abroad, they closed shop and are no longer producing in the United States. The prediction is that all the watch industry will fold unless something is done.

These are not isolated cases, they are the rule, and not the exception.

Insofar as your figures for export and import of electrical equipment, the testimony given us is that of all the export business done by American producers all but \$200,000 worth was paid for by our own money under mutual aid, ICA, and other Government spending and lending agencies.

Even this market is now threatened by new regulations being put into effect.

I believe a trade agreement has to be mutually beneficial and mutually respected.

In the case of British selling our Government generators and other power-producing equipment, the testimony shows that the British do not permit any foreign country to sell any item of this nature to their entire power industry.

In the case of the Jeannette Elliott plant, the differential was approximately 12 percent and this, according to the President's order, should have given the business to our local company.

However, they invoked a new item into the calculations by giving credit to the Swiss company for the 13 percent ad valorem duty charged on the import.

Needless to say, the Jeannette company, nor their workers, were given credit for the taxes, Federal, State and local, paid.

I don't want to appear to be an isolationist or a high tariff advocate. I do, however, recognize our higher standards of pay, fringe benefits, personal and corporate taxes.

I also recognize that we need friends everywhere. Somehow, I can't believe we make friends by taking over their production facilities with our investments and our markets.

I may be a little short on the economics of the situation, but I can't figure how it will help the American workman and the American businessman by making it more attractive profitwise, and taxwise for an American manufacturer to close his plants here to make investments abroad and to be allowed to take his foreign profits tax free, if he reinvests in other foreign enterprises. The promotion also calls for limiting American investors in foreign enterprise taxes to the limit of the taxes paid through foreign corporation earnings and investments to the taxes assessed by the foreign country.

One example given shows where a steel producer pays a limit of 30 percent on net income compared to 52 percent here. This may be all right if we can afford it, however, I doubt if we can with the debt and budget greater than all the rest of the world combined.

In closing, and to make a point, I refer back to my statement that agreements have to be mutually beneficial and respected.

Let's take the auto industry. We give concessions to foreign cars that permit the following comparative prices in New York City and other places:

New York, United States of America: American Ford \$350 more than British Consul, \$900 more than German Volkswagen.

London, England: Ford \$3,850 more than Consul, \$3,800 more than Volkswagen.

Cologne, Germany: Ford \$1,900 more than Consul, \$3,800 more than Volkswagen.

Copenhagen, Denmark: Ford \$2,800 more than Consul, \$3,700 more than Volkswagen. Caracas, Venezuela: Ford, \$2,800; Consul, \$2,050; Volkswagen, \$1,750.

South Africa: Ford, \$3,350; Consul, \$2,250; Volkswagen, \$1,800.

Mexico: Puts a 100 percent tariff on all American cars.

The formula shifts in its application in Brazil, Japan, the Philippines, and other markets, but in every case the heaviest duties apply to American cars.

This is known as market rigging and this is the reason we have lost our foreign market and about 13 percent of our home market.

When we can't keep our production lines at full capacity, it adds to the cost of the item produced and with the loss of foreign markets we are necessarily put into a position where we can't compete successfully with imports.

This doesn't alibi our big cars and luxury items but how do we explain the fact that Nash has all of its "Metropolitan," their cheap, small, unadorned car, made exclusively in England and it's the same car formerly produced here.

I know that both sides of an argument has logic and sincerity on their side. I can't, however, as a public servant, be choosy in the matter of whose job I shall try to save.

To me a worker in the glass plants, rubber works, bicycle shops, coal mines, electrical or any other endeavor is equally distressed if he is unemployed.

I shall never knowingly vote to create conditions that will cause any American worker to lose his job or any American business, including your journalistic enterprise to lose its earnings on its investments and services.

I know this is a long "letter" but believe me, I haven't scratched the surface of the problem.

I hope we can find a solution that will help us keep both our friends, our jobs, and our standard of living.

Sincerely,

JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Feb. 25, 1959]

How To PROTECT JOBS

Before Congressmen—and Jeannette's Representative JOHN DENT notably among them—take action to curtail the American importation of such goods as electrical generators, they should be reminded that foreign trade is a two-way street on which this country enjoys a preponderance of the traffic.

The current debate has arisen because Swiss and British firms have underbid American firms on electric generators contracted for by agencies of the Federal Government. Mr. DENT and others have complained that this would deprive American workmen of jobs. While Mr. DENT certainly can't be blamed for protecting what he believes to be the best interests of his constituents, he should take a look at the other side of the street.

Pittsburgh Congressman WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD has pointed out that this country exports far more electrical equipment than it imports. State Department figures for 1957 show that the United States exported \$1 billion worth of electric machinery and apparatus while importing the same sort of material valued at only \$145 million. In the field of electrical generators alone, American exports totaled \$175 million as compared with imports of only \$13 million.

When renewal of the reciprocal trade program was up for congressional consideration last year, it was estimated by Government officials that world trade makes jobs for at least 4½ million American workers. Closer to home, exports bring \$793.2 million yearly to Pennsylvania, \$164.7 million annually to Allegheny County alone. This trade repre-

sents full-time jobs for more than 9,400 workers in the Pittsburgh area's five principal industries.

The jobs of these and other workers would be jeopardized, and this Nation's unemployment problem would be aggravated, if Congress supported a program aimed at protecting American workers through higher tariffs or subterfuges in the name of national security. That would invite reprisal by foreign countries which could cost more American jobs than would be protected. If we are to continue to sell our products abroad, we must encourage conditions under which foreign countries can do business with us.

Mr. HARRY PORE, Jr.,
Editor, the Monessen Daily Independent,
Monessen, Pa.

MY DEAR HARRY: Your story and editorial again demonstrate your technique of telling half-truths.

Where did you get the story that Congressman MOORHEAD "hits" DENT on Buy American?

Mr. MOORHEAD has never once argued with me on my position of fighting for the Government orders for Westinghouse and Elliott Co., of Jeannette.

In fact, he was one of the cosponsors of my resolution asking that the orders be given to the American concerns.

The only difference between my thinking and some of the others is that I can't see any difference between my unemployed glass workers, steelworkers, and others because of our trade policy than an electrical worker.

There is no change in the position of my congressional district, since my predecessor, Congressman Kelley, fought and voted against reciprocal trade agreements.

Our district happens to be one of the areas that has been sacrificed to the sacred cow of cotton and other low man-hour production exports.

I am not now, nor have ever been, a Smoot-Hawley high-tariff advocate.

I am now, and have always been, a believer in fair trade and believed what every President and every Secretary of State and every Secretary of Commerce of the United States have said time and time again for the record, "That no reciprocal trade agreement will be made that will cause undue hardship or injury to any American industry."

I believe in that, and I believe also that if we made concessions we should receive same.

I know you would like to be fair, so I'll give you some facts that are compelling, at least to a Representative of the 21st Congressional District of Pennsylvania, with its heavy unemployment. I've just received the latest figures on our trade balance with Japan, and I believe it tells the story that I'm trying to emphasize. We trade payrolls and raw materials for consumer goods and unemployment.

We sell Japan: Cotton, wheat, soya beans, metalworking machinery, heavy oil, crude petroleum, bituminous coal for steel producing, iron and steel scrap, barley, cotton mill waste and pulp, hides and skins, beef tallow, corn, miscellaneous.

We buy from Japan: Processed and canned fish products, iron and steel, pottery, silk fabrics, sewing machines, optical instruments, cotton fabrics, wool and worsted fabrics, pearls, cotton clothing, railway sleepers, glassware, cooking utensils, miscellaneous.

Although there is a slight trade balance in dollars in our favor, the indisputable fact remains that the things we sell are used to make products to sell back to us.

We have 38 million tons of steel capacity idle, yet the U.S. Navy buys 5,700 tons of steel plate from Japan. Last week we ordered \$9 million worth of radar equipment from Canada and Westinghouse and

General Electric are on short workweeks with thousands unemployed.

It isn't an easy matter to know the answer but one thing is sure, we can't operate without employment and when the State Department decides which jobs to sacrifice and which jobs are to be protected, let us hope that our district factory workers get as much consideration in the future as oil, wheat and corn planters.

I am not against trades—all I want is reciprocal trades that are reciprocal.

I am attaching a letter with more details of interest which I have sent to the Post Gazette.

Hoping we can work together, at least for our district, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. DENT, Member of Congress.

FULL CIRCLE

Representative JOHN H. DENT, of Westmoreland County, is engaged in a strange campaign for a Democratic Congressman of the New Deal persuasion. He is promoting so-called buy American legislation to protect U.S. manufacturers against foreign competition.

It has been a good quarter-century since a Congressman from this area adopted such a position. The last one from Westmoreland County was classified by the Democrats, if memory serves us, as a reactionary.

So apparently we have come full circle on the question of free trade versus protective tariffs. Representative DENT's position is indistinguishable from that of the blackest Republican of the Smoot-Hawley era.

It is hard to avoid the impression that Mr. DENT is more interested in votes than in finding the right answers to problems of foreign competition and world trade. Some industries in his district are feeling the effects of foreign imports; so he proposes the simplest possible remedy—shut out the imports, buy American.

What it pleases him to overlook is that the United States by and large is an exporting country. Take Europe, from where come the products that are bothering Mr. DENT. In 1957 the United States shipped to Europe nearly \$6 billion worth of products; we imported from Europe about \$3 billion worth.

Does anyone seriously believe that if the United States reverts to a high tariff policy, it will continue to find the world's markets open to it?

Columbus Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, for many years there has arisen, from time to time, a movement to make October 12, Columbus Day, a national holiday. It is true that nearly all the States today observe it in one form or another, either as a legal or a public holiday. My purpose, however, in introducing this bill is to make October 12 a truly national holiday, sponsored by the Federal Government. There has, properly speaking, been but one occasion when Congress has purported to declare a national holiday throughout the United States, and that was by the act of March 2, 1889, which used the expression with reference to the following April 30, the "Centennial Anniversary of the Inauguration

of the First President of the United States."

I submit that it is time to break the precedent again and the purpose of this bill—H.R. 418—is to declare October 12 a permanent national holiday. No anniversary, surely, could be more basic nor fundamental than that which marks that day in the year 1492 when the eyes of Christopher Columbus first beheld an outpost of the New World. Although he did not know it was a new world, believing it to be merely the western Indies, and died in that belief, it was nonetheless the faith and persistence of this one man, in the face of almost inconceivable obstacles and heartbreaking humiliation and delay, which threw open a new hemisphere for the settlement of mankind and the eventual emergence of a great republic founded on democracy and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Surely this epochal day merits a yearly observance, both in tribute to the man himself and to an event which forever changed the face of the earth and altered the destiny of the human race.

Oregon, the Beaver State, Host to the World in 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article about the Valentine State of Oregon written by one of Oregon's outstanding native sons—Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER. The story appeared in the February 1959 issue of Retirement Life.

THE STORY OF A "FRONTIER OF THE FUTURE"—THE BEAVER STATE—HOST TO THE WORLD IN 1959

The first Americans to journey westward to Oregon were on the payroll of the Federal Government. They were a pair of Army captains named Meriwether Lewis and William Clark—the most famous exploring team in all history.

The pay of this redoubtable pair was skimpy. Each collected only \$1,228 for a pilgrimage which lasted 2½ years. Nor was there any National Association of Retired Civil Employees in 1805 to assure them of a steady Government annuity when the epochal trek was over, although a grateful Congress did vote the exploring leaders 1,600 acres of choice homestead land apiece.

Oregon, which lay at the sunset end of the trail of Lewis and Clark, this year celebrates its first century of statehood. Oregon was admitted to the Union on Valentine's Day of 1859, just about half a century after Lewis and Clark had brought our flag down to tidewater on the Pacific coast.

SUPERLATIVES STUD STATE

Meriwether Lewis had been private secretary to President Thomas Jefferson. He sent to his illustrious superior fabulous reports about the realm called Oregon—its swift rivers, towering mountains, deep harbors, and riches in timber, pelts and fisheries. Oregon still makes this enduring and vivid

impression on residents and visitors alike. Superlatives stud the State like raisins in a pudding.

On its eastern boundary, Oregon is bordered by Hells Canyon of the Snake River, deepest chasm on the continent. In some places, it measures over 7,000 feet from rim to river. The western boundary of Oregon is the Pacific Ocean, which caresses beaches of white sand or sends jets of spray against rocky capes and headlands. I once heard a photographer for Life magazine say he had taken pictures of virtually all of the great seacoasts of the world, but the Oregon seacoast was by far the most picturesque and beautiful of any of them.

OREGON CLIMATE MILD

Oregon's northern border is the Columbia River. In its surging reaches lurks nearly one-third of the entire hydroelectric power potential of North America. The Columbia, second in size only to the Mississippi among the rivers of the Nation, drops 2,700 feet from its distant source in the Canadian Rockies to its union with the sea near Astoria, where Lewis and Clark put in the first winter ever spent by Americans along the Pacific seaboard. In addition, the prodigious Chinook and Blueback salmon runs of the Columbia are among the most valuable fisheries on earth—worth almost \$20 million annually.

Because of the mild climate which dominates its western slope, Oregon is particularly popular with retired people. Many members of NARCE in Oregon are men and women who came to the State after retirement, liked what they saw—and stayed. My wife and I understand this feeling. We are natives of Oregon, born and bred. The instant Congress adjourns each session, we rush to Oregon, and we never return to the National Capital until just when Congress is ready to resume. We extract every last possible minute in our beloved Oregon.

Besides its awesome topography, which culminates in the 11,225-foot glacial summit of Mount Hood, Oregon has made striking contributions to Government during its 100 years of statehood.

INITIATED GOVERNMENT REFORMS

Oregon was the first State to enact laws setting maximum hours and minimum pay to protect women and children in industry. This set the pace for similar social legislation all over the Nation, Oregon also pioneered in adopting the initiative and referendum. Indeed, these reforms have become commonly known as the "Oregon system." Under them, citizens may circulate petitions on street corners or along country roads collecting signatures to place any proposal on the ballot. Such petitions have been used to enact statutes safeguarding natural resources or providing higher standards of old-age assistance.

Furthermore, Oregon led all other States in bringing about the direct election of U.S. Senators. Until Oregon elected a Senator by popular vote, Members of the Senate were appointed by State legislatures. This often encouraged corruption, deals and the supremacy of special interests. After Oregon had made the breakthrough, the 17th amendment to the Federal Constitution soon followed, making mandatory the election of all Senators at the ballot box. The famed Senator William E. Borah, of Idaho, said Oregon's people were entitled to principal credit for this major reform.

Oregon is noted for its educational attainments. During the mass aptitude tests given our GI's during the Korean hostilities, soldiers from Oregon ranked second in the United States, exceeded only by those from Minnesota. Oregon spends more per pupil on its students than any State where school districts operate the public schools. The University of Oregon Medical School, the

forestry department of Oregon State College and other specialized categories are outstanding in the Nation.

PEAKS COMPARED WITH ALPS

Yet, despite Oregon's leadership in the realm of government, it is the vast outdoor amphitheater of the State which characterizes Oregon most predominantly.

Awesome scenery abounds in Oregon. The Willowa Mountain Range, with its granite spires and upland meadows, has been compared to the Swiss Alps. Justice William O. Douglas, of the U.S. Supreme Court, actually insists that the Willows are the more magnificent. Crater Lake National Park throws a protective stockade around the bluest lake in all the world—a lake formed when a prehistoric volcano blew off its summit in a mighty cataclysm. The lake fills the ancient crater, where icy water has replaced molten lava.

