

## SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 19, 1959

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m. Rev. George M. Docherty, D.D., minister, New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Lord of all the earth, Almighty Father, our profoundest wisdom is fear of Thee; our mightiest achievements are obedience of Thy will; our noblest life is found in knowledge of Thee.

Grant to all of us on this spring-kissed morning the certainty of Thy protecting presence, and to lift high the deliberations of this day as an offering of the service of our lives to Thee.

Grant to these Senators a deepening perspective of their noble calling, that they may behold beyond the crosscurrents of daily debate and legislation the waters of the river of destiny that nourishes this culture. May they know themselves as soldiers in the conflict for freedom and justice, and in their day and generation to be found faithful.

O Lord and Father of all nations, the earth is one because Thou art over all; all children are Thine, for Thou alone art the Creator. We pray for the peace of the earth, for justice and equity at home, and beseech a blessing upon all our loved ones, wherever they may be.

This we ask in the name of 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 Wednesday, March 18, 1959, was dispensed with.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

## COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION ON MARCH 26, 1959

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet in New Orleans, La., during the session of the Senate on March 26, 1959.

## LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the introduction

of bills and the transaction of other routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements made in that connection be limited to 3 minutes.

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

## APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL MEMBER OF JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. At the request of the Vice President, the Chair announces the appointment by him of Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, as an additional member of the Joint Economic Committee, authorized by Public Law 1 of the 86th Congress.

## ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR SPECIAL STUDY BY JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to give notice that, as soon as we can obtain clearance from the minority side, we hope to have the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 107, Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, to provide additional funds for special study by the Joint Economic Committee. The concurrent resolution is a very important one, and it will require action by the other body. I have been requested by the chairman of the committee to attempt to call up this measure at the earliest possible date.

So I should like to have all Senators on notice of the possibility that we shall bring up by motion Calendar No. 107, Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, to provide funds for special study by the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas will state it.

## AMENDMENT OF BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, last evening I asked consent that the Senate vote on Calendar No. 98, Senate bill 1094, to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, and on all amendments thereto, at not later than 3 o'clock this afternoon. I assume that if amendments are submitted, the Senate will proceed with the debate until 3 p.m.; and that at 3 p.m. the Senate will begin to vote, first, on any amendments, and then on the question of final passage. Is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; without debate after 3 p.m.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let me ascertain how the debate is to be controlled and divided, and who will control the time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas is to control the time for the committee; the time for the opposition is to be controlled by the minority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is my understanding.

I further understand that that debate will take place at the conclusion of the morning hour. Is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; following the morning hour.

At this time, morning business is in order.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

## REPORT ON AGREEMENTS CONCLUDED UNDER AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on agreements concluded during February 1959, under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 with the Governments of Turkey and Uruguay (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

## REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of the Army for "Operation and maintenance, Army, 1959", had been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

## RESTORATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF PIER FACILITY AT SOUTH PORTLAND, MAINE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, on a project for the restoration and development of a pier facility at South Portland, Maine, at an estimated total cost of \$50,000; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF CONTRACTS WITH LIBRASCOPE, INC., GLENDALE, CALIF.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of the pricing of Department of the Navy contracts and subcontracts with Librascope, Inc., Glendale, Calif., dated March 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

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

## "SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 4

"Joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the President of the United States; to the Congress of the United States; to Senators JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD from the State of Montana; to Congressmen LEE METCALF and LEROY ANDERSON from Montana; requesting the reaffirmation of National Policy of Federal Financial Support for Education

"Whereas we, the Montana State Legislature, recognize the education of our youth as the most important responsibility of our local, State and National Governments, if our national defense, our system of free enterprise, and our devotion to the ideals of American democracy are to endure; and

"Whereas despite earnest efforts on the part of the several school districts of the State of Montana to meet the cost of providing adequate school facilities for an ever

expanding enrollment and despite the continued increase in State funds to help meet the cost of supporting public elementary and secondary schools, there continues to be a widening gap between need, and funds to meet the need; and

"Whereas the financial resources of the counties and the States are increasingly overburdened by using school costs and enrollments, and to the neglect of other essential county and State responsibilities; and

"Whereas there continues to be a shortage of qualified teachers, since, despite all efforts to the contrary, teachers' salaries in Montana are inadequate to recruit and retain a sufficient number of good teachers to serve all the children: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Montana State Legislature petition the United States Congress to provide sufficient funds through the proposed "School Support Act of 1959" (sponsored by Senators MURRAY, MANSFIELD and others, and introduced by Congressman LEE METCALF and others, including Congressman LEROY ANDERSON) in order that local and State control of education may be continued by providing, by means of the more equitable taxing authority of the Federal Government, a share of the Federal income to the several States in amounts sufficient to supplement State and local financial resources for this most important of all State services; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we hereby respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to reaffirm the national policy of Federal financial support for education which has ample precedent in the school land grants given to this and other States nearly 100 years ago and without which even the present inadequate programs of public education could not survive; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be submitted by the Secretary of State of the State of Montana to the President of the United States; to the Congress of the United States; to Senators JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD from the State of Montana; to Congressmen LEE METCALF and LEROY ANDERSON from Montana.

"PAUL CANNON,

*President of the Senate.*

"JOHN J. MACDONALD,

*Speaker of the House.*"

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Public Works:

#### "HOUSE RESOLUTION 8

"Resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower; the Congress of the United States; JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from the State of Montana; LEE METCALF and LEROY ANDERSON, Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana; the Committee on Public Works of the U.S. Senate; the Committee on Public Works of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Committee on Appropriations of the U.S. Senate; the Committee on Appropriations of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Secretary of the Army, Wilber M. Brucker; the Chief of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, Maj. Gen. E. C. Itchner; the Director of the Budget, Maurice H. Stans; requesting the introduction and enactment into law of the necessary and proper legislation to authorize construction by the Federal Government of the Paradise Dam on the Clark Fork River in the State of Montana and authorize sufficient appropriations for the detailed planning and construction of the Paradise Dam.

"Whereas the Paradise Dam site located in Sanders County in western Montana on the Clark Fork River 4 miles below its confluence with the Flathead River near the town of Plains, Mont., is one of the best remaining

undeveloped hydroelectric and storage sites in the Upper Columbia Basin; and

"Whereas the extensive studies and reports of the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers show an ultimate installed generating capacity of 1,008,000 kilowatts of electrical power and a storage capacity of more than four million acre-feet; and

"Whereas the studies of the Corps of U.S. Army Engineers shows that no alternative plans equal Paradise in the amount of electrical energy to be produced or in storage capacity and that Paradise offers much greater benefit and less detriment to western Montana than any alternative plans thus far presented; and

"Whereas bills to authorize construction of Paradise Dam have been drafted and have been subject to close scrutiny by the people of the affected areas and such draft proposals have included specific provisions for the relief of personal hardship which may result from relocation of people in the flooded area and for payment in lieu of any taxes now being received which may be lost to local governments as a result of the construction of Paradise Dam; and

"Whereas expansion of industry in western Montana has been stalemated since the construction of Hungry Horse Dam, and will remain stalemated until we go forward with the construction of Paradise and other dams on the Upper Columbia; and

"Whereas because of the detailed studies already made of the Paradise Dam site, an early start could be made on its construction once the project is authorized and appropriations made; and

"Whereas construction of Paradise Dam would give an immediate and substantial stimulus to business in western Montana and the whole northwest and great permanent benefit to all areas of Montana and the northwest in the development of industry, reclamation of arid lands, control of floods, protection of forest lands and recreation areas, development of fish and wildlife resources and generally in making for a more abundant life for all of the people of the northwest: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana*, That the Representatives of the State of Montana in the Congress of the United States be urged and requested to introduce and the Congress of the United States be urged and requested to enact into law necessary and proper legislation to authorize construction by the Federal Government of the Paradise Dam on the Clark Fork River in the State of Montana and to authorize that sufficient appropriations be provided for the detailed planning and construction of the Paradise Dam; and be it further

*Resolved*, That such legislation include a reservation of hydroelectric power to be used within the State of Montana; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be submitted by the secretary of the State of Montana to each of the individuals and to the chairmen of each of the committees named in the title of this resolution and also to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of the Congress of the United States, RICHARD M. NIXON and SAM E. RAYBURN."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; ordered to lie on the table:

#### "SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 12

"Joint memorial to His Excellency, the Governor of the newly created State of Alaska, to the Legislature of the State of Alaska, and to the citizens thereof

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

"Whereas Alakh-Skhak, the great country of the Aleutians, which we now call Alaska, adopted a flag bearing the eight stars of the

Big Dipper and Polaris, the steadfast North Star; and

"Whereas even in its inception Alaska was discovered under an edict of Peter, the Great; and

"Whereas after its discovery, Catherine, the Great, through a ukase furthered the development of Alaska with a great dream of empire; and

"Whereas it would appear that the Big Dipper and the North Star had smiled benignly and spilled the gifts of Almighty God with unending munificence upon her; and

"Whereas Alaska, the great country of the Aleutians is larger by far in area than any of the other States of the Union, and is one-fifth the area of the entire United States; and

"Whereas Alaska is great and almost boundless in her natural resources, clothed as she is with the vast mantle of her magnificent forests which are nourished by the richness of her virgin soil and watered by her singing streams in which abound fish of many varieties in vast numbers, and girdled by the diadem of her shining, snowcapped and mighty mountains, the coffers of her untold mineral wealth; and

"Whereas under the beauty and wonder of her skies her wildlife is varied and perpetuating and her seas and shores teem with the creatures of the deep, and offer peace, contentment, and abundance to her people; and

"Whereas in all ways, the people of this great country match her in greatness in their integrity, their courage, their indomitable will and their passionate desire for freedom of the individual, for freedom from the bonds of territorialism and for self-government; and

"Whereas the people of this great country have proven their steadfastness as symbolized by their emblem of Polaris, their tenacity, their capacity to endure privation and the singular frustrations of a territorial government, and their capacity to develop, to create, and to govern; and

"Whereas Alakh-Skhak—or Alaska—the great country was admitted as the 49th State in the Union of these United States of America on January 3, 1959: 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 therein)*, That our great new State of Alaska be, and she is hereby memorialized and welcomed with warmth, interest, and sincere cooperation as a sister State of Idaho and as the 49th State of these United States of America, with all the glory, honor, and acclaim which she so rightly and richly deserves as a great State; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he is hereby directed to mail certified copies of this senate joint memorial to the Governor of the State of Alaska, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the State of Alaska, and to the Honorable President and Vice President, and to each Governor of these united 49 States of the United States of America."

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Portsmouth, N.H., relating to wage scales at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

The petition of Ralph E. Turton, of Georgetown, Ky., relating to old-age pensions at age 64; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions adopted by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association, Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Maui, Hawaii, expressing appreciation to the Congress for the passage of legislation providing for the admission of Hawaii into the Union; ordered to lie on the table.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the eighth-grade class of Anahola School,



Anahola, Kauai, Hawaii, signed by Dick Yoshii, class president, relating to the granting of statehood to Hawaii; ordered to lie on the table.

#### JOINT RESOLUTION OF COLORADO LEGISLATURE

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, House Joint Resolution 5 has been given unanimous approval by the Colorado Legislature. It deals with State parks and lauds the bill introduced by our distinguished colleague, FRANK E. MOSS, of Utah. I ask unanimous consent the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 5

Memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact S. 1032, introduced in the Congress of the United States by Senator FRANK E. MOSS from Utah, and relating to the development of a State park system in public land States

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States, S. 1032, introduced by Senator FRANK E. MOSS from Utah, which bill has for its primary purpose the further development of a State park system in the public land States; and

Whereas S. 1032 more specifically provides: First, it would remove the 640-acre limitation on the transfer of Federal lands to the States when the lands are to be used for State park purposes; and

Second, it would provide that such conveyances for park purposes would be without monetary consideration; and

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Land Management has no program to preserve historical sites, scenic areas, or unique features on the lands which it is administering, and as a result many of our great recreational historic and scenic landmarks are being neglected, and even damaged or destroyed; and

Whereas the State of Colorado is attempting to build up a State park system and it would be advantageous to the State to assume the management and development of some of these areas on federally owned lands: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 42d General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the Senate concurring herein, That this assembly hereby respectfully memorializes the 86th Congress of the United States to enact S. 1032 now pending in the Congress, which bill is sponsored by Senator FRANK E. MOSS from Utah, and provides for the development of a State park system in public land States; and be it further*

*Resolved, That copies of this memorial be duly transmitted to Senator FRANK E. MOSS from the State of Utah, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Colorado.*

CHARLES R. CONKLIN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

ROBERT S. EBERHARDT,

Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

ROBERT I. KNOUSE,

President of the Senate.

LUCILE L. SHUSTER,

Secretary of the Senate.

#### EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF WORCESTER, MASS.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the City Council of the city of Worcester, Mass., has forwarded to me a copy of a

resolution adopted by that body calling for the extension of legislation for unemployment compensation payments. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

The city of Worcester has had a substantial labor surplus for over 18 months. Currently, 1 out of every 12 members of the labor force in Worcester is unemployed. Indeed, every major labor market area in Massachusetts, except Boston, suffers from substantial labor surpluses. Brockton, Fall River, Lawrence, Lowell, New Bedford, Springfield-Holyoke, and Worcester areas all have an unemployment rate in excess of 8 percent. In addition, Fitchburg, Greenfield, Haverhill, Marlboro, Milford, Newburyport, North Adams, Pittsfield, Southbridge, Webster, Taunton, and Ware also bear the brunt of large scale unemployment.

I have heard various optimistic forecasts about the extent to which we have recovered from the recession. I believe it would be difficult to explain this economic theory to the 900,000 workers who have exhausted the unemployment insurance available to them, even after the extension voted last year. There is no official estimate of how many of these workers are still jobless.

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

Whereas the Federal temporary unemployment compensation program expires the week ending April 4, 1959; and

Whereas this area is considered a distress area with approximately 10 percent unemployment: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, That our Massachusetts Senators and Congressmen be and are hereby urged to extend legislation for unemployment compensation payments for such further period as they deem necessary.*

#### RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF PORTSMOUTH, N.H.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and myself, I present a resolution adopted by the City Council of the city of Portsmouth, N.H., relating to equalization of salaries of employees at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. The senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] has introduced S. 19 to accomplish this objective and I hope the bill will have early consideration by the Senate Armed Services Committee.

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

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

*Be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Portsmouth, N.H., assembled, as follows:*

Whereas the construction of submarines and other vessels for the U.S. Fleet is the same at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard as at the Boston Shipyard; and

Whereas at the present time there is a difference in salary paid to the employees at the two shipyards: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Portsmouth memorialize the Congress of the United States to give consideration to an equalization of salaries of employees at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard to that paid employees at the Boston Shipyard; and be it further*

*Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Navy, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the New Hampshire delegation in Congress.*

ANDREW JARVIS,

Mayor.

Adopted March 2, 1959.

T. J. McDONOUGH,

City Clerk.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments:

S.J. Res. 73. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1964 Olympic games at Detroit, Mich. (Rept. No. 119).

#### FIRST INTERIM REPORT ON THE STUDY OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY (S. REPT. NO. 118)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as you know, the Senate on July 31, 1958, adopted Senate Resolution 336, authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to make a full and complete study of U.S. foreign policy. Senate Resolution 31, adopted by the Senate on February 2, 1959, authorizes the committee to continue this study. The committee is directed to complete its study by June 1960, and is authorized to enter into contracts for this purpose with such individuals, groups, and institutions as it may deem appropriate.

The Committee on Foreign Relations has completed arrangements with all research organizations and institutions which are to undertake studies for the committee in connection with its study of U.S. foreign policy.

In my capacity as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I am submitting herewith the first interim report of the committee. This interim report describes the work of the committee to this point. It lists the 15 studies now under way, names the contractor for each study, and outlines the area to be covered under each contract.

No substantive conclusion of the committee appears in this interim report.

The purpose in issuing a report at this time is simply to make available to the Senate and the public the general outlines of the areas to be covered by the committee in the contractual studies which are now under way.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed.

#### REPORT ON USE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES BY COMMITTEES AND JOINT COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Mutual Security Act of 1958, chapter





Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1958

Nation	Currency	Transportation		Lodging		Meals		Other		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars
Great Britain	Pound	20/1/5	55.00	54/2/2	151.50	22/8/7	62.30	16/18/4	47.17	113/10/5	316.87
Switzerland	Franc	133	30.68	1,312	302.98	1,196	276.18	158	36.50	2,799	646.34
France	do	599,960	1,428.00	1,486,704	3,539.00	139,300	332.00	134,029	319.00	2,359,993	5,618.00
Belgium	do	1,180	23.60			1,800	36.00			2,980	59.60
Spain	Peseta	790	18.81	1,365	32.50	1,270	30.24			3,425	81.55
Greece	Drachma	1,063	35.43	1,264	42.13	1,550	51.67			3,877	129.23
Turkey	Lira					160	17.71			160	17.71
Pakistan	Rupee					52	10.92			52	10.92
Ceylon	do					96	20.15			96	20.15
India	do	284/5	59.73	2,178/4	457.61	584	122.69	197	41.39	3,243/9	681.42
Burma	Kyat			144	30.25			9	2.24	153	32.49
Thailand	Ticals	10.00	.50	3,852.00	192.60	808.00	40.40	764.00	38.20	5,434.00	271.70
Singapore	Malay dollars			34.50	11.50			77.00	25.70	111.50	37.20
Indonesia	Rupiah	22	.64			330	11.05	5,760	190.58	6,112	202.07
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollars	67.00	11.55	1,252.20	215.90	751.00	129.48	304.50	52.50	2,374.70	409.43
Japan	Yen	26,699	74.19	185,714	516.33	40,000	111.16	31,489	87.63	283,002	789.31
Total			1,739.13		5,492.30		1,251.85		840.71		9,323.99

Air transportation provided the committee by the Department of State and embassy posts from local currencies

		Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Total dollars			Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Total dollars
France	Franc	436,077	1,042.00	1,042.00	Japan	Yen	6,710	18.64	18.64
Thailand	Tical	1,500	75.00	75.00					
Brazil	Cruzeiro	65,387	850.00	850.00					7,026.02
West Germany	Deutsche mark	11,912.30	2,883.88						9,323.99
		4,579.68	1,090.40	3,974.28					
Norway	Kroner	6,733	942.60						16,350.01
		204	28.50						
		680	95.00	1,066.10					

Counterpart funds—Report of Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate; foreign currency and U.S. dollar equivalents expended between July 1 and Dec. 31, 1958

Country	Name of currency	Transportation		Lodging		Meals		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars
Great Britain	Pound	418/2	1,171.20	142/13	401.23	73	205.16	8/11	23.88	642/5	1,801.47
France	Franc	282,197	664.67	501,365	1,199.60	193,875	464.38	167,351	403.48	1,144,688	2,732.13
Switzerland	do	3,681.30	869.16	1,550.62	366.53	335.80	78.69	1,818.28	425.38	7,389	1,739.76
Norway	Kroner	1,968	275.70	697	97.90	754	105.90	342	47.55	3,769	327.05
Denmark	do	928	134.60	513	74.05	385	55.50	69	10.00	1,895	274.15
Sweden	do	732	141.68	326.20	63.07	316	61.07	319	61.68	1,693.20	327.40
Finland	Markka	517,810	1,623.16			29,986	94.00	32,063	259.12	629,859	1,976.28
West Germany	Deutsche mark	360.40	85.70	901	214.52	397.60	94.67	80	19.05	1,739	413.95
Italy	Lira	690,534	1,112.66	192,000	308.25	154,550	348.48	17,800	28.68	1,054,884	1,698.07
Spain	Peseta	615	14.58	6,210	147.86	3,270	77.62	605	14.41	10,700	254.47
Belgium	Franc	940	18.80	2,600	52.00	1,400	28.00			4,940	98.80
Total			6,111.81		2,925.01		1,513.47		1,293.24		11,843.53

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, March 5, 1959.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,

Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-477, I submit herewith a report of the amounts and dollar equivalent values of all foreign currencies expended by this committee during the last 6 months of the past year:

Country	Amount of local Currency	Dollar equivalent					Country	Amount of local Currency	Dollar equivalent				
			Food	Travel	Lodging	Other				Food	Travel	Lodging	Other
Belgium	7,100 francs	\$142	\$50	\$20	\$62	\$10	Italy	50,000 lire	\$80	\$23	\$39	\$28	
England	150 pounds	420	120	47	96	157	Netherlands	200 guilders	50	12	13	25	
France	115,000 francs	251	68	62	85	37	Portugal	4,000 escudas	140	40	42	58	
Greece	8,700 drachmas	290	55	125	100		Spain	20,700 pesetas	400	80	194	120	

\$819.40; French francs; air transportation, Washington-London-Paris-Washington.

\$1,542.70; Italian lire, 964,188; air transportation, Washington-Tel Aviv-Madrid-Washington. (No allowance for unused portions of ticket.)

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,  
Chairman.

Counterpart funds—Report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, U.S. Senate—Foreign currency and U.S. dollar equivalents expended between July 1 and Dec. 31, 1958

Name of currency	Transportation		Lodging		Meals		Other		Total	
	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars
Belgian francs.....			3,528	70.56	5,322	106.44	1,150	23.00	10,000	200.00
Brazil cruzeiros.....	127,653	862.53							127,653	862.53
German deutsche marks.....	6,403.11	1,524.55							6,403.11	1,524.55
French francs.....	230,657	325.37	27,600	65.71	48,400	115.23	24,000	57.14	320,657	753.45
Italian lire.....	327,813	604.50							327,813	604.50
Spanish pesetas.....			15,224	271.85	10,504	348.28	8,272	147.73	43,000	767.86
Swiss francs.....			1,241	288.65	1,547	350.67	762	177.25	3,550	825.57
Total.....		3,516.95		696.77		929.62		465.12		5,548.46

Committee on the Judiciary—Expenditures of foreign currencies for calendar year 1958

Country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Other expenditures		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars
Austria.....	Schillings.....	6,833.70	291.87	5,280	233.0	417	16.10	5,950	257.75	18,480.70	798.72
Belgium.....	Belgium francs.....					46,800	936.00			46,800	936.00
France.....	Francs.....	272,169	647.92	317,960	757.47	706,288	1,686.90	267,751	637.07	1,564,168	3,729.36
Germany.....	Marks.....	586.80	139.71	530	126.19	4,318.54	1,028.22	279	66.53	5,714.34	1,360.65
Great Britain.....	Pounds.....	91/19	257.28	69/20	177.24	6/06	16.98	56/80	135.30	217/25	586.80
Italy.....	Lire.....	619,571	1,026.89	473,236	785.37	1,699,612	2,718.90	604,295	981.03	3,396,714	5,512.19
Portugal.....	Escudos.....	31,547.22	1,096.73	14,327	498.40	29,120.60	1,017.86	29,249.18	1,021.58	104,244	3,634.57
Spain.....	Pesetas.....	3,755	70.94	2,480	46.85			5,345.00	97.21	11,589	215.09
Switzerland.....	Swiss francs.....	1,107	257.16	1,268	294.42	36.90	8.58	648.80	150.42	3,060.70	710.58
Total.....											17,483.87

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, calendar year 1958—Amounts expended of each foreign currency

Country	Expenditures	Foreign currency	Dollar equivalent
France.....	Meals, lodging, communications, etc.....	709,500 francs.....	1,689.22
	Transportation (to Belgium, Holland, and Denmark and taxis in France).....	646,310 francs.....	1,438.75
	Transportation (United States and return).....	419,748 francs.....	999.40
Belgium.....	Meals, lodging, communications, transportation, etc. (withdrew 106,275 francs, returned 63,775 francs).....	42,500 francs.....	849.90
	Meals, lodging, communications, etc.....	2,265 guilders.....	595.95
Netherlands.....	Transportation.....	67 guilders.....	17.63
	Meals, lodging, communications, etc.....	4,200 kroner.....	608.70
Denmark.....	Transportation.....	601 kroner.....	87.00
	Meals, lodging, communications, etc.....	3,680 kroner.....	516.85
Norway.....	Transportation entire group, United States to Europe.....	43,197.65 kroner.....	6,067.05
	Meals, lodging, communications, etc.....	8,165 deutsche marks.....	1,994.09
Germany.....	Transportation.....	2,605 deutsche marks.....	620.20
	Meals, lodging, communications, etc.....	2,657.50 francs.....	621.03
Switzerland.....	Transportation.....	1,752.30 francs.....	407.51
	Meals, lodging, communications, etc.....	46,000 pesetas.....	807.01
Spain.....	Transportation, United States and return.....	10,000 cruzeiros.....	76.92
Brazil.....	Meals, lodging, communications, etc.....	130,313.40 cruzeiros.....	845.54
	Transportation, United States and return.....	12,128 sols.....	489.99
Peru.....	Transportation, United States and return.....	20,363.63 sols.....	811.30

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND  
ADMINISTRATION,  
March 6, 1959.