The quiet tree-shaded trails which thread the coast and Cascade Mountain ranges offer an unparalleled opportunity to view the magnificent stands of virgin timber which constitute one of Oregon's major resources. Many of the giant Douglas-fir seen today were standing when Lewis and Clark traveled through this country 150 years ago.

Oregon Caves National Monument, the John Day fossil beds, and the lava formations of the Deschutes and Crooked River gorges provide both entertainment and education for those interested in the history of the earth's crust.

RECREATION AVAILABLE TO ALL

Portland, the metropolis of Oregon, has long, cool spring seasons which are ideal for the growing of majestic roses. This culminates every June in the Portland Rose Festival, where some of earth's loveliest flowers are on display. Portland also has more evergreen trees growing within its city limits than any other community, even including Vienna with its vernal groves which Johann Strauss immortalized in "Tales From the Vienna Woods." Forest Park is a primeval solitude almost within mashie shot of downtown skyscrapers.

Oregon has made a determined effort to insure that all its citizens, and their guests, may enjoy the recreational benefits inherent in the State's scenic grandeur.

Oregon was the first State to levy a gasoline tax to pay for its roads, also the first State to paint a center stripe down the highway to promote safety in fog and night conditions. The efficient highway system reflects this leadership. U.S. 30, the Columbia River Highway, is one of the world's most scenic drives. It has been compared with journeys along the Rhine, the Hudson, and the St. Lawrence, but with the Columbia offering by far the grandest dimensions. U.S. 101 clings to the headlands above the Pacific Ocean like a lariat. This road alternately presents vistas of mountain and sea. Its restaurants and hotels feature meals which highlight a wide variety of seafoods and fresh fish, because the waters off Oregon teem with aquatic life.

HAS MOST STATE PARKS

All the beaches of Oregon belong to the State, thanks to a progressive program instituted by Gov. Oswald West in 1912. No beach can be fenced off. The gleaming sands are a public playground for over 300 miles.

Oregon has more State parks than any other State in the Union. Some combine timbered uplands with ocean bathing. Others are located in the evergreen-shrouded interior mountain ranges, near clear snowed lakes or rushing rivers with picturesque names such as Rogue, Siuslaw, and Metolius. For the vacationer, free camping sites are available. For the weekend visitor, roadside picnic facilities are provided. Boating, swimming, fishing, and hiking are accessible to all. These recreation areas are in addition

to the myriad of forest camps to be found in Oregon's 12 national forests.

DEER, ELK ATTRACT NIMRODS

Each year over half a million hunters and fishermen find the Beaver State's woodlands, fields, and streams a sportsman's mecca. Deer and elk seasons lure thousands of hunters to the woods in Oregon. Lewis and Clark actually located their historic Fort Clatsop within the present boundaries of Oregon because they glimpsed so many elk, as a source both of food and of replenishing their tattered garments. Oregon ranks second (to California) in the number of mule deer among the States, and second (to Idaho) in its elk population. Mule deer are the biggest of all the deer species.

Pheasant, quail, grouse, and partridge offer fine bird shooting, and for the benefit of waterfowl hunters there exist several public shooting grounds on wildlife management areas.

The State is justly famous for its fine trout and salmon. Deep-sea fishing, a living for many Oregon residents, is an avocation to thousands more who find invigorating sport in landing sea bass, halibut, perch, and other game fish indigenous to Oregon waters.

In all fish and wildlife matters, conservation is the keynote of State policy, thus insuring that future generations will enjoy the same privileges available to sportsmen today.

MUSIC, ART SUPPORTED

Portland maintains one of the finest symphony orchestras in the Nation, and also supports a symphonic choir. The Civic Theater stages numerous contemporary and classic productions with both local and Broadway casts. Regional and internationally known art is displayed in the Portland Art Museum. An extensive free public library system serves the city.

While Oregon's bountiful heritage of natural beauty and outdoor recreational opportunity has drawn thousands of Americans to this Northwest State, there are strong cultural and economic reasons for its popularity with our retired citizens.

ADULT EDUCATION CENTERS

Towns and cities which contain Oregon's 19 colleges and universities provide special advantages associated with the academic community, such as lectures, concerts, and sports events. Extension and adult education courses are accessible in all areas. In smaller communities, organizational events and local festivities provide a ready road to social contacts and congenial companionship.

In a time of generally rising prices, economics becomes more than an academic discipline for those dependent upon fixed incomes. Retirees living on unchanging annuities have no defense against this unfair tax. For this reason I was pleased to join with others in the last Congress to secure a 10-percent increase in the annuities of retired Federal employees. I regard few causes as more merited than that of providing fair upward adjustment of benefits for retired Federal employees and, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Retirement, I intend to continue my efforts in the 86th Congress to insure that retirement funds available to former Government workers bear a reasonable relationship to living costs.

FEDERAL ACTION NEEDED

It is my hope that during the next 2 years Congress will delve deeply into the economic problems facing America's senior citizens. There are serious questions involving not only inflation but job discrimination, compulsory retirement, housing and medical care which demand immediate attention. The need for effective solutions grows more imperative each year as the proportion of our populace over 65 years of age continues

to expand. In this connection, I plan to reintroduce in the Senate a proposal for a White House Conference on Aging—an approach suggested by a leader in matters of social welfare and humanitarian concerns, Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island.

Major responsibility for the correction of injustices toward older persons belongs to the Federal Government, since only at this level can any substantial degree of uniformity be assured. However, I am proud that Oregon has taken countenance of some of the pressing needs of its senior citizens through effective State action. One example: During the 1957 session of the State legislature a bill was passed and signed by Governor Robert Holmes exempting annuities up to \$2,400 from State income taxes.

Oregon has repeatedly resisted adoption of a sales tax, which so discriminates against those forced to subsist on small monthly pension payments. Oregon offers certain inbred economic advantages for retirees who desire to stretch a monthly annuity check.

Housing is readily available in both urban and rural communities. In urban areas apartment selection is broad, and numerous projects devoted entirely to elderly people are under way.

MONEYSAVING POSSIBILITIES

Individual vegetable gardens—a feature of thousands of Oregon suburban and rural homes—permit a moneysaving method of supplementing food supplies. Oregon's climate permits the growing of nearly all fruits and vegetables.

Food processing, a major statewide industry, provides many older persons with an excellent source of supplementary income and a pleasant summer diversion.

Mild weather of western Oregon means low heat bills in winter. The Northwest's vast network of hydroelectric power sources keeps the cost of electricity low.

Perhaps the most persuasive argument attesting to Oregon's desirability as a retirement home is the simple fact that the percentage of people over 65 years in our State is increasing twice as rapidly as the total Oregon population—and an unexpectedly high percentage of the increase is due to migration. Recent statistics indicate that 9.2 percent of Oregon's population is in this age group; the figure is well above the national average.

CENTENNIAL TO ATTRACT 8 MILLION

This year an estimated 8 million persons will visit Oregon's 1959 Centennial Exposition and International Trade Fair. It will be the largest such event held in the West since the San Francisco World's Fair in 1939. Special programs to celebrate Oregon's 100th birthday will be held in cities and towns throughout the State.

Oregon will be on display in 1959. I believe that many who come as interested viewers will eventually remain as enthusiastic residents. Oregon is like that.

Hon. Latham Castle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower is to be congratulated for nominating the present attorney general of the State of Illinois, Latham

Castle, to become a judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit—Illinois—to succeed the late Judge Philip J. Finnegan.

Latham Castle is of old Illinois pioneer stock. His grandfather, Miles Beach Castle, an early settler in De Kalb County, founded the Sandwich State Bank in 1856. Latham, after service in World War I, was graduated from Northwestern University Law School in 1924. He became city attorney of Sandwich, Ill., in 1926; and in 1928 was elected States attorney of De Kalb County, reelected in 1932 and 1936. His future in the law continued in 1942 until 1952 as county judge. In 1952 he was elected attorney general of the State of Illinois and re-elected in 1956.

Latham Castle is a legal scholar as well as a brilliant lawyer. He represents the highest ideals in his profession. He has never forgotten his loyalties to friendship. His career as a public servant has been marked with a real sense of high integrity. He has a fine mind, and life's experience has mellowed his judgment and understanding. His judicial training, together with a high quality of the understanding of law enforcement, both as States attorney and attorney general, have prepared him for the responsibility of this high office.

I congratulate him, his lovely mate, Georgiana, and his son, John, for this merited honor. The court of appeals will welcome such an illustrious son of the law.

Taxpayers' Revolt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, a long predicted and long overdue taxpayers' revolt against excessive Government spending and high taxes has started in the State of Washington.

Tens of thousands of Washington State citizens are signing petitions and writing letters to State legislators and Members of Congress urging less spending on new programs and demanding that these legislators "hold the line against increasing Government expenditures" and refrain from levying any new and additional State or Federal taxes.

Washington State's two U.S. Senators are quoted in the press as saying that each of them already has received petitions or letters from Washington State bearing more than 1,000 signatures.

The Aberdeen World of Aberdeen, Wash., in my home county—population 55,000—reports leaders of the taxpayers' revolt claim they will obtain petitions or letters to Congressmen and State legislators bearing at least 5,000 signatures.

I received 344 taxpayers' revolt letters from my own county Monday morning and the drive there for a curb on extrava-

CV—202

gant governmental spending appears to be only at its beginning.

This taxpayers' revolt, newspapers report, is nonpartisan and has the endorsement of leaders in both political parties.

The petitions bear the following heading:

A renewed declaration of independence to the Governor, State of Washington:

We, the undersigned citizens, knowing that the power to tax is the power to destroy, and believing that man is best governed who is least governed, and that government should be held to the same financial responsibility as that to which we are held—namely, to live within its means—do hereby pledge that we shall not require more services of our Government than such as are already being rendered.

We therefore demand that no increased taxes be enacted and that Government, both State and Federal, confine their expenditures to existing sources and limits of revenue.

We further declare that any elected representative of the people who does not subscribe to these views is not worthy of our support at the polls.

Other petitions are addressed to Members of Congress and to State legislators.

Signers of the petitions are following up their petition signing by writing letters to Members of Congress and to State legislators. A typical letter of this kind follows:

I have signed a petition addressed to the Governor, our representatives in the National Congress and our State representatives, in which I have pledged that I will not request any increased governmental services and demanding that no increased taxes of any kind be levied.

You will shortly receive this petition, which it is expected will have the signatures of at least 5,000 citizens of Grays Harbor County, Wash., most of whom will write you a similar letter.

This position is endorsed by leaders and members of both political parties.

I urge that you exert every effort to prevent any additional taxation whatsoever.

Here is a taxpayers' revolt that may become nationwide. If it does become nationwide, it may contribute greatly to Congress and State legislatures obtaining balanced budgets this year.

If the revolting taxpayers accomplish that goal, they will put a brake on the continued rising prices of inflation which are reducing the living standards of millions of American citizens, especially pensioners, retired persons, and others who are on fixed incomes.

The Fight With Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address made by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] before the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association at Philadelphia, on Tuesday, February 24, 1959.

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

THE FIGHT WITH INFLATION: ADDRESS BY SENATOR WALLACE F. BENNETT, OF UTAH, BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, AT PHILADELPHIA, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1959

It is always a great inspiration to have the privilege of speaking to an audience of manufacturers, because to me it is like coming home. For 30 years, before I went to the Senate, I was part of the management of a small manufacturing plant in Utah and, like you, I am proud of it. American manufacturers can be proud of their accomplishment, the great heritage of capital they have produced for our country, the millions of jobs they have provided, and the value and variety of the products they supply for our ever-expanding pattern of living. To do this has required the use of all the keys to success—initiative, imagination, great drive and vigor, high integrity and sound judgment.

The very fact that we have done all this makes it hard for me to understand why we are so blind to the forces that, unless we wake up, will destroy both our freedom and our wealth. For 20 years now, a thief has been preying on us and, rather than catching and exposing him, we have helped him rob everybody, including ourselves. Maybe this is true because he is the world's most accomplished confidence man whose hand is much quicker than the eye. He blinds us with promises of something for nothing. He drains our capital away, falsifies our records, dries up our markets, and finally squeezes us dry in our old age. And we applaud him and call for more.

Inflation is a thief that can steal the substance of our wealth without altering its outward appearance. Christ said, "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." Inflation preserves the letter of economic values, but kills the spirit.

So real is inflation's illusion that many hardheaded businessmen—who can spot a phony business deal a mile away—not only think that a little inflation is either natural, inevitable, or desirable, but that it offers a real opportunity for growth and profit to a shrewd and daring operator.

Perhaps all this is possible because without realizing it, most of us have become addicted to a powerful narcotic. We reach eagerly for increasing doses of economic "happy dust" because it brings illusions of greater success and well-being, easier and faster progress, and greater profit.

Or perhaps even though we are wracked with the pain of economic cancer, we mistake fever for the glow of health and puff swelling for expanding muscle. If this is so, then we are using the narcotic to disguise the pain.

No matter in what terms you describe it, there is a force abroad in our economy that has already taken a fearful toll from every American company, family or individual—an evil that must be exposed, faced, and conquered.

What is its awesome name? Inflation.

LET US WAKE UP TO THE DANGER

Fortunately, many Americans are beginning to wake up to the danger, to recognize inflation for what it is—thief, cancer, and narcotic. President Eisenhower is one of these and in his recent messages to Congress and the people has called for "Action to meet these challenges by all groups in our society, and by all units of Government."

Specifically, he has challenged consumers, government, labor leaders, and businessmen to meet the particular challenge that inflation presents to them.

Being human, as well as being businessmen, we could generate a great glow of self-righteousness by pointing out to government

and labor both the extent of their particular responsibility for the present inflation and the things they should do to correct their faults. But there has already been too much finger pointing and blaming of one group by another. Tonight, I propose that we businessmen look our own weaknesses squarely in the eye and see what we can do to cure them.

WHY SHOULD WE BE CONCERNED?

There are two basic reasons why we should be concerned with inflation—one humanitarian, and the other based on enlightened self-interest.

If we have any active sense of social responsibility, we will fight inflation for the sake of those who are most vulnerable to its damages and least able to protect themselves. These include all who live on fixed incomes and pensions, the aged, the widowed, and the disabled. Not much better off are the schoolteachers and the civil servants at all levels of government. If any man profits by inflation—even temporarily—it is eventually from these people on pensions and fixed income that his profit comes—a cruel story of Robin Hood in reverse.

But if a few of us are indifferent to the fate of these victims of inflation, none of us should ignore its damage to ourselves—in the context of the well-being of business and industry, both in general, and in our own particular company. In this respect, let me point out four specific ways in which we can be hurt.

1. Inflation discourages the accumulation of capital

By eating away purchasing power year after year, it penalizes thrift and discourages investment. Oh, I know that the smart boys think that investment in common stocks or real estate is a safe hedge, but as more and more people crowd into that escape hatch, they create and accelerate the very force from which they fled until the whole structure of inflated values collapses, as it did in 1929.

2. Inflation destroys capital already accumulated

That this is already going on is demonstrated to every businessman who finds that his allowable accumulation of depreciation reserves will not replace his depreciated assets. As prices rise more rapidly, this erosion shows up in inventory too—while accounts receivable are settled at a discount. The end is bankruptcy, as the Germans found in the twenties.

3. Inflation distorts figures, destroys accurate comparison and forces uneconomic decisions

Speculation replaces sound merchandising, and investments intended to replace money as a device for the dead storage of value are substituted for investments in productive industry to produce more value. Thus we reverse the lesson of the parable, and emulate the man who buried his one talent, rather than the one who put his talents to use and doubled them.

4. Inflation narrows our markets—both at home and abroad

As true purchasing power shrinks, more and more people must use more and more of their remaining purchasing power for basic necessities, and more and more products are in danger of being priced out of the market. This is true for services too, as the great do-it-yourself movement in America demonstrates.

But even more dramatically, inflation dries up our foreign trade. In 1957 we sold \$19.5 billion worth of American products abroad. In 1958 it dropped to \$16 billion. While our commodity balance of trade is still on the plus side, our balance of payments shifted from plus to minus. In that year we had to

pay out \$2.3 billion in gold plus \$1 billion in dollar balances held by foreigners in U.S. banks to fill the gap. In the past, the effects of our inflation have been balanced by greater inflation abroad, but lately, and by heroic efforts, our chief customers in Europe—finally including even France—have moved to greater stability. The new European Common Market will protect that stability and unless we solve our problem too, our own price policies will be even more responsible than their tariff barriers for shutting us out. And when we can't export goods, we will export capital and know-how behind the European wall, and there will be fewer American industrial jobs. Then our inflated wage scales will be a statistical mockery—victims of inflation. This mockery has already begun.

Inflation effects on the purchasing power of the dollar

These, then, are among the ways in which inflation is hurting both people and business. But when we come to measure the actual reduction in the purchasing power of the dollar since 1939, we become truly alarmed.

The most frequent measurement is in terms of a weighted average of consumer prices—the so-called cost of living index. On this scale the 1939 dollar has shrunk in 20 years to 48 cents.

But there have been other serious shrinkages in purchasing power. When we measure it as income, we have to consider also the increased tax bite before we can translate it into a consumer's dollar. A gross income of \$3,000 in 1939 would need to have risen to \$6,457 today for a man to pay his taxes and buy the same goods he bought in the year 1939. If a man made \$10,000 in 1939 he would have to be making nearly \$24,000 today to hold his own. In other words, his spendable dollar is worth only 43 cents. And if a man was in the \$25,000 bracket in 1939 he would have to be making \$70,000 in 1959 dollars to have the same available purchasing power. His spendable dollar then has shrunk to 36 cents.

And this is not all. Some dollars have shrunk faster than others. Looking at price indexes again, while the average 1939 consumer dollar is now worth 48 cents, the dollar you spend on some other products today is worth even less than 48 cents. Take these examples:

The dollar you spend for prime industrial products is worth 45 cents.

Your commercial and factory construction dollar is worth 37 cents.

If you build a new house, your construction dollar is worth 36 cents.

If you buy a house today which was constructed in 1939, you are spending a 33-cent dollar.

If you have your car repaired, you use 30-cent dollars.

These are samples of the damage inflation has done in 20 years. Unfortunately, history—even recent history—shows that once inflation is accepted as inevitable or desirable its rate always accelerates. When we begin to build a factor for inflation into our personal and business decisions, we give it an extra push. Unless we make a stand soon, it can pass the point of no return, beyond which there will be no question as to whether we will have an economic collapse—only when it will come. To argue that we can live with inflation and control its rate is to forget that it is an economic cancer, and that if we can really control it, we can, in fact, eliminate it.

HOW SHALL WE CONTROL IT?

Up to this point I have been pointing out why inflation must be stopped. Now it's time to try to answer the more difficult question—How? As businessmen and managers of industry, what can and must we do to meet President Eisenhower's special chal-

lenge to us, and win the fight against inflation in our special and particular area?

I have four concrete suggestions.

First, we must face the problem and prepare to solve it. This requires the same process that we use to solve any other business problem—plus a little extra spiritual strength. We must wipe out from our own thinking the illusions that inflation has created and replace them with the hard facts. Among these illusions are several false ideas.

1. That we have always had inflation

The fact is that until the thirties, the price levels went up and down, but the long term level remained fairly stable. Wholesale prices in 1930 were about the same as in 1790.

2. That inflation is necessary to growth; that without its artificial stimulation men will not work harder or invest more

The same thing can be said about a narcotic, but here we recognize that the effect is temporary and the price for it is too high. Actually, in most periods of great growth like the twenties, prices were slowly falling. Inflation distorts figures to counterfeit growth, as you will easily see when you measure the rate of increase in your business in tons or gallons and then compare this with the rate in dollars.

3. That inflation can be profitable, because it produces something out of nothing

This is the oldest confidence come-on in human experience and always conceals a clever larceny.

4. That even if inflation is inevitable, a shrewd man can outsmart it by clever investment

This is both stupid and cowardly, the action of a soldier who runs from the fight—or a strong man who pushes the helpless out of the lifeboat. In the end, when the inevitable crash comes, even the smart boys get it.

5. That even if it is bad, it's someone else's fault—and that there is nothing we can do about it

This dims and rejects the very spirit of American free enterprise and makes hollow mockeries of all our great technical and productive achievements. If we approach inflation as another business problem, which it is, and develop an understanding of its effects, we can master it. The first job then is to straighten out our own thinking and accept our share of the responsibility.

TEACH THE TRUTH ABOUT INFLATION

The second suggestion in our fight against inflation is to help others—and specifically our own employees—to get the same understanding of the truth. This will not be easy, because while the official union line on inflation is essentially wrong, it is very appealing. Because their basic approach of more pay for less work is obviously inflationary, they support it with the idea that if wages can be raised faster, new markets will be created, and enough new production will come in to control inflation. What they must ignore is that wages are always the predominant element of cost, and that wages that rise faster than productivity are engines of inflation. When price rises inevitably follow such wages increases, they blame it onto exorbitant profits. The true effect can easily be shown by such figures as these from manufacturing. While physical productivity increased only 31 percent between 1947 and 1957, average hourly wages in manufacturing increased 67 percent. Some have referred to this spread between wages and productivity as the "inflationary gap." It is interesting to compare this spread of 36 percentage points with the 32 percent increase in industrial prices over the same period.

Because employees are being fed misinformation regarding the relationship of wages, profits and prices, they too have illusions about inflation. Through patient planned programs of education, these false ideas must be replaced with truth. For obvious reasons the unions will not undertake this, and if work is to be done, we must do it.

In making this suggestion I know it is another case of calling for education in solving specific problems. This need is always with us and always will be. This job will never be finished. But with respect to inflation, it has a special urgency because there is a definite educational process going on through unions intended to produce the wrong results, and this must be offset, and soon.

ADOPT SOUND OPERATING POLICIES

There is a third area in which we can move against inflation, that of our own operating policies. From now on we must think in terms of stable values and force ourselves to face our operating records and our balance sheet after we have wrung out the water of inflation. We should adopt some stable benchmarks for comparison and tie our planning and evaluating to them. From time to time we should make a report to our stockholders and the public in which we spotlight the effects of inflation on our typical dollar figures.

We should always face the problem of inflation in our dealings with our employees and, specifically, fight to keep wage increases well within the total rate of increase in productivity. If we do this, we will leave some share of the benefits of increased productivity for the stockholders whose investment in new equipment really makes most of it possible. But most important of all, we will thus preserve some part of this for the consumer.

In many ways the consumer is the real key to the control of inflation. He is the one who is robbed when prices rise and only when prices fall—ever so slightly—does he, or more properly, she, have a sure share in our progress. When we provide a share of the added benefits of increased productivity to those on the productive side of our two-part economic cycle, it comes in the form of increases, and it means increased wages to the worker and greater profits to the investor. But if the consumer is to have a share, it must be expressed in decreases in price. This has largely been forgotten in the current era of inflation. Forgotten, too, is the once commonly accepted business axiom that mass production produces lower prices. When we in industry begin to plan to give the consumer his share of the progress we make, prices will stabilize or drop, and inflation in consumer prices will disappear. It's just that simple.

REMOVE GOVERNMENT INFLATIONARY PRESSURES

Fourth, and finally, we must work to remove the inflationary pressures that originate in government. These take many forms.

1. Pressures to increase the supply of money to provide easy bank credit at low interest. This is inflationary by definition.

2. Pressures for nonproductive, non-self-liquidating Government programs that either increase taxes or pile up more public debt. As a Senator, I am appalled to find that many Americans, including businessmen, are economic schizophrenics where Government finances are concerned. They keep their concepts of Government expenditures and Government income in two thought-tight compartments. They want more local programs, more loans and grants, but lower taxes. They fight increases in the debt ceiling and are piously for economy but only if it does not affect them. If we are to control or eliminate inflation, we must move into a sustained period of balanced budgets, and

this inevitably involves the control of expenditures for procurement and services at the local level—in your town or State and in mine. So long as we insist on more for any reason we will face the threat of inflation.

ELECT NONINFLATIONISTS TO CONGRESS

Since ours is a representative form of government run by men and women chosen through popular elections following campaigns conducted by political parties, we who want to cure inflation and other weaknesses in government must devote enough time and effort in political activity to first select, and then elect, representatives who understand the dangers of inflation—and will resist its temptations. The union leaders, who are essentially inflationists by philosophy, have moved into this field with great success and the representatives they have sponsored and elected are too often inflationists. In my opinion, this has made inflation, direct or disguised, our greatest nationwide economic issue.

Well, this is my story. Inflation is a great and vicious evil, a form of larceny, a cancer, a destructive narcotic. There are many reasons, social and selfish, why we must conquer it. This is true for all of us, and particularly for the managers of business and industrial enterprise. But there is one final and particular reason why this is especially true for you, the members of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association. One of the chief functions of your association is to supply casualty insurance. In this field, inflation has been especially destructive. Costs of settling claims have skyrocketed. General figures that demonstrate this are hard to get, but your association officials know that in the field of casualty insurance inflation is a real burden.

INFLATION MUST BE STOPPED

Inflation must be stopped, and we must do it as citizens and businessmen. If we leave this fight entirely to the power of Government, it can only be done by increasing Government interference with our own right to manage our own business, even to the possible imposition in peacetime of price and wage controls. There are men in Congress now who favor that step if inflation continues. Our own experiences with controls occurred so recently that they should still be convincing enough to make us realize that this step should mean the disappearance of freedom and free enterprise—and the end of our way of life.

Shall we continue to drift blindly into economic destruction—or wake up and live? Regardless of what others may do, I think the real challenge is to the leaders of business and industry. Have we the courage and faith with which to meet it? I believe we have, but we must act now to be effective.

Address by Hon. Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee, Before Vanderbilt University Law School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the speech I made on the problems of inflation and antitrust before the Vanderbilt University Law School on February 25, 1959.

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

ADDRESS OF SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER BEFORE VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL, NASHVILLE, TENN., FEBRUARY 25, 1959

Vanderbilt University is one of the great educational institutions of the South. It has traditionally sought for and taught truth. This is one of the reasons why Vanderbilt men and women have always been able to contribute so much to the building of America. I am indeed honored to be here today and for this opportunity to address the law school. The theme of my talk today presents the choice that must be made if we are to preserve our free, competitive system.

I firmly believe that the high cost of living is our No. 1 domestic problem. This has been increasingly emphasized in recent weeks as we have heard more and more from all sides expressions of alarm over high prices and inflation. The President, in his Economic Report to the Congress of January 20, 1959, also recognized this problem.

For several years I have served as chairman of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate. As chairman, in the spring of 1957, I announced that the subcommittee would conduct an investigation and hold public hearings on administered price industries. As I explained at that time, "The high cost of living is due in no small part to the upward manipulation of prices by big companies in administered price industries." The subcommittee began by hearing from some of the country's leading economists who have specialized in administered prices. From the testimony of these experts, an administered price may be defined as one having two characteristics: (a) it is set by administrative actions and (b) it is maintained for a period of time. With respect to the first characteristic, it is the seller as a matter of individual choice who establishes the price at which he will make sales, whereas in competitive industries, it is the impersonal market which establishes the price. With respect to the second characteristic, there is no generally accepted period of time during which a price must remain unchanged before it can be regarded as an administered price. What is significant here is not so much the frequency of change, but the responsiveness of a price to changes in the market. Prices which are administratively set and maintained are insensitive to changes in the market; that is, they are increased and maintained at the same time that demand is falling off by decreasing output. Dr. Edwin Nourse, a former economic adviser to the President, in his definition of an administered price industry, emphasized that the essential point is that they can maintain a predetermined price by restricting production. These are the administered prices having the potential for economic distress with which the subcommittee is concerned in its inquiry.

Following the testimony of the economic experts, the subcommittee conducted extensive hearings in the steel and automobile industries, two of the most basic in our economy. It was found in these industries that there existed a kind of upside-down competition. This describes the situation where prices continue to go up even when demand decreases. These high prices are put into effect by the largest company in the industry, with their so-called competitors following almost identically. Apparently this is accomplished without any express agreement.

In the steel industry since World War II, the hearings revealed that prices have moved on a number of occasions in the opposite direction to that which was indicated by the changes in demand. The steel price index

continued its virtually unbroken rise even when demand and production declined, as they did in 1949, 1954, and 1957. It also continued its climb when unit labor costs declined, as they did in 1950 and 1955. No matter what the change in cost or in demand, steel prices since 1947 have moved steadily and regularly in only one direction, upward. The subcommittee found that in 1957 steel price increases substantially exceeded cost increases. It was also clear at the time the 1957 price increases were made there was nothing in the information available to the industry to suggest a forthcoming increase in demand that would have supported higher prices. The fact that these price increases were made and maintained despite such underlying adverse economic conditions illustrates how, through price administration by the leader in the steel industry, upside-down competition can result.

In some industries such price behavior possibly would not have caused substantial injury to the public interest, but this is not true of the steel industry which is the very underpinning of our entire economy. Every time the price of steel goes up, it is inevitable that steel consuming industries raise their prices. This has a tendency to cause price increases in many other lines.

When the subcommittee began its hearings in 1957, I think it fair to state that it was the preponderate opinion that the inflation which our country was experiencing was the product of excess demand. It will be remembered that this opinion was so strongly held that the Federal Reserve Board tightened its money policy in an effort to contract demand. In the opinion of many this policy was based on a false analysis and contributed substantially to the recession from which we have not yet fully recovered. Even during this recession period prices continued to rise in most of the administered price industries, such as steel. Dr. Gardiner C. Means, an eminent economist who is the pioneer in the field of administered prices, appearing before the subcommittee on January 24, 1959, said: "Today, after experiencing inflation and depression at the same time, there are few who still think that this inflation has been the product of too much demand. Clearly, the inflation has not been of the old-fashioned, classical kind with all prices going up more or less together. Also, it is now generally understood that the new type of inflation is associated with administered prices and wage rates. For bringing about this understanding, I believe your committee is in large measure responsible. Indeed, we are fortunate that your chairman and your committee had the imagination to see the relation between these two things and the courage to focus attention on them."

In this recent appearance before the subcommittee, Dr. Means also presented wholesale price changes by product groups for the periods 1942-53, 1942-47, 1953-57, and 1953-October 1958.

In the 1942-53 period the wholesale price changes for all commodity groups generally rose in price and by not too different amounts. During some of this period prices were controlled by OPA and OPS.