Report of the Committee on Rules and Administration to the Committee on Appro-

priations of the Senate concerning the use of foreign currencies, pursuant to section 502 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by the Mutual Security Act of 1958, Public Law 85-477, approved on June 30, 1958.

The Committee on Rules and Administration, pursuant to the statutory reference above cited, presents herewith a report showing the total itemized expenditures of foreign currencies made by the committee during the calendar year 1958:

Country	Amount	Dollar equivalent	Country	Amount	Dollar equivalent
England, total.....	British pounds 189/3/12	528.06	France, Total.....	French francs 63,100	151.49
Lodging.....	67/14/4	189.60	Lodging.....	25,020	60.00
Meals.....	18/0/8	51.74	Meals.....	13,344	32.00
Transportation.....	96/5/5	269.55	Transportation.....	20,255	48.70
Other expenses.....	6/2/9	17.17	Other expenses.....	4,481	10.79
Belgium, total.....	Belgian francs 1,030	20.60	Spain, Total.....	Spanish pesetas 5,969	142.14
Lodging.....	1,030	20.60	Lodging.....	2,940	70.00
			Meals.....	1,680	40.00
			Transportation.....	630	15.00
			Other expenses.....	719	17.14

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,  
Chairman.



Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—Report on foreign currency and U.S. dollar equivalents expended between Aug. 22 and Nov. 30, 1958

Country	Name of currency	Transportation		Lodging		Meals		Other purposes		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars
Great Britain	Pound	266/8/5	747.32	297/05/00	842.43	197/4/0	554.82	55/16/7	157.38	816/14/00	2,301.95
Switzerland	Franc	3,218.56	752.00	9,039.36	2,112.00	8,654.16	2,022.00	552.12	129.00	21,464.20	5,015.00
Italy	Lira	629,215	1,006.74	588,810	942.10	657,140	1,051.42	207,040	331.26	2,082,205	3,331.52
Belgium	Franc	9,735	194.70	26,789	535.78	22,398	447.97	18,420	368.40	77,342	1,546.85
France	do.	788,340	1,877.00	622,466	1,482.00	676,480	1,610.72	200,775	478.04	2,288,061	5,447.76
Austria	Shilling	8,581.39	331.20	11,653.65	449.77	10,344.96	399.23	2,590	100.00	33,170	1,280.20
Denmark	Kroner			134	19.50	104	15.00	62	8.98	300	43.48
Germany	Deutsche mark	9,144	2,177.00	252	60.00	189	45.00	25	6.00	9,610	2,288.00
Netherlands	Guilder	6,707	1,765.00							6,707	1,765.00
Norway	Kroner	15,274.74	2,146.47							15,274.74	2,146.47
Spain	Peseta	815	15.00	4,675	86.00	2,808	51.66	1,630	30.00	9,928	182.66
Sweden	Kroner	312	60.35	189	36.50	187	36.19	204	39.50	892	172.54
Totals			11,072.78		6,566.08		6,234.01		1,648.56		25,521.43

Joint Economic Committee expense account—Use of counterpart funds

Name: Joint Economic Committee—Foreign currency and U.S. dollar equivalents expended between July 1 and Dec. 31, 1958:

Country	Name of currency	Transportation		Lodging		Meals		Other purposes		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars
Belgium	Belgian franc	2,850	57.14	1,459	29.25	1,640	32.88	1,661	33.31	7,610	152.58
England	Sterling	92/18/3	260.15	399/12/5	1,120.21	285/1/7	804.87	125/9/7	345.50	903/1/10	2,530.73
France	Franc	287,753	676.59	181,071	431.15	180,236	429.56	87,973	209.71	733,033	1,747.01
Germany	Deutsche mark	754.05	177.33	2,123.55	506.13	1,762.81	419.86	609.07	145.07	5,239.53	1,248.39
Italy	Lira	204,420	328.79	201,296	323.36	210,657	338.48	64,772	103.86	681,145	1,094.49
The Netherlands	Guilder	68.00	18.02	844.25	223.62	693.52	183.92	514.66	137.78	2,120.43	563.34
Portugal	Escudo	180	6.30	710	24.80	683	23.90	927	32.40	2,500	87.40
Sweden	Kroner	80.35	15.52	348.00	67.18	296.33	57.21	511.50	98.74	1,236.18	238.65
Switzerland	Swiss franc			101.35	23.66	68.95	16.09	275.45	63.91	445.75	103.66
Total			1,539.84		2,749.36		2,306.77		1,170.28		7,766.25

Transportation other than noted above (tickets purchased in Washington, transoceanic travel, etc.)

	Local currency	Dollar equivalent
French franc	843,946	2,009.39
Italian lire	1,606,358	2,670.35
Netherlands guilders	5,171	1,361.00
Total		5,940.74

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1459. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Dairy Research Laboratory; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

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

S. 1460. A bill to provide for the establishment of Minuteman National Historical Park in Massachusetts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1461. A bill to amend section 9(h) of the Civil Service Retirement Act to eliminate the requirement of good health with respect to unmarried employees or Members electing to provide survivor annuities to certain persons; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1462. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide for certain disabled war veterans a deduction for income-tax purposes of necessary expenses for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1463. A bill to authorize the furnishing of Gold Star lapel buttons to widows, parents, and next of kin of persons who lost or lose their lives as the result of injury or disease

incurred or aggravated in the armed services of the United States in time of war; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1464. A bill to indemnify drivers of motor vehicles of the postal service against liability for damages arising out of the operation of such vehicles in the performance of official duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1465. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to make a preliminary investigation of lands in the United States situated within the exterior boundaries of Indian reservations to determine whether mineral resources exist on such lands in amounts sufficient to justify commercial development; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1466. A bill for the relief of Sofia N. Saris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 1467. A bill to extend the provision of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, providing for the preservation of unused acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

S. 1468. A bill providing for the issuance of special nonquota immigrant visas to certain alien orphans adopted by citizens of the

United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1469. A bill for the relief of Dr. Liang-Tsung Fan, and his wife, Eva Shuka-Sam Cheung Fan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 1470. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to insure to farmers engaged in raising livestock an exemption for the employment in agriculture of certain of their employees engaged in other duties related to livestock auction operations; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 1471. A bill for the relief of Jesse R. Chamberlin and Esther Chamberlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. MCGEE):

S. 1472. A bill to eliminate the fractionated heirship problem on the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (by request):

S. 1473. A bill to repeal the act of May 27, 1912, which authorized and directed the Secretary of the Treasury to sell certain land to the First Baptist Church of Plymouth, Mass.; and

S. 1474. A bill to make permanent the provisions of the Reorganization Act of

1949; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 1475. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the admissions tax where a substantial part of the program consists of live musical or dramatic performances in order to provide greatly increased employment, accompanied by larger tax revenues which will offset any losses to the Federal Government, in the entertainment and related industries; to aid the motion-picture industry which has suffered a decline; to foster the growth and development of the fine arts in the United States without resort to the subsidies common in other countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 1476. A bill for the relief of Calliope Papaioannou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. KEFAUVER) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17) favoring a convention of delegates from Atlantic democracies looking to greater cooperation and unity of purpose, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF DAIRY RESEARCH CENTER AT MADISON, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a dairy research center at Madison, Wis.

In this technological age the dairy industry will depend more and more upon a broad foundation of research to meet the challenges facing the dairy industry and to fulfill the need of the consuming public.

Among the objectives of the research center would be included efforts to, first, improve packaging, refrigeration, powdering, and condensing merchandising of dairy products, to better serve and meet the modern needs of the consuming public; second, combat livestock diseases; third, increase productivity and reduce costs of dairy farm operations; fourth, develop new industrial uses for the constituent parts of milk; fifth, adapt more dairy products to better meet human nutritional needs; sixth, improve marketing at home and abroad; seventh, expand research relating to the effect of radiation and antibiotics upon dairy products and byproducts; eighth, develop new and better ways of processing milk for home consumption and for shipping products over long distances to expand the market area for dairy products; and, ninth, through research, develop new ways and means of treatment and disposal meth-

ods for dairy plant wastes; and for other purposes.

We recognize, of course, that currently splendid programs of research are being carried on by the Federal and State Departments of Agriculture, by universities and colleges, and by the dairy industry itself.

The establishment of the laboratory in Wisconsin, the heart of America's dairyland, would be aimed at supplementing and better correlating and coordinating—not supplanting—their research programs.

The establishment of the research center, I believe, also would help to achieve four overall objectives necessary to improve the dairy outlook. These include: Improved production methods, greater consumption, better distribution, and increased utilization of dairy products.

To achieve these goals as early as possible, I respectfully urge early hearings by the Agriculture Committee on this much needed research center.

I request unanimous consent to have the bill printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1459) to provide for the establishment of a dairy research laboratory, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, 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 Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is hereby authorized and directed to establish a dairy research laboratory to be known and designated as the Dairy Research Laboratory of the Department of Agriculture. The Secretary shall establish such laboratory at Madison, Wisconsin.*

SEC. 2. The objectives of the laboratory to be established under this Act shall be to conduct and stimulate continuous research into the basic problems of dairying, including but not limited to research relating to the improvement of the quality of, and the development of new and improved methods of packaging, processing, refrigeration, powdering, condensing, transportation, storing, marketing, distribution, and merchandising of dairy commodities; research relating to the combating of livestock disease, the increasing of dairy productivity, the lowering of dairy costs; research relating to the problems of human nutrition and the nutritive value of dairy products, including gains and losses in nutritive value that may take place at any stage in their production, distribution, processing and preparation for use by the consumer; research relating to the effects of radiation and antibiotics upon dairy products and byproducts; research relating to the development of present, new and extended food and nonfood uses and markets for dairy products and byproducts; research relating to the development of treatment and disposal methods for dairy plant wastes; research relating to the design, development, improvement, and the more efficient use of dairy machines and equipment; and research relating to any other matters that may contribute to the establishment and maintenance of a more effective dairy industry.

SEC. 3. The Secretary is hereby authorized (a) to provide, by construction or otherwise, the necessary facilities for the housing of the Dairy Research Laboratory established under this Act, including any equipment necessary to the operation of such laboratory; (b) to maintain, repair, and alter such facilities; (c) to acquire buildings, property, and rights and interests therein by purchase, lease, gift, transfer, condemnation, or otherwise, necessary to the operation of such laboratory; (d) to incur necessary administrative expenses in the establishment and operation of such laboratory, including personal services; (e) to accept in the name of the United States donations of any buildings, property, real or personal, to such laboratory; and (f) to utilize voluntary or uncompensated services at such laboratory.

SEC. 4. In order to facilitate administration and to increase the effectiveness of all dairy research facilities of the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary is authorized and directed, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to transfer the functions, powers, and duties of any other agency, division, bureau, service, section, or other administrative unit in the Department of Agriculture, which is primarily concerned with research in connection with dairy products, to the Dairy Research Laboratory established under this Act.

SEC. 5. In carrying out the provisions of this Act the Secretary may cooperate with other agencies of the Government, State agencies, State colleges and universities, private research organizations, purchasing and consuming organizations, chambers of commerce, transportation and storage agencies and organizations, and other persons or corporations engaged in the production, packaging, processing, refrigeration, powdering, condensing, transportation, storing, marketing, distribution, and merchandising of dairy products or byproducts.

SEC. 6. The Secretary shall promulgate such orders, rules, and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such funds as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

#### MINUTEMAN NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the establishment of Minuteman National Historical Park in Massachusetts, and for other purposes.

In 1955 the Congress created the Boston National Historic Sites Commission and authorized this Commission to undertake a study of historic objects, sites, and buildings in Boston and the surrounding area to determine the advisability of establishing a coordinated program by Federal, State, and local governments and private historical societies for the preservation of the important colonial and revolutionary properties in that area which form a part of America's historical heritage.

In its report to the Congress, the Commission has recommended the establishment of a national historical park to preserve the last relatively unspoiled section, about 4 miles, of the historic Lexington-Concord Battle Road, which was the scene of the opening events of the American Revolution on April 19, 1775.



Mr. President, I believe that the establishment of this park would indeed be a fitting way of memorializing and preserving for future generations the site at which the war for American independence was born. The proposed park to be established under the terms of this bill would consist of two tracts of land in Lexington, Lincoln, and Concord along the route traversed by the British on their march from Boston on the morning of April 19, 1775, and used by the minutemen and Provincial Militia to route the British into a fighting retreat. The larger part of the proposed park would form a stretch of about 4 miles of the historic battle road from Lexington to Meriam's Corner in Concord. Part of this route was covered by Paul Revere in his famous ride to alert the countryside and includes the site of his capture by the British. The smaller part would consist of properties adjacent to the battleground at the North Bridge in Concord, scene of the first attack on the British by the minutemen and Provincial Militia and location of the famed Minuteman Statue. Authority is urgently needed for immediate acquisition of the vacant parcels of land in both parts, as well as for the establishment of a long-range program for acquisition and preservation of other sites in the proposed park area. This area has been undergoing rapid development and is threatened with more. As recently as 1957 the Air Force proposed to use for a military housing project a relatively unspoiled roadside parcel of 8 acres through which the Battle Road passes in Lincoln.

The march of the British from Boston to Concord covered a distance of more than 20 miles. Many of the sites and structures relating to the incidents that occurred on the eve and the day of the opening of the Revolution are still identifiable. However, more than three-quarters of this historic route and its adjacent roadside area have succumbed to the growth and expansion of the city of Boston and its suburbs. Since it would not be possible to retrieve all the land along the battle road for inclusion in a national park, this bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to erect a uniform system of historical markers along the entire length of the battle road from Boston to Concord. For the many sites east of the proposed park area, such a system of markers would provide the only practicable identification of the sites for the inspiration and education of people who are interested in this historic area.

Much fine work has been done by the State and local governments and by private historical organizations in the renovation and preservation of individual historic sites and properties in the area. To assure protection and national recognition of these important sites and structures, this bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior, under authority granted him by the Historic Sites Act of 1935, to negotiate cooperative agreements with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and its political subdivisions, and private societies and individuals to facilitate the aims of a co-

ordinated program for the entire historic area.

The bill also authorizes the Secretary to appoint an advisory commission of five members to assist him in the development of the proposed historical park.

Mr. President, the events and incidents which took place on this historic ground in April of 1775 have been memorialized by some of America's finest poets and writers. They inspired Longfellow to write his familiar verses in "Tales of a Wayside Inn," and Emerson to commemorate "the embattled farmers" in his "Concord Hymn." The turning point of the American Revolution has been recognized and commemorated by the establishment of the Saratoga National Historical Park, and the conclusion of warfare on land in the Colonial National Historical Park at Yorktown. The establishment of a Minuteman National Historical Park in Lexington, Lincoln, and Concord would give commensurate recognition to the beginning of the fight that joined the Thirteen Colonies in their struggle for national freedom. I believe that such a park would not only emphasize the importance of the events which occurred within its borders, but would also serve as a center of information and orientation for the entire battle route. At the present time no public agency or private organization is active or strong enough to handle a program necessary for the preservation of this historic area.

On April 19, 1975, less than two decades away, the Nation will celebrate the 200th anniversary of the start of the American Revolutionary War. The most fitting way in which to commemorate the occasion will be by means of suitable exercises and activities in the proposed Minuteman National Historical Park, comprising much of the area where our fight for freedom began. By passing the bill which I am offering today with my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], Congress will assure that the sites and structures associated with the start of the Revolution will be preserved or commemorated as permanent symbols of the important historic events which occurred on April 19, 1775. Unless this bill is passed all the remaining historic indicia in the birthplace of the Revolution will be faced with obliteration by the spread of urbanization.

I hope Congress will act promptly to establish Minuteman National Historical Park.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks two newspaper articles about the proposed Minuteman National Historical Park; one from the New York Times of February 1, 1959, and one from the Boston American of January 22, 1959.

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

The bill (S. 1460) to provide for the establishment of Minuteman National Historical Park in Massachusetts, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr.

SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The articles presented by Mr. SALTONSTALL are as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 1, 1959]  
PATRIOTS' HIGHWAY—NATIONAL PARK PROPOSED TO PRESERVE ROAD WHERE MINUTEMEN FOUGHT

(By John Fenton)

BOSTON.—The battle road along which the minutemen sniped at British Redcoats at the opening of the Revolutionary War in 1775 is being considered for a national historical park.

Of particular interest is a stretch of 4 miles of rather sparsely settled road in the suburban towns of Lexington, Concord, and Lincoln. Although it is made up largely of privately owned parcels of land, the Boston National Historic Sites Commission is looking toward April 19, 1975, the 200th anniversary.

With the present rate of growth of the Boston suburbs, the land might well be gobbled up for housing development in the next 16 years. Hence, the Commission has filed an interim report recommending the creation of such a park by Congress.

Representative THOMAS P. O'NEILL JR., Democrat, of Massachusetts, has filed a bill calling for the creation of Minuteman National Historical Park. He and Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican of Massachusetts, are the congressional Members of the Commission.

#### GROUP'S OBJECTIVE

The Boston Commission was created under the Historic Sites Act of 1935. Its function is to investigate the problems of preserving the most important sites and structures of the Colonial and Revolutionary periods of American history in this area.

Mark Bortmann, who is Chairman of the Commission, said that such a park would be a logical development. He noted that sites of other important battles of the Revolution, at Saratoga, N.Y., and Yorktown, Va., had been memorialized as historical parks. Hence, he said, the spot where the struggle for American independence began also merited recognition.

Historic districts established by State law already safeguarded such areas as the Battle Green, Buckman Tavern, the Hancock-Clarke House, and the Munroe Tavern in Lexington. In Concord, the Antiquarian Society has been the repository of significant objects associated with the Revolution.

But the Commission felt that the problem of protecting larger areas properly lay within the scope of Federal agencies. The park would be under the Department of the Interior and administered by the National Park Service.

#### TWO SECTIONS

The proposed park would be made up of two principal units. The larger, of 557 acres, would include land on both sides of the 4-mile stretch of road from Fiske Hill, Lexington, through Lincoln, to Meriam's Corner, Concord. It is bordered by woods and fields for the most part.

The smaller unit, of 155 acres, would embrace the area around the North Bridge, in Concord, where the embattled farmers stood and "fired the shot heard round the world," according to Ralph Waldo Emerson's poem.

Fiske Hill abuts on State Route 128, a circumferential highway around Boston, and is about 18 miles from the Old North Church in Boston, where the warning lanterns were hung as a signal to Paul Revere.

Whatever the disputes over the routes taken by Revere and his fellow patriot, William Dawes, on their famous rides of April 18, 1775, Edwin M. Small, who serves as his-

torian to the Commission, says there is no doubt about the location of the battle road. The British marched along it intending to destroy Colonial powder and arms in Concord.

The present-day road forms part of Route 2A and may be traveled by tourists from Cambridge, or by turning off Route 128 at an interchange at Fiske Hill. A modern motel is situated at the interchange.

A relatively undisturbed parcel of 8 acres in Lincoln already has been turned over to the Interior Department by the Air Force as a nucleus for the park. In 1775 the property in this section was made up of pastures and the Josiah Nelson homestead. Although much of it is now overgrown with brush, the stone walls and boulders behind which the minutemen took cover to snipe at the Redcoats are still there. The parcel was part of the site of a military housing project for nearby Hanscom Air Force Base.

Private property owners have been assured at a public hearing of the protection of their rights. No displacement of homes will be involved.

If the land could have been acquired in 1925, when such a historical park was first considered, it might have been had for around \$100,000. The present market value of the 666 acres in both units has been estimated by the Commission at \$4,838,100.

Should the park be authorized by Congress, the Commission suggests the urgency of initiating promptly a program to acquire 310 acres made up of vacant parcels in both units. These have an estimated market value of \$503,400.

#### SYSTEM OF MARKERS

The Commission's report also calls for the erection of a uniform system of historical markers to identify the sites of events on the night of April 18, 1775, and the following morning. These markers would be distributed over a distance of about 20 miles between Hanover Street, in Boston's north end, to the Barrett farm on the banks of the Assabet River in Concord. Intermediate communities along the routes taken by Revere, Dawes and the British force include Arlington, Brookline, Cambridge, Medford and Somerville.

Historic areas outside the boundaries of the proposed park would be protected by cooperative agreements between property owners and the individual communities.

[From the Boston American, Jan. 22, 1959]  
CONCORD, LEXINGTON BATTLE ROAD TO BE MARKED

A 20-year plan to perpetuate all phases of the Battle of Concord and Lexington in a national park with markers, was announced today by the Boston National Historic Sites Commission.

Mark Bortman, Commission Chairman, said that Congress had been asked to set aside two principal units along the battle road of the Revolution in the two historic towns, to be under jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, and to have markers placed elsewhere.

The markers would outline the route of the famed rides of Paul Revere and William Dawes from Boston to Middlesex County on the eve of the battle of April 19, 1775. Other markers would show the course taken by the British Redcoats. The markers would be set up in Arlington, Brookline, Cambridge, Medford, Somerville and in the many spots in Boston where the ill-trained patriots prepared to take on the supposedly redoubtable English Regulars.

A week ago it was announced in Washington that Congressman THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr., had introduced a bill to authorize establishment of the Minuteman National Historical Park. Details were not available.

Principal units needed, the report said, would be a 557-acre area from Fiske Hill, on Route 128 in Lexington to Meriam's

Corner in Concord, a continuous stretch of 4 miles, and a 155-acre plot at the North Bridge in Concord, along both sides of Concord River from Monument Street to Liberty Street and Lowell Road.

The current market value of the combined private properties, the report went on, is \$4,838,100. Should Congress approve the plan, immediate steps must be taken to obtain 310 acres of vacant land in both units, now valued at \$503,400.

Actually, a start already has been made toward the park. The Air Force turned over to the Secretary of the Interior a parcel of 8 acres originally intended to be combined into Hanscom Field as a housing project. It was saved from that fate by the Commission.

And, the report declared, on those 8 acres there still remain some of the stonewalls from behind which the minutemen introduced a new concept of warfare, the skirmish and hit-run tactics utterly foreign to the British square system of old.

The Commission set April 19, 1975, as the target date for completing the present phase of the project. Even then, the report conceded, the task would not be finished.

The plan was conceived after long conferences with local historical groups and study of State laws which now protect many of the areas involved in the battle.

The executive secretary of the Commission, named by the President, is Dr. John P. Sullivan, a professor at Stonehill College, North Easton. Other members are Senator Saltonstall, Congressman O'Neill, Conrad L. Wirth of Washington, D.C., Walter M. Whitehill, and Mrs. Elizabeth West Pigeon, both of Boston.

#### DISCRIMINATION AGAINST SPINSTER AND BACHELOR CIVIL SERVANTS AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to eliminate from the Civil Service Retirement Act the requirement that an unmarried employee or Member of Congress must be in good health in order to elect to provide a survivor annuity to persons with an insurable interest.

Under the present law, a married person is not required to pass a medical examination in order to name a survivor as the beneficiary of his civil service annuity. But an unmarried person must be "found by the Commission to be in good health" in order to exercise that privilege. My proposal would eliminate the requirement of good health for unmarried civil servants, thus bringing it in line with the standards for married civil service workers.

The inequity in the law was brought to my attention by a post office clerk with 44 years Government service. He complained to me that because of a heart attack and his unmarried status, he would be prevented from naming his sister as his annuitant. He asked me to correct what he termed the "great injustice" of the present law.

Mr. President, the present statute, requiring good health for unmarried civil servants and Members of Congress, but not for those married, in naming annuitants, is grossly unfair and discriminatory. There is no logical reason for withholding this privilege from anyone simply because, through the whims of fate, he happens not to have been married.

In a Nation founded on the principle of universal equality, we cannot allow one standard for married persons and another for unmarried persons. It is high time we put an end to this discrimination against the honorable states of spinsterhood and bachelorhood. We can do that, simply and swiftly in this case, by eliminating the requirement of good health for unmarried civil service workers and Members of Congress who wish to name an annuitant.

I am sure this measure will have the support of all fairminded people, and most particularly and directly, those bachelors now serving in Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1461) to amend section 9 (h) of the Civil Service Retirement Act to eliminate the requirement of good health with respect to unmarried employees or Members electing to provide survivor annuities to certain persons, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, 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 section 9(h) of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2259(h)) is amended by striking out "and found by the Commission to be in good health".*

#### TRANSPORTATION TAX REDUCTIONS FOR DISABLED VETERANS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for certain disabled war veterans a deduction for income-tax purposes of necessary expenses for transportation to and from work.