In the period 1942-47, demand was far in excess of supply and prices in all commodity groups rose. However, prices in the competitive groups far outrose prices in the administered price groups.

In the period 1953-57, there was an entirely different picture. Price increases were practically entirely in the administered price groups. In some market price groups, prices rose very slightly; in others, they actually went down.

The fourth period 1953-October 1958 extending the third period to October 1958, showed generally the same picture as the period from 1953 through 1957, namely,

higher prices in administered price groups with little increases or declines in the competitive groups.

Dr. Means made one point clear: administered steel prices had the dominant role in the 1953-58 inflation. Not only did steel prices rise the most in that period, but prices in the steel and steel using groups also rose more than those of any other groups and accounted for two-thirds of the gross increase in prices. It is significant that, as Dr. Means pointed out, the administered price groups accounted for 85 percent of the gross increase in the wholesale price index. Moreover, he stated that if prices in these administered price groups had not gone up, the wholesale price index would have risen less than 1 percent and that so far as the wholesale price index is concerned, there would have been no inflation.

The result of inflation is strikingly shown in the recent Economic Report of the President. The table on page 142 of that report reveals that in current prices, the total gross national product increased from \$397.5 billion in 1955 to \$436.7 in 1958. However, when expressed in 1958 prices, the total gross national product only increased from \$435.4 billion in 1955 to \$436.7 in 1958. Thus it is shown that during this period gross national product has increased only \$1.3 billion in terms of 1958 prices. Hence when inflation is milked out of the large increase in dollar values, we have only enjoyed a slight increase in gross national product.

The seriousness of the cost of inflation to the American people is further revealed in the Economic Report of the President. In a chart which appears on page 155 of that report, it is shown that the per capita disposable personal income, using current prices, increased from \$1,661 in 1955 to \$1,784 in 1958. In contrast, however, when 1958 prices are used, per capita disposable personal income actually declined from \$1,790 in 1955 to \$1,784 in 1958. Thus we reach the remarkable conclusion that every person in the United States was \$6 worse off in 1958 than they were in 1955.

Because the automobile industry is so pivotal in the overall economy, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee also inquired into the pricing practice of that industry. It is claimed that one out of every seven workers in this country is dependent, directly or indirectly, on the automobile industry for his livelihood. This study reveals that General Motors today commands approximately 50 percent of the automobile market in the United States. During the past 10 years this company's average profit, after taxes, has been an impressive 25 percent of net worth. This compares with a national average of 11 percent for all manufacturing corporations. In 1947 General Motors' profit was only 17 percent, but in 1950 its profits reached 37.5 percent, which was higher than its profits of 36.2 percent in the boom year of 1929. These figures are all the more impressive when the income tax rise is taken into consideration. In 1929 General Motors' profit margin before taxes was 38.5 percent, while in 1950 its before taxes earnings reached 77.4 percent.

Mr. Harlow Curtice, president of General Motors, in his appearance before the subcommittee, stated that he and three other executives determined the prices for all divisions of the corporation and that such prices were fixed so as to return 15 to 20 percent profit after taxes on total investment. It would appear that General Motors sets prices by a formula method, the first ingredient of which is the fixed 15 to 20 percent profit after taxes. To this is added the cost of materials, labor, overhead, taxes, and fixed costs based on a standard volume of 80 percent of production capacity. It is easy to see that if volume exceeds 80 percent of capacity, which it has in many years, profits are

bound to rise above the 20 percent goal. The hearings showed that after these prices have been so fixed by General Motors, they become the prices of the industry. A comparison of comparable models of the major producers reveals little or no price differences.

Except for public utilities, our economy is not regulated. Ours has traditionally been a free, competitive enterprise system. But competition is fast disappearing among our basic industries because price competition is disappearing. In almost every industry we now find a big one, two, three, or four where the leader establishes prices and the others immediately follow suit. The problem of high prices and inflation also grows increasingly worse with the decline of price competition.

Almost 70 years ago the first of the anti-trust laws, the Sherman Act, was passed by the Congress. This act has been supplemented by a number of others. We refer to these laws as the charter of our economic freedom. We early elected not to force companies to compete. Our antitrust laws seek to remove illegal restraints and monopolistic abuses so that they could compete. Hard core evidence is necessary to prove illegality.

In the past such evidence was forthcoming and many successful cases were brought against giant combinations of economic power. However, evidence of collusion is often lacking today because companies simply do not have to get together to set prices. As I have said, they simply follow the price pattern set by the leader. The Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission have told the subcommittee that they are helpless against such pricing practices unless direct evidence of collusion can be produced.

In this unhappy state of affairs the people are caught in a price inflation and the Government, under present laws, appears powerless to do anything about it. The day of decision is here. America must decide, and decide now, whether it wants a free, competitive economic system—not in fancy words, but in reality. It is up to Congress to discover how to exercise its constitutional responsibility of regulating commerce. Today, it appears that more and more of that power is being exercised by a relatively few managers in key industries.

The time has also come for the public interest to be put ahead of the private interests of either management or labor. During this time of high prices, I don't believe labor should demand or receive any wage increases in basic industries which management could justifiably use as the basis for necessary price increases.

Since the end of World War II our economy has been on a wild merry-go-round. As the cost of living increased, labor asked for wage increases as compensation. When wage increases were granted, prices were raised and the cost of living increased again. This, in turn, led to additional wage demands and so on. High prices and inflation obviously affect every group in America. Many U.S. businessmen believe the danger of the United States pricing itself out of foreign markets is an immediate one. In the President's economic message to Congress was the insistence that high prices here at home could lower our capability to compete in world markets. Labor has likewise been harmed. During this same period, we have seen great increases in unemployment. This problem is still with us today.

We now stand at the fork in the road. We must choose either Government regulation of business or the improvement of our anti-trust laws. We must restore the climate where competition can be expected. The choice for me is easy. Regulation except in times of extreme emergency is undesirable.

Specifically what legislation might be passed to strengthen the antitrust laws? I would suggest three basic supplements to ex-

isting law. First, the test of section 7 of the Clayton Act, with respect to mergers, should be made to apply to section 2 of the Sherman Act. Under this section of the Clayton Act, the evidence need support only a finding of substantial lessening of competition or tendency toward monopoly in order to make a merger illegal. This change in section 2 of the Sherman Act would afford the Government greater power to destroy monopolies.

Second, I would suggest that unfair methods of competition and unfair acts and practices in commerce which are unlawful under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act should be declared illegal under section 1 of the Sherman Act. This would enable the Department of Justice to attack all trade restraining evils.

Third, I would suggest that there be enacted into law my bill S. 716 authorizing the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws. Not having this power today, the Department is unable to gather evidence on which to base a suit except by use of grand juries in criminal investigations.

Together with the staff of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, I am presently working on bills to amend section 1 and section 2 of the Sherman Act in the manner in which I have just suggested. When these bills are drafted, I shall introduce them in the Senate.

Although I believe the principal problem in our economy is the undue concentration of economic power, I also suggest that the antitrust laws be strengthened in respect to other problems. For example, I have tried for several years to secure the enactment of legislation which would partially change the law as interpreted by the Supreme Court in the Standard Oil of Indiana case in 1951. This bill designated for several Congresses as S. 11 would, contrary to the decision in the Standard Oil case, make illegal under section 2(a) of the Clayton Act price discriminations which may substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly, even where they are made in good faith.

In 1950, when the Kefauver-Celler amendment to the antimerger section of the Clayton Act was enacted, I was hopeful that the amendment would arrest the great merger movement which was then in progress. However, the enforcement efforts of the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice of the antimerger law even as so amended has been most disappointing. Under the amended law only one case, the Bethlehem-Youngstown proposed merger, has been finally adjudicated in the courts, and this case was not appealed. I have again joined with Senator O'MAHONEY in sponsoring S. 442 requiring in specific instances that premerger notification be given to the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice, with the hope that such amendment might add stimulus to the enforcement program of the antimerger law.

Standing at the forks in the road, I have indicated that answer to our basic economic problems of today lies in an improvement in our antitrust laws rather than in Government regulation. I have made some suggestions as to what some of these improvements should be. I believe that given an understanding of the problem and the choice of remedies, the public would support congressional action along the lines I have indicated.

History teaches us that when a nation loses its economic freedom, it also loses its political freedom. Germany, under Hitler, and Italy, under Mussolini, went through this experience. We must not have it happen in the United States. Keeping competitive may not be popular. To insist upon price competition may work temporary hardships on present concentrations of power, but in the

long run, it is the only way a democracy can survive. The accomplishment of this purpose is the joint responsibility of business, labor, and Government and one in which lawyers must play a major part.

American Bar Association Supports House-Passed Bill To Free the Federal Payroll of Communists and Fellow Travelers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I share the deep concern expressed by the American Bar Association in its resolution recommending prompt enactment of legislation to close loopholes in the law which permit Communists and fellow travelers in many Federal positions.

After full and complete consideration of individual rights as well as national security requirements, the American Bar Association has strongly endorsed legislation to prevent Federal employment of Communists and subversives—S. 1411—as reported by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and passed by an overwhelming vote in the House last year.

Unfortunately, this urgently needed legislation was not acted on by the other body when we could not obtain conference agreement on the House-passed bill.

I agree wholeheartedly with the action of the American Bar Association in thus squarely endorsing the action taken last year by the House of Representatives. The resolution once more confirms the determination made by this House, that a security system for Federal employment, to be really effective, should be spelled out clearly in the law rather than left to the whims and caprices of administrative officials.

As far back as 1946 I secured the adoption of a resolution to investigate reports of malfunctioning of the Federal employees' loyalty program. Investigation disclosed extreme laxity in certain parts of the executive branch concerning infiltration of subversive elements. Based on these findings, a Federal employees' loyalty program was established—but soon proved inadequate because not based on law. The House of Representatives in 1948 approved my bill to establish an effective loyalty program, but there again the other body did not act. Finally, the House passed a bill in the 81st Congress which was approved by the other body and became Public Law 733, providing for summary removal of Federal employees whose actions jeopardize national security.

Public Law 733 was seriously weakened, as a measure to protect national security, by the Supreme Court decision in *Cole* against Young. The Court decision invalidated a portion of the Executive order on securities issued in 1953 and thereby

opened the door for many known security risks to force their way back on the Federal payroll. Also, under this and later decisions, the Government has been required to give over \$450,000 in back pay to persons who had been removed from Federal positions as security risks. This came about, not because these persons are not security risks but solely because of the technicality that their positions had not been specifically designated as "sensitive."

The real issue is simply this: Should any individual who is a Communist, fellow traveler, or subversive hold any public office or position in the Government of the United States? The American Bar Association now has joined with the House of Representatives in answering "No." After full deliberation, and with proper consideration of the protection of individual rights in the light of the national interest, they strongly urge enactment of Federal employees' security legislation approved by the House last year.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I can assure the Members that one of the first bills to be brought to the floor by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in this session will be the bill to close existing loopholes and provide a permanent, fair, and effective security program for Federal employment. These are the major provisions of such legislation:

First. The head of any department or agency may suspend any employee when deemed necessary in the interest of national security.

Second. Within 30 days, after such suspension, the employee shall have an opportunity to reply.

Third. After complete review of investigation the department or agency head may separate the employee if he determines it necessary in the interest of national security.

Fourth. The suspended employee is entitled to a written statement of charges, reasonable opportunity to answer, a hearing, review by the department head, and a written decision.

Fifth. The term "national security" means all Government activities of the United States involving national safety and security, and every Government employee is deemed to be engaged in an activity involving national security.

Sixth. Any reinstated employee shall be paid for time improperly off the payroll in an amount not to exceed the amount he would have earned had he not been separated, less any earnings during the separation.

Seventh. Procedures under the Lloyd-La Follette Act of 1912 or the Veterans Preference Act of 1944, as applicable, must be followed in any suspension or separation, to the extent consistent with national security.

Eighth. Any employee separated under the security provisions is entitled to appeal to the Civil Service Commission for complete review and the Commission's decision is final and must be followed by the department or agency.

This legislation, as was the case with S. 1411 last year, reaffirms the intent of Public Law 733 as enacted by the 81st Congress. It gives every proper measure of protection to the loyal employee, and

at the same time will help keep the Federal payroll clear of Communists and fellow travelers. It will place in effect most of the recommendations of the Wright Commission on Federal employees' security. This Commission, appointed by the President several years ago, submitted a report of nearly 1,000 pages and recommended even stronger Federal employees' security legislation. Mr. Wright, Chairman of the Commission, in testimony before our committee, endorsed this legislation and added:

It is a tragedy, indeed, that we need any loyalty or security programs, and I fervently hope that the day will hasten when we can abolish them. Until that day, however, we dare not forget that the threat is not only real but formidable.

The discerning and forthright resolution of the American Bar Association is in the highest public service tradition of this great professional association. Its report and resolution are of great value in bringing to public attention the crucial importance of early legislation providing the means to deal permanently and effectively with the problem of subversive infiltration in our more than 2 million Federal positions. I commend this report and resolution to the attention of all Members of the 86th Congress.

Statement of Secretary of the Interior Seaton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, recently the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs invited Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton to discuss the operation and plans of his Department as they related to the 86th Congress. In his usual precise manner, Secretary Seaton delivered the following statement, the reading of which I commend to our colleagues:

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR
FRED A. SEATON, BEFORE THE HOUSE INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY
18, 1959

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to appear again before this committee. My understanding is that you are interested today in discussing the operations and plans of the Department of the Interior as they relate to consideration by, and possible action of, your committee.

Before commencing this discussion, permit me to present to you the members of my staff who are here.

First is Under Secretary Elmer F. Bennett. Many of you, I know, are acquainted with his background. For the information of your new members and the record, however, let me say that Mr. Bennett came to the Department of the Interior from the office of Senator Eugene Millikin, of Colorado. He is an attorney with 17 years' experience in the Federal Government. He has successively served in the Department as legislative counsel, as my personal assistant, as solicitor, and since September 20, 1958, as Under Secretary.

Another gentleman whom most of the members of this committee know is Assistant Secretary Fred G. Aandahl. A former Governor of North Dakota, he also served as a member of this committee when he was Member of the 82d Congress. Secretary Aandahl's responsibility in the Department is in the joint field of water and power. The Bureau of Reclamation, Bonneville Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration, Office of Saline Water, report to him.

Our Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife is Ross L. Leffler. Secretary Leffler came to Interior with a lifetime record of devotion to conservation. He served 29 years with the Pennsylvania Fish and Game Department. While jurisdiction over a great part of the activities of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and the Office of the Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife, all of which report to Secretary Leffler, rests with another committee of the Congress; there is a definite relationship between public lands legislation and action and fish and wildlife conservation.

Roger C. Ernst, our Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management, supervises the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the National Park Service, and the Office of Territories. Formerly the Land and Water Commissioner of the State of Arizona, Secretary Ernst also has a full background of experience in the fields of reclamation and conservation.

Another area of our Department, that of Mineral Resources, is supervised by Assistant Secretary Royce A. Hardy. It includes the Geological Survey, Bureau of Mines, Office of Oil and Gas, Office of Geography, Office of Minerals Mobilization and the Office of Minerals Exploration. Secretary Hardy, a graduate of the University of Nevada in mining engineering, is a registered professional mining and metallurgical engineer. Before joining the Department, he was vice president and general manager of Manganese, Inc., of Henderson, Nev.

The next member of our staff needs little introduction here. George W. Abbott, our Solicitor, was counsel for this committee from 1953 to 1957. He is now our chief legal officer. Earlier he served as my assistant.

The Department's administrative management activities are the responsibility of D. Otis Beasley, our Administrative Assistant Secretary. Secretary Beasley, who began his career in Government in 1928, now has the top career position in our Department. He is responsible for Administrative Services, Budget and Finance, Inspection, Management Research, Personnel Management, Property Management, and Security.

The last member of my staff with me today is Ted Stevens, one of my assistants who also serves as legislative counsel. He came to the Department of the Interior from Fairbanks, Alaska, where he had served as U.S. attorney.

Mr. Chairman, as you requested, I am here today to discuss the program of our Department—particularly the budget and legislative aspects of it.

We have completed our hearings before the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, in which we supported a request for \$344,564,400, exclusive of the Reclamation and power agencies. In all, our total budget request for fiscal 1960 is \$633,775,400. This amount reflects our recognition of two facts.

First, our programs—in conservation, in science and technology, and in the advancement of human welfare—are of such importance to the Nation as a whole that we must continue to carry them on at a high level of efficiency and intensity.

Second, if we overexpand these programs and thus require excessive cash outlays, we shall necessarily contribute to inflationary pressures, decreasing the value of the dollar,

and ultimately hobble the very programs we were trying to aid.

It is of great interest to this committee, I believe, that we are not requesting funds for new reclamation construction starts for fiscal year 1960.

One reason, largely, is that there are 11 new starts in the current fiscal year. During the next few years, these 11 projects, added to the large list we already had underway, will pyramid the fund requirements for the Bureau of Reclamation. The following tabulation lists the totals of fund requirements for construction and rehabilitation from regular funds and from the Upper Colorado River Basin fund, for fiscal years 1959 to 1965 inclusive, with and without the new starts for which funds were appropriated for the fiscal year 1959.

Fund requirements for Bureau of Reclamation construction and rehabilitation, regular funds and Upper Colorado River Basin fund, fiscal years 1959-65

FUNDS REQUIRED

Fiscal year	With 11 new starts provided for in the 1959 Appropriation Act	Without 11 new starts	Increase required by new starts
1959-----	\$214,048,335	\$207,828,335	\$6,220,000
1960-----	212,445,000	195,000,000	17,885,000
1961-----	207,172,000	227,671,000	39,501,000
1962-----	263,276,000	211,181,000	52,095,000
1963-----	203,182,000	157,763,000	45,419,000
1964-----	127,950,000	100,735,000	27,215,000
1965-----	84,053,000	70,631,000	13,422,000

While the new starts included in the 1959 Appropriation Act raised the fund requirements of the Bureau only about \$6 million in 1959, they increased these requirements \$17 million for 1960, \$39 million for 1961, and \$52 million for 1962. More new starts in 1960 would mean more pyramiding in the 2 or 3 years ahead.

The no-new-starts policy for water resources projects is governmentwide; the administration is seeking no funds for starting new projects for flood control, navigation, and related activities of the Bureau of Reclamation or the Corps of Engineers. Nevertheless, the total activities of these two agencies in 1960 are expected to reach an all-time high of \$1.1 billion.

If the 11 new starts had not been added last year but rather commenced this year, our schedule through 1965, exclusive of additional new starts, would have looked like this:

Fiscal year:	With 11 new starts in 1960 appropriation act
1960-----	\$201,280,000
1961-----	245,056,000
1962-----	250,682,000
1963-----	209,858,000
1964-----	146,154,000
1965-----	97,846,000

The peak demand would have occurred in 1962 rather than 1961 and would have been almost \$17 million less. When we recall that Congress over the past 12 years has appropriated an average of \$188,940,480 for reclamation construction, the point becomes clear. It does seem to me that a further pyramiding of reclamation fund requirements might result in disaster. The surest way to destroy the reclamation program, in my opinion, is to extend the fund requirements beyond hope of realization.

In preliminary legislative studies before the convening of this Congress, the Department reviewed approximately 300 pieces of legislation, a large majority which are within the area of interest to this committee. Some of them have already been sent to you, or similar bills have been introduced by Members of Congress, and referred to your committee.

Foremost of all the items under consideration is, of course, Hawaii statehood. We are grateful to this committee for the privilege extended to me to present my views on the Hawaii bill and for the fact that you have already favorably reported it. To me, few bills to be considered by this Congress will have the national—yes, even the international—attention that will follow action upon the Hawaii statehood bill. And I know, Mr. Chairman, that you will call upon me or any member of my staff, if there is anything more we can do to further its prompt passage.

Next in importance, to me, is our proposal to establish an effective helium conservation program. As you, of course, all know, helium is a unique resource. Its use is essential to our most vital defense and nuclear programs and of growing importance to medicine and industry. Our annual consumption of helium has increased fivefold since 1950, yet no major new source of this gas has been discovered in the natural gases being produced from a relatively small area in Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas. This helium constitutes a minor percentage of these natural gases. Helium, which will not burn, is wasted into the atmosphere through millions of gas stoves and furnaces.

Our conservation program envisions the construction of up to 12 new recovery plants, to be located on certain pipelines, transporting helium-bearing natural gases to commercial markets. This helium would be stored underground until needed.

Since we submitted our legislative proposal to the Congress in the final weeks of the last session, we have reviewed this proposal in its entirety and made some changes in it. As soon as these have been cleared through the executive branch, we shall resubmit our proposal to the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, we have many other items which we consider important. We will again urge favorable consideration of the Frypan-Arkansas project in Colorado, the San Luis project in California, the Burns Creek Dam in Idaho, and several other projects for possible initiation of construction after 1960 when our fiscal situation permits. Of course, my recommendations for joint development of the Trinity River Division of the Central Valley project are still before you.

One of the important problems in the mineral resources field is that of coal research. We have previously reported our views to your committee on bills which call for the creation of a Coal Research Commission. We have noted a bill introduced in this Congress which would give contract authority to the Bureau of Mines for research. Our experts have predicted a phenomenal growth in national demand for energy in the next two decades. Increased emphasis on the development and more efficient use of our vast coal reserves should result from research programs conducted by both industry and Government. We hope to have our report on this legislation completed and cleared soon.

Meanwhile the Bureau of Mines is continuing its research program on the production, use, and conservation of coal. Recognizing the need for greater emphasis on shorter range problems, the Bureau has programed research work for the next fiscal year on hydraulic mining and transportation of coal, on degasifying coal beds to eliminate hazards that exist in gassy mines, and on the performance characteristics of commercial coal-cleaning equipment.

Generally, the resurgence in the economy has materially improved employment and the outlook for the major metals and minerals industries. For example, already, copper, aluminum and steel have enjoyed a significant recovery. And there are signs of strength in other mineral markets that were giving us concern in the recent past. For example, the import quotas established by the President, 5 months ago, have had the ef-

fect of tending to firm the U.S. price for lead and zinc. Despite the recent drop in lead, U.S. prices still exceed the prices when quotas were imposed. We believe that the general economic recovery will stimulate additional consumption of these commodities.

The work of the Bureau of Mines and the Geologic Survey of our Department is also essential to the continued health and vigor of our minerals industries. Through geologic and mineral resource surveys, investigations and research, both agencies provide the public and industry with basic data, which stimulates exploration for and development of new sources of mineral raw materials.

Through research in geology, geochemistry, and geophysics, the Geological Survey is developing new and more definite knowledge concerning the occurrence and origin of mineral deposits. It is vigorously pursuing the development of new prospecting techniques to provide the key to the discovery of new mineral deposits, particularly those not obvious to surface exploration. Through research in mining methods and metallurgical techniques, the Bureau of Mines is making major contributions to fuller and more efficient utilization of the Nation's mineral resources.

Our Office of Minerals Mobilization is constantly reviewing the mineral mobilization situation of various segments of the American mineral and solid fuels industries, and revising programs to conform with changing defense requirements. In carrying out this function, OMM provides the staff work for the Department under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act, the Defense Production Act, the Trade Agreements Act, and Public Law 480—known as the agricultural barter program.

We are also just initiating the program of the Office of Minerals Exploration designed to stimulate exploration for new domestic mineral reserves. We have already had more than 600 requests for information on this new program.

The Bureau of Land Management is responsible for approximately 475 million acres of the Nation's public lands, including 298 million in the new State of Alaska. Most of the remaining 177 million are in the other 11 westernmost States. The Bureau also has responsibilities in connection with more than 300 million additional acres and for mineral leasing on the submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf.

As principal custodian of the public lands, BLM's primary purpose is the wise administration, selective disposal, conservation, and management of the Nation's public lands and resources. These resources include the land itself, minerals (including oil and gas), forests, and range vegetation. Some idea of the scope of the Bureau's responsibilities may be seen in the fact that about 174 million acres are administered under the Taylor Grazing Act and almost 100 million acres are under oil and gas leases. During the fiscal year ending on June 30, 1958, the BLM took in gross receipts for \$127,385,000, to increase the total of receipts since the BLM was formed in 1946 from union of the General Land Office and the Grazing Service to nearly \$1,077 million.

Among the significant items of legislation we propose to submit to the Congress in this field will be bills to regulate and control the activities and effect of land locators and promoters on the public domain.

We are faced today with a serious situation, resulting from the entrance into the land locating business of a number of promoters, some of whom are not qualified and may be unethical in their practices. They prey upon the desire of people to own land and upon the ignorance of the general public concerning the requirements of the public land laws. Advertising widely, executing contracts which actually promise

nothing more than to file an application with the land office, and holding out great expectations of gain, they have induced people by the thousands to file applications—sometimes for substantial fees—under various public land laws.

By and large, these applications have been filed upon lands without respect to the acceptability of the application under the regulations or the availability of the lands under the law. This practice costs the public many thousands of dollars in wasted money and tends to paralyze the land offices by the very numbers of applications and by the conflicts with other applications that result.

We hope to have legislative proposals in this area.

We also believe that the present public land laws do not provide a convenient means by which public lands can be made available for needed developments. We are considering a proposal to permit the sale of public lands chiefly valuable for business and urban purposes. The chief features of this proposal would authorize the sale of such lands to States and local governments at their appraised fair market value and also, where appropriate, sales at public auction to private individuals, associations, and corporations. This proposal, we believe, might facilitate needed commercial, industrial, and suburban developments in the public land areas.

Section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act establishes a minimum rental for non-competitive oil and gas leases of 25 cents per acre per annum, with a waiver of all rentals for the second and third years. By regulation we have raised the rental for the first year and for the 6th through 10th years to 50 cents. We cannot, however, alter the waiver provision by administrative action. We have found that the low rental and the waiver of 2 years' rental may have encouraged speculation and have in reality been detrimental to oil and gas development. By the payment of a very small sum a party may hold a lease for a number of years with no intention of developing the leasehold but with the hope of selling the lease for a profit. If annual rentals are increased, and there is no longer a waiver of any year's rental, the mere holding of a lease for possible resale will be less attractive, and the speculating leaseholders will, we believe, be replaced by leaseholders interested in the active development of the oil and gas potentialities of the leasehold. The proposed legislation which we have prepared, H.R. 3263, would increase the minimum annual rental per acre to 50 cents and would eliminate the waiver provision. This amendment would have the added advantages of bringing Federal rentals more into line with the prices charged on State and privately owned lands and of recognizing the changes which have occurred in the value of money since this rental provision was first enacted in 1935.

One of the significant legislative proposals affecting the National Park Service is contained in legislation pending before you to authorize the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park and Parkway. Originally it was thought that a parkway road should be constructed along the canal between Washington and Cumberland. Further studies have demonstrated that the canal and adjoining lands should be set aside as a park with emphasis on the preservation of its historic, scenic, and recreational values. We, of course, subscribe to the general objectives of this legislation. Specific details will be discussed in our report, which has not yet been cleared with other interested executive agencies.

We are considering whether we need additional authority to enable the National Park Service to utilize land acquisition funds to pay for options in the acquisition of lands, and to utilize Federal lands adjoining

park areas for park facilities—with the concurrence of affected Federal agencies—without including these lands within boundaries of the park. Moreover, the Park Service should be given authority to avail itself of nongovernmental architectural and engineering services. This is particularly necessary if we are to avoid the necessity of large, temporary increases in our professional and technical staff while Mission 66 is under way. This new authority will make possible a more efficient execution of our Mission 66 program.

In the field of Indian affairs, several controversial subjects will require the consideration of Congress. Unfortunately, there are no easy answers. This is a field in which opinions frequently differ and in which emotional reactions are sometimes strong.

One of the problems that need congressional consideration is the disposition to be made of the submarginal lands that were acquired by the United States during the depression in the middle 1930's and that were transferred by Executive order to the Department of the Interior for administration for the benefit of various Indian tribes. Approximately 326,000 acres are involved. Title has been in the United States now for more than 20 years, and a decision needs to be made regarding the conditions under which the lands may be acquired by the Indians. The problem has been faced on a piecemeal basis in two instances (with the Seminoles in Florida and the Pueblos in New Mexico).

Another problem involving Indian lands that need attention is the heirship problem. After tribal lands were broken up and allotted (i.e., conveyed) in separate parcels to individual Indians, the original owners have died, and the inheritance process has resulted in the creation of almost unbelievable numbers of undivided fractional interests in the lands. In many instances this process has virtually frozen the title in a manner that makes it difficult for the individual owners to use the land themselves or to dispose of it. The problem is to determine the conditions under which the land may be sold by the individual Indian owners when some of them do not agree or cannot be located, and the conditions under which the tribes may, if they wish, acquire the lands that are offered for sale. In the latter case the big problem is how tribal acquisitions should be financed.

The Department's study of these subjects is also proceeding—and we shall work closely with your Indian Affairs Subcommittee in regard to specific recommendations in these areas.

The policy of terminating Federal supervision over the affairs of the various tribes as they become ready for that action has received much attention in the past. The Department expects to submit to this Congress a few termination bills, but as I have previously announced and emphasized, the Department will submit a proposal in this field only if it is fully understood and concurred in by a majority of the Indian group affected. The groups under consideration are small ones and will not present the complex issues that were involved in the Klamath and Menominee legislation.

The major item of legislation we shall submit to your committee in the fish and wildlife field will be our proposal to establish the Arctic Wildlife Range in Alaska. This area of approximately 9 million acres is located in the extreme northwest corner of our new State. Over 5 million acres of the area was formerly withdrawn as part of Public Land Order 82. As a refuge for caribou, grizzly and polar bears, Dall sheep, and wolverine, plus countless flocks of migratory birds of over 100 species, this wildlife range will provide a working laboratory for the study of Arctic life.

Our proposal for this area will seek authorization to permit metalliferous mining under a permit system and to open the area to mineral leasing. We will, however, seek to limit access to the area in order to prohibit appropriation of the surface title under the public land laws. We are currently working with the Department of Defense to eliminate their objections to our original draft bill. We are in substantial agreement now, and as soon as the technical drafting is completed and clearance has been given by the Bureau of the Budget, we shall submit this proposal to Congress.

Of primary interest to this committee is our saline water program. As you know, we recently had an independent board of consultants make a study of the needs of the Office of Saline Water in light of our expanded responsibilities under the demonstration plant authority enacted by Congress last year. This survey resulted in a series of recommendations, mostly administrative in character, which will be put into effect as the program progresses.