This bill would benefit a most deserving group of person, our 100-percent disabled war veterans. It would permit these people, who have given their country so much, to deduct from their income tax transportation costs to and from work.

Fortunately, a small group is concerned, and the loss of revenue to the country which is deeply in their debt would be small. We can never adequately repay these heroic men, and this is just one more small demonstration of our gratitude for the sacrifice they have made.

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

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. 1462) to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide for certain disabled war veterans a deduction for income-tax purposes of necessary expenses for transportation to and from work, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred



to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deductions from gross income) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(gg) Transportation of disabled war veterans to and from work: In the case of an individual entitled to compensation under part I of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1(a) for disability rated 100 per centum, all the necessary expenses paid or incurred during the taxable year for transportation to and from work."

#### GOLD STAR LAPEL BUTTONS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the furnishing of gold star lapel buttons to widows, parents, and next of kin of persons who lost or lose their lives as the result of injuries or disease incurred or aggravated in our Armed Forces in time of war.

This measure would amend the present law which provides for gold star lapel buttons to be awarded certain survivors of veterans who lose their lives during a war. However, no provision is made in the existing statute for survivors of those who die as a result of war-incurred injuries or disease. My bill is designed to fill that void. I see no reason for drawing a distinction between awarding these buttons to those whose loved ones actually died in wartime, and those whose loved ones died as a result of injuries received in time of war.

I had the high honor to be the author of the original gold star lapel bill, which is now the law of the land. I believe very strongly we should take this additional step.

Enactment of this measure would honor in a small but significant manner the widows, parents, and relatives who have suffered an irreparable loss in the defense of the United States.

Mr. President, the cost of this bill would be small. The meaning of the button, rather than its price, is the important consideration. I am delighted to report that this measure has the support of that fine organization, the Gold Star Mothers. I hope it will gain speedy enactment.

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

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. 1463) to authorize the furnishing of gold star lapel buttons to widows, parents, and next of kin of persons who lost or lose their lives as the result of injury or disease incurred or aggravated in the armed services of the United States in time of war, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, 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 first sen-

tence of section 1 of the Act of August 1, 1947, chapter 426 (36 U.S.C. 182a), is amended to read as follows: "The Secretary of Defense shall formulate and fix the size, design, and composition of a lapel button (to be known as the 'gold star lapel button') suitable as a means of identification for widows, parents, and next of kin of persons who lost or lose their lives—

"(1) in the armed services of the United States during World War I, World War II, or any subsequent war or period of armed hostilities in which the United States may be engaged; or

"(2) as the result of injury or disease incurred or aggravated in line of duty in the armed services of the United States during any such war or period of armed hostilities."

SEC. 2. Section 2 (a) of the Act of August 1, 1947, chapter 426 (36 U.S.C. 182b (a)), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Upon application to the Department of the Army, Department of the Navy, or Department of the Air Force, as the case may be, one such gold star lapel button shall be furnished, without cost, to the widow and to each of the parents of a person who lost or loses his or her life—

"(1) in the armed services of the United States during World War I, World War II, or any subsequent war or period of armed hostilities in which the United States may be engaged; or

"(2) as the result of injury or disease incurred or aggravated in line of duty in the armed services of the United States during any such war or period of armed hostilities."

#### INDEMNIFICATION OF POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES FOR LIABILITY INCURRED IN PERFORMANCE OF DUTY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to indemnify drivers of motor vehicles of the Postal Service against liability for damages arising out of the operation of such vehicles in the performance of their official duties. This bill is designed to provide authority to the Postmaster General to reimburse employees who have been subject to suits and consequent money damages because of accidents involving vehicles they operate in the course of their employment.

The present practice is to pass private bills to reimburse such employees for sums they are compelled to pay as a result of legal actions against them. This has resulted in an undue burden on the respective Judiciary Committees which must consider each claim as a separate piece of legislation. It is obviously desirable under the circumstances to enact general legislation dealing with the subject.

It may be desirable to make the bill applicable to all Government employees, and to make an exception for cases involving willful or wanton conduct or gross negligence. But certainly in the ordinary case liability should devolve, as would be the case if a private employer were involved, upon the public employer, the U.S. Government. Such has appeared to be consistently the policy of Congress in the past, expressed, however, in repeated private bills, rather than in general legislation.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately re-

ferred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1464) to indemnify drivers of motor vehicles of the postal service against liability for damages arising out of the operation of such vehicles in the performance of official duties, introduced by Mr. KEATING, 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 no officer or employee of the field service of the Post Office Department who operates, in the performance of his official duties, a motortruck, automobile, or other motor vehicle of the postal service shall be held responsible or liable to the United States (1) for any damage to such motor vehicle resulting from the operation of such motor vehicle in the performance of his official duties, or (2) for any damage to property or for any personal injury, including death, to any person resulting from the operation of such motor vehicle in the performance of his official duties.

SEC. 2. The United States shall pay, in the manner provided in section 3 of this Act, for any damage to property and for any personal injury, including death, to any person resulting from the operation of any motortruck, automobile, or other motor vehicle of the postal service by any officer or employee of the field service of the Post Office Department in the performance of his official duties.

SEC. 3. (a) Payments under section 2 of this Act shall be made by the Postmaster General, and shall be made to—

(1) the officer or employee of the field service of the Post Office Department concerned, if the legal liability of such officer or employee has been determined by a court of competent jurisdiction and if the officer or employee has satisfied the judgment of such court; or

(2) the person, or his legal representative, suffering the damage or injury, if such person or legal representative has secured a judgment in a court of competent jurisdiction against the officer or employee concerned and if such judgment is not satisfied.

(b) Payment under subsection (a)(2) shall be made only upon condition that the person who has secured the judgment against the officer or employee concerned executes a full and complete satisfaction of such judgment.

SEC. 4. The Postmaster General may settle and pay any claim, not reduced to judgment, for damage to property or for personal injury, including death, resulting from the operation of a motortruck, automobile, or other motor vehicle of the postal service by an officer or employee of the field service of the Post Office Department in the performance of his official duties. Settlement and payment of any such claim may be made only upon condition that the claimant (1) executes a full and complete release to the United States and to the officer or employee concerned of any further liability arising out of the facts upon which such claim is based, and (2) withdraws any civil action he may have commenced against the officer or employee.

SEC. 5. (a) The Attorney General shall defend any civil action brought in any court against an officer or employee of the field service of the Post Office Department for damage to property or for personal injury, including death, resulting from the operation by such officer or employee of a motortruck, automobile, or other motor vehicle of the postal service in the performance of his official duties. All costs of defending any such civil action shall be borne by the United States. If the Attorney General is unable to defend any such action, the

Postmaster General shall reimburse the officer or employee for legal counsel retained by him to defend such action and for all other costs of defending such action.

(b) The Attorney General shall, at the request of the Postmaster General, assist in the settlement of claims under section 4 of this Act.

Sec. 6. (a) Any officer or employee of the field service of the Post Office Department shall promptly notify the Postmaster General of any claim alleged against him for damage to property or for injury, including death, to any person resulting from the operation of any motortruck, automobile, or other motor vehicle of the postal service in the performance of his official duties. In addition, such officer or employee shall promptly notify the Postmaster General of the commencement of any civil action against him based upon any such claim.

(b) The Postmaster General shall transmit to the Attorney General any notice received by him under subsection (a) of the commencement of a civil action against an officer or employee of the field service.

Sec. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

#### SURVEY OF MINERAL POTENTIAL ON CERTAIN LANDS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to initiate a survey of the mineral potential on lands situated within the exterior boundaries of Indian reservations.

The bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to make a preliminary investigation of lands situated within the confines of Indian reservations to determine whether mineral resources (including oil and gas) exist on such lands in amounts sufficient to justify commercial development. This legislative proposal further directs the Secretary of the Interior to report the results of his investigation to the Congress on or before June 30, 1960, together with such recommendations as the Secretary may have with respect to additional exploration in specified areas.

Mr. President, the basic purposes of the bill are in line with recommendations which I have received from the Governors' Interstate Indian Council, an interstate council representing all States in which Indian lands are located. The survey proposed is also thoroughly consistent with the Eisenhower administration policies dedicated to encouraging private business groups to establish commercial enterprises within Indian reservations, thus providing much needed employment for our Indian people.

Many bills have been introduced in recent years, which propose to establish industrial plant facilities within the confines of Indian reservations, in order to provide employment for the Indian residents. Laudable as the purposes of these bills may be, there is little reason to believe that American business will be tempted to locate plant facilities in the Indian country unless there are resources in the area which can be developed. The study proposed in my bill will provide a clear showing of the Indian lands which might be worthy of industrial and commercial development.

I am confident that an initial and well-documented showing of mineral,

oil, or gas potential will serve as an adequate incentive to encourage many mining and oil companies to conduct additional exploratory surveys throughout various segments of the Indian country.

If the American Indian is to obtain his fair share of the Nation's wealth, and if job opportunities are to be provided for our Indian citizens there must be a great expansion in economic development of the Indian land holdings throughout America. A well-documented survey of commercial mineral potential existing on the Indian reservations would certainly be a giant step forward in a national program to develop maximum economic utilization of these Indian lands.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, which is not lengthy, and an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1465) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to make a preliminary investigation of lands in the United States situated within the exterior boundaries of Indian reservations to determine whether mineral resources exist on such lands in amounts sufficient to justify commercial development, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, 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 and directed to make a preliminary investigation of lands in the United States situated within the exterior boundaries of Indian reservations with a view to determining whether mineral resources (including oil and gas) exist on such lands in amounts sufficient to justify commercial development. The Secretary of the Interior shall report to the Congress, on or before June 30, 1960, the results of such investigation, together with such recommendations as to the need for further exploration, or otherwise, as he deems appropriate.*

The editorial presented by Mr. MUNDT is as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 17, 1959]

#### THE INDIAN PROBLEM: A CHALLENGE—AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM THE PACIFIC COAST (By Kimmlis Hendrick)

LOS ANGELES.—Is the United States solving the American Indian problem?

No. But the problem is getting better understood, and progress is being made. This is encouraging. The United States' moral obligation to help descendants of the first Americans enjoy the privileges of modern freedom is a debt long overdue, and watchful people throughout the world want to see how it is being paid.

Simply stated, the problem is one of trusteeship for lands given the Indian tribes in exchange for lands taken by the advancing white man. The Federal Government, through its Indian Bureau, undertakes to protect these lands which belong to Indians—Indians, as persons, are not Government wards. They are voting citizens, free

to come and go, to buy and sell—except the tribal lands—just like other Americans.

What gives their lands a critical status is the congressional policy called termination. The Government wants to give their lands back to the Indians. It wants to be free of the trust. Most Indians are not enthusiastic about this policy because it leaves them the job of improving lands which the Government has woefully neglected. In many cases, they are totally unprepared by education, experience, and aptitude to take on the responsibility.

But there is a deeper problem. Of the 450,000 Indians on tribal rolls, about 250,000 have become involved in the mainstream of American life and are solving their problems independently of Government help or neglect. Some of these live in cities; some still live on reservations. Some are preeminently successful in business or otherwise; characteristically all of them are modern Americans. It is the other 200,000 on reservations who challenge us.

They challenge us because their whole approach to life basically is different from that which is typical of modern America. It is philosophically and religiously different. It puts the group before the individual. It includes no concept of accomplishment in time. It does not reckon on meeting economic obligations or on regular work. It falls back on the wonderful but unmodern Indian idea of sharing—that if Tim Whitefeather cannot pay his bills, everybody in the community will help. It is not his obligation really.

This attitude or approach to life has its own peculiar virtues, but they are not mid-century American virtues. The challenge is to find ways to encourage Indians to keep the kernel of these virtues—respect for life's beauty and reverence for its deeper meanings—and at the same time suit this temper to competitive and progressive modern life.

So far, the one major program the Indian Bureau has evolved to meet this challenge is relocation. It offers reservation Indians a chance to settle in cities. The program has heartbreaks and drawbacks, but it is working better all the time. Congress has increased funds enabling the Bureau to be more helpful and more discriminating all the time in carrying out relocation plans.

But relocation isn't in itself an adequate answer. Evidence indicates that a large portion of the 200,000 reservation Indians who live according to the old pattern have neither preparation for relocation nor aptitude for remaining profitably on reservations. They are caught betwixt and between two cultures. What heightens their trouble is the fact that their children are frustrated by their frustration. And there are many children. One Sioux group, for instance, numbering 2,000, is made up half of children under 15. Their older folks have no more than third or fourth grade educations.

It is easy to argue that the United States might have started 50 years ago educating Indians to assume responsibility for their lands. Of course. But 50 years ago there was almost no awareness by white folks or Indians that this was possible. Today it is recognized. The Indian Bureau recognizes it. Indians recognize it. This is the beginning of an answer.

One Bureau official of wide experience, himself an Indian, said the other day that if he could design a program it would be this: Start with the kindergarten. Provide subsistence farms for reservation Indians who won't change their way of life. Expand tremendously the social services work with relocatees. Follow young Indians all the way through school, to help them individually. Intensify development of reservation resources. Above all: Stress social work.

A nonbureau man, critical of Indian Bureau bureaucracy, spoke almost to the same effect. But he said this: "The Bureau should



be an educator. If a tribal committee sees the need for a dam or a domestic water supply, the Bureau should help it tackle the job—not take over. Just this one change in approach would solve the Indian problem in America."

#### NONQUOTA IMMIGRANT STATUS FOR CERTAIN ORPHANS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to grant nonquota immigrant status to orphans under 14 years of age who have been adopted or who will be adopted upon their admission to the United States.

The present law which permits these children to come into the United States will expire on June 30 of this year. That termination date was established in order that we might have an opportunity to determine how this provision of the law would operate. As the Senate report stated:

The authority to issue such nonquota immigrant visas expires on June 30, 1959, at which time the Congress may review the operation of the program and a determination may then be made whether the program should be curtailed, modified, or canceled.

I firmly believe that this program has successfully proved itself and should be continued. It would be tragic, indeed, if the law under which American parents can bring into the country children they have adopted or propose to adopt is permitted to expire. During the past 10 years the lives of thousands of parents have been enriched by special immigrant orphan legislation. The adopting parents have had both the opportunity to participate in a great humanitarian program and to experience the satisfaction of raising a child and watching him develop. The children have been afforded the opportunity to experience a natural and healthy childhood in our land and to share in our abundance. This should be continued as a permanent part of our law.

The proposed legislation establishes safeguards against abuses. Both the parents and the children will be checked to determine their fitness for each other prior to the adoption. This is particularly important in order to prevent the unfortunate maladjustments which have arisen in some instances after proxy adoptions.

The present law, which is known as Public Law 316, was the fourth measure adopted since the end of World War II to provide for special admission of orphans as nonquota immigrants. Over 11,000 orphans—and an equal number of families in the United States—have benefited from these 4 laws. The first law dealing with this subject was the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. It authorized the issuance of 5,000 visas to United Nations and Greek orphans and 5,000 to orphans residing in Western Europe. Only 4,065 orphans were admitted under this act, and these came principally from Greece and Germany. The second law was the act of July 29, 1953, which allowed servicemen and ci-

vilians living abroad to bring home and adopt children. Five hundred visas were authorized under this act and 466 orphans were admitted. The third law making provisions for orphans was the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. It authorized 4,000 special nonquota immigrant visas to eligible orphans. Approximately 3,800 orphans have entered the United States under this act. Then, 2 years ago, I introduced the bill which became known as Public Law 316. As of December 30, 1958, 2,740 orphans were admitted under it.

Although these laws have illustrated, as perhaps no other legislation can, the inherent generosity and the humanitarian traditions of our country, there have been a number of serious abuses. Some children have been mistreated and some have been unable to adjust to their new environment. Recent investigations conducted by the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Matrimonial and Family Laws, under the chairmanship of Senator Janet Hill Gordon, have called these cases to the attention of the Nation.

The bill I am introducing profits from the disclosures in that investigation, from studies which have been made by the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, and from experience gained by the International Social Service. It provides for the participation and advice of the voluntary agencies in connection with any adoption procedures.

I believe this bill deserves the early attention of Congress so that the immigrant orphan program may be allowed to continue uninterrupted after the June 30 deadline.

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

The bill (S. 1463) providing for the issuance of special nonquota immigrant visas to certain alien orphans adopted by citizens of the United States, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am indeed pleased to join with my warm friend the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] in sponsoring legislation to continue to permit the entry into the United States of orphan children under the age of 14 who have been or will be adopted by American families. My office has actively participated in the drafting of the proposed legislation, and this bill represents many compromises.

I sponsored a similar measure which was enacted into law, Public Law 85-316, which provides for the admission of orphan children adopted abroad or who will be adopted in the United States. This section of the law will expire on June 30, 1959, and if children adopted by American families are to be admitted to the United States on a quota-free basis, prompt action will be necessary. It is my hope that a proposal to allow the admission into the United States of children adopted or to be adopted will

be promptly enacted into law so that children will not be kept separated abroad from their adoptive parents.

I am encouraged in this regard with the discussion I had on the Senate floor with the distinguished chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee [Mr. EASTLAND] in August 1957, when orphan legislation was being considered, which developed that there was no known opposition to extending the provisions of the orphan law when they expire this year.

#### VISAS ISSUED TO 3,000 CHILDREN

Under the terms of the orphan section of Public Law 85-316, 2,948 visas have been issued to eligible orphans through January 1959. Of this number, 2,369 were issued to children who were legally adopted abroad and 579 to children admitted to the United States to be adopted in our country.

Under the terms of our bill, provision is made for the admission of children lawfully adopted abroad under the laws of a foreign country and children who are to be adopted in the United States under the laws of the State of the adopting parents. It is my opinion that if an effective program for the adoption of foreign children is to be continued provision must be made for the admission of children adopted abroad, as well as children to be adopted in the United States.

#### PROXY ADOPTIONS

Serious concern has been expressed by social agencies with respect to so-called proxy adoptions. Such adoptions are permitted under the laws of certain foreign countries, whereby a third party, having a power of attorney, can make a legal adoption for a family in the United States. Adequate checks may not be made by the foreign country or the person holding the power of attorney as to the ability of the family in the United States to adequately care for the adopted child. A similar problem could also exist when a member of a family travels abroad for the purpose of adopting a child under the laws of a foreign country.

Some abuses have undoubtedly taken place with respect to proxy adoptions, and corrective action clearly needs to be taken through tightening immigration procedures. Our bill provides that prior to the admission of any child to the United States the adoptive parents shall file assurances with the Attorney General and the assurances shall contain information to assure that the family can properly care for the child. The Attorney General, acting through the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, can make a detailed home check to determine, if necessary, the ability of the parents to properly care for the child.

Under the existing law, the Attorney General is required to make a determination as to the ability of an American family to properly care for a foreign child only if the child is to be adopted in the United States. Under our proposal such a determination must be made prior to the issuance of the visa for all children, both those adopted abroad and those to be adopted in our country. The Attorney General has had experience in this field by preparing re-

ports that are submitted to congressional committees in connection with private immigration bills.

#### HOME CHECKS

The Immigration Service, operating under the Attorney General, maintains district offices in principal cities in the United States and has a field staff available to make the necessary determination of the ability of families to properly care for adopted children. It is my understanding that such a determination can be made within a few months and thus prospective adoptive parents will know promptly whether an immigrant visa can be issued for any child they may plan to adopt abroad or to adopt after the child has entered the United States. A uniform Federal standard should be used in determining the ability of the prospective adoptive parents to adequately care for a child.

Mr. President, I have long believed that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and particularly the Children's Bureau, should play a role in any orphan immigration program. Legislation which I introduced in 1956 to extend the orphan provisions of the now expired Refugee Relief Act, provided that the Children's Bureau should assist in the operation of the law. I am pleased our bill provides that the Attorney General shall consult with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in drawing up regulations for the administration of this law.

Our bill also provides for accredited United States social welfare agencies to participate in drawing up the regulations for the operation of the law. These agencies are familiar with the problems involved and should have the opportunity of presenting their views on this subject.

#### PROMPT ACTION NEEDED

I should like to stress the need for prompt action by the Congress. The orphan section of Public Law 85-316 expires on June 30, 1959, and after that time children adopted abroad or to be adopted in our country will not be able to enter the United States on a quota-free basis. Children may be separated from their adoptive parents. Hardship and suffering will exist.

A similar situation took place in 1957 after the expiration of the Refugee Relief Act in December 1956 and prior to the enactment of Public Law 85-316 in September 1957. Children were separated from their families. Many of these children in foreign lands faced problems of inadequate food and water and lack of proper medical care. Some children already adopted by American families died during the period they were unable to enter the United States. I know that every Member of the Senate wants to avoid a repetition of such a tragedy.

This problem also concerns members and families of our Armed Forces stationed abroad who have adopted foreign children. When the military transfers its personnel back to the United States, any family which consists of children adopted abroad after June 30, 1959, will be unable to enter our country until new legislation is enacted.

During the 1957 session of Congress a tremendous number of private orphan immigration bills were introduced in an attempt to deal individually with a problem that required general legislation. Prompt action by Congress in extending authority for the admission of children adopted abroad or to be adopted in the United States will make the introduction of private legislation in this field unnecessary.

#### HARRY HOLT FAMILY SERVES HUMANITY

Mr. President, I would like to call attention to the devoted and humanitarian efforts of Mr. and Mrs. Harry Holt, of Creswell, Oreg., and the members of the Holt family, who have assisted in the entry of more than a thousand Korean orphan children, many of whom were fathered by American military personnel. Mr. Holt is presently in Korea assisting in this humanitarian work. He has constructed near Seoul one of the outstanding orphanages in that country. The fine work of the Holts has been widely recognized and last January was the subject of a nationwide television program on the Loretta Young show. I sponsored the original private legislation enacted in 1955 which allowed Mr. and Mrs. Holt to adopt and bring to the United States eight Korean orphan children who are now members of their family. Last year these children obtained full U.S. citizenship. Mrs. Neuberger spoke at the Holt's annual picnic last August to many families from all over our country who have adopted Korean orphan children. The Holts have expended freely of their time, efforts, and good health, and I know of no family which has better symbolized the Biblical good Samaritan.

Sizable numbers of American military personnel are still stationed in Korea, Formosa, Okinawa, Japan, and other Far Eastern areas. The problem of mixed blood orphan children, fathered by American military personnel continues, but on a reduced scale. These children are unwanted in their native lands.

Mr. President, there has been some opposition to the admission of foreign orphan children as well as other immigrants. I can think of no more worthy cause than to assist homeless and helpless children who have been adopted by American families.

#### IMMIGRATION HAS HELPED TO BUILD AMERICA

It is important to remember that all of us, except full blooded American Indians, are either immigrants or the descendants of immigrants. The United States has a tradition of offering sanctuary to the oppressed. Immigration has helped to build America. Each immigrant is not only a jobholder but he and his family are also consumers who buy goods and services. While our population has grown by 25 million in the last 10 years, only 2,770,000 immigrants have entered our country. Immigration thus plays only a minor role in our continued population increase. Certainly no one can say that the admission of 2,000 children under the age of 14 adopted by American families would infer with our economy or American traditions.

Mr. President, I am reminded of the famed words on the base of the Statue of Liberty by Emma Lazarus which have typified our Nation's traditional feeling toward immigrants:

Give me your tired, your poor,

Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,

The wretched refuse of your teeming shore. Send these, the homeless, the tempest-tost to me

I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks with respect to the bill may be printed in the RECORD following the remarks to be made later today by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is ordered.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I welcome this opportunity to join with the junior Senator from Massachusetts in the introduction of a new and improved bill to grant non-quota immigrant status to orphans under 14 years of age who have been adopted or who will be adopted upon their admission to the United States.

Mr. KENNEDY has ably explained the purpose of this bill. I, too, believe in a program whereby foreign-born orphan children may be permitted to enter this country, to thrive in a wholesome family group they would otherwise never know, and to share in the abundance of this great land. I also believe qualified American citizens should be permitted the rich experience and the rewarding challenge of bringing these children into their homes and rearing them as their own. If properly planned and administered, such a program will not only enrich the lives of the children and adoptive parents. It will—in the long run—prove a solid contribution to the culture and strength of our Nation and to the welfare of mankind as a whole.

As you know, the provisions of Public Law 316 which permit these orphans to enter the United States are about to expire. By no means should the program for which the law provides be abandoned. On the other hand, I think it imperative that safeguards be provided in the new law to curtail abuses and tragedies that have resulted from some proxy adoptions. These safeguards are essential for the protection of both children and adoptive parents. I am aware that, in some instances, unnecessary redtape entangling adoption procedure has been fortunately bypassed under Public Law 316, yet I am also aware of heartbreaking, shocking experiences that have occurred in cases where innocent children have been adopted by proxy by equally innocent American citizens. Sometimes the children are emotionally disturbed because of the horrifying conditions they have survived; some are physically ill; and many are of mixed racial heritage. All of these cases require adoptive families of an exceptional nature. Otherwise it is likely the children will suffer maltreatment and neglect, conditions that have been brought to my attention many times.