Interest in the contemplated demonstration plant activity has been intense. We are approaching the date for the selection of the first process to be demonstrated under this program. Selection of the process will precede and influence selection of the site.

Our budget request for fiscal year 1960 for this portion of our saline water program is \$300,000. This amount includes funds for the selection of processes and for the engineering plans for the first conversion plants.

Of course, our basic activity in research and development is continuing.

The development activity is in the areas of three major processes—distillation, membrane, and freezing. In distillation small pilot plant work is under way on rotary vapor-compression stills, long-tube vertical multiple-effect systems, and solar stills of several types. The LTV distillation and the multistage flash distillation cycles continue to look very promising.

Two membrane processes are in commercial use, and a number of small plants are in operation on brackish water treatment. Improvement in equipment and membranes is continuing.

A small pilot plant using freezing as a separation process is now being built. It is based upon successful laboratory research and development recently completed.

Research is being carried out on these major processes, including the reverse osmosis and osmotic processes, and on others, such as solvent extraction. Some of these will be going into small pilot plant development.

In closing, let me repeat, Mr. Chairman, the comments I made to some of the members of this committee recently. It has been a matter of continuing pride to those of us now serving in the Department of the Interior that our relationships over the years with your committee and its members have been most satisfactory and pleasant. We have disagreed—at times—but our disagreement has normally been as to the means we should adopt to accomplish a mutually agreed upon objective. Partisanship has not impeded the important work of the committee (and I like to believe has not impeded the important work of the Department), and the people we all serve have benefited thereby.

I make these comments again to give me the opportunity to assure you, Mr. Chairman, on the record, that it is our intention to do our part in continuing, in every way possible, this outstanding record of cooperation.

We stand ready to assist this committee in any way. And it is my feeling that any disagreements arising during this Congress between any of us will be eventually resolved as they always can be by reasonable and sincere men. If our relationships continue in the future as they have in the past, and I

feel confident they will, we will continue to build sound and wise programs for the development, wise use, and conservation of our precious natural resources.

A Definite Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there is an article in the Wall Street Journal of March 2, 1959, entitled, "Challenge in Science." A summary of the article is in the first paragraph as follows:

Considering Russia's accelerating pace in research and the Russians' intense motivation to overtake Americans on all fronts, the United States is in danger of losing its overall science leadership within 10 years.

This is, indeed, a sobering statement and so is a statement dated February 26, 1959, of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Arthur S. Flemming. His statement may be summarized as follows:

I have learned, with considerable disappointment, that many schools across the country, for one reason or another, are failing to take advantage of a virtually cost-free opportunity to strengthen the teaching of science and mathematics.

Government surplus equipment suitable for use in teaching science and mathematics is currently declared surplus at the rate of about \$100 million in initial value each year.

Although the equipment is available to colleges and universities and to public, parochial and nonprofit private schools throughout the country, only about 20 percent of the scientific items actually find their way into educational institutions.

Mr. Speaker, the implication of the Secretary's statement seems to be that the schools in the United States are at fault in failing to get valuable scientific equipment virtually free. As chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Donable Property of the House Government Operations Committee and as sponsor of Public Law 61 which made surplus property available to educational activities it is my considered judgment that the failure of the educational institutions to make 100 percent use of the surplus equipment is due to lack of leadership and coordination in the executive branch of the Government. I regret that it is necessary to make this statement but since the passage of Public Law 61 in the spring of 1955 there have been numerous examples of lack of cooperation and coordination between the several executive agencies which are responsible for the execution of the program which was unanimously passed by the Congress.

It is a serious matter, Mr. Speaker, to state on the one hand that the Russians are challenging our leadership in the overall scientific fields and at the same time admitting that useful and necessary scientific items which are surplus to the requirements of the Federal Government are utilized only to the extent of 20 per-

cent for purposes which involve our survival. I urge that Secretary Flemming utilize his authority either directly or through higher echelons and do what is now possible under existing legislation to insure that surplus property when useful and necessary for purposes of education, health and civil defense are so employed and at the earliest possible moment.

Last calendar year surplus property at initial cost of \$334,109,167 was transferred to the States for purposes of education, health, and civil defense. However, the 1960 budget statement indicates that there will be a total of \$8 billion in surplus property declared in fiscal 1959 and a total of \$10 billion in fiscal 1960.

Why there is so much surplus property is a serious matter upon which I have often spoken and, of course, involves the necessary organization of the Department of Defense which generates more than 90 percent of all surplus property.

The full statement of Secretary Flemming follows:

STATEMENT BY ARTHUR S. FLEMMING, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

I have learned, with considerable disappointment, that many schools across the country, for one reason or another, are failing to take advantage of a virtually cost-free opportunity to strengthen the teaching of science and mathematics.

Government surplus equipment suitable for use in teaching science and mathematics is currently declared surplus at the rate of about \$100 million in initial value each year.

Although the equipment is available to colleges and universities and to public, parochial, and nonprofit private schools throughout the country, only about 20 percent of the scientific items actually find their way into educational institutions.

Schools that have picked up scientific surplus property have put it to good use in science and mathematics teaching; but there are many more schools that apparently are unaware of the kinds of equipment that they can obtain simply by paying warehousing and transportation costs.

This equipment ranges all the way from push buttons for second graders to jet airplanes for engineering students. It includes nautical and navigation instruments; radio and radar equipment; electric motors and generators; photographic equipment; spectrometers; laboratory items and supplies, including chemicals; lenses, and electronic items and components.

A large part of this equipment comes from the Department of Defense, where it has been used in research laboratories, in training personnel, or in actual operations throughout the country. Other items come from the Atomic Energy Commission, from the laboratories of the Department of Agriculture, from the Veterans' Administration, and from other Federal agencies. Many of the items are in the original packing cases.

The spotty demand for scientific surplus equipment is in sharp contrast to the speed with which other surplus items, such as building supplies for school maintenance and machine tools and materials for vocational education programs, are picked up.

That scientific equipment could be equally valuable to schools and colleges generally—if they know of its existence—is shown by the fact that it is constantly being bought up by dealers, after it has gone begging for a sufficient length of time, and then is resold to schools.

Once property has been determined surplus—that is, its usefulness to the Government has ceased—the Surplus Property Division of this Department assumes responsi-

bility for getting as much of it as possible where it can do the most good. State surplus property agencies—and every State and the District of Columbia has one—let the Department know how much they think will be requested, and the property is transferred to State warehouses. Representatives of schools may visit these State warehouses and select the items they require. Some States also circulate lists of available materials and accept orders by mail.

Real and personal property which is not disposed of in this way is advertised for sale to the public. About a year ago, for example, 100 instruments which record direction and velocity of the wind were declared surplus property, but educational institutions did not ask for them. They were sold to surplus dealers who in turn sold them to schools. Electrical measuring instruments have been sold by the thousands for as little as a few cents each and later resold to schools.

Where real efforts have been made to inform the schools, the results have been extremely gratifying. The North Carolina State agency, for example, has circularized every school in the State with a list of scientific items available, and established a Saturday warehouse open house for science teachers. The State agency now accepts all the scientific equipment it can get, knowing that the schools will put it to good use. In Nebraska the State agency worked with the University of Nebraska in preparing guide sheets for science teachers, to show how available equipment can be modified or adapted. The Texas agency has on its staff a specialist whose chief concern is to see that available scientific equipment is put to maximum use in Texas schools.

I am convinced that all that is needed is more information about what is available in the surplus property warehouses and greater initiative on the part of the schools themselves.

A school can obtain much useful equipment for its science and mathematics courses simply by:

1. Getting in touch with the State surplus property agency and establishing the school's eligibility.
2. Sending the appropriate personnel to the warehouse to see what is actually available or likely to be coming in.
3. Informing each science or mathematics teacher what is available and at the same time obtaining a list of items that each teacher would like to have for his classes.
4. Providing the State agency with a list of desired items so that the State agency can be on the lookout for them as they become surplus.

In many instances it is simply a matter of backing the school bus or station wagon up to the loading platform of the warehouse, picking up previously selected items and driving off with them.

Valuable scientific equipment constantly comes on this market. Within a few weeks 19 unused dynamometers for checking engine efficiency are likely to be available in the New Orleans area, left over from the Michoud ordnance plant, which formerly built tanks. Each has an acquisition cost of more than \$11,000. These dynamometers will—I hope—find their way into engineering schools which need them.

A large number of secondary schools, colleges, and universities have taken advantage of the opportunity to obtain valuable equipment at little or no cost. Just last week \$4 million worth of radar units were allocated to universities and colleges. Last fall a \$1,300,000 aerial navigation trainer was given to the University of Pennsylvania, which will use its components in building a nuclear reactor. Electronic computers have been given to the University of New Mexico, the Louisiana Polytechnic Institution, the University of Kansas, and George Washington

University in Washington, D.C. Students in a Kentucky high school operate a "ham" radio station put together with surplus property—and students in a Virginia technical school operate their own TV station—also assembled from surplus property. The Aeronautical Engineering Department of the University of Maryland has constructed a supersonic wind tunnel from parts of a former Japanese wind tunnel and two large steel tanks formerly used by the Navy in conducting a diving school.

The surplus property utilization program as a whole has made major contributions to our schools, and our public health and civil defense agencies since its establishment in 1946.

During the past 13 years 84,522 acres of land and 6,871 buildings have been conveyed to colleges, universities, and junior colleges. These represent an acquisition and improvement cost of over \$296 million.

Over 20,000 buildings have been transferred to elementary and high schools, mostly for use as shops and classrooms. The facilities given to public schools through surplus property are worth more than \$500 million.

Early in 1958 vocational and trade schools—and colleges and universities—reported an urgent need for machine tools to expand training facilities and replace obsolete equipment. For this reason, increased emphasis was given this phase of the surplus property program. During 1958, 7,476 machine tools were allocated, with an acquisition cost of nearly \$13½ million. This represents an increase over 1957 of 339 percent in the number of machine tools donated, and a 312-percent increase in their acquisition cost. Additional thousands of components, accessories and supplies for these machines, as well as related testing and measuring equipment, were also given to schools. As patterns of defense production continue to change, even more machines are expected to be available in the tools-for-schools program. These machine tools should be in especial demand by area vocational educational programs now being established or expanded under title VIII of the National Defense Education Act.

During the past year, about 80 percent of all surplus personal property was distributed to schools, about 10 percent to hospital and health facilities, and 10 percent for civil defense purposes.

Since the inception of the surplus property utilization program in 1946, personal property with a Government acquisition cost of \$1,590,835,673 had been made available to State agencies for donation for health, education, and civil defense purposes. Real property with an acquisition cost of \$742,373,674 has been transferred to health and educational institutions.

The Argument for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of those who are not fully prepared with certain facts and figures on the newest proposed State in the Union, I want to present some information that may help our people to have a better understanding of Hawaii, its peoples, its aims, its habits, and more important, its united effort and yearning to become one

of the great States of the United States of America.

After 46 years as an organized Territory of the United States, Alaska in 1958 became the 49th State and left her older sister, Hawaii, the only remaining incorporated Territory.

Hawaii has proved its qualifications for statehood time and time again since becoming a Territory in 1900. The islands' people revere the American flag and the principles it symbolizes. Their mode of life, the type of local government they support, and the service they give to the Nation are a credit to the colors.

They are much like the people of Main Street, U.S.A. For more than half a century they have lived as Americans, worked as Americans, and fought in wars for America. They have always conducted themselves as first-class citizens.

Modern Hawaii, destined to become Uncle Sam's 50th star, is already the Nation's star performer in the Pacific.

Before going into the details, here are some of the salient points that show Hawaii as one of the country's most modern, progressive, and prosperous areas in 1958:

First. A fast-growing population reached 575,000, plus another 41,000 military personnel.

Second. Business in the Territory approached a volume of \$2 billion annually, with sugar, pineapple, and tourism leading the industrial moneymakers.

Third. Fifty-nine banks had a total of \$481 million assets, clearings of \$3.3 billion.

Fourth. With the expansion of tourist facilities and industry, including a forthcoming Standard Oil refinery and a steel mill, construction was a \$200 million island industry.

Fifth. Two hundred thousand employed persons in the Islands were paid \$850 million annually in wages and salaries.

Sixth. Per capita personal income rose to \$1,821 in 1957, ranking Hawaii 25th with the States.

Seventh. Taxes paid the Federal Government reached a record \$166 million, putting Hawaii ahead of 10 States as a taxpayer.

Eighth. A total of 136,000 students attended the Islands' 208 public schools in 1958, and 7,000 were enrolled at the University of Hawaii, highest per population in the Nation.

Ninth. The United States was spending more than \$300 million to maintain the strength of this Pacific bastion of defense and America's show window on Asia.

Such are some of the highlights of modern Hawaii, an integral part of the United States since 1898, a proud and loyal community of half a million American citizens asking their full measure of equality under the American flag. Hawaii has repeatedly shown her true red-white-and-blue colors. She was never more fit and ready for the crowning honor or statehood. Hawaii is headed for stardom.

By embracing Hawaii as a State, America would advance three bold steps

closer to victory in the cold war against communism in the Pacific and Asia.

First. It would demonstrate dramatically that the United States both cherishes and practices the democratic ideal that her citizens stand equal before the law regardless of color and creed. The example of a State of Hawaii would shine in the Pacific for half the world's people to see and to compare with the empty promise of equality held out by communism.

Second. Admission to the Union would bolster Hawaii's role as our defense outpost in the Pacific.

Third. It would make Hawaii a center where the people of the Pacific basin could study and learn our best American traditions.

When the United States granted independence to the Republic of the Philippines, the peoples of Asia understood. Statehood for the strong, loyal body of American citizens of many Pacific races in Hawaii would be an even more striking example for Asia.

It would be a sign to a billion men, women, and children that the Pacific Ocean is no longer a barrier between them and a free way of life. Statehood would confirm their hope that America believes in the full development of local self-government.

In these times, statehood for Hawaii is an ethical rather than a political question.

Old World colonialism has run its course in Asia, leaving its people with a choice—a free way of life, or communism.

Our national policies will be judged in no small measure by the decisions we make in respect to the people of Hawaii.

It is imperative that we continue to demonstrate our belief that all people should have a government of their own choosing.

Hawaii already is a Pacific outpost of the American way of life, a window on our freedoms. The people of Hawaii already have reached a goal still sought by the rest of the world. Nowhere else is there a mosaic of races, national origins, tongues, cultures to compare with this community of Americans.

The Territory is no longer an experiment in democracy. It is proof, tested in war and peace, that people of the East and West can work together for the good of all under the flag of freedom.

Hawaii occupies a key position in the commerce and defense of the Pacific. Her many racial backgrounds give her people a keen and knowing interest in Pacific affairs. A State of Hawaii, fully represented in Washington, would be a voice alert to the problems of national security in the Pacific, with a background of knowledge to furnish ways of meeting the problems.

The people of the islands have long paid tribute to the American way of life by their persistent demand for statehood. They do not seek independence. They do not ask dominion status. They seek American union.

They ask, with overwhelming voice, to share the privileges and responsibilities of full citizenship with their fellow Americans.

Again, more than 50,000 young men of Hawaii served in the Armed Forces during World War II and the Korean conflict. Hundreds more are volunteering or being drafted today on quotas enforced in the same proportion as in the States. Yet Hawaii's citizens had no voice in the passing of the draft law.