I have before me a letter I have received from Miss Jeanne Jewett, administrator of the Oregon State Public Welfare Commission. She writes:

Since the beginning of the Refugee Relief Act in 1953, our agency has been assisting citizens of Oregon in bringing foreign children to this State for adoption. We found participation in this program an interesting experience and believe that we have extended a needed service to the citizens of the State and to children residing abroad who needed adoptive homes. As we have worked on this program, we have become convinced that foreign children need even greater protections in adoption than children placed by the authorized agencies of this State. Before a child is sent to this country for adoption, an investigation of the prospective adoptive parents' home should be required by experienced and qualified staff of an authorized agency in order to assure that the adoptive home will give the child care that will enable him to develop into useful and normal adulthood. Our experience has strengthened our conviction that a child should live in the home of his adoptive parents for a period of time before the adoption is granted in order to assure that the home selected for him will meet his needs. Unless this program is administered by a qualified social agency at both national and local levels, neither the children, the adoptive parents, nor the community, receive adequate protections.

It does seem to me that the proposed legislation establishes these safeguards through assurances provided by the Attorney General in consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and through the participation and advice of accredited U.S. social welfare agencies.

Because the present law expires on June 30, 1959, I urge the Congress to give early consideration to this bill.

**REPEAL OF ACT OF MAY 27, 1912, RELATING TO SALE OF CERTAIN LAND TO FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH OF PLYMOUTH, MASS.**

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to repeal the act of May 27, 1912, which authorized and directed the Secretary of the Treasury to sell certain land to the First Baptist Church of Plymouth, Mass., (37 Stat. 117, ch. 134).

This bill was drafted and submitted to Congress by letter dated March 10, 1958, from the Administrator of General Services. The Administrator reported that this bill was required to repeal the act of May 27, 1912, which not only authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to sell the property, but directed him to convey the property to a specific grantee. The property has not been conveyed as authorized by law but in lieu thereof has been used for public purposes pursuant to a revocable license granted to the town of Plymouth on October 19, 1921. It is therefore requested that this proposal be enacted into law in order that the property can be sold as surplus, or conveyed to the city for park and recreational purposes, pursuant to section 13(h) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended. Additional background and justification explaining the need for this legislation is contained in Mr. Floete's letter dated March 10, 1959.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter addressed to the President of the Senate from the Administrator of General Services, together with the enclosures thereto, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1473) to repeal the act of May 27, 1912, which authorized and directed the Secretary of the Treasury to sell certain land to the First Baptist Church, Plymouth, Mass., introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter and enclosures presented by Mr. McCLELLAN are as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, D.C., March 10, 1959.  
HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,  
President of the Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith for referral to the appropriate committee a draft bill prepared by this agency, "To repeal the act of May 27, 1912, which authorized and directed the Secretary of the Treasury to sell certain land to the First Baptist Church of Plymouth, Mass."

The proposal is a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1959.

In 1911, the U.S. Treasury acquired through condemnation proceedings, title to certain land in Plymouth, Mass., at a cost of approximately \$29,600, for the construction of a post office building. The act of May 27, 1912 (37 Stat. 117, ch. 134) authorized and directed the Secretary of the Treasury to grant, relinquish, and convey, by quitclaim deed, for and in consideration of \$100 cash, to the First Baptist Church of Plymouth, Mass., that portion of the Burns' lot included in the Federal building site in said city, to the south of the continuation of the southerly boundary line of the next adjacent property conveyed to the United States by said First Baptist Church, and to deposit the proceeds of such sale in the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt.

The portion of the post office site to be conveyed, pursuant to the act of May 27, 1912, is situated in the rear of said site and is a rectangular piece of vacant land measuring 43 feet by 147 feet. A quitclaim deed was executed on June 6, 1912, by the Secretary of the Treasury conveying said land to the First Baptist Church of Plymouth, Mass. According to a memorandum for Assistant Treasury Secretary Allen, dated March 10, 1913, from the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department, copy enclosed, the deed was forwarded to the postmaster at Plymouth for delivery to the grantee; but when Dr. Burns, the former owner of said land, heard of the proposed transfer, he vigorously objected thereto and threatened to bring suit to recover the property proposed to be deeded to the church, claiming that the Government, having condemned the land for Federal building purposes, could not legally dispose of the same in this manner. Mr. Harry B. Davis, attorney for the First Baptist Church of Plymouth, informed Assistant Treasury Secretary Allen, in a letter dated February 24, 1913, copy enclosed, that because of the threatened suit by Dr. Burns, the First Baptist Church had sold its property adjoining the Federal building site and requested that the Government recall its deed and refund the payment of \$100 which had been made by the church. Accordingly, the quitclaim deed was returned to the

Treasury Department and the disbursing clerk of that Department returned the check for \$100 to the postmaster of Plymouth with instructions that the same be delivered to the proper officials of the church.

Although the post office is constructed on a portion of the Federal building site, no portion of the area referred to in the act of May 27, 1912, has ever been used and is not now being used for post office purposes. On October 19, 1921, a revocable license was given to the town of Plymouth, Mass., to use the land referred to in the act of May 27, 1912, for public park purposes.

The Post Office Department has indicated that the area referred to in the act of May 27, 1912, is not required for expansion of its existing facilities, and that it is, therefore, excess to its needs and will be reported as such to the General Services Administration. Inasmuch as the act of May 27, 1912, not only authorized but also directed the Secretary of the Treasury to convey the property referred to therein to a specific grantee, this Administration can make no other disposition of this property until said act is repealed. If said act is repealed and the Post Office Department reports the property excess to its needs, the property would be screened by this Administration with other Federal agencies as excess property and, if no Federal requirement is found, could then be disposed of as surplus property pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended. In the category of surplus property, the city of Plymouth, Mass., would have an opportunity to present its need for this property for public park and recreational purposes, pursuant to section 13(h) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (62 Stat. 350), as amended.

For the reasons stated above, prompt and favorable consideration of the enclosed draft bill which repeals the act of May 27, 1912, is recommended.

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

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN FLOETE, Administrator.

A BILL TO REPEAL THE ACT OF MAY 27, 1912, WHICH AUTHORIZED AND DIRECTED THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY TO SELL CERTAIN LAND TO THE FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH OF PLYMOUTH, MASS.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of May 27, 1912 (37 Stat. 117, ch. 134), is hereby repealed.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, March 10, 1913.

MEMORANDUM FOR ASSISTANT SECRETARY ALLEN

I attach hereto a letter dated the 24th ultimo from the attorney for the First Baptist Church of Plymouth, Mass., regarding the sale to said church of a portion of the land heretofore acquired as the Federal building site at that place. From the statements contained in said communication, it will be seen that the church does not now desire to purchase the portion of the site in question.

In order to refresh your memory of the facts in connection with this case it may not be out of place to state that a portion of the Plymouth site was acquired by condemnation proceedings, Dr. Burns being the principal defendant. After the title to the property had been vested in the United States, representatives of said Baptist church secured an act of Congress authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to convey to them, by quitclaim deed, a portion off the rear of said site for \$100. The usual quitclaim deed was duly executed and forwarded to the postmaster at Plymouth

for delivery. When Dr. Burns heard of the proposed transfer, he vigorously objected thereto and threatened to bring suit to recover the property proposed to be deeded to the church, claiming that the Government, having condemned the land for Federal building purposes, could not legally dispose of same in this manner. The United States attorney stated that Dr. Burns' contention was well supported in law. The church people were unwilling to purchase the property under these circumstances and it appears from the attached letter that they have sold their property adjoining the Federal building site and purchased land elsewhere for the erection of their church. The Attorney General, however, does not agree with the U.S. attorney as to the legality of Dr. Burns' contention.

The quitclaim deed is now in the hands of the postmaster at Plymouth, and the check for \$100 tendered in payment for the property is in the hands of Disbursing Clerk Jacobs. In view of the circumstances it would appear that the proposed sale of the property may as well be abandoned and I therefore attach letters directing the postmaster to return here the quitclaim deed of the property and requesting the disbursing clerk to return to the postmaster the check for \$100, now in his possession, with instructions that same be delivered to the proper officials of the church.

If this action meets with your approval, will you kindly so indicate hereon.

Supervising Architect.

Approved:

SHERMAN ALLEN,  
Assistant Secretary.

PLYMOUTH, MASS., February 24, 1913.

Mr. SHERMAN ALLEN,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SIR: I have for some time been straightening out certain matters in connection with the transfer of a certain piece of land in Plymouth by the U.S. Government to the First Baptist Church of Plymouth. I talked the matter over with Mr. French on several occasions and regret that it has moved along so slowly, not through any fault of Mr. French, but owing to the fact that we had great difficulty in dealing with Dr. Burns. You are probably acquainted through Mr. French with the facts of the case, which are, briefly, these: That when Dr. Burns found that this lot to be transferred to the First Baptist Church he notified them that if they took title he intended to take a writ of entry to recover the property. I went over the case carefully and came to the conclusion that it was a very close case, and that while it might be possible that the First Baptist Church would win in the end there was enough doubt in regard to it to make it unsafe for them to proceed to build their church until the matter was settled. I knew further that Dr. Burns would keep his word in regard to bringing that suit. If proceedings were begun, I knew that it would be some time before they would be settled and this would seriously inconvenience my clients in their building operations.

I, therefore, advised them that in my opinion it would be better to seek another site, and, acting upon this advice, they did so. They have recently acquired a very desirable site.

Almost immediately they received a very good offer for the lot on Main Street, which they accepted, and that property was transferred Monday to Mr. Mansfield S. O'Brien. My clients, therefore, do not now feel that they should accept the deed of the Burns lot which is here at the post office.

I assume that, having abandoned the site for church purposes, the Government would no longer care to transfer it to them. That phase of the case was discussed last week in connection with the selling of the other lot.

If it had simply been a question at that time of accepting the title and fighting it out with Mr. Burns, I should have advised them to do it and then sell it, if successful, but I did not believe that the First Baptist Church could do it in good faith.

I think, therefore, that if it is satisfactory to your department the best thing to be done under all the circumstances is for you to recall your deed and refund the payment of \$100 which I understand is in your hands at the present time.

I was in Boston last Friday and called Mr. French on the telephone, and he suggested that I take this matter up directly with you.

Very truly yours,

HARRY B. DAVIS.

#### PERMANENCY OF PROVISIONS OF REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to make permanent the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949.

I am introducing this bill, Mr. President, at the request of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget so that the views of appropriate agencies may be attained upon it.

The bill was submitted to the President of the Senate on February 25, 1959, by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget with the accompanying letter which I request unanimous consent be printed in the RECORD, along with a copy of the aforementioned bill.

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

The bill (S. 1474) to make permanent the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, 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 subsection (b) of section 5 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 205), as last amended by the Act of September 4, 1957 (71 Stat. 611; 5 U.S.C. 133z-3(b)), is hereby repealed. The subsection designation "(a)", appearing in the said section 5, is hereby deleted from that section.*

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,  
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,  
Washington, D.C., February 25, 1959.  
HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,  
President of the Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to present for the consideration of the Senate a draft of 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."

Enactment of the proposed legislation would carry out the recommendation made by the President in his message of January 19, 1959, transmitting the budget for fiscal year 1960, that the Congress extend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended. Under present law, no provision contained in a reorganization plan shall take effect unless

the plan is transmitted to the Congress before June 1, 1959. The draft bill provides for the repeal of the limitation respecting time of transmittal of reorganization plans to the Congress. Enactment of the bill would permanently authorize the transmittal of reorganization plans under the Act.

Sincerely yours,

MAURICE H. STANS,  
Director.

#### REDUCTION OF FEDERAL ADMISSIONS TAX

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to stimulate employment in music and the theater industry by further reducing the Federal admissions tax on the performing arts. Similar legislation has been introduced in the other body by the distinguished Member from the Fourth District of New Jersey, Mr. FRANK THOMPSON. Under our proposal, the tax savings resulting from the proposed bill would be put into a special fund under an arrangement which is not mandatory; and the fund would be administered by representatives of management and labor in the music and theater industry together with representatives of the public for the purpose of assisting the growth and expansion of live music and drama throughout the United States. The President of the United States would appoint the trustees of the new fund which conceivably could have several millions of dollars for its purposes.

At the turn of the century there were more than 5,000 professional theaters in the United States, while today there are less than 100.

This legislation is essential if the performing arts are not to disappear entirely. In developing our bill we were encouraged by the advice given by the father of the American theater, William Dunlap, of Perth Amboy, N.J., in his famed "History of the American Theater," published in 1833. Mr. Dunlap urged Federal assistance to the theater in order to raise the standards of the arts in our country. He said this aid could be paid for by "taxes on taverns and tipping houses."

The proposed bill applies to the legitimate theater, operas, concerts, and motion pictures. It would halve the cabaret tax, the only one of the Federal excise taxes which remains at the wartime level of 20 percent.

Interest in the new bill has been expressed already by wide segments of the music and theater industry, including the Theater Guild-American Theater Society, the congressionally chartered American National Theater and Academy, the Council of the Living Theater, Actors' Equity Association, the American Guild of Musical Artists, the Hollywood AFL Film Council, and the American Federation of Musicians.

Our bill declares that it is the intention of the Congress in providing tax reductions under this act that any savings which are derived therefrom by persons engaged in presenting live musical and dramatic performances shall be



set aside and used to promote the growth and expansion of live music and drama throughout the United States. To this end, the President is requested to take such action as may be necessary to encourage the establishment of a special fund and—through appropriate officers and agencies of the United States—to provide advice and assistance in the administration and operation of such fund, which shall consist of contributions from savings derived under this act and moneys from any other available sources and shall be held, administered, and used by a board made up of representatives of management and labor in the music, theater and entertainment industry, and the general public to be appointed by the President after receiving and considering recommendations from organizations in the fields involved, in promoting the growth and expansion of live music and drama—educational and civic as well as professional—throughout the United States and thereby stimulating wider appreciation of and increased participation and employment in the musical and dramatic arts.

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

The bill (S. 1475) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the admissions tax where a substantial part of the program consists of live musical or dramatic performances in order to provide greatly increased employment, accompanied by larger tax revenues which will offset any losses to the Federal Government, in the entertainment and related industries; to aid the motion picture industry which has suffered a decline; to foster the growth and development of the fine arts in the United States without resort to the subsidies common in other countries, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. JAVITS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### ADVANCEMENT OF COMMON ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL AFFAIRS OF NORTH ATLANTIC NATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the many-sided struggle between Communist totalitarianism and democracy it is imperative that the free nations cooperate as closely as possible, each drawing strength and help from the others. Today the United States is cooperating with many free nations in the United Nations and its specialized agencies. We are tied closely to 14 other countries in the NATO Pack signed on April 4, 1949. We are also allied with the 20 Latin American Republics under the Rio Pact of 1947. In other treaties we are associated with several free nations of Asia.

Through these associations with free nations around the world we are augmenting our military, political and economic strength in the face of a powerful and determined foe.

In the belief that we should explore possibilities for drawing even closer to-

gether, I am submitting a resolution urging a convention of the 15 NATO members and other democratic nations to examine further ways of "advancing their common economic and political affairs" in the interests of international peace and stability. I believe honest exploration of this kind may lead to new ideas and fresh approaches for the mutual enrichment of all participating countries. When the threat of nuclear war hangs over us, no effort should be spared which stands some chance of increasing understanding and cooperation among those countries committed to the democratic way of organizing society.

On behalf of myself, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], I submit a concurrent resolution on this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17) submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY, for himself and other Senators, was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas united action by democracies is essential for preservation of democratic institutions everywhere, without regard for race, religion, or region, and will bring new hope for disarmament and peace; and

Whereas the North Atlantic Treaty has already committed its members to "contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions," and to "encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them"; and

Whereas it is increasingly urgent that the free peoples gain more strength—moral, political, scientific, industrial, and economic—while avoiding present financial dangers; and

Whereas the strength that proverbially lies in unity offers the free peoples vast, untapped resources for solving this dilemma; and

Whereas the Third NATO Parliamentarians Conference unanimously recommended that a conference be officially called "composed of leading representative citizens selected on a nonpartisan basis and directed to convene as often as necessary in order to examine exhaustively and to recommend how greater cooperation and unity of purpose, as envisioned by the North Atlantic Treaty, within the Atlantic community may best be developed"; and

Whereas the Third NATO Parliamentarians Conference also proposed that "the members of the conference should, as far as possible, be officially appointed but should act in accordance with their individual convictions \* \* \*": Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That the legislatures of the other democratic governments of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization shall be invited to name delegates to meet in a convention with delegates from the United States and from such other democracies, wherever situated, as the convention may invite, to explore and to report to what extent their people might, within the framework of the United Nations and in accord with the basic principles of the Constitution of the United States, achieve more effective and democratic unity in advancing their common economic and political affairs, their joint defense and the aims of world peace and individual freedom.

That the convention should be composed of leading representative citizens officially

appointed on a nonpartisan basis but free to explore the problem fully as individuals without being officially instructed or able to commit their governments.

#### ALLEVIATION OF CONDITIONS OF UNEMPLOYMENT AND UNDEREMPLOYMENT IN CERTAIN DEPRESSED AREAS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. BENNETT) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 722) to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 722, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit amendments, intended to be proposed by me, to Senate bill 722, the so-called depressed areas bill. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be printed and lie on the table, and be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments submitted by Mr. JAVITS are as follows:

On page 9, line 15, after the parenthesis "(" and before the word "including", insert the word "not."

On page 12, line 12, the same amendment.

#### VOLUNTARY PENSION PLANS BY SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 10) to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals, which were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

#### 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. HUMPHREY:  
Article entitled "Indian Economic Development and U.S. Aid," written by Senator HUMPHREY and published in a special India supplement of the New York Times dated January 25, 1959.

Article entitled "Unfinished Business Outdoors," written by Senator NEUBERGER, and published in the New Republic of March 9, 1959.

#### MILWAUKEE FOREMEN'S SAFETY SCHOOL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that throughout America there

is, annually, a tremendous loss—both in property and, tragically, in deaths—from the occurrence of accidents in homes, on farms, in businesses, on the highways, and elsewhere.

Today, I should like to call attention particularly to a constructive program which is aimed at reducing the total of casualties.

On March 25, the Milwaukee Association of Commerce is scheduled to open its 1959 Milwaukee Foremen's Safety School. The school has, as its noble objective, life conservation.

In announcing the program to members of the association, the following startling factors were pointed out—and I quote from a leaflet distributed to the members:

Did you know—

That every employee lost-time accident in your firm last year cost your company an average of \$608 in direct compensation and medical expenses?

That the total of such compensable injuries and deaths—including lost wages, medical and hospital expenses, insurance overhead, and direct-production losses—cost Milwaukee business more than \$16 million last year?

That more than twice as many employees were injured and killed off the job in traffic and in their homes—with an additional \$15 million sustained by Milwaukee business in lost-time production?

That 85 percent of all of these accidents are due to human error—which can be controlled through education?

That hundreds of member firms of the association have found that employee training in safety is the most effective means of curtailing this economic waste?

Mr. President, those factors are indeed food for thought—not only for individuals, businesses, and industries engaged in commerce, but also for Congress, as well as other segments of the economy, in attempting to cut down the terrible loss each year as a result of accidents. According to estimates, more than 90,000 persons are killed annually in workshops, on streets and highways, and in the homes.

Recognizing that the need for improved safety is a national problem, I request unanimous consent to have excerpts from the constructive program for the 39th annual session of the Milwaukee Foremen's Safety School, 1959, printed in the RECORD, along with a listing of the program advisory committee and the industrial safety division operating committee of the Milwaukee Association of Commerce.

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

You are welcome. The Milwaukee Association of Commerce is proud to present this school in the interest of the challenging objective of life conservation.

You—as an employee of a member firm of the association—are cordially invited to participate in this training program directed toward the conservation of human life both on and off the job.

This school is open to all interested employees—no registration fee.

#### THE SAFETY CHALLENGE

The killing of more than 90,000 persons through carelessness each year in the workshops of the Nation, on our streets and high-

ways and in our homes is one of the greatest tragedies in America.

Milwaukee, the birthplace of the national safety movement, has set a shining example of the effectiveness of safety education through the training annually of thousands of employees in the fundamentals of accident prevention.

Occupational injuries and fatalities in metropolitan Milwaukee have been reduced to less than 50 percent of the national level, with a saving last year of 55 lives and 7,000 crippling injuries.

Since twice as many employees are killed and injured away from the job—in traffic and in homes—the same principles of occupational safety must now be applied to the growing off-the-job accident problem.

To this end, the Milwaukee Association of Commerce dedicates its 1959 school.

Educational training of employees is the key to the safety challenge.

Milwaukee Association of Commerce: President, Lester S. Olsen, Olsen Publishing Co.; executive vice president, Ray H. Weisbrod.

Industrial safety division operating committee:

Chairman of division, S. Lloyd Nemeier, Milwaukee Gas Light Co.

Chairman of school, E. Clark Woodward, A. O. Smith Corp.

Allen W. Bathke, Chain Belt Co.  
Charles A. Baumann, the Heil Co.

Philip W. Behling, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.

Wilbur J. Berard, Koehring Co.  
Michael F. Biancardi, Allis-Chalmers Mfg. Co.

Erwin C. Brenner, Milwaukee Gas Light Co.  
Joseph E. Carone, Pressed Steel Tank Co.

Jean G. Dapp, International Harvester Co.  
James G. Dickinson, Wisconsin Electric Power Co.

Donald J. Diederich, Wehr Steel Co.  
Henry W. Fels, Bucyrus-Erie Co.

Robert E. Gess, Employers Mutuals of Wausau.

Edward G. Goldbeck, Milwaukee Solvay Coke Co.

Edward L. Hanley, Wisconsin Society of Professional Engineers.

Edward Haverberg, American Motors Corp.  
Thomas F. Hedglin, General Electric Co., X-ray department.

Karl H. Hinrichs, Harnishfeger Corp.  
John R. Joerg, Harley-Davidson Motor Co.

Myron E. Jolidon, Standard Oil Co.  
Herbert H. Koepke, Johnson Service Co.

John H. Kopmeyer, Wisconsin Ice & Coal Co.

Fred J. Ladwig, the Milwaukee Road.  
Richard D. Lutz, the Falk Corp.

Cyril V. McDonald, Froedtert Malt Corp.  
Franklin A. McVety, the Borden Co.

Walter E. Meyer, Plankinton Packing Co.  
Francis T. Murphy, Ladish Co.

Donald F. Possell, Nordberg Mfg. Co.  
Murdoch G. Pryor, Allen-Bradley Co.

James G. Reilly, Cutler-Hammer, Inc.  
Arnold W. Rosmann, Norris, FitzGerald & Russell.

Clarence R. Seybold, Smith Engineering Works.

Dorr C. Snoyenbos, AC Spark Plug, General Motors Corp.

Clarence J. Muth, manager, industrial safety division, Milwaukee Association of Commerce, 611 North Broadway, Milwaukee 2.

Program advisory committee:

Past chairmen, industrial safety division: 1954-57, John H. Kopmeyer, president, Wisconsin Ice & Coal Co.; 1958, Joseph F. Cairnes, president, Milwaukee Braves.

Past chairmen of school: 1950-52, Myron E. Jolidon, Standard Oil Co.; 1953-54, Erwin C. Brenner, Milwaukee Gas Light Co.; 1955-56, Michael F. Biancardi, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.; 1957-58, James G. Dickinson, Wisconsin Electric Power Co.

Reception and ushering committee: Chairman, Robert E. Gess, Employers Mutuals of Wausau; Edward L. Hanley, Wisconsin Society of Professional Engineers; Arnold W. Rosmann, Norris, FitzGerald & Russell Co.

#### SENATOR FULBRIGHT'S SPEECH OF MARCH 16 ON BERLIN, WEST GERMANY, AND RELATIONS WITH THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Washington Daily News of March 18 and the Washington Star of the same date there appeared two editorials on the speech delivered on Monday last by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. His speech was made on the floor of the Senate on the same day the President made his speech to the Nation. Both were very important; both were by responsible leaders. I hope that the speech made by the senior Senator from Arkansas has not been lost sight of, because I believe what he said is of the greatest importance. Furthermore, in view of the fact that he made the speech from his position as Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, what he said should be given every possible consideration.

Mr. President, it is well to point out that on the basis of the speech made by the Senator from Arkansas, the Soviet Union should be aware of three things:

First, the United States will make no separate "deals" with the Soviet Union.