Only the change from territorial status to statehood will properly correct this situation by giving Hawaii full equality in the American system of government, including:

First. The right to full voting representation in both the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives, with the people of Hawaii selecting these representatives.

Second. The right to vote for the President and Vice President of the United States.

Third. The right to choose its own governor, and to carry on functions of government by its own elected officials instead of Federal Administrators.

Fourth. The right to the wider latitude of a State in lawmaking by its own legislature.

Fifth. The right to judicial functioning in its courts by local authority rather than by Federal appointees.

Sixth. The right to freedom from overlapping of Federal and local authority.

Seventh. The right to an equal share on a per capita basis in Federal grants for education, health, highways and other public improvements.

Eighth. The right to voice in any proposed amendment of the constitution.

And all of these rights would be irrevocable.

Citizens of all the States enjoy these rights; Hawaii's Americans have earned them too.

Hawaii is an industrious, prosperous, and progressive community—a showcase for democracy.

It is a land of sunshine, scenic beauty, natural grandeur—as Mark Twain said: "The loveliest fleet of islands that lies anchored in any ocean."

It is America's strongest military outpost in the Pacific, a symbol of our Nation's firm intentions.

Hawaii is also a modern American community. It has a streamlined government, a high standard of living, progressive industries, first-rate schools, familiar churches, and up-to-date transportation and communication facilities.

Its citizens live in modern houses, drive new automobiles—some with help of the finance company—belong to Republican and Democratic clubs, and send their children to the University of Hawaii or a favorite mainland college.

Hawaii residents yell themselves hoarse at football games, eat hot dogs, attend church services, watch television. They enjoy Broadway hit plays at Honolulu Community Theater and they take in "thriller" movies at drive-ins; they go to afternoon jazz sessions and attend evening Honolulu Symphony Orchestra concerts; they enjoy exhibits at the Honolulu Academy of Arts and read the funny papers.

They are Americans, through and through.

They are particularly proud that whatever their racial origin, they have learned to live together, work together, play together and study together—that is Americanism too, and the kind that makes the deepest impression on the half of the world's population that faces toward Hawaii. To these peoples, Hawaii is a fascinating laboratory; a place where democracy has been planted and thrives in fertile soil, whose appealing crops are worthy of attention.

This land of economic prosperity and social opportunity deserves a close look from its Pacific neighbors—and from its American neighbors on the mainland.

Hawaii has an area of approximately 6,400 square miles, larger than any of three States—Connecticut, Delaware, or Rhode Island.

The Territorial Department of Health estimates October 30, 1958, put Hawaii's population at 575,711, or a total of 616,711 including military personnel. Hawaii's population was thus larger than the population of any of five States: Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Nevada, and Alaska. Hawaii has a larger population than existed in any State at the time of admission with the exception of Oklahoma. As a State, Hawaii will fit the pattern of 14 States, with 1 or 2 Representatives in Congress and the usual 2 Senators.

Eighty-five percent of Hawaii's people are citizens of the United States. More important, between 98 and 99 percent of grade and high school students are citizens.

Hawaii's finances are sound. The Territory has substantial resources in lands and industries and has taken care to build a strong economy with them. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, the Territory paid a record high of \$166,306,000 in Federal taxes, more than any of 10 States, including Alaska.

Hawaii has paid more than \$2.3 billion in Federal taxes since becoming a Territory.

At the end of June 1957, total assets of the 59 banks in Hawaii were \$481 million. Clearings amounted to \$3.3 billion.

Hawaii's 1957 mainland dollar earnings were \$856 million. Hawaii spent \$833 million.

Per capita personal income rose to \$1,821 in 1957, putting Hawaii in 25th place nationally or ahead of 24 States—U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, State Tax Collection in 1958, August 1958.

A notable expansion and diversification of industry is taking place. Among the most dramatic of recent developments was the choice of a site on Barber's Point several miles from Honolulu for a \$40-million refinery by Standard Oil Co. of California. Construction has begun in October 1958, for this first oil refinery in Hawaii.

The island's first steel mill, for production of reinforcing bars for the construction industry, was to be completed and in operation early in 1959.

Agriculture has branched out into other fields besides sugar and pineapple, such as macadamia nut production.

Hawaii's homegrown textile industry is setting tropical garment fashions for all the Nation.

Agriculture is the foundation of Hawaii's economy. The Territory leads the world in the technique of sugar production and far outstrips the rest of the world combined in the canning of pineapple products.

Nowhere in the world have scientific methods been applied to agriculture on the scale that prevails in the sugar and pineapple production of Hawaii.

The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported in 1951. In 1957, Hawaii's 28 independent sugar plantations produced 1,085,000 tons of raw sugar on their 220,000 acres with a crop value of \$148 million.

Hawaii's 9 pineapple canneries processed 30,787,000 cases of fruit and juice grown on 77,000 acres of 13 plantations. Total value of the crop was \$117 million.

The young coffee industry in 1957 grew 4,404 tons worth nearly \$6 million. Beef and dairy products continued their rapid expansion in order to match the demands of a vital, growing population. Fruits, nuts, vegetables, and flower crops contributed nearly \$5 million to Hawaii's economy.

Islanders consumed 7½ million dozen eggs and a goodly quantity of chicken to account for \$6.5 million in the poultry industry.

Hawaii's superb climate, scenic beauty, and recreational facilities are a major economic asset to the islands.

Tourism ranks as Hawaii's third basic industry, and is determinedly challenging sugar and pineapple in dollar value.

Every year sees new highs in the number of visitors, which reached a record figure of 168,000 in 1957. In dollar volume this has meant a jump from \$6 million in 1946 to \$77 million in 1957, or an increase of 1,183 percent. The elements that caused this increase point to further expansion. These include the continuing national population migration to the west coast, and the expansion in volume and speed of air transportation. By early 1959, Hawaii will be served regularly by jet liners taking a scant 4½ hours to fly the 2,000 miles from California.

To accommodate the increase in visitors, multimillion-dollar developments like Henry J. Kaiser's Hawaiian Village Hotel and the rapid rise of luxurious apartment-hotels have become common sights.

Several first-class hotels have been built on the neighbor islands of Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai. One notable area is the Kona coast of the island of Hawaii, which, in a smaller way than Waikiki, has grown phenomenally.

A projection by the Hawaii Visitors Bureau indicates the Territory will be hosting 280,000 tourists annually by 1965.

In 1950, 63 delegates were elected throughout the islands to write a constitution for the proposed State of Hawaii. Foes of statehood said that the ILWU's Communist leadership would control a majority of the delegates. But

candidates identified as representing the ILWU leadership were defeated.

As the convention met, the subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities opened hearings in Honolulu. One convention delegate resigned and another was expelled as a result of testimony, or of refusing to testify, at the hearings.

The State constitution finally drawn contains a provision that "no person who advocates, or who aids or belongs to any party, organization or association which advocates the overthrow by force of violence of the Government of this State or of the United States shall be qualified to hold any public office or employment."

It is the first State constitution to contain such a provision.

Despite bitter ILWU opposition to this conservative constitution, it was ratified by the people by better than 3 to 1 in a plebiscite. The National Municipal League of New York City said Hawaii "had set a new standard in the writing of a modern State constitution by convention."

Among strong anti-Communist measures, Hawaii's Legislature has enacted:

First. Legislation setting up a subversive activities commission to ferret out security risks.

Second. A series of loyalty acts as stringent as in any State.

To summarize, the Nation needs Hawaii because:

Statehood would be an example before the world of American democracy in action. It would bolster Hawaii's defense role in the Pacific. It would make Hawaii a center where Pacific peoples could study American traditions.

Hawaii is a community of Americans who have proved that East and West can live and work together, in peace and war, under the flag of freedom.

Hawaii has passed every test. Congressional committees, Government departments, military leaders and others have marked her "A" for American. Five major Pacific commands in Hawaii show the Islands' military importance. Statehood will serve notice to the world that the United States intends to stay in the Pacific.

The Nation wants Hawaii because:

National surveys since 1941 show public opinion overwhelmingly in favor of admitting Hawaii into the Union.

The American press is nearly unanimous in its support of Hawaiian statehood.

Nearly two score national organizations are on record in favor of it.

The platforms of both political parties call for immediate statehood.

Twenty separate Congressional hearings have exhaustively investigated Hawaii's fitness for statehood.

The U.S. House of Representatives has passed Hawaiian statehood bills three times, in 1947, 1950, and 1953.

Although reported out favorably by the Senate and House Interior Committees in succeeding sessions of Congress, Hawaii's bills never came to a vote in either chamber. The Hawaii and Alaska measures were combined, then

reintroduced separately, and Alaska's bill was finally enacted in the 85th Congress.

Why Hawaii wants statehood:

Hawaii's 575,000 people have fulfilled the obligations of citizenship for more than half a century without enjoying all the privileges.

They pay taxes as residents of the States do and serve on battlefronts equally, but have no voice in either tax or draft legislation. Taxation without representation violates a basic American precept.

Statehood is the expressed will of Hawaii's people. They have elected or reelected 10 ardently pro-statehood Delegates to Washington since 1900. In a plebiscite in 1940, 67 percent of those voting said they favored statehood.

In 1949, the people elected 63 delegates to a convention to draft a proposed State constitution. At the next year's elections they ratified the constitution drawn by better than 3 to 1.

In February 1954, 116,000 persons on all the major islands signed a huge petition for statehood addressed to the U.S. Senate.

The case for Hawaii rests. The people of Hawaii have spoken eloquently and without reservation. They want to belong. Now the American people, through their representatives, must make the all-important decision.

Will Hawaii be admitted as a State in the firmament of the United States of America?

I say "Yes."

Castro's Cuban Justice on Trial Before the Cleveland City Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered last Saturday, February 28, 1959, before a luncheon meeting of the Cleveland City Club in Cleveland, Ohio:

Before I speak about a nation whose new Government is barely 2 months old today, please let me say a word about a State whose 100th birthday was February 14, 1959, Oregon, my State, that is. In the Pacific Northwest we are having a big centennial celebration out there this spring and summer. You are all invited. I personally invited Fidel Castro earlier this week, pointing out to him that he would feel at home because many of the men are sporting outrageous beards and our mountains would please any rebel band. We have many other attractions. Do plan to visit this newer Northwest territory. I guarantee that you will enjoy yourselves.

Here is a proposition I trust you will concede without argument: A Member of Congress becomes an authority in any area, physical or abstract, by any contact—he it ever so slight. I hope to demonstrate this to you today.

According to the title of my remarks today I am an "eyewitness" and as such I am supposed to report to you on Castro's Cuban justice. In a moment I shall lay a foundation for my testimony. First, let us consider the issues on which I shall testify:

1. Does the quality of Castro's justice indicate that Cuba is now a police state or soon will be?

2. Does it show Communist influence and anti-U.S. sentiments, existing and potential?

3. Does it mean that Castro intends to bring revolution to other lands?

4. What can we do, officially and personally, to improve the qualities of Castro's justice and our relationships with Castro's Cuba?

JUSTICE IN THE BROADER SENSE

I make no apology for using justice in the broader sense. I do not confine it to the cases of the accused war criminals. Justice as I use it in these remarks represents the purpose of government. In other words, what does Castro's treatment of accused war criminals tell us about the nature of Castro's government?

Now, as to my qualifications as a witness, a few words so you who have questions for me won't be too hard on me when your turn comes. I don't speak Spanish. I have never had a formal course relating to Latin America. Within the last 2 years I have made two short visits to Puerto Rico, two to Venezuela, one each to Costa Rica, Colombia, Honduras, and Panama. I have visited Cuba three times, the first on my way back from Honduras in December of 1957 for about 3 hours between planes. My wife and I took a taxi into Havana and discovered that we couldn't get within four blocks of the presidential palace because of police barricades. The second time was last month for 2 days and the third time was a week ago for 3 days. Exactly a week ago at this time I was making a speech in Santiago de Cuba at a meeting sponsored by the Santiago Committee for Industrialization and Progress. The Lions Club, the Rotary Club, the Twenty-Third Club, and the chamber of commerce were all there. Last Monday I again talked with Fidel Castro, this time for 45 minutes.

Now, if you'll bear with me, just one more flashback:

Shortly after I arrived in Washington, in December of 1956, I learned that a constituent of mine, Gerald Lester Murphy, had disappeared in the Dominican (so-called) Republic. In the course of trying to find out what happened to him I discovered that our official policy was to be kind to dictators. I didn't like this. I said so. Not only did I believe our treating Trujillo as though he were respectable had made him think he could get away with murdering Gerry Murphy, but it was plain to me that our policy conflicted with our Nation's deepest traditions and played into the hands of Communists.

HOW THE BATTLE WAS JOINED

In the course of my expressing my protests about our official policies I naturally included other dictators, Perez Jimenez, of Venezuela; Stroessner, of Paraguay; Somoza, of Nicaragua; and Batista, of Cuba. In my office and in my travels I met many of the antidictator nationals of these countries. I received many letters from them. I learned a great deal from persons who had been in this fight much longer than I, such people as Herbert Matthews, of the New York Times editorial board; Gov. Muñoz Marín, of Puerto Rico; Jose Figueres, former President of Costa Rica; Alberto Lleras Camargo, now President of Colombia; Romulo Betancourt, now President of Venezuela; and many others. I found that my strongest allies were the Inter-American Press Association and newspapermen who knew the area, and also or-

ganized labor, particularly the AFL-CIO vice president, Serafino Romualdi.

I am still ignorant in many respects, but not quite so much so, thanks to my friends. My distinguished colleague, Mr. BRAZILLA CARROLL REECE of Tennessee, former chairman of the Republican National Committee, disagrees with me about Castro's justice. On February 9, in an insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, he calls me his irrepressible colleague (which in this connection will doubtless continue to be true), and he also calls me one of the principal apologists for Castro. He thinks Castro is encouraging communism. He doesn't want us "to condemn in word or action any government with whom we are in free alliance," but he thinks we "owe it to mankind" to protest the "obvious and proven disregard of the basic elements of justice and fair play" by the Castro government.

THE QUESTION OF A POLICE STATE

This brings us to the first issue on which I shall testify as an eyewitness. Is Cuba now a police state?

It is true that Castro is the strong man in Cuba today. It is true that military tribunals are trying accused war criminals and that some 300 have been executed upon being found guilty. It is true that the procedures do not involve the use of a jury nor of many of the procedural safeguards we deem essential in Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence. It is true there are no freely elected officials in the executive or legislative branches.

It is also true that Fidel Castro, President Manuel Urrutia, Ambassador Dihigo, his Cabinet Ministers, and the barbudos, or "bearded ones" in the 26th of July movement are not the kind of people who countenance "blood baths," much less arrange them. The Cuban people love the barbudos. They greet them and wave to them. What a difference from the way they felt about Batista's soldiers and police.

I think the beards mislead many people in our country. For example, a week ago in Santiago de Cuba, the capital of Oriente Province where the revolution began, I met Manuel Pinero, the commandant of Castro's forces there. He has the most magnificent red beard and locks I've ever seen. Until you talk with him and unless you had known other Castro men, you might think, "What a screwball this guy must be." In fact, though, Commander Pinero is a capable, sensitive and decent man. He studied economics at Columbia University. His wife, Lorna, who has an M.A. in psychology, comes from New London, Conn. At midnight last Saturday he escorted me on a tour of the Moncada, the military barracks in Santiago, where Castro made his famous attack on the 26th of July and where Masferrer, Batista's terrorist-in-chief, had his headquarters and where many boys and men were horribly tortured.