Second, the United States will not be driven or enticed from Berlin or West Germany.

Third, the United States will not accept, even tacitly, any propositions designed to formalize the subjugation of the once-free satellite peoples.

Mr. President, the speech made by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas is a most important one. I hope all Senators will give it their most serious and most earnest consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that the two editorials which refer to the speech of the Senator from Arkansas be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Daily News, Mar. 18, 1959]

#### FULBRIGHT'S OFFER

President Eisenhower's address eclipsed an equally important—maybe more important—statement on the Berlin crisis by Senator FULBRIGHT, new Democratic chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The Senator offers the President the opportunity of Democratic-Republican cooperation not only in the immediate crisis but the long-range negotiations with the Russians. He endorses Ike's stand firm policy but puts the emphasis on what else is to be done while standing firm. He urges some hard thinking now on the German problem and relations with the Soviet as a whole.

Nikita Khrushchev should know well the three points on which the Senator says there is complete unity in this country:

The United States will make no separate deals with the Soviet Union.

It will not be driven or enticed from Berlin or West Germany.



It will not accept, even tacitly, any propositions designed to formalize the subjugation of the once-free satellite peoples.

If the Russians understand that, and respect it, the Senator said, there are some negotiable points. One of these is the disposition of East-West forces in Germany.

"It seems to me," he said, "that if both were to move back an equal distance—however slight the distance—the possibility of war, especially accidental war, would be reduced."

His condition for such a move is important—"under no circumstances \* \* \* except in return for a bona fide quid pro quo—in short, an agreement that would benefit the Western Allies at least as much as the Soviet Union."

His warning against expecting quick spectacular results is equally important—"it may be a matter of years rather than months before the Russians will extend a quid equal in value to our quo."

The nub of Senator FULBRIGHT's advice—keep strong, be patient and determined, and "chip away relentlessly at the encrusted Communist mixture of dogma, braggadocio, and fear."

One of the most unfortunate—and dangerous—events on the Washington scene these days is the continuing and running debate between the President and Congress over the adequacy of our military program. Both have constitutional responsibilities in this field—and both should be seeking a compromise for agreement rather than trying to win the argument.

The important thing about Senator FULBRIGHT's statement is that it offers a chance to prevent development of a similar controversy in the months ahead over our diplomatic policies.

The Fulbright statement alone is a major contribution to formation of a strong American diplomatic posture. It is now up to the President to take advantage of the opportunity offered—to combine the thoughts of the best minds in both parties for the diplomatic confrontations ahead this spring and summer with the Russians.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 18, 1959]

#### PRISONERS OF WORDS

Senator FULBRIGHT has addressed himself to a useful and timely point—the danger that our foreign policy may become the captive of words and slogans.

The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee is not in any sense an appeaser. Nevertheless, he thinks it may be possible to negotiate with the Russians and, as an example, he suggests the desirability of agreement on a mutual withdrawal of forces in central Europe. If this were done it might ease tensions and reduce the danger of an "accidental" war. But those who propose this kind of disengagement often are assailed as "appeasers." That this should be the case is not especially surprising. Given a certain kind of mentality, and a total lack of responsibility, it is easy to resolve such momentous things as the Berlin issue in terms of slurring words and half-baked phrases.

Senator FULBRIGHT's basic point is that we must not fall into the error of equating negotiations or disengagement with such words as "appeasement" and "retreat." To negotiate a settlement on a given point, assuming an acceptable quid pro quo, is neither an act of appeasement nor of retreat. And we must not permit the specialists in inective to shackle our freedom of action.

For one thing is certain. Our dispute with the Russians over Berlin and Germany is going to be settled by a war, which no sane person wants, or through a process of negotiation which will compose differences

without sacrifice of principle. This latter process will be difficult at best. It will become impossible if we let the catchword artists take us into camp.

#### ATOMIC POWER IN THE 86TH CONGRESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ANDERSON

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, all of us in the Senate admire the brilliant and outstanding leadership of the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] in the whole general realm of atomic energy. The Senator's knowledge in this field has been of value to our Nation and to the free world.

The Senator from New Mexico last night, March 18, to the National Capital Democratic Club, delivered a characteristically able, informative, and thoughtful address on the whole question of atomic energy in the 86th Congress. I ask unanimous consent that this outstanding address by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### ATOMIC POWER IN THE 86TH CONGRESS

(Speech before National Capital Democratic Club by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, March 18, 1959)

It is a pleasure to be with such a pleasant and sympathetic group this evening. I am sure that you appreciate, however, that I am not talking to you primarily as a partisan Democrat, but rather as the chairman of a joint committee that has in the main operated in a nonpartisan manner. Indeed, I was pleased to hear one of our senior minority members say recently that the joint committee was the least political of any congressional committee on which he had ever served.

I must admit with regret that ever since the AEC and the Budget Bureau injected politics into the atomic energy program via the infamous Dixon-Yates contract, there have been some political overtones on any atomic project involving the production of substantial quantities of electricity. I am glad to say that the Democratic majority of the joint committee, with some help from the minority, has kept the faith and sponsored a vigorous atomic power program.

#### SEVERAL APPROACHES TO PROBLEMS

There are several approaches I could take in discussing atomic power in the 86th Congress.

First of all, I might trace for you the laborious processes by which an atomic powerplant gets in an authorization bill, has money made available to it if the appropriation bill is passed and signed by the President, and then resumes the hazardous journey across the ice pursued, like Little Eva, by the bloodhounds of the Bureau of the Budget.

Or I could take a historical view and contrast the rosy predictions of what was supposed to happen when we unleashed the forces of private enterprise in 1954, and the current unhappy state of the atomic power industry where things are on dead center.

Another approach would be to trace the long and patient negotiations the Joint Committee and its staff have undertaken with the Atomic Energy Commission looking to an agreed program of accelerated reactor construction—thus far to little avail.

Or I could give you a chronology of the battles we have had with the Commission over the years, with a list of our victories and defeats.

And finally, I could outline for you the program I hope the Joint Committee will consider and report out for fiscal year 1960.

#### TWO KEY ISSUES

Tonight, however, I would like to analyze two key issues facing us in the 86th Congress which may perhaps give you a flavor of all these approaches. The issues which I will discuss are the plutonium and power issue and the gas-cooled reactor prototype issue, with possibly a few words about leadership and planning for the future.

As some of you may know, atomic reactors produce two principal products from the chain reaction in their uranium fuel. First, is the new element plutonium and second is large quantities of heat. The heat from these reactors can be utilized to make electric power, or it can be wasted by dumping it in the river, as the AEC now does with its single-purpose plutonium reactors at Hanford, Wash.

A whole speech could easily be devoted to the Hanford reactors and the fights they have generated over Government entrance into the power business. Let me devote a few minutes to the subject to show you the battles which have to be fought to advance the nuclear program.

Plutonium is a prime ingredient in atomic and hydrogen weapons, and we hope and believe that someday soon it can also be used as fuel in atomic powerplants.

#### FIGHT TO INCREASE PLUTONIUM PRODUCTION

The Democratic members of the Joint Committee have fought long and hard to increase plutonium production facilities, so as to be ready for added production which will be necessary when the small atomic weapons are developed. The Joint Committee was supported by the Army, Navy, and Air Force and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, going as far back as 1956 and 1957.

In 1958 Congress was finally able to authorize construction of a plutonium production reactor at the AEC Hanford installation, which included features by which the reactor could be converted to the production of large quantities of electric power—perhaps as much as 900,000 kilowatts.

For a time there were signs that the project would run into trouble—trouble traceable to the fact that the AEC and the administration did not want to see Government generating power.

The Commission, under Chairman McCone, proceeded with the design of the convertible plant. But AEC, on its own initiative, selected the Stone & Webster Co. to make a so-called technical and economical analysis of the convertible reactor. Stone & Webster, along with being good engineers, are noted particularly in the Northwest for their private power bias.

Sure enough, a few weeks ago the AEC sent us the Stone & Webster report and suggested that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy reexamine the economics of whether AEC should go ahead with the convertible features of the reactor.

#### CONGRESSIONAL ASSUMPTIONS REVERSED

It has been very difficult to wade through the tangled assumptions and statistics of the Stone & Webster report. Suffice it to say that they have reversed the assumptions used by the Congress in authorizing the plant, and have attempted to determine the economics of the cost of power from the reactor using an assumed cost of plutonium. After setting up this strawman, and rigging the costs with nonexistent interest and insurance charges, Stone & Webster proceeded to compare it with the cost of power

from the most efficient conventional plant which could be built near the load center.

It would not surprise you that Stone & Webster found this hypothetical conventional plant would produce power cheaper than the hypothetical dual-purpose reactor. They apparently never got around to seeing how cheap plutonium could be made from the reactor using the projected established value of power approved by the Federal Power Commission and the Bonneville Power Administration.

Also not taken into account was the fact that private and public utilities in the area recommended going ahead with the construction of the convertible reactor.

We squared away for a fight, but I have talked the problem over with Mr. McCone and I believe he takes a more reasonable attitude than Stone & Webster did. I have faith that the project will go ahead as Congress planned.

#### BUY-BACK PRICE MORE THAN DOUBLE

It is interesting to note, however, that AEC is moving right along on a proposed agreement with a foreign country for the procurement of plutonium. The Joint Committee has been informed that AEC proposes to pay the so-called weapons buy-back price for this plutonium, which is \$30 a gram instead of a price in the neighborhood of \$14 a gram which was the basis on which this foreign plutonium production has been financed.

Make no mistake about it. We are not talking about peanuts. We are talking about thousands of kilograms of plutonium, and over \$175 million of excess costs.

Last year AEC proposed essentially the same thing as an amendment to section 55 of our law in connection with the amendments on exchange of weapons information with NATO countries. Some of my colleagues and I objected that this was a stratum to permit the subsidization of our lagging private atomic program. Perhaps a bit of history would be appropriate. In a speech to the Washington Press Club on May 15, 1958, I stated:

"I have tried to be consistent on this score. When a briefing session was held at the White House in December 1957, I did not remain silent as the buy-back was discussed. On the contrary, I said frankly then to the President and to his assembled advisers that this proposal looked to me like an effort to bail out Walker Cislis and his Detroit Edison plant now under construction at Lagoona Beach, Mich. I smelled a mouse, and sure enough when the AEC testimony was given in January, it was made clear that the AEC planned to treat domestic producers of plutonium equally as well as it treated foreign producers. That meant a \$30 price to Detroit Edison for a 10-year period. Its project is still in trouble from a safety standpoint, and there are collateral financial questions. It is still locked in litigation. Yet I am convinced that the AEC Chairman, as in the Dixon-Yates controversy, hopes that some-day opposition from the Joint Committee will die down and that thereafter the \$30 price for plutonium may rescue Detroit Edison stockholders."

As a result of our objections last year, AEC reluctantly dropped the controversial section 55 amendments. Now this year once again AEC is coming up with what is apparently the same proposal, but with no amendments to authorize it. I have recently written a letter, dated March 13, 1959, to the AEC raising these policy and legal objections.

Here again we have the seeds of trouble. At first glance, it might appear that the administration worries about wasteful spending and its effect on a balanced budget while at the same time it subsidizes or bails out domestic and foreign power organizations. We could vigorously oppose such a program.

But we also must remember that we do not live alone in the world. Britain has been our oldest and most reliable ally. I hope we may assist her without prejudicing our domestic atomic energy program.

#### DOMESTIC POWER PROGRAM

So much for plutonium and its relation to power. Let us now turn for a few minutes to the program at home.

You will remember that there have been two basic atomic energy acts. One was the McMahon Act of 1946 taking atomic energy from the military and giving it to a civilian commission. The other was the Cole-Hickenlooper Act of 1954, adopted after long hearings and a tough floor fight, including some 13 days of Senate debate.

During the 1954 hearings the testimony to end the Government monopoly in atomic energy and turn private enterprise loose was both lengthy and eloquent. The vice president of General Electric said: "Congress has a tremendous opportunity to unleash the forces of free enterprise and in that way insure that we lead the world."

Well, we passed the bill, but it was a little like the dramatic plea that the Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek be unleashed so that he might invade the Chinese mainland. Chiang has been unleashed now for quite some time. But the mainland was never more secure. We unleashed a lot of power companies and if I wanted to be cynical, I might say that we unleashed them to let them make rather substantial financial errors.

#### GOVERNMENT FOOTS BILL

The forum memo of the Atomic Industrial Forum for March 1959, page 33, lists U.S. reactor costs based on AEC figures submitted to the joint committee. First on its list is Shippingport which is generating 60,000 kilowatts of electric energy but not due to the 1954 act. Shippingport, which is sometimes held up as a great example of private initiative at work, is an inspiring sight, as I can testify, having visited it just 1 week ago today. But Shippingport was started under the 1946 act and is a Government plant in that all but \$5 million on the nuclear end comes from the U.S. Treasury and some \$20 million for turbo-generation facilities from the Duquesne Power Co. The forum memo lists its 1959 costs at \$73,577,000, an increase of 38 percent over the original estimate. So you must remember that of that large sum only \$5 million represents the contribution of the private enterprise to the nuclear reactor proper.

I like the Shippingport plant. I like the fact that Admiral Rickover has put into Shippingport a lot of challenging ideas that eventually will bring us closer to competitive atomic power. I like the fact that he plans to step up its production pace to 10,000 kilowatts—maybe to 125,000 kilowatts, and eventually if all goes well to 150,000 kilowatts and even more. But this isn't private enterprise turned loose to run with the ball. This is your money and mine, the funds of the taxpayers of the United States invested in an attempt to see how much could be done under the McMahon Act of 1946 prior to the day that the forces of free enterprise were so dramatically unleashed. Perhaps this is why Shippingport is sometimes the object of a slander campaign designed to indicate that its power is expensive because it was Government-sponsored.

#### LOSSES SUBSTANTIAL

But let's take a peek at what happens when you unleash private enterprise in this field. Just outside of Chicago, Commonwealth Edison is building the Dresden plant. It is being built as a turnkey job to cost \$45 million, of which Commonwealth Edison puts up \$30 million and various other companies interest in research will put up \$15

million. But rumor has it that there may be some substantial losses on the \$45 million figure. In a talk with a manufacturing executive, I estimated the loss at \$15 million, and his reply was that I wasn't close to the final figure that General Electric—the builder of the plant for Commonwealth—will have to budget, that the loss will be much larger.

At Indian Point, N.Y., Consolidated Edison of New York is building a plant which will have a capacity of more than 200,000 kilowatts, not all of which will be atomic. The forum memo shows the original estimate as \$55 million. By 1958, the estimate reached \$90 million. More recent testimony was that the cost has been moved up to \$100 million. Only last week I got a private estimate that the cost will go far beyond that because not all the development has yet been done. The introduction of thorium has presented some perplexing problems, and the increase over the original estimate of \$55 million may more than double the original figure when all the expenses are totaled.

Many of us on the Joint Committee feared these increases and delays might happen and said: "Let the Government build the first generation plants. Let it test out the concepts and the theories. Let it find out how these devices perform, exactly as it did when, in the military reactors, we built a land-based prototype of the powerplant of the *Nautilus* and tried it out before we developed the plants for the *Nautilus*, the *Skate*, and the *Skipjack*."

#### GOVERNMENT AID NOT FORECAST

But every time we suggested the route of caution and the procedure of proving out the advance steps by Government construction, we were challenged to let private industry "go it alone."

When the Detroit Edison reactor was being considered, the Joint Committee was told: "We do not expect any financial appropriation to the project." Later on there was a suggestion that the Government finance some work in Government laboratories and thereby make a contribution to the project. But there followed these words: "If the Government is unwilling to make this contribution some of our scientists are willing to go it alone."

Let me use as an example the testimony of Charles B. Oakes, then President of the Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., in the 1956 hearings when the private utilities were doing their best to beat the Gore-Holfield bill.

"Industry" Mr. Oakes assured us, "is moving just as fast as it can \* \* \*. What I am saying here is that the public utility industry is prepared to do this job, and under those circumstances the Government of the United States should not intervene." Intervene? All the Government wanted to do was help—not hinder.

#### RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUNDS PROVIDED

Mr. Oakes, of course, was talking about private construction of a homogenous reactor to forestall AEC construction of such a plant. The fact remains that in 1958 Pennsylvania Power & Light was back asking for research and development money. Even though there had been rather adverse testimony a couple of years before, the joint committee reported out legislation authorizing the special research and development money and it was included in proper appropriation bills. After all that and within 4 or 5 months of our hearings, Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. gave up the project on financial and technical grounds. Can you imagine what would have been said about us if we had held back the money? That would, of course, have given aid and comfort to those who would have contended that we were trying to pass bills to put the Government in the business of constructi



these reactors when private industry was ready, willing, and able to do it.

I say that because members of the Joint Committee, particularly on the Democratic side, always have to face the charge that there is something a little socialistic about their zeal to have the Government build these experimental prototype reactors which we know are not commercially attractive or economically feasible. The former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the current Secretary of Commerce, Lewis Strauss, spoke on September 18, 1957, at the dedication of a research center for the U.S. Rubber Co., of which he was a director for a generation. He stressed the need for "faith in the preservation of our American system of free enterprise. This is the winning of the cold war that has been going on within our own country for years."

#### UTILITY CUSTOMERS PAY COSTS

"Make no mistake about it," said Admiral Strauss, "this threat is a serious one. There are people who are politically dedicated to the encouragement of socialist projects." I break in there to remind you that there will always be talk of socialism whenever the Government construction of prototype reactors, and even second generation reactors, is under consideration. That is what Admiral Strauss was shooting at, those of us who believe that it is no favor to Consolidated Edison of New York or its customers who in the end pay the costs of the Indian Point Reactor in their rate structures to have the project scheduled to cost \$55 million and have it in the end cost \$150 million. We don't think it is any favor to General Electric, Bechtel, and the other firms participating in the Commonwealth Edison reactor, to have a turnkey job at \$45 million which eventually costs \$75 million, and we don't think it is socialistic to say so, Mr. Strauss to the contrary notwithstanding.

I now go back to his statement: "There are people who are politically dedicated to the encouragement of socialist projects," says the admiral, "and their continual election to office evidences that public support exists for such misguided economics. Unless continually fought, the battle against socialism can be lost here within the United States. I do not think we have lost any recent ground to this doctrine." Admiral Strauss could say that in 1957 because we had not then held the election of 1958. But when the smoke had cleared away after the 1958 election, he could see what happened from Ohio to Wyoming, from Connecticut to California, a double amputation in the Republican Senators from West Virginia, all over the map where Republican candidates for Senate and House had to pay for the talk that Strauss and company threw into the 1958 campaign about socialism in atomic energy.

But I must return to Admiral Strauss and his speech: "I do not think we have lost any recent ground to this doctrine, but its proponents are vigorous, intelligent, ruthless, and indefatigable. If we intend to maintain the system that made us prosperous and great, we leave this sector undefended at our peril."

#### GAS-COOLED REACTOR CONSTRUCTION

What sector was he talking about? Well, I suppose he had in mind the proposal of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that, in addition to the plutonium reactor at Hanford required for our national defense, provision be made for the construction of a gas-cooled reactor. This is a long story, but you need to know a little of its history.

The Joint Committee, after considering gas-cooled reactor proposals since 1956, finally got a study project authorized in 1957 over AEC opposition.

The study was contracted to Kaiser-ACF and they prepared a design report. AEC then requested authorization of \$51 million of this type reactor for detailed design and

construction and it was included in the AEC authorization for fiscal 1959 on which hearings were held early in 1958.

At that time, during May and June 1958, there were rumors that a new combine would come forth and offer to build a high-temperature gas-cooled project to replace the Kaiser-ACF design. Time will not permit me to read page after page from the testimony developed June 4, 1958, but the conclusion of the spokesman of the AEC was that industry would not want to come in under the private demonstration program on a gas-cooled reactor, and a definite commitment for the Government to go ahead in case industry did not come in was then and there made.

#### DIFFERENT TYPES PROPOSED

On November 21, 1958, the last day under the law, a group of 52 utilities headed by Philadelphia Electric and including representatives of General Dynamics, submitted a proposal for a high-temperature gas-cooled prototype of a different design from the Kaiser-ACF type.

We do not plan a seminar on reactor design tonight, but I must spend a moment on these two ideas.

The British have gas-cooled natural uranium reactors now operating at Calder Hall. They are reasonably successful. Let's call them the first generation of the Calder Hall type.

The British are now building an advanced Calder Hall type, a second generation. It, too, is gas cooled but uses slightly enriched uranium. We see the British selling a nuclear plant to Japan, and we want to see our manufacturers and workmen have a chance for world business. So the Joint Committee made the proposals I have mentioned, and they led to the Kaiser-ACF studies.

But the British have a third Calder Hall type—a third generation. This is purely in the design stage there. It will use enriched uranium and work at higher temperatures, which should increase its efficiency. Many things about it remain to be tested, but it could give power costs nearly competitive in England with coal- and oil-fueled types, maybe actually so. We want to watch that closely, and General Dynamics, Philadelphia Electric, 51 other utilities and the AEC want to build it with the Government putting \$14½ million into its research and development and writing off \$8½ million more by the tax route, a total of \$23 million out of a total cost of just under \$40 million.

#### POWER GENERATION BASES ISSUE

Maybe we ought to build them both—the Kaiser-ACF design and the General Dynamics-Philadelphia Electric project—but it isn't just that simple. The AEC has talked of reducing the \$51 million already authorized for the Kaiser-ACF reactor to \$30 million, eliminating the prototype aspect by building it in a much more experimental manner, and leaving out all but a nominal amount of electric power. Simultaneously it would take \$14.5 million of the \$21 million so saved and give it to the General Dynamics-Philadelphia Electric Co. for research on its project which the British feel is a little too risky for them to construct now.

That is all there is to the controversy. Should the Government now go ahead and build the Kaiser-ACF experimental prototype as originally authorized by the Congress even though it has some power connected with it and might scare some private utility, or should it put the Kaiser-ACF study virtually on the shelf by making it far more experimental, and making sure that no power is generated which the Government might have to utilize in one of its installations?

I think the situation is easy to understand. The AEC did not get a proposal by Novem-

ber 21 for the construction of the type of reactor contemplated by the congressional act signed by the President. Never mind whether the General Dynamics-Philadelphia Electric proposal is good or bad. There still remains the obligation under the law to proceed. The General Counsel of the AEC on January 2, 1959 said that the General Dynamics-Philadelphia Electric proposal did not qualify under the criteria set forth in the law. Why did not AEC proceed on the Kaiser-ACF proposal that day, or the next, or the week following? Why are we—2 months later—stalled on dead center with the joint committee being asked to retreat from its former position, which it established only after three or four vigorous floor fights?

I understand that AEC may be undergoing a change of heart on the Kaiser-ACF concept. Apparently they may be willing to go ahead after all with the original project if we are willing to cut down on electric power production somewhat, and not call it a prototype. At this moment, we are not so concerned with semantics as we are with compliance with the law. Again, I have hope.

#### AEC PROGRAM "TIMID"

From what I have told you thus far, it should be clear that AEC moves slowly with Government construction of prototype atomic power plants. In lieu of such a program the Commission has proposed a continuation of its power reactor demonstration program, with increased financial assistance to private organizations. This type of program has lagged rather badly in the past, and the AEC program for 1960 of financial assistance for two or three small prototypes has been characterized by my colleague ALBERT GORE as being somewhat timid. CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman of our Subcommittee on Legislation, who is now known as the "First Chef" of our legislative kitchen, characterized the AEC program in the same vein.

I would like to emphasize that we aren't making these comments just to be critical. We are in dead earnest that U.S. leadership in atomic technology is in process of being seriously threatened. AEC estimates that by the end of 1963 we will have less than 1 million kilowatts of atomic power plants, whereas England will have three times that much. It appears that the Soviet Union will also have 2 million to 3 million kilowatts by that time with considerable diversity.

Moreover the pattern that is developing in the United Kingdom and the U.S.S.R. is in marked contrast to the program AEC is recommending here. In England in their expanded program, they are constructing large-scale reactors of up to 250,000 kilowatts per reactor and 600,000 kilowatts per station. In Soviet Russia they are also apparently constructing large reactors up to 200,000 kilowatts per reactor and 400,000 kilowatts per station.

What is the American public going to say about this situation if we find ourselves in 1963 a second or third rate competitor in the field of atomic power and technology? Where are the plants coming from after 1963? To exist then, they have to be put on the drawing boards in the next year or so.

#### THE 1960 PROGRAM

It is for the above reasons, plus the fact that our own energy needs will require atomic power in the 1970's as a supplement to conventional fuels, that some of us in the joint committee have supported an accelerated atomic power program. For fiscal 1960, in addition to the projects proposed by AEC, I believe we should consider the following projects:

1. AEC construction of 1 or 2 experimental power prototypes at AEC sites with the power to be absorbed at the site (these

projects might include a natural uranium-heavy water prototype and an organic prototype);

2. AEC support of 1 or 2 large-scale or intermediate-size second or third generation power plants under the power demonstration program utilizing differential construction grants on a trial basis;

3. Extension of the second round power demonstration program to include one or two small or intermediate-size second or third generation plants. (The plants under two and three might include boiling and pressurized water reactors.)

4. Authorization of several additional design studies of promising reactor types.

In addition to the civilian atomic power program, we shall of course be concerned with civilian ship propulsion reactors, the naval reactor program so ably directed by Vice Admiral Rickover, and the aircraft nuclear propulsion project which Mel Price and the rest of us would like to get off the ground.

#### LONG-TERM PLANNING

The problems and shortcomings I have discussed so far have been of a short term nature. They cover what is and should be happening in the next year or 2 or the next 5 or 10 years at the most.

But man does not live by bread alone. He has to dream, and indeed he has to plan and forecast ahead if he is to avoid his bread being overly radioactive.

I have felt for some time that the joint committee should sponsor a long range survey of advanced applications of atomic power for the period up to the year 2000. Such a survey would consider such advanced ideas as controlled thermonuclear power, the direct conversion of heat to electricity, atomic power for outer space propulsion, the utilization of solar energy, and the like. I hope to get this survey under way in the 86th Congress, and it may just possibly be the most productive effort we undertake.

#### NEED FOR LEADERSHIP

All of the problems and issues I have discussed with you revolve in one or another on the matter of leadership. The laissez faire system unleashed by Mr. Strauss in 1954 has not provided the results hoped for, and has been abandoned by the AEC. It remains to be seen whether the AEC-directed small prototype program can be successful. Their policy of inviting proposals in all cases from industry would seem to entail all the hassling and delays which have plagued the program in the past.

I hope the Commission and its new Chairman will see the light and try to get the program on the track again. We on the Joint Committee are anxious to cooperate in any way possible. But AEC must learn, as we have learned, that cooperation is a two-way street, and that there has to be some give as well as take.

In any event the Joint Committee, through its majority and, I hope, with the support of the minority, is ready in the 86th Congress once again to provide the leadership which is the biggest gap in the atomic power program of the United States.

#### AN INDEPENDENT SUPREME COURT

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, "We cannot permit the Supreme Court's independence to be undermined by direct or indirect assaults. Nor can we stand by and let the Court suffer for its declaration of some of the finest values in American life; for its recognition that the declared standards must be lived by; for the reaffirmation of the integrity of the individual; and that the State is required to treat its citizens with equality.

We should be proud to support and defend each additional step toward the day that man shall be judged in accordance with his intrinsic worth as a member of the family of God."

Mr. President, those sturdy words were used by a distinguished American lawyer, the Solicitor General of the United States, the Honorable J. Lee Rankin, in closing an excellent address on March 13 before the Pittsburgh regional meeting of the American Bar Association. Solicitor General Rankin's address is entitled, "An Independent Supreme Court." It ought to be read by the Members of the Congress; it ought to be read by the lawyers of America; indeed, it ought to be read and studied by all citizens. The excellent and vigorous logic with which the Solicitor General has courageously answered the intemperate abuse by some of the U.S. Supreme Court ought to invigorate and restore the faith in that venerable institution which it merits.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

#### AN INDEPENDENT SUPREME COURT

(Address by Hon. J. Lee Rankin, Solicitor General of the United States, before the Pittsburgh regional meeting of the American Bar Association, Pittsburgh, Pa., March 13, 1959)

If we did not have a Supreme Court today we would have to create one or our basic freedoms would rapidly disappear. But despite this fact a favorite sport of the day is to attack the Court. It is the target of a rare combination of dissident groups who have found common ground in their displeasure with decisions in their fields of special interest. Segregation is the particular rallying point at the moment but the complaints cover limitations on congressional power in congressional hearings,<sup>1</sup> restrictions on dismissal of Government employees in security programs,<sup>2</sup> prohibition against punishment by States for sedition directed against the United States,<sup>3</sup> denial of power to discharge an employee for claiming privilege against self-incrimination before congressional committees,<sup>4</sup> and determination that a State cannot draw unfavorable inferences from a mistaken but honest refusal to answer relevant questions in a proceeding for admission to the bar.<sup>5</sup>

It is not a new development to find the Court the center of such assaults. Throughout our history it has been near the storm center.<sup>6</sup> The very nature of its work requires it to pass upon questions of great sensitivity to interested groups of citizens. Since passions are easily aroused in such matters, a slight shift in course may move the Court out of the eye of the hurricane and precipitate it into the whirling vortex.

A brief reference to our history reveals periods of disenchantment with the Court by persons from various sections of the country. These complaints date back almost to the founding of the Union. When the Court held, in 1793, that a State could

be sued by a citizen of another State,<sup>7</sup> the States were aroused because many of them had outstanding obligations which were delinquent. Georgia's Legislature promptly prohibited collection of the judgment against it and the clamor subsided when the 11th amendment was passed to prevent any further suits against a State in Federal courts by citizens of another State, or a citizen of a foreign state.

In 1798 Virginia and Kentucky were stirred up by the alien and sedition laws, and anticipating that the Court would uphold the acts, Madison, and Jefferson and John Breckenridge, together, anonymously drafted the resolutions against the Court for the respective States.<sup>8</sup> In the Virginia resolution Madison made the first reference to the doctrine of interposition. There he expounded the idea that each party (the State and Federal Governments) had the power to judge for itself as to excesses in governmental action and to determine the measure of redress.

When the Court, in 1816, decided that it had the power to review the action of the supreme court of a State<sup>9</sup> there was little immediate reaction. However, between 1821 and 1862 there were at least 10 bills introduced in Congress to deprive the Court of such jurisdiction in whole or in part.

South Carolina defied the Federal Government and incidentally the Court with its nullification ordinance on November 24, 1832, specifically directed against the Tariff Act of 1828 after the decision in the second Cherokee case. Then it was disappointed when its native son, Andrew Jackson, did not take his part in the dispute. However, soon after that the legislature declared the tariff null and void and forbade Federal agents to collect it, and Jackson met this action by the Force bill of 1833 conferring protective jurisdiction on the Federal district courts and threatened to place warships in the port of Charleston. After a compromise tariff South Carolina withdrew its nullification statute.

It was not merely in the South or Border States that we find this opposition to the Court. In the North, in 1809, the Pennsylvania Legislature defied the Federal Court's ruling as to the ownership of a sloop claimed by the State.<sup>10</sup> The marshal was prevented by State troops from serving the process of the Court and the grand jury indicted the commander of the militia.

Madison's response to the Governor's letter was:

"The Executive of the United States is not only unauthorized to prevent the execution of a decree sanctioned by the Supreme Court of the United States, but is expressly enjoined, by statute, to carry into effect any such decree where opposition may be made to it."<sup>11</sup>

Although State troops were withdrawn, the general was convicted, but his sentence was remitted to 1 month by President Madison.

President Eisenhower expressed his recognition of the responsibility of the Chief Executive in a similar manner with regard to Little Rock.<sup>12</sup>

The War of 1812 with its embargo on shipping produced the same kind of anti-Union sentiments in New England that supported

<sup>7</sup> *Chisholm v. Georgia* (2 Dallas 419).

<sup>8</sup> "The Kentucky Resolutions of 1798," by Ethelbert Dudley Warfield, p. 163.

<sup>9</sup> *Martin v. Hunters' Lessee*, 1 Wheaton 304.

<sup>10</sup> *United States v. Judge Peters*, 5 Cranch 115.

<sup>11</sup> 11th Cong., 2d sess., 2269-2270.

<sup>12</sup> Nationwide radio-television speech, New York Times, Sept. 25, 1957, p. 14; telegram to Senator RUSSELL, New York Times, Sept. 29, 1957, p. 56; news conference, New York Times, Oct. 4, 1957, p. 8.

<sup>1</sup> *Watkins v. U.S.*, 354 U.S. 178.

<sup>2</sup> *Cole v. Young*, 351 U.S. 536.

<sup>3</sup> *Pennsylvania v. Nelson*, 350 U.S. 497.

<sup>4</sup> *Slochower v. Bd. of Education of N.Y.*, 350 U.S. 551.

<sup>5</sup> *Koenigsberg v. State Bar of California*, 353 U.S. 252.

<sup>6</sup> "Holmes, Collected Legal Papers," p. 292.



the South Carolinians in 1832 and in fact the first secessionists were the New Englanders. Conflicts became so bitter at times that Marshall indicated his discouragement in writing to his friend Story in 1832, saying:

"I yield slowly and reluctantly to the conviction that our Constitution cannot last. \* \* \* The Union has been prolonged thus far by miracles. I fear they cannot continue."<sup>13</sup>

Of all resistance movements the most violent reaction in the North was caused by the fugitive slave law and the Court's decisions relative to fugitive slaves.<sup>14</sup> The people were aroused by the convictions of abolitionists in Federal courts but these were nullified by habeas corpus proceedings in State courts. When the Court held the State courts were exceeding their authority,<sup>15</sup> the opinion was vigorously denounced.

At the time of the Dred Scott decision in 1857<sup>16</sup> the claim was made that the Court's action was one of the principal causes that brought on the Civil War. Many historians believe that that conflict was inevitable in view of the positions of the North and South but there is no question that the decision largely reduced the reputation and standing of the Court for many years. The effect was so substantial that in the period between 1860 and 1870 the independence of the Court was more seriously threatened than at any time since Jefferson. Historians now recognize that this result was in a considerable measure caused by the continuous assault on the Court that was maintained for 9 years before the decision, for the purpose of reducing its influence in the anticipated graver controversy over slavery.

The Civil War brought a brief respite during which the country was engrossed with that conflict. Shortly after the war was over, however, the Court proved to be a cohesive force and a conciliatory means when it held unconstitutional as bills of attainder and ex post facto laws both State and Federal test oaths of past loyalty as conditions to the practice of the professions.<sup>17</sup>

From this time on until recently the nature of the opposition shifted so that it came from groups having a common interest rather than from sections of the country. Organized labor fought against the labor injunction,<sup>18</sup> and during the New Deal in 1937 the Court-packing plan failed of enactment when the trend of Court decisions changed and public opinion did not support the plan.

This is a summary review of some of the storms that have beat about the Court prior to this one. The present high winds of opposition are probably one of the more violent attacks and the gale which started this was the segregation cases.

In considering those actions it is helpful to examine the choices open to the Court. The provision of the Constitution involved was the application of the following portion of the 14th amendment:

"Nor [shall any State] deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

What meaning was to be given this language in the context of these cases? Was it to be what the draftsmen had in mind

at the moment of adoption, and if so, who were the draftsmen? Or is the sense to be given it by those who have to make the determination today, under present conditions, but in the light of the broad purpose of the amendment? Was the interpretation one to be made in the light of the classic statement by Chief Justice Marshall: " \* \* \* it is a constitution we are expounding"?<sup>19</sup> And does that include applying it as a charter of government that is expected to last through the ages? If the latter is the correct application the Constitution must have an inherent ability to grow with the law.

Some parts of the Constitution deal with historical terms like "attainder of treason," "corruption of blood," "letters of marque and reprisal," and "infamous" as applied to crimes, and, therefore, we must seek their meaning in history. Others such as "due process of law," "regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States," and "the general welfare of the United States," and words like "liberty" and "property" express broad concepts and standards that cannot be so limited or confined but must be recognized as involving growth factors if the Constitution is to serve an evolving and dynamic country. For the Constitution to be a living organism we must assume that the meaning of its provisions shall be gained from "their origin and the line of their growth" as Justice Holmes said.<sup>20</sup> As Judge Hough said about the due-process clause, these expressions are of "convenient vagueness."<sup>21</sup> They require the Court to put meaning into the Constitution and not to take it out.

Obviously, the significance of such an approach to interpretation is vital to our national development. It is a mere formality. Such constructions are quite distinct from mathematical formulas which have their essence in their form.

Turning again to the amendment it is clear that the language—equal protection of the law—was born out of the concern for elimination of racial discriminations.<sup>22</sup> It was developed primarily to meet anticipated State action that was expected to be discriminatory because of race. Any interpretation that was to have validity would have to recognize this basic consideration. In addition, the amendment as it applied to racial discriminations had had a significant line of growth when the segregation cases reached the Court.

It had already been recognized that although service on a jury was a duty rather than a privilege, it was within the clause.<sup>23</sup> Municipal zoning laws on a racial basis, while providing equally for exclusion of whites from Negro sections of a community and colored from white areas had been forbidden.<sup>24</sup> The Court had held that under the 15th amendment in primary elections there must be a nondiscriminatory suffrage despite the claim that primaries were private affairs and not State activity.<sup>25</sup> And when education was examined in a group of cases where colored persons sought entry into State-supported universities, it was determined that they were entitled to admission and the petitioners were within the equal

protection guarantee.<sup>26</sup> In each of the latter cases it was accepted by the Court and the parties, including the State concerned, that the educational provisions made by the State had to meet the requirements of due process of law and equal protection of the laws declared by the 14th amendment. It was not seriously thought or believed that because education is primarily a State responsibility, it could be carried on in a manner contrary to the 14th amendment. For otherwise even the so-called separate but equal doctrine would have been an infringement on State rights.

Each of these cases was earnestly and strenuously contested and although the result may now seem to have been clearly indicated, the outcome at the time was not obvious. However, the development of the equal protection doctrine was manifest to the careful observer.

When the segregation cases reached the Court, three lines of decision were open to it. One was to apply the old separate but equal doctrine and declare in 1954 that segregation by law was consistent with the national understanding of legal equality. But in any event such an application of the rule would require that it first be reexamined under the theory that interpretations of the Constitution are not automatically foreclosed by stare decisis. This principle is based on the assumption that such holdings cannot be readily corrected by the legislature and should be reexamined from time to time in the light of later experience, greater wisdom, and understanding.

It can hardly be assumed that such a construction would have been accepted by the Nation even if some way could have been found to reconcile it with the decisions referred to. The conscience of a great people could not be denied so easily. It is also difficult to imagine how we could have justified such a judgment to the peoples of the world after repeated claims that under our law citizens have equal rights and that we have no second-class citizenry.

A second approach would have been to say that the cases involved a political question to be determined by the Congress under its power to legislate as provided in the amendment. This course would not only be evasive but also would have been a sharp departure from the practice of the Court in 14th amendment cases. It would, in addition, have been contrary to the established law, since for 75 years Congress had left it to the Court and the Court had undertaken to develop the content of the equal protection clause.<sup>27</sup>

The third solution is the one the Court followed.<sup>28</sup> It is assumed the responsibility, applied the experience it had and the developed law and concluded that since "education is perhaps the most important function of State and local governments" and the "very foundation of good citizenship" where the State undertakes to provide it, the "right \* \* \* must be made available to all on equal terms." It proceeded to declare that separation of children in the educational process from others of their own age and qualifications "because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone." The Court concluded by saying that "Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal," and are in viola-

<sup>13</sup> *M'ulloch v. Maryland*, 4 Wheat. 316, 407.

<sup>14</sup> *Gompers v. U.S.* (233 U.S. 604, 610).

<sup>15</sup> 32 "Harvard Law Review," 218.

<sup>16</sup> Slaughter-House cases (16 Wall. 36, 71); *Strader v. West Virginia* (100 U.S. 303, 306-307); *Virginia v. Rives* (100 U.S. 313, 318); *Ex Parte Virginia* (100 U.S. 339, 344-345); *Maxwell v. Dow* (176 U.S. 581, 592).

<sup>17</sup> *Ex Parte Virginia* (100 U.S. 339).

<sup>18</sup> *Buchanan v. Warley* (245 U.S. 60. See also

*Shelley v. Kramer* (334 U.S. 1, 23).

<sup>19</sup> *Nixon v. Herndon* (273 U.S. 536, 541); *Smith v. Allwright* (321 U.S. 649).

<sup>20</sup> *Missouri ex rel. Gaines v. Canada* (305 U.S. 337); *Sipuel v. Board of Regents* (332 U.S. 631); *Sweatt v. Painter* (339 U.S. 629); *McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents* (339 U.S. 637).

<sup>21</sup> See notes 22-25, *supra*, pp. 8-9.

<sup>22</sup> *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347, U.S. 483.

<sup>13</sup> Warren, "The Supreme Court," vol. 2, p. 229.

<sup>14</sup> *Prigg v. Pennsylvania*, 16 Pet. 539; *Jones v. Van Zandt*, 5 How. 215.

<sup>15</sup> *Abelman v. Booth*, 62 U.S. 506.

<sup>16</sup> 9 How. 393.

<sup>17</sup> *Cummings v. Missouri*, 4 Wall. 277; *Ex Parte Garland*, 4 Wall. 333.

<sup>18</sup> *New Negro Alliance v. Sanitary Grocery Co.*, 303 U.S. 552, 559-563; *United States v. Hutcheson*, 312 U.S. 219, 235-236.

tion of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment.

The Court was unhurried in arriving at its decision and the disposition of the cases. It requested two arguments and extensive briefs before it arrived at the unanimous determination that separate public schools because of race was a violation of the equal protection clause. Additional argument was had before the Court proceeded to the decree stage.<sup>29</sup> In the relief ordered it carefully provided for the local Federal courts to pass upon proposed plans for desegregation according to equitable principles. It directed the lower courts to require a prompt and reasonable start and after that provided that they might find some delay necessary when it was affirmatively shown to be required in good faith compliance. The lower courts were instructed that with regard to allowing additional time they might consider problems relating to the physical condition of the school plant, the school transportation system, personnel, revision of school districts, and attendance areas into compact units to achieve a system of determining admission to the public schools on a nonracial basis and revision of local laws and regulations which may be necessary in solving those problems.

The courts were also directed to enter such orders and decrees as were necessary and proper to admit to public schools on a racially nondiscriminatory basis the children involved in the cases with all deliberate speed. They were enjoined not to allow the "vitality of these constitutional principles \* \* \* to yield simply because of disagreement with them."

Much speculation has resulted as to what the Court intended by the expression "with all deliberate speed." It was not the first time that that phrase had been used by the Court, since it had been relied upon in other cases. The phrase "with all deliberate speed" did not originate, of course, in the opinion of May 31, 1955. This classic phrase, derived from the English courts of chancery, is traditionally used by courts of equity in fashioning decrees to meet the needs of justice in cases before them where flexibility and adaptability to varying circumstances are required.<sup>30</sup>

Thus the Court demonstrated thorough study and reflection, a keen appreciation of the sensitivity of the issues, and a thoughtful selection of a plan for their solution. There was nothing precipitate about its action although there could also be no uncertainty about its conclusions or the relief that was accorded under the Constitution.

Let us turn now to the problems of implementation. Actions in Little Rock, *Aaron v. Cooper*,<sup>31</sup> proceedings and developments in Virginia,<sup>32</sup> are common knowledge which we all obtained from the daily press. Recent count discloses that out of some 2,800 school districts which were segregated prior to the *Brown* decision about 800 are either partially or entirely desegregated. There still remains many areas where nothing has been done.

I would not suggest that desegregation will be accomplished by positive law alone. But there are other powerful forces at work. Religious groups have generally taken positions actively supporting desegregation on moral grounds. Business and other economic in-

terests are showing alarm at the adverse effects experienced and anticipated as to industrial and economic growth and development in areas of resistance. Citizens generally have become fearful of the possibility of attempts to destroy public education as a countermeasure and all that that prospect means to a community. Youth is demonstrably ready to adjust quickly to the necessary changes in most cases.

All of these groups acting with good will are at work outside the area of mere law to try to achieve as easy a transition as possible. There is confirmation in experience that compliance does produce a successful change-over and may, in improving the Negroes' status and self-respect, eliminate other problems.

However, the people with the greatest interest in and influence upon, and to be sure the largest stake in the successful resolution of this issue according to law, are southerners. They cannot afford to abandon the phenomenal progress the South has made in recent years—a modern industrialization that is only partially achieved. In the competition between various sections of the country for people, investments and business growth the South cannot be content to abandon the program that it has undertaken along with the rest of the Nation to train its people for their greatest capabilities as well as the responsibilities of citizenship, in a system of public schools.

The leaders of the South who have vision and wisdom will keenly appreciate that regardless of its wealth in natural resources, incomparably the greatest assets of the area are the children, both white and black, who with or without the educational experience which is their due will be the citizens of tomorrow. It is difficult even to imagine at this late date in the 20th century the abyss into which a community could sink if it failed to provide public education within its means, to develop its citizens to their full capacities.

The whole problem also cries out for assistance from those not directly involved. The men and women courageously engrossed in the effort to implement these decisions need moral support and leadership. And in this vital task the bar can play an important part. Others must have an awareness of the grave difficulties involved in such a fundamental break from past practices and that it requires an active encouragement of all genuine and peaceful action for its achievement. Success will demand a realization of how necessary the change is to the preservation and progress of the South, and in addition, and, in at least like degree, a warm-hearted sympathy for the suffering necessarily involved in the tearing out and replacement of such a deep-rooted custom.

However, returning to the Court, we must be vigilant that we guard against the indirect effects upon its independence by the current onslaught. Independence is primary in the administration of justice and we can never be too watchful in protecting it. We would be shocked to learn that the Court had been reached by bribes or other approaches by interested parties either within or outside the Government, but long continued, public attacks may cause an even more serious damage to the Court although it be an insidious and indirect effort to affect its judgment.

Justice gains her sustenance from a serene confidence that truth revealed will ultimately prevail. In examining the Court's work we lawyers readily forget that the public tends to equate law with morality. But any careful study reveals that censure is often directed at the Court for its sensitivity to the protection of the rights of the individual and its recognition in effect that moral principles are involved. But, may I

suggest that that is one of its principal and indispensable functions. Our Constitution was conceived as an instrument to not only establish a government but to put into writing certain guaranteed rights of the people. Many of the amendments were adopted so as to further reinforce and make explicit that purpose. Obviously the Court would do us a great disservice if it tended to interpret those rights away.

These are heroic times and man is engaged in a period of not only historic thoughts, but orbital enterprises. From medieval times when he dreamed of the lunar system he has progressed to where he now plans to make a trip to the moon. His opportunities and prospects in almost all fields of endeavor are on a comparable scale. His knowledge of fissionable materials vastly increases his power to do good or evil. With such rapid developments involving great aggregations of capital, associations of labor and huge government, the individual never needed more the protection of his freedom by an independent Court.

Our profession has special knowledge and should have singular understanding of the very difficult questions the Court is called upon to decide, almost continuously. I urge you when you consider and then comment upon the Court's decisions that you keep before your mind's eye the protection that there is for individual rights in our opportunity to appear before the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States in their defense. As Justice Brandeis said: "What we must do in America, is not to attack our judges but to educate them." That principle especially applies to all those who purport to be learned in the law.

The layman cannot fully realize how much the Court means to the preservation of his freedoms and his fundamental rights. But we who labor in the law know that our responsibility for the defense of the Court is therefore incomparably greater. We cannot permit the Supreme Court's independence to be undermined by direct or indirect assaults. Nor can we stand by and let the Court suffer for its declaration of some of the finest values in American life; for its recognition that the declared standards must be lived by; for the reaffirmation of the integrity of the individual; and that the State is required to treat its citizens with equality. We should be proud to support and defend each additional step toward the day that man shall be judged in accordance with his intrinsic worth as a member of the family of God.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S DECISION TO IMPOSE OIL IMPORT QUOTAS CAN IMPERIL RELATIONSHIPS WITH CANADA

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to add my voice to the protests being made against President Eisenhower's decision to impose oil import quotas. I also desire to emphasize an additional reason why the decision of the President is highly unwise.

This decision complicates our already delicate relations with our closest ally, Canada. We of the Pacific Northwest are extremely conscious of these relationships. We share with Canada the continent's major source of hydroelectricity, the Columbia River. We are dependent on friendship with Canada to use that mighty river in the economic interest of both nations. Canada could divert the Columbia, which would be disaster to us.

<sup>29</sup> *Brown v. Board of Education*, 349 U.S. 294.

<sup>30</sup> *Virginia v. West Virginia*, 222 U.S. 17, 20.

<sup>31</sup> *Aaron v. Cooper*, 358 U.S. 1.

<sup>32</sup> *School Board of City of Norfolk v. Beckett, et al.*, 260 F. 2d F. 18, — F. 2d —; *Allen v. County School Board of Prince Edward County*, 249 F. 2d 462, — F. 2d —; *Warden et al. v. Richmond School Board*, — F. 2d —; *Kilby et al. v. County School Board of Warren County*, — F. 2d —.