"We don't like this place," Pinero told me. They plan to destroy the buildings where the atrocities were committed and to make a school out of the rest. The weather was excellent that night. Many people were on the streets at 1 a.m. Under Batista, my hosts told me, the streets were deserted after 9 o'clock.

A LESSON IN HUMILITY

On the following day, Sunday, Pinero told me they were going to have a degradation ceremony. His wife thought at first he meant to say "decoration" but he didn't. Some noncom had made a mistake and he was being stripped of his rank in a public ceremony. The Castro men never looted, they never raped, they never tortured or killed prisoners. They don't drink whisky. I have met many of them. Never have I seen one who swaggered or was loud spoken. They are not a rabble in arms. They are

disciplined and restrained, dedicated but not fanatical—because of a humility they all possess. Major is their highest rank. One captain told me they had just been paid for January. His salary after deductions was \$208.

I asked Commander Pinero how they were able to indoctrinate the new recruits who joined them in great numbers when they left the mountains last December to march toward Havana. He told me that, in addition to giving them examples of conduct and specific instructions, they shot one new man who stole a can of milk. They are very serious about maintaining the high morality of their revolution, but not to the point of setting up their own terror.

A REBEL IN SUNDAY SCHOOL

As I left Santiago the man across the aisle in the airplane was a Baptist minister from Park Forest, Ill., by the name of Joseph L. Hughes. He and several other Baptist ministers had just spent 2 days in Santiago. "We hadn't been here 10 minutes," he told me, "until we had a different picture than the press had given us." He said they had just left one of Castro's top men teaching a Sunday school class. He shared my admiration for these men and said he and his colleagues would be speaking up on their side when they returned to the United States.

Yes, an army is in control of Cuba, the rebel army. But there are civil liberties, including freedom of the press, and there is a promise of free and honest elections in less than 2 years. The men who are in command are decent men worthy of our support and sympathy in their struggle to establish democracy in Cuba.

After my talk in Santiago last Saturday the Castro men flew me about 50 miles north to the Sagua de Tanamo, a town of about 6,000 inhabitants, which had been cruelly damaged by Batista's air force. Nearly 300 civilians were killed there. This was the first time I had seen a bombed city in this hemisphere. Whether or not it was a war crime is not clear. The evidence is conflicting. The 21-year-old captain who escorted me, owner of a sugarcane farm and student of chemistry who intends to enter politics someday, a softspoken athletic lad by the name of Caleb de Quesada, told me he had been informed that there was no resistance, but barbudos in the village told me they did fight back. Both could be correct. The assault extended over 10 days. The resistance probably developed after repeated attacks. The invariable Castro tactic was to come into a town at night, take all the guns and retire to the hills before dawn. All air attacks were in the daytime. This young captain, by the way was Castro's heavy weapons expert.

WHAT IS A WAR CRIME?

The point here of course is which, if any, of the 40 or more Batista pilots now on trial in Santiago are war criminals. I talked this over with Pinero and with Castro. They agreed that the burden of proof was on the prosecution to show that the accused man knew he was shooting or bombing only to terrorize civilians and not as part of an attack on enemy forces.

This testimony of mine adds up to the finding that Castro and his men are as decent as Batista and his men were indecent.

But, you might ask, because in many instances their procedures were summary and they have executed many men, how do we know that they haven't killed innocent men? I attended no trials. I relied on a free press to tell me about them. The press has been free and wide-ranging since Batista left, yet I have to date seen not even one allegation that an innocent person has been executed or that any one of those condemned had no opportunity to defend himself. This does not mean I endorse the procedures. I do

not. From the first I have urged their improvement.

The persons being executed are not shot because they are Batista supporters as one news story stated, but because they were murderers of defenseless men, women, and children. Castro can predict that about 400 will be executed because he knows very well the files on the notorious murderers in the police and in Masferrer's "tiger" army. These files were carefully prepared by thousands of spies. Batista's men helped by not trying to hide many of their atrocities, thinking to intimidate the Cubans. Pinero made available to me pictures taken by Masferrer and his sadistic underlings. They are beyond description. What man can do to man is incredible. The Nazis did no worse.

THE HIGH COST OF WORDS

I knew about these atrocities and I blamed Batista for them while he was in office. Many Cubans and others sent me stories and photographs. Why didn't the Nation know? One reason is that Batista corrupted the press, even some of our own. He bought good words or, at least, silence. The Associated Press, a fine organization with high ideals, fired one of its employees in Havana, Arroyo Maldonado, a Cuban citizen, about a year ago when it found he was receiving money from Batista.

An Associated Press staff writer, Robert Berrellez, one member of the entirely new AP American contingent in Havana, finished his recent series on the Batista atrocities with this paragraph, referring to the 400 (out of 2,000 detained) who Castro said would probably die:

"It could have been more, some quarters say, were it not for the strength of criticism outside Cuba—much of it probably growing out of a lack of information on what had happened here."

The Cuban revolution was not a change of the palace guard. It may not achieve all its noble ends. It may even degenerate into a police state of the left or the right. I don't think it will. The determination in the Cuban heart to establish an honest and democratic government is too intense and too universal.

THE PROS AND CONS

This brings us to the next question, what about procommunism and anti-U.S. feeling in the Castro government? Every enemy of a Latin American dictator is called a Communist and worse. Many Catholics supported Castro and most of his men are of that faith. One cannot be a Catholic and a Communist. Furthermore, Castro and his leaders are middle class people with a social and economic reform program which is not communistic. Of course the Communists are on the scene, with money and know-how, to take advantage if they can of disorganization and to fire up, as best they can, anti-U.S. sentiments.

A Cuban can be anti-United States without being pro-Communist. Historically there has been very little anti-U.S. feeling in Cuba compared to other Latin American countries. I have found no such feelings. I asked Castro last Monday why, in a telecast a few nights previously, he had put out an anti-U.S. version of Cuban-U.S. history. He replied that he had to be honest, but that he was not anti-United States. I believe him. The best proof is the kind of men he has put in high places and the kind of government Cuba now has.

THE NERVOUS NEIGHBOR POLICY

Both Commander Pinero and Premier Castro assured me that they did not intend to sponsor aggression against their nervous neighbor, Rafael Trujillo, the senile dictator of the Dominican Republic. They know that such action would inevitably invoke the organized action of the Organization of American States against them. This brings

us to the third issue: Is Castro's government planning to take the lead in igniting the overthrow of other tyrants in Latin America? "Exiles from any land can come here," Castro told me Monday, "and I will not allow the police to bother them." He makes no secret of his dislike for Trujillo.

Trujillo tried to help Batista. He tried to help Dictator Pérez Jiménez, of Venezuela. Now he has, in his capital city, two deposed dictators, Perón and Batista, as living reminders to his long-suffering people that a day of reckoning for such men eventually comes. No wonder Trujillo wishes they would go away.

The shoe is now on the other foot in Latin America. Not long ago the lovers of freedom were running and hiding from torture and death. Now the forces of decency and democracy are strong and becoming stronger. They control Cuba and Venezuela, both potentially wealthy countries. Their leaders speak out against Trujillo. They are only justified in doing so. I think this is in keeping with the most sacred traditions of the United States, a country which was born out of revolution against a tyrant, a country whose citizens know that democracy once attained must be maintained.

THE PROMISE—NOT THE THREAT

Vice President Nixon, with whom I sometimes do not agree, said in Oregon week before last in my presence that "we should concern ourselves more with our faith in freedom, more with the promise of the American Revolution and less with the threat of the Russian revolution." I say amen to that.

My observations in Cuba lead me to conclude that the Cuban leaders do not intend any rash Bolivarlike expeditions against the declining dictators, but that they will join with Venezuela and other countries in condemning all governments based on terror and tribute and that they will carry this policy into the Organization of American States and other international organizations. Such expressions, in my opinion, particularly if joined in by the United States, will be quite sufficient to insure the early downfall of Trujillo by internal forces which heretofore have been frustrated by the respectability misguidedly accorded to this despotic regime. An invasion of attitude in these circumstances can be more readily effective than an invasion of barbudos.

THERE'S A DIFFERENCE

What about Castro's Cuba in its relationships with the United States? I think we will be more friendly than ever, now that our administration has endorsed a policy of differentiating between democracies and dictatorships, now that Cuba is an emerging democracy, and now that we have an outstanding Ambassador in Havana, a career man, Philip Wilson Bonsal, whose opposition to dictators needs no further demonstration. The two political appointees who preceded Bonsal made a sorry mess of our official standing in Cuba by identifying themselves with the dictator and his minions. Our refusal to withdraw our military missions from the Batista government was an error of immense proportions, yet we are now sending Marines to Haiti to repeat that mistake.

A free, uncorrupted press will do much to help reestablish our good relations with Cuba. Cuba's own struggle as it becomes better known here will enlist support and sympathy. I predict brighter days and closer ties between this fair country and our own, ties based on our common devotion to human freedom. Its government is taking hold. Castro appeared more severe and assured when he spoke Monday. Sunday he and the Cabinet spent on a yacht out at sea where they could confer without telephones. I found this out because I was to have had dinner with the brilliant young secretary of

the treasury, Lopez Fresquet. His U.S.-born wife explained where he was and why.

I conclude by listing a few of the features I feel we must include in our Latin American policy:

A GOLDEN RULE OF DIPLOMACY

First, and foremost, we must speak up for freedom and against tyranny. This goes beyond our American Revolution and back to a manger in Bethlehem. Our ambassadors and military men must be instructed not to identify themselves with tyrants but to be particularly friendly in countries striving for the establishment of human freedom.

Second, we should cut off all foreign aid, both military and technical assistance, to Latin American nations whose governments are based on fraud and force. We should increase such aid to democracies.

Third, we should encourage the exchange of information and citizens. When I was in Santiago I found the local businessmen were eager that the American sailors be allowed to come there again on leave, this not having happened for almost 2 years. State Department officials in Cuba favored it. So did Fidel Castro and the U.S. Navy when I asked them. It is now up to the Department of

State, and I hope they decide affirmatively without delay.

Fourth, we must work toward commodity controls, particularly with respect to coffee, along the lines of the sugar agreements which have worked so well.

Fifth, we must make more capital loan funds available through the Development Loan Fund and the Inter-American Bank.

Sixth, and this applies to me, there should be more study of the Spanish language in the United States. We should insist that our Foreign Service personnel in Latin America and elsewhere maintain a continuing and intense interest in the language of the country in which they serve.

No doubt there are many other policies we need to adopt or to improve, some perhaps more vital than several I have listed. The most hopeful sign, however, in my opinion as a peripatetic eyewitness of part of this hemisphere, is the greatly increased interest shown by the American people in Latin America in the last year. There is no question where the American people stand with respect to democracy and tyranny, but I know Fidel Castro in his lonely mountain hideout often had cause to wonder why the United States Government didn't reflect

more accurately the sentiments of its citizens.

In sum, this eyewitness, on the basis of what he has seen in Cuba and elsewhere, reports to you that Fidel Castro, his bar-budos and the people of Cuba are doing their utmost to establish an honest and Democratic government in Cuba. The nightmare of the Batista terror is at last ended. The notorious criminals are being punished. Castro told me Monday that all the trials would probably be finished in a month and that many of those convicted would receive only jail sentences. It was my impression that he too will be glad when this phase of the revolution is finished.

I close with an observation made recently by my friend Jose Figueres, former President of Costa Rica and an outstanding leader of democracy. For many years in this hemisphere, Figueres pointed out, no partisan of Democratic government was safe in Latin America. The dictators, through their thugs, penetrated everywhere, even into the United States. The Cuban war crimes trials, Figueres believes, offer a fitting occasion to show that the hemisphere is a little less safe for the men who do a dictator's dirty work.

Thank you very much.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 3, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Edward G. Latch, minister, Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, Thou everlasting sustainer of our spirits, we thank Thee for the coming of a new day, for every awakening of mind that comes to us, and for the noble ideas that seek lodgment in our minds endeavoring to be heard. Unto Thee would we dedicate the work of this day.

Forgive us, when in our pride and conceit, we think that but for us Thy purposes would fail. Forgive our rebellion against all that is unpleasant in life—against discipline and disappointment and defeat. By Thy spirit living within our hearts help us to learn the lessons whereby we can grow into a greater maturity of mind and of heart.

Lay Thou Thy hand in blessing upon us—the leaders of our people—and grant us wisdom, grant us courage for the living of these days. In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

MARCH 3, 1959.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 8002 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the Honorable NOAH M. MASON, of the Committee on Ways and Means, has been designated as a member of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to fill the vacancy created by the death of the late Honorable Daniel A. Reed.

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman.

OUR FIRST DUTY IS TO RAISE DUTIES ON IMPORTS THAT PUT AMERICANS OUT OF WORK

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, people often ask why the language used in drawing up a bill is so vague and confusing.

Legislators cannot possibly anticipate all the possible ramifications of a given piece of legislation, or the defects in it that will be revealed only through actual experience.

Some programs of the Federal Government start off in a constructive manner, then boomerang back to bite the hand that feeds them.

Then we must tighten up the original law by specific amendments to correct those contradictions that we could not foresee.

Take the Rural Electrification Administration, for example, and the legislation governing its organization, its purpose, and its operation.

Being rural, one would never expect that it would become involved with foreign manufacturers or tariffs. As a consequence, no specific provision was written into the law requiring that corporations or cooperatives securing loans from the REA must place their orders for turbine generators with American manufacturers doing business in this country.

This oversight is now harming American industry and American workers.

Money loaned by the REA is being used by the borrower to buy generators from a Swiss manufacturer, when that business should have gone to General Electric of Lynn, or some other manufacturer in this country.

The Congress must act swiftly to close this loophole before American business

and American workers lose their shirts to foreign competitors who will have a field day in our domestic market. For your information on this issue, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD the following editorial of February 17, 1959, from the Daily Evening Item, of Lynn, Mass.:

THIS IS RIDICULOUS

With all its other headaches, it is regrettable that American business is now going to be called upon to compete with foreign firms for orders financed by U.S. Government loans and lack of adequate duty protection will deprive American workmen of employment which should rightfully be theirs.

In simple, unvarnished language, that is exactly what has happened to the General Electric Co.'s River Works here in Lynn.

A Swiss manufacturer has been given an order for three 22,000-kilowatt turbine-generators which could have been manufactured by the company's Lynn medium steam turbine, generator, and gear department.

The contract would have given 150 people a full year's work.

The Swiss firm, paying only one-third the wages which GE pays, was able to underbid GE 25 percent even after adding a 15-percent import duty on top of Swiss shipping and production costs.

But the real bit of irony in the whole deal is that funds for the order were provided by the U.S. Rural Electrification Administration, a Federal agency which lends money to groups which promote electrical development.

GE says it is not unusual for its turbines and generators to be higher priced than those of competitors, either American or foreign, but discerning buyers are willing to pay the difference for GE's shorter delivery dates, reliable performance, efficient operation and fast, effective service.

A week ago a similar instance was brought to light when the Tennessee Valley Authority placed a 500,000 kilowatt turbine-generator with a British company, despite a GE bid for the order.

We don't know what the answer is, but it would seem to us that Congress ought to give the tariff and duty regulations which permit such things to happen another long, hard look. It seems ridiculous that the funds of American taxpayers should be used to help knock American workmen out of jobs.