Yet, the administration has disturbed and offended Canada by imposition of oil import embargoes. Already the Canadian Government has expressed grave concern over the action of our Government. Do we not jeopardize mutual use with Canada of the great Columbia, Yukon, and St. John Rivers when our Government takes action which cripples Canada's oil industry?

I ask unanimous consent to have printed with my brief remarks a thoughtful and vigorous editorial from an independent Republican newspaper, the Oregonian of Portland, for March 12, 1959, which, likewise, protests against the President's imposition of quotas and bans on oil imports. The title of the editorial is "Ike Takes Sides On Oil."

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

#### IKE TAKES SIDES ON OIL

With his new order controlling oil imports to this country, President Eisenhower has taken sides on a most controversial question involving the proper use of America's petroleum resources. He has allied himself with those who would accelerate the development of our own domestic oil reserves, as opposed to those who would let much of America's oil lie underground while taking advantage of the opportunity—which may not always be with us—to bring in oil from the Middle East, South America and Canada.

There are good arguments on both sides of this debate. The President evidently was most impressed by those who told him unlimited imports of cheap foreign oil were hurting the independent oil producers in Texas, Oklahoma and California. If there is no incentive to search for new oil fields in this country, he was told, the Nation might be in a dangerous situation if war suddenly should shut off oil imports. Also, the U.S. coal industry has been hit hard by competition from foreign oil for industrial furnaces.

On the other hand, resource conservationists believe it makes sense to save America's oil for a rainy day. They are joined in this by large, international oil companies which have heavy investments in foreign oil fields and tanker fleets. There is the delicate matter, too, of diplomatic relations with the oil-producing countries. Cutting down their income from oil sales to us won't help our popularity in Canada and Venezuela.

While the President's order cuts crude imports about 25 percent, it slashes the import of gasoline and other refined products more sharply. This may have a considerable effect on gasoline prices, which already are showing an upward trend despite heavy stocks of gasoline now in storage. Producers say recent wage increases for refinery employees, plus the extra cost of turning out the higher octane fuels needed for modern auto engines, mean an inevitable rise of a half cent to a cent-and-a-half a gallon at the service station pump this spring. If refiners must use higher-priced domestic oil, this will add another inflationary factor. Yet motorists already are unhappy about the existing gasoline price level.

President Eisenhower's proclamation says he has directed the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization to keep an eye out for price increases, and inform the President "whether such increases are necessary to accomplish the national security objectives of the proclamation."

The response to the President's decision has been just as one would expect. Congressmen from States with oil and coal fields have hailed it. Spokesmen for oil companies

with heavy import programs have been critical of it. If the cost of running the family car and heating the family house goes up because of the President's order, he may hear an expression of opinion from the public that he has picked the wrong side of the argument.

#### AMBASSADORIAL APPOINTMENTS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, like Will Rogers, all I know is what I read in the newspapers. I read a little squib in a local paper which reports on a meeting in Washington of the Workshop for Religious Liberals. I cannot mention the gentleman's name who made the speech quoted, because he is a member of another very distinguished deliberative body, but I notice in discussing politics as usual, he is quoted as saying:

Under "politics as usual," (he) accused the administration of selling ambassadorships for campaign contributions filling the State Department with "incompetent schedule C political appointees"—

And so forth. I shall ask to have the clipping printed in the RECORD, Mr. President, but I thought I ought to make a comment or two regarding it.

Mr. President, ever so often when a noncareer ambassador is appointed and generously publicized, it has become a favorite indoor sport to place the emphasis on the appointee's wealth, if he is wealthy, and make it appear that this standing by itself is a disqualification for foreign service.

If that were true, one would be compelled to conclude with respect to those appointed under prior administrations that they also were disqualified and were mere political appointees who were favored because of contributions to the party.

I believe the record will show that in 1936 diplomatic appointees contributed \$170,575 to the Democrat Party coffers and contributed \$74,337 to the committee in 1944.

I allude to the matter because the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT] did say that—

Some (of) our ambassadorial appointments have not been up to the standard that should be maintained if our interests abroad are to be fully promoted.

It is, therefore, well to look at the record; and I believe it is quite outstanding under this administration.

There are a greater number of career diplomats serving in key positions today than ever before, and that is not only true of our missions abroad, but in the State Department as well. Of the 18 statutory State Department positions requiring Senate confirmation, 10 are filled by career persons and 8 by noncareer appointees.

An examination of the noncareer diplomatic appointments indicates that in this group also persons of high caliber and competence have been selected.

Four have served in Congress. They are Richard Wigglesworth, of Massachusetts, with whom I served on the House Committee on Appropriations, who is now our Ambassador to Canada; Walter C. Ploeser, of Missouri, with whom I served in the House, who is now our Am-

bassador to Paraguay; John D. Lodge, with whom I served in the House, now our Ambassador to Spain; and Clare Boothe Luce, with whom I also served in the House, who has served with distinction in Italy and is the President's appointee as our Ambassador to Brazil.

Let us consider other noncareer appointees also, and take note of the number who have had previous diplomatic or other experience to qualify them for the service which they now render.

The list includes David Bruce, Ambassador to Germany, who served in that capacity as our representative in Paris; Joseph S. Farland, our Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, who was a former Military Governor in Korea; Walter Howe, our Chilean Ambassador, who was director of our Economic Mission there before appointment as Ambassador; Amory Houghton, now serving in Paris, who was Deputy Chief of Mission for Economic Affairs during World War II.

Ambassador James M. Langley in Pakistan was chairman of our trade negotiations with the Philippines in 1954.

John Hay Whitney, Ambassador to Great Britain, was special adviser on public affairs to the Secretary of State before he became Ambassador.

Philip Young, representing us in the Netherlands, discharged high responsibilities in the Office of Lend Lease of the Foreign Economic Administration.

James D. Zellerbach, our Ambassador to Rome, had a splendid record as chief of our economic mission in Italy.

Robert Hill was our Ambassador to Costa Rica and El Salvador before he was sent to represent the United States in Mexico City. I think nearly every Member of the Senate knows of the real diplomatic attainments of Bob Hill.

Francis White, our Ambassador to Sweden, was for many years a career Foreign Service officer, and was once Ambassador to Mexico. Ambassador Philip Crowe, appointed to represent us in the Union of South Africa was former Ambassador to Ceylon and also served in China.

Ellsworth Bunker, our Ambassador to India, served in the Argentine and also in Italy.

Thomas E. Whelan has been Ambassador to Nicaragua since 1951.

Then there is a person we affectionately know as "Whitey" Willauer. His given name is Whiting Willauer. He was with the Foreign Economic Administration before appointment as Ambassador to Honduras.

Richard L. Jones was formerly director of the FOA Mission in Liberia before becoming Ambassador.

Val Peterson served as Governor of Nebraska and Administrator of Federal Civil Defense before appointment as Ambassador to Denmark.

Henry J. Taylor had a distinguished record as a foreign correspondent, I think for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, and then as a businessman, before assignment to Switzerland.

Scott McLeod, who is presently in America, since we have been honored by a visit of the President of Ireland, had broad experience as an assistant to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and in the FBI, and also in the

State Department, before appointment as Ambassador to Ireland.

I believe an examination of the background of these appointees indicates that they have the experience, the competence, and the broad qualifications which meet the high standards set by this administration for service abroad.

That many of them are Republicans certainly does not argue that they are not dedicated to the country and its best interests.

So, Mr. President, I simply say that if anyone wants to look at the record, I am only too glad to cite the record and compare it with the record of appointees in prior administrations. I believe it can be said that the Eisenhower administration has performed notable service to the country by securing the best available talent for service abroad in the interest of people and good will.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the clipping to which I referred, as well as an article written by Peter Edson, published in the February 13, 1959, issue of the Washington Daily News, under the rather intriguing caption, "GOP Control Slim on State Appointees."

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

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

REPRESENTATIVE REUSS HITS POLITICAL PRACTICES

A Democratic Congressman from Wisconsin, HENRY S. REUSS, told a religious meeting yesterday that the United States should give up two luxuries: Economics as usual and politics as usual.

REUSS spoke at the final session of a 3-day National Workshop for Religious Liberals, at All Souls' Church (Unitarian), 16th and Harvard Streets NW.

By economics as usual, he said he meant "5 million unemployed, one-fourth of our productive capacity at a standstill, and an annual growth rate in our economy of only 2 percent, compared to 8-10 percent in the Soviet Union."

Under politics as usual, REUSS accused the administration of selling ambassadorships for campaign contributions filling the State Department with incompetent schedule C political appointees, and insincerity in carrying out the reciprocal trade program.

"We kick low foreign bidders in the face," he said, "when a Republican senatorial candidate says his election depends on giving the contract to an American high bidder."

[From the Washington Daily News, Feb. 13, 1959]

GOP CONTROL SLIM ON STATE APPOINTEES  
(By Peter Edson)

Much malarkey is being spread around on the question of State Department political appointees.

The underlying fact of the situation is that the Republicans still have only a slim control over the State Department, though they have been in office 6 years.

ONLY A FEW

Of the 18 top policymaking jobs in the Department organization chart, the Republicans can claim only enough to count on one hand of a normal five-fingered child:

Secretary Dulles, Acting Secretary Christian A. Herter, Under Secretary C. Douglas Dillon, Assistant Secretary for Congressional

Relations William B. Macomber and Legal Adviser Wallace Becker.

Below this top rank you have to get down to the fourth level of hierarchy before you find other Republicans. Then only two are easily identifiable. They are:

Administrator of Security and Consular Affairs John W. Hanes and Deputy Assistant for International Organization Horace E. Henderson.

The other 12 out of 18 top officials in State are career diplomats like Under Secretaries Robert Murphy and Loy W. Henderson. All of them will give you an argument that they are nonpartisan, professional foreign service officers interested only in their country's welfare.

TWO HUNDRED AND EIGHTEEN KEY POSTS

In the entire State Department organization of nearly 35,000 employees, there are 218 key policy making jobs. Foreign Service officers now hold 173 of them.

The other 45 "C" classification confidential jobholders are hard to identify politically. But GOP headquarters says they are by no means all Republicans.

Ambassadorships divide about the same way. There are now 77 ambassadorial and three ministerial posts with two vacancies. The 78 filled positions divide 56 Foreign Service officers and 22 non-career political appointees. Nineteen of the latter identifiable as Republicans.

Every ambassadorial and every other presidential appointee is cleared at Republican National Committee headquarters on a pink sheet. It gives his political endorsement before the appointment goes through. This constitutes a veto power in fact, if not in name.

CHARLES M. RUSSELL, MONTANA'S CONTRIBUTION TO STATUARY HALL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, March 17th was a great day for the Irish, but today is a great day for all Montanans and the Treasure State.

Mr. President, this afternoon we are unveiling our first contribution to Statuary Hall here in the U.S. Capitol. As many Senators know, the man being honored is Montana's cowboy artist, Charles M. Russell.

I am delighted to see the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] in the Chamber. Charles M. Russell came up the Missouri River by flatboat from his native State of Missouri.

Recently I received a copy of a poem, entitled "Lasting Footprints," by Charles A. Shrewsbury, of Buffalo, Mont. This poem was brought to my attention by Mr. Mont Davey, a former Montanan, who now lives in the State of Illinois.

In honor of this occasion, I ask unanimous consent to have this poem printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

LASTING FOOTPRINTS

(By Charles A. Shrewsbury, Cowboy Poet, Buffalo, Mont.)

From the rugged Rocky Mountains  
To the Bear Paws standing by  
To the Little Big Horn River  
Where with Custer brave men lie

Where the Crow fought with the Piegans  
And the warring Blackfeet dwell  
Lies the range that Russell rode  
And Brother Van served well

Dauntless men of kindred spirit  
As through life's full course they ran  
Purses lean but ever open

For each loved his fellow man

Russell seeking high adventure  
Made of life a gay romance  
Quite content to leave the future  
To the laws of fate or chance

Brother Van sought not a fortune  
Nor cared he for great acclaim  
He was here to spread the Gospel  
In his Holy Maker's name

Often they would meet in passing  
In those days of pioneers  
Made a friendship that well fostered  
Grew and flourished through the years

Welcomed by the half wild redman  
To their hunt and to their play  
Russell put them in his paintings  
Brother Van taught them to pray

While the cowboy rode the ranges  
With the punchers of the land  
Idly painted for their pleasure  
Anything that came to hand

Vividly he told the story  
While they laughed around the fire  
Of the bronc that came to breakfast  
And aroused the camp cook's ire

Waiting for the first Chinook  
Starting night guard in the rain  
Cowboys shooting up the town  
Wagon trains upon the plain

Men still boast, that rode with Russell  
Bent with age and beard grown gray  
How they watched him make these paintings  
Of that lonely frontier day

Sparing not, the gay young puncher  
Of the skill that he possessed  
To perpetuate forever  
The drama of the West

His pictures hang in hallowed halls  
His name we eulogize  
He has left a cherished treasure  
For posterity to prize

We owe a debt we can't repay  
To kindly Brother Van  
For the years he freely gave  
To help his fellow man

When lonely men dropped in to hear  
His friendly spoken word  
To aid a fellow man in need  
Would be his great reward

The people all loved Brother Van  
And soon a way was found  
To build a church of logs or sod  
To spread the word around

Outlaws, thieves and gamblers  
Were often gathered there  
Though some wore notches on their guns  
All joined him in prayer

The many schools and churches  
That the brother helped to build  
We cherish in his memory  
He has seen his dream fulfilled

Two great men with different visions  
Each has given of his best  
Left his footprints in his passing  
Deeply graven in the West.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I extend a personal and warm invitation to every Member of the Senate to be in the rotunda of the Capitol at 3:45 o'clock this afternoon, at which time we shall honor the greatest of all Montanans, and, in many respects, one of the great Americans of all time.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.



Mr. SYMINGTON. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Montana. We in Missouri are just as proud of Charles M. Russell as are the people of Montana; and I look forward to the ceremony.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

#### STRANGULATION OF THE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the benefits of the national school lunch program to the school children of our Nation are very well known.

Since its inception, the school lunch program has received bipartisan recognition and support.

But we now find that this program faces fiscal strangulation, unless the Congress takes positive action.

The President's 1960 budget recommendation calls for a cut of nearly one-third—\$45 million—in the funds available for the school lunch program during the 1959 and 1960 school year.

Obviously this recommendation completely disregards the needs of this important program.

The House Appropriations Committee is scheduled to begin hearings next week on the 1960 appropriations for the school lunch program.

The Senate Appropriations Committee will begin consideration of this matter early next month.

The plight of the school lunch program is very ably presented in a letter from Mr. Earl M. Langkop, director of the Missouri school lunch program, and this year's chairman of the legislative committee of the American School Food Service Association.

In order that all Members of Congress have an opportunity to read Mr. Langkop's clear and conclusive statement, I ask unanimous consent that his letter of March 5 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,  
DIVISION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS,  
Jefferson City, Mo., March 5, 1959.

HON. STUART SYMINGTON,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SYMINGTON: As State director of the school lunch program, I feel that it is my duty and responsibility to the school children in Missouri to keep our national Representatives informed on matters dealing with Federal legislation, particularly with reference to the national school lunch program.

During each of the past several years it has been my unpleasant task to report to school administrators about this time of the year that Federal funds appropriated for the school lunch program are again inadequate to provide continuing reimbursement throughout the school year, even though our reimbursement rate has been reduced to 4 cents. At the time the National School Lunch Act was passed, sufficient funds were appropriated at the national level to permit reimbursement at the rate of 9 cents for all type A lunches served in Missouri. Program expansion, over the years, on a nationwide basis has increased by 225.7 percent. During this same period, however, Federal appropriations have increased by only 23.5 percent.

This accounts for the main reason we have had to reduce our reimbursement down to 4 cents for type A lunches and discontinue completely reimbursement for type B and type C lunches. Even with our reimbursement decreased to 4 cents during this school year, we now find ourselves in a position where our available funds for type A lunches to be served this year will be less than 4 cents.

We are deeply grateful for your personal action in connection with the appropriation last year and for the action taken by our national Representatives nationwide in authorizing an appropriation in excess of the amount recommended by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. We were also very much encouraged by the congressional transfer of section 32 funds, which we felt would assist in narrowing the gap between increasing enrollments and participation and Federal appropriations for the national school lunch program. We were of the opinion at that time that this additional help would permit us to at least continue our limited reimbursement throughout the 1958-59 school year.

We now find that a further increase in participation has completely absorbed the additional funds appropriated, and we are in the same financial position as we were a year ago. Our schools in Missouri have been notified that, due to increased enrollments and a further participation gain, our allocation of Federal funds will become exhausted with the payment of April claims.

It is difficult for us to believe that the Congress, in passing the National School Lunch Act, intended that such a situation should develop. Section 2 of the act sets forth the very laudable purposes for which Federal aid was to be provided, and the wording in this section certainly implies that expansion of the program was desired. Section 3 of the act authorizes the Congress to appropriate such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the act. Section 7 establishes the basis upon which the States and local districts were to match the Federal funds as the program expanded. We feel that this section very definitely carries the implication that it was the intent of Congress that the necessary Federal funds would be provided as the program expanded, so long as the State and local communities carried their full share in matching the Federal contribution. There can be no question that the States have met this responsibility. In fact, in our own State last year these contributions reached the point of matching the Federal dollar on the basis of 7 to 1, even though the National School Lunch Act required matching of only 3 to 1.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has access to participation figures on a monthly basis from all States and is well acquainted with the tremendous expansion of this program. In view of this situation, it is very difficult for us to understand why this agency has on two occasions seen fit to recommend a reduction in the national school lunch appropriation. We have the third such example of Federal apathy this year. In each instance, in the past, departmental officials in appearing before the Appropriations Committees, have maintained that the reduction in funds would be offset through increased allocations of surplus commodities. We have always maintained, and I believe the records will bear us out, that surplus commodities and such promises represent a most undependable source of aid for the schools in planning their budgets. The commodity program, over the years, has been one of "feast or famine." Those who maintain that surplus foods have offset the reduced cash assistance are either woefully misinformed as to the workings of the price support program, or they are deliberately trying to mislead the public and Congress with respect to school lunch assistance.

You will recall the drastic reduction in surplus commodities last year which created a tremendous additional financial burden for the schools. This reduction in surplus foods came at a time when unemployment rolls were at a peak and the demand for free lunches was heavy. Our schools have not recovered from the financial losses sustained last year, and unemployment in many sections of our State is still a problem, along with the accompanying increased requests for free lunches. Our welfare department now has a heavier caseload of unemployed persons receiving commodities than a year ago.

The Congress acted last year to assist program sponsors by transferring \$35 million from section 32 funds to be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase additional foods needed to replace the losses resulting from lack of action by the Federal Agency on price support operations during the 1957-58 school year. During hearings on the appropriation the committees were very critical of the USDA because of this lack of action for aiding both agriculture and the school lunch program.

We have had some help from this transfer of section 32 funds during the present school year, and certainly, without this transfer, we would have been in serious financial trouble. Outside of the mandatory support items of dairy products and cereals, the only surplus foods offered by the Department during this school year have been a very meager offering of fresh cabbage and peanut butter. Neither of these items were offered in sufficient quantity to permit statewide distribution to our schools. This leads us to believe that the Department has, through discretionary authority, successfully circumvented the intent of Congress on the transfer of section 32 funds by merely using them to carry out normal section 32 operations. We say this because each of the items purchased with the transferred funds this year have, in the past, been offered under the regular section 32 program. We now have a further indication of such action through the current purchases of large quantities of dried eggs during the heavy production period and the fact that offerings of this product, coming so late in the school year, cannot possibly benefit the schools in this year's program.

As of March 1, approximately \$6 million of the \$35 million transferred remains unused. This situation exists at a time when school lunch programs nationwide are experiencing extreme financial difficulty. In Missouri, 60 percent of our programs are operating at a deficit. The deficits are even greater in some of our other States. For example: 95 percent of the programs in Montana are presently operating at a deficit. Other States are in a similar position: California, 85 percent; Washington, 75 percent; Oklahoma and Wisconsin, 70 percent; New Mexico, 50 percent; Wyoming, 48 percent; Michigan, 40 percent; and so forth. Requests for free lunches for needy children are increasing. In fact, Michigan reports that in the city of Detroit two lunch programs had to be closed due to financial difficulties when free lunch servings totaled 80 percent. Many of the States have reported that because of increased participation this year, Federal funds available for reimbursement to the schools will amount to less than 4 cents.

It is rather difficult for us to explain to local school administrators why our reimbursement rate under the National School Lunch Program for the serving of complete type A lunches, which must include a half-pint serving of milk, has reached a point where it is less than the reimbursement available under another Federal program administered by the USDA for the serving of a half-pint of milk only.

All of our major agricultural groups in Missouri, the Missouri Farm Bureau Federation, Missouri Farmers Association, and the American Dairy Association, are fully acquainted with the contribution this program is making to our agricultural economy and are on record as favoring an expanded school lunch program, which at the present time represents a \$25 million industry in our State. We think this is evidence that the agricultural aspects of the program are being carried out in Missouri.

In order to restore the level of cash assistance alone that was available when the national act was passed would require a current appropriation of \$171 million. This does not even take into consideration the greatly decreased purchasing power of the 1959 dollar.

Unless more interest is demonstrated by the USDA in budget recommendations for the national school lunch program, it is obvious to many of us that this program will begin to disintegrate, and many schools will revert back to the candy and coke lunches which we have tried diligently during the past 11 years to replace with nutritiously adequate lunches for all children. This situation is beginning to develop, and we are hopeful that you will lend your help in assisting us to head off this situation before it gets out of hand.

In behalf of the schoolchildren in Missouri and nationwide, we sincerely urge your support of an appropriation of \$130 million for the national school lunch program for fiscal year 1960 and the transfer of \$45 million of dormant section 32 funds to the national school lunch program. We are firmly convinced that this is the minimum amount that will be needed next year if the national school lunch program is to avoid disaster. In the transfer of the section 32 funds, we urge that legislation be developed to effect a cash transfer of \$45 million from section 32 under the same plan that was used in the complete financing of the school lunch program during the 2 or 3 years immediately preceding passage of the National School Lunch Act. In this way the funds could be distributed to the States along with the national school lunch appropriation. We are convinced that the schools of this Nation can and will do a better job in accomplishing the intent of section 32 than has been demonstrated by the Federal agency in the use of the \$35 million transferred to the program during this school year.

In conclusion, let us say that the States and local communities are more than doubling the matching requirements set forth in section 7 of the National School Lunch Act. We are sincerely hopeful that our Federal Government will see fit to assume its fair share of the responsibility for financing this program as it continues to expand and in line with the very clear intention implied in the wording of the National School Lunch Act.

Your continued interest and cooperation in the sound financing in this program is deeply appreciated by all of us who are so closely associated with the administration and operation of the school lunch program in the States.

Yours sincerely,

EARL M. LANGKOP,  
Director, School Lunch Section.

#### THE IMPORTANCE OF FULL EMPLOYMENT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, last week the Labor and Commerce Departments reported that unemployment rose again in the month of February, a month in which it usually declines.

It was also reported that seasonally adjusted unemployment was again over 6 percent of the work force.

This high rate of unemployment results in impairment not only of our standard of living, but also of the safety and welfare of the United States.

Aside from the personal tragedy this unemployment brings to millions of workers and their families, it is also very, very wasteful. These workers are unable to contribute to our national strength at a time when their contribution is urgently needed.

Because of unemployment of men and machines, our economy is standing still, while that of other nations is rising.

The Committee on the Economic Report, under the able leadership of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, has prepared a study which shows that between 1953 and 1958, our gross national product per capita actually declined.

In 1953, the average production per person was \$2,576. In 1958, it was \$2,508.

This decline compares with an increase over the same period of 8.5 percent in West Germany, 7.5 percent in France, 4 percent in Italy, and 2.5 percent in the United Kingdom.

Our recent stagnation also compares most unfavorably with the increasing strides in production being made by our possible adversaries of the Sino-Soviet empire.

Some sectors of our economy have recovered from last year's recession. The high unemployment, however, persists. I have seen reports in the press that some economic leaders have concluded, from this experience, that an unemployment rate of 5 percent or more must be expected for the foreseeable future.

Mr. President, I can think of no more dangerous and defeatist attitude than that one.

This is the richest country in the world. If we cannot provide employment opportunities for all who are able to work, then something must be very wrong, indeed. I fear that the defeatist attitude is just another example of the inferiority complex which seems to affect some of our national leaders.

These say we cannot afford an adequate defense. They say we cannot afford the necessary education for our children. They say we cannot afford a decent standard of health for all. Now they say we cannot afford full production and employment.

Mr. President, we must begin to plan now to operate our economy on a full production basis. Capital should be available at low enough interest rates so that businesses can borrow to expand, and homeowners can borrow to build.

The spendable income of the 7½ million people who still earn under \$2,000 should be increased.

We should extend unemployment insurance, along the lines of the bill sponsored by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts.

We should do something about the practice of administered prices, which cuts production and prolongs high prices even in the absence of demand.

We must clear away the barriers to the full operation of our private enterprise system.

If positive action is taken in this session, Mr. President, next year will bring us reports of real progress, rather than such sad reports as we have just received of increases in midwinter unemployment.

#### ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in the issue of Time magazine dated March 16, 1959, the following comment appears:

Pennsylvania liberal Democrat JOE CLARK took the Senate floor to recommend a balanced budget—liberal Democrat style. He proposed to raise both taxes and spending by \$4 billion, strike the balance at \$81 billion. Demanding higher outlays for defense, education, urban redevelopment, housing, airports, water resources, public health, welfare, and foreign aid, CLARK argued that the new money could be raised by tougher enforcement of income-tax laws, stiffer rules against business expense deductions, higher taxes on capital gains and dividends, lowered depletion allowances (from 27½ to 15 percent) on oil and gas wells. Nowhere did Clark suggest where costs could be cut.

Mr. President, the last statement is false. I ask unanimous consent that there may appear in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the portion of my speech to which Time magazine had reference, and which deals with where costs could be cut.

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

#### ECONOMIES

I have no doubt that the Congress will be able to find some economies in the budget. Again, I do not want to prejudice where savings might be found, because the members of the Appropriations Committee are far more experienced and skilled than I in ferreting out waste in the budget. I am inclined to believe, however, that some of the bills proposed for agriculture by Democratic Senators from farm States, whose devotion to the welfare of the family farmer is thoroughly tested and proven, would result in considerable economies below the more than \$3 billion in this year's price support operations. I am also sure that through further unification of the armed services, better management of procurement and other means, the Defense Department could save considerable sums.

However, I want to be conservative in this presentation and I therefore will not attempt to place any dollar figure on these economies to offset them against the additional expenditures I have outlined above. As they develop during the session, we can take account of them, but there are undoubtedly further expenditure needs also, beyond those I have mentioned earlier. So let us regard these potential economies instead as providing us with a reserve for contingencies over and beyond the \$100 million set out as a reserve in the President's budget.

Mr. CLARK. Of course, this is not the first nor the last time that Time magazine has or will distort the facts. I should point out, in lighter vein, that one of the best methods of distortion is to print unflattering photographs of Members of this body and others in public life whom Time magazine does not favor. Such a picture of me, with



my mouth open, appears opposite the comment in *Time* magazine which I have just read.

If *Time* magazine were selling applesauce instead of a weekly publication, it would not be able to call itself, as it does, "the weekly news magazine," because the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 would prohibit it. That act requires the truthful labeling of goods for sale.

The Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, prohibits "the introduction into interstate commerce of any food, drug, device, or cosmetic that is adulterated or misbranded."

It also provides that—

In determining whether the labeling (of such a product) is misleading there shall be taken into account (among other things) not only representations made or suggested by statement, word, design, device, or any combination thereof, but also the extent to which the labeling fails to reveal facts material to consequences which may result from the use of the article to which the labeling relates under the conditions of use prescribed in the labeling thereof or under such conditions of use as are customary or usual.

It has always been my view that it would be far more candid of *Time* magazine to call itself a journal of plutocratic opinion rather than a weekly news magazine. Such a description would be in accordance with the principle of truth in advertising. The other day I had occasion to look up an article in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* on Pluto. The article states, in part:

A euphemistic name for the Greek god of the lower world. \* \* \* He is stern and pitiless, deaf to prayer or flattery, and sacrifice to him is of no avail. \* \* \* Being feared he is usually referred to by euphemistic epithets such as "illustrious" or "the giver of good counsel" \* \* \* but perhaps by contamination with a god of the fertility of the earth, he is also the giver of wealth \* \* \* and at most of the centers of his cult he was so worshipped.

"Euphemism" is defined in Webster's Dictionary as "a way of describing an offensive thing by an inoffensive expression."

"Plutocrat" is defined in Webster's Dictionary as "one who has power or influence due to his wealth."

A little while ago a reporter on the *Providence Journal-Bulletin* had occasion to analyze *Time* magazine in an article which was subsequently printed in the *New Republic*. I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from that article be printed in the *Record* at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

The elusiveness of truth must have worried the editors of *Time* occasionally. But if so, they have spared the reader this human doubt. Each week the world is created absolute and dogmatic, the good guys on one side, the bad guys on the other, with *Time* holding the only scorecard. Only when the reader checks back does he discover that the good guy of October may be the bad guy of January, that truth and *Time* change.

For example, was it the truth, when *Time* reported Dwight Eisenhower's appearance at the start of his 1952 campaign in Abilene in the June 16, 1952, issue:

"They saw Ike, and they liked what they saw.

"They liked him because he turned out to be an amazingly good campaigner. \* \* \* They liked him for his strong, vigorous manner of speech, for his quiet control. \* \* \* It was a crashing conquest."

Or was it the truth when, after the campaign was over, *Time* in its issue of November 3, 1952, described that same week in Abilene:

"At first the echoes were not strong. Ike \* \* \* as a political candidate \* \* \* did not quite 'come across' \* \* \* his voice was flat; he looked like an old man on TV."

*Time*, during the 1952 campaign: "Stevenson tore into this straw man \* \* \* the Democratic candidate made a careful pitch \* \* \* In the same speech, Stevenson got in a reference to aid to India, which is getting to be the stock Democratic way of changing the subject on China."

*Time*, 4 years later: "Stevenson of 1952, a man meticulously concerned with the facts."

*Time*, before Adlai Stevenson became a presidential candidate:

"Illinois has a good Governor now: Adlai Ewing Stevenson. \* \* \* In his 3 years \* \* \* Stevenson has \* \* \* sent State police out to stop commercial gambling downstate \* \* \* lopped 1,300 political hangers-on off the State payroll \* \* \* he didn't think State's Attorney John Boyle of Chicago was a good candidate. Stevenson has largely kept hands off law enforcement in Cook County, on the theory that local authorities are better staffed to handle it. But he didn't like the way Boyle had done the job \* \* \* promptly dumped Boyle. \* \* \* If Lincoln Steffens was right, corruption is the norm of U.S. political life. \* \* \* But men like Adlai Stevenson have dedicated themselves to a more hopeful and dynamic proposition: that the United States is not a static pattern but an experiment, among other things—in good government."

*Time*, after Stevenson became a presidential candidate, 8 days before election:

"Stevenson \* \* \* has himself cited his record as Governor to support his argument that he can deal with corruption; he tells his audience that he knows about corruption because he followed '8 years of Republican rascality.' He never so much as slapped the wrist of the Cook County Democratic organization, the most corrupt and powerful of existing big-city machines."

*Time*, August 1, 1955, on President Eisenhower's accomplishment at Geneva:

"If Geneva was to be measured by the spirit, as all the participants insisted it should be, then quite a bit was achieved \* \* \* the chances of war started by the Russians is continuing to diminish. This was the reading of Geneva."

*Time*, May 19, 1958, quoting Dean Acheson approvingly to support *Time*'s thesis that a summit conference should not be held:

"From former (1949-53) U.S. Secretary of State Dean Acheson came two forceful, well-argued statements on U.S. foreign policy. \* \* \* The 1955 Geneva Conference, said Dean Acheson, 'was not merely a failure; it was a fraud and positive harm.'"

The changeability of truth in the pages of *Time* was noted in 1955 by a Harvard student, Milton S. Gwirtzman, who listed in the *Harvard Crimson* some *Time* truths which seemed to change with administrations.

*Time*, March 10, 1952, on the income tax under a Democratic administration:

"This week, once again, the American taxpayer \* \* \* was working over his income tax return. He did not do the job happily. \* \* \* The blow, in full and crushing measure, now lands each March 15 on the chin of a fellow named John Q."

*Time*, April 18, 1955, on the income tax during a Republican administration: "60

million Americans have by this week signed their 1954 income tax forms. \* \* \* They did this, wonderful to tell, without riots or protest. \* \* \* It has become more and more unfashionable to criticize the income tax level."

*Time*, August 12, 1946, on the character of George E. Allen under a Democratic administration:

"Last week \* \* \* the President [Truman] eased his cronest crony, George E. Allen, into the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation."

And on January 28, 1946: "George is all the more remarkable because to the naked eye, he is a clown."

*Time*, December 14, 1954, on the character of George E. Allen under a Republican administration: "Last week \* \* \* the President [Eisenhower] chatted quietly with \* \* \* golfing companion George E. Allen, Washington lawyer and friend of Presidents."

*Time* throughout the 1956 campaign ridiculed public questions about the risk of having a sick President in office; or as it said in the July 22, 1956, issue on the President's decision to run again: "\* \* \* Settled the issue with the simplicity and finality of a 1-foot putt." And 16 months after the campaign, *Time* raised the question, in its March 3, 1958, issue:

"President Eisenhower is 67; the cumulative effect of his three major illnesses has sapped his second-term strengths. \* \* \* Most of the work curtailment has come in the field of domestic affairs \* \* \* If allowed to slide, small problems can snowball into major cases, for example, the present economic recession, and it is in this area that the President's inability to ride constant herd is most often felt."

The late William Allen White once wrote:

"I think on the whole, sooner or later, the American people do get the truth. But they often get it when it is cold potatoes and does them no good."

#### THE DEADLY PARALLEL

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, yesterday the President of the Irish Republic, Hon. Sean T. O'Kelly, addressed a joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress, and referred to the fact that in 1880 another distinguished Irishman, Charles Parnell, had addressed a like session.

Mr. President, this reference is tremendously interesting in contemporary American history. It is an interesting vignette that sheds light on problems with which the U.S. Senate has been concerned and will be concerned. Only yesterday, in the Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] said:

I belong to a minority. If there is any minority in this country today, it is white southerners. I belong to a minority.

Charles Parnell was a member of the British House of Commons, representing an Irish minority. His steadfast purpose was to remove from the people of Ireland the yoke and oppression of British overlordship and tyranny. After returning from the United States he was incarcerated for his alleged sedition. But, thank God, he still had the right to a trial by jury and no jury of Irishmen would convict him. From jail he returned to the British Parliament. The pending business was a bill to solve the Irish question. Two of its worse features provided that arrests could be made on

mere suspicion and the suspect incarcerated in jail without trial for a long period of time, and, secondly, it denied to such person the right of habeas corpus. To this coercion bill, Parnell offered the following amendment:

That peace and tranquillity cannot be promoted in Ireland by suspending any of the constitutional rights of the Irish people.

In the words of Justin McCarthy, then an Irish member of the Parliament, this is what transpired:

We were then about 20 strong, all told; and the House of Commons contains some 650 members. With the exception of some half a dozen stout English Radicals who were always on our side, the whole house was against us. Every man's hand was against us, but I am bound to admit that our hand was against every man. We made a great many speeches in those days. The House of Commons did not always listen to us, but we made our speeches all the same. We kept the house sitting through long and weary nights; we kept the house sitting once from 4 o'clock on Monday afternoon until 6 o'clock on the following Wednesday evening—no intermission of debate all that time. We went in for open and avowed obstruction; we declared that, so long as we could, we would resist the coercion bill. Then they tried to amend their procedure, and made all sorts of new rules to introduce a closure, meant, of course, only for the Irish members—I mean those who called themselves emphatically the Irish members. Once or twice the Speaker accomplished a very coup d'état, and brought a long debate to a sudden close. We were each of us suspended from the service of the house. We were all of us expelled from the house in a body on one memorable evening; each of us refusing to leave the house until the sergeant at arms had gone through the formula of using force to carry out the mandate of the majority. Of course we came back again the next day, or on whatever day the sentence of suspension expired; and we went on with our work of obstruction as if nothing had happened. We were doing just what we wanted to do; we were arousing the attention of England and Scotland and the civilized world. Our cause was gaining every day in Ireland, and among the Irish in America and Australia.

History repeats itself. Reflect on the Irish Coercion Act of 1881, the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, and those proposed today directed against the constitutional rights, liberties, and privileges of the southern white minority. Mr. President, what a deadly parallel.

#### CRITICAL AND STRATEGICAL MATERIALS OF THE EASTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs published, in December 1958, as a committee print, the authorized Senate report on the 73 nations and entities of the Eastern Hemisphere.

Mr. President, the report was authorized by Senate Resolution 78, as amended by Senate Resolution 225, 85th Congress, providing for a report on the availability of the critical mineral resources of the Eastern Hemisphere.

This report was compiled and edited under the direction of former U.S. Senator George W. Malone, of Nevada, then ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,

and a member of the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials and Fuels.

In appendix II will be found: 20th century trade wars, page 522; atomic weights, page 605; our military position, page 610; and war treaties, page 613.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks the introduction, findings, recommendations, and other pertinent material, as they appeared in the page proofs of the report.

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

#### ACCESSIBILITY OF CRITICAL AND STRATEGICAL MATERIALS OF THE EASTERN HEMISPHERE, INCLUDING THE SOVIET UNION AND SATELLITE COUNTRIES—73 NATIONS AND ENTITIES—SENATE RESOLUTION 78 AMENDED BY SENATE RESOLUTION 225, 85TH CONGRESS

(By George W. Malone)

##### INTRODUCTION

Both the Western and Eastern Hemispheres can be self-sufficient in the production of the so-called critical minerals and materials for war or peace.

Neither hemisphere can cripple the other through withholding supplies of any kind or nature—including the complete list of 77 fuels and minerals.

Any treaties between the nations of the respective hemispheres, or trade among the respective nationals of these nations can and must be on a mutually attractive and profitable basis, without endangering the security of this Nation.

In the event of war, or the threat of war it would be impossible for either hemisphere to defend lines of transportation and communication across major oceans for materials of any kind.

The first prerequisite to a foreign investment is a sound investment climate, which can only be established by the individual nations—the answer cannot be found through grants-in-aid or guarantee of stability by a second nation, even the United States.

The threat of confiscation of property and the manipulation of the value of their currency in terms of the dollar for trade advantage discourages private investors.

The answer is found in a free currency exchange, free from manipulation by a nation of the value of its money in terms of another nation's money for trade or other advantage and an established record of integrity toward private investments. Also, the former stabilizer gold has been discarded as a common denominator of world currencies.

With the exception of the United States nearly every nation in the world today can and does exercise executive control over foreign exchange, manipulating its currency at will for trade advantage without approval of its legislative body.

Since World War II through 1958 the taxpayers of the United States have shipped more than \$70 billion abroad in gifts and soft loans—the lion's share to the Eastern Hemisphere.

These funds have been utilized to build production and mining enterprises abroad, to use the cheaper foreign labor, importing the goods into the United States to compete with the American investor and workman.

The United States is the only Nation in the world today that does not protect its investors and workmen once the investment is made, through the use of tariffs, import permits, exchange permits and the manipulation of the value of its currency in terms of its competitor's money for trade advantage.

It is believed that these data and the information in this report, not hitherto available as a reference work, will afford a useful background picture of the Eastern Hemisphere countries. The committee report, 85th Congress, 2d session, on the political, economic and social status of the nations of the Eastern Hemisphere is a final supplement to two previous reports, Senate Report 1627, 83d Congress, and Senate Document No. 83 of the 84th Congress on the Western Hemisphere.

The committee report describes the political, economic and social structures of the following 73 nations and entities of the Eastern Hemisphere:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belgium.

British Commonwealth: Australia, Ceylon, Ghana, India, Malaya, New Zealand, Pakistan, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom.

Bulgaria, Burma, Cambodia, China (Communist), China (Nationalist), Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany (East), Germany (West), Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Korea (North), Korea (South), Laos, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Libya, Luxembourg, Monaco, Mongolia (Outer), Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Republic, U.S.S.R., Vatican City, Vietnam (North), Vietnam (South), Yugoslavia.

##### FORMAL RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST CHINA

Twenty-one free-world countries and ten Communist countries have formally recognized the Government of Communist China, as follows:

Free world countries: Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Denmark, Finland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Sweden, Switzerland, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

Communist countries: Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, North Korea, North Vietnam, Outer Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, U.S.S.R.

All trade agreements are capitulations, in which a government agrees to surrender some part of its economy or sovereignty to another government and the world knew and recognized it as such until a more pleasing phrase could be invented: "reciprocal trade."

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act (so-called reciprocal trade) was a voluntary "capitulation" by this Nation through an act of Congress, under the guise of reciprocal trade.

The GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) charter under which 36 foreign competitive nations continue to divide our markets among themselves through multilateral trade agreements specifically exempts such nations from keeping their part of any such agreement as long as they can show they are short of dollar balance payments to the United States—and they can show such shortage of dollar balance payments until our wealth is equally divided between them.

A disillusioned President Woodrow Wilson said on September 5, 1919—10 months following the Armistice of World War I—and after he had sat in on the Paris peace settlement negotiations:

"The real reason that the war we have just finished took place was that Germany was afraid her commercial rivals were going to get the better of her, and the reason some nations went into war against Germany

<sup>1</sup> The United Kingdom includes the following: England, Scotland, Wales, and North Ireland.



was that they thought Germany would get the commercial advantage of them.

"The seed of jealousy, the seed of deep-seated hatred, was hot, successful commercial and industrial rivalry. This war in its inception was a commercial and industrial war. It was not a political war."

Wilson neglected to delineate that of the Allies, England and France had been commercial giants dominating the trade of extended colonial areas for 300 years, more often at each other's throats than at that of a common competitor, that it was Germany which was achieving industrial and commercial success, and that seed of jealousy, and deep-seated hatred sprouted from the older trading nations.

President Franklin Roosevelt learned his lesson at Yalta and Teheran—and President Harry S. Truman learned his at Potsdam.

None of these eminent heads of our Government, however, have bothered to explain to the American people that these wars have been trade wars since hundreds of years B.C., and that these agreements and trade treaties simply mean a further capitulation and a surrender of more of the sovereignty of the United States of America.

We have made hundreds of agreements and treaties with the nations in Europe and Asia since World War II. Prior to World War II we recognized Communist Russia without any safeguards whatever; all under the guise of improving our world trade position.

We have established military bases in many of these countries on the premise that they would follow us in any international conflict.

We have continued the division of our wealth—our taxpayers' money and markets—through successive Marshall plans and the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act extensions.

Apparently we must relearn the lesson the hard way that was first learned by the writers of our Constitution that no sovereign nation ever keeps an agreement or treaty when it becomes obnoxious to it.

#### FINDINGS

Between 1947 and 1955 inclusive, I have systematically inspected every important nation in the world, not only for the purpose of determining their living standards, their production, including the accessibility of the critical minerals and materials to such nations for war or peace, but the treatment accorded their investors and workmen under their national and international policies.

The findings are arrived at as a result of such personal investigations of the 73 nations and entities of the Eastern Hemisphere. The findings are the result of a digest of the research material and include—

1. That most of the nations of Europe and Asia have controlled area beyond their borders under colonial systems beginning hundreds of years B.C., and that many of such nations have overrun each other over that period, as the fortunes of war have changed.

2. That the United States is the only country in the world that does not systematically protect its own investors and workmen, through the judicious use of tariffs, exchange permits, quotas, or other effective device. Such protection is operated to direct the flow of industrial capital investments to the protected area.

3. That practically all wars between nations for 2,000 years have been trade wars. That such wars have developed the so-called colonial nations—meaning control of a weaker nation's markets by a stronger and distant power.

4. That history shows that international trade rivalry breeds such trade wars between nations, and that the greatest international trade war in history is now brewing.

5. That the Eastern Hemisphere can be made self-sufficient in the production of the

critical minerals and materials necessary for war or peace. That the Western Hemisphere can likewise be made self-sufficient and can be successfully defended from North America is shown in Senate Report 1627, 83d Congress, and Senate Document 83, 84th Congress. A going concern industry is the best stockpile.

6. That the power in the Eastern Hemisphere has shifted to Russia and that Russia can make the area under its control self-sufficient in the production of the critical minerals and materials for war or peace. Power in the Western Hemisphere is in the United States, as shown by Senate Report 1627, 83d Congress.

7. That under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act (so-called Reciprocal Trade Act) through the State Department and Geneva, we have opened our own domestic markets to the trading nations of the world—and during the same period have priced ourselves out of the foreign markets through inflation, which can only result in an ultimate lowering of the American living standard. There is no difference in the final objective of importing the goods produced by low wage living standard labor and importing the cheap labor. No one can consistently support free imports from lower wage living standard countries and oppose free immigration.

8. That we are living on a war economy, since we have consistently adopted national and international policies creating an unfavorable investment climate here and favoring foreign investments.

9. That our adherence to an unconditional most favored nation clause has accelerated the division of our markets among the nations of the world. An unconditional "most favored nation" clause means that when a concession is granted any nation under any one of the multitude of bilateral or multilateral trade agreements made by the State Department or in Geneva under GATT, then all nations are automatically entitled to the same concession, whether or not any compensatory concession is granted by that nation.

10. That under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and the foreign trade policies operating under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act we have returned to the interminable trade wars of old Europe and Asia and are becoming a greater economic colonial of those areas today than we were before the Declaration of Independence in 1776.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That a sound investment climate, which would include a return to the Constitution, article 1, section 8, in the regulation of foreign trade, and adequate depletion allowances in the field of fuels and minerals, thus creating a favorable domestic investment climate is necessary. A going concern producing industry is the best stockpile.

2. A recognition of the fact that the Western and Eastern Hemispheres can each be made self-sufficient in the production of the 77 critical minerals and materials, or adequate substitutes, for war or peace.

3. A further recognition, in the accessibility of critical minerals and materials, that there are just two major powers, one in each hemisphere; the United States and Russia.

4. Elimination of our Nation's present dependency upon remote and possibly unfriendly or neutral areas of the world for the critical materials, without which we cannot live in peace or conduct a war.

5. A recognition of the fact that the Western Hemisphere can and must be defended from North America, since there is an expanding movement throughout the Eastern Hemisphere to deny this Nation military bases on the grounds of endangering their own security.

6. A further recognition of the fact that our future markets and security lies within the Western Hemisphere containing one

third of the land area of the world and more than 350 million people and that any encroachment of that area by any nation with a view of establishing control politically, economically or militarily will be dangerous to our security and economic well-being. To do this a revival of the 135-year-old Monroe Doctrine principle is in order.

7. That the unconditional "most favored nation" clause be eliminated—and a return to the Constitution in the regulation of foreign trade—and that all future trade agreements be regarded as treaties, which must be approved by a two-thirds vote of the U.S. Senate.

8. That this Nation give every consideration to maintaining self-sufficiency of the production of the critical minerals and materials in the Western Hemisphere and the defense of this area from North America, since the transportation of these materials across major oceans would be impossible in wartime.

9. That foreign trade be based upon fair and reasonable competition—that the flexible duty or tariff be continually adjusted on the "equalization of costs of production" principle—always equaling the difference in costs of production here and in the principal competing country on each product, and that a free market exchange value of all nations' currencies be maintained in the interest of favorable "investment climate." Gold should be reestablished as a common denominator of world currencies.

10. Rejection of international controls of production, prices, and supplies of critical and strategic materials unless by legislative action by the Congress of the United States. By such rejection, and recognition of the self-sufficiency and the great trade potential of the Western Hemisphere, the greatest trade war in history now building up can be averted.

#### NATIONAL STOCKPILE

As of June 30, 1958, there were 76 metals, minerals, and nonmetals and minerals in the national stockpile either in inventory or on order. The major part of requirements has been fulfilled. The materials authorized for open market purchase are amosite asbestos, small diamond dies and muscovite block and film mica.

Materials acquired in barter for agricultural products are held in a supplementary stockpile and will only be taken over by the national stockpile as need arises.

#### Critical and strategic minerals

A material may be critical due to its scarcity or unusual chemical and physical properties either in peace or war. A material may be strategic due to its difficulty of procurement for any reason in time of war. This could apply to either domestic or foreign production.

The current definition in the Government is that only those materials that are still needed for the stockpile are critical and strategic.

#### FOREIGN TRADE

##### Gifts and subsidies deducted

The volume of the so-called foreign trade and the volume of foreign trade on a mutually profitable and agreeable basis are entirely two different figures.

The first includes all gifts, so-called loans and subsidies to the foreign nations with which to purchase American goods, and the second is shown in the right-hand percentage column with such gifts and subsidies deducted.

It will be noted that the percentage of exports of American exportable or movable goods on a mutually profitable or agreeable basis has ranged from a low 5.5 percent in 1953 to high of 13.2 percent in 1921 with the general average lower since the 1934 Trade Agreements Act (so-called Reciprocal Trade Act) was first passed.

It will be noted that the general average of the profitable exports of American exportable goods from 1909 to and including 1953, which included three wars was from 5.5 to 7.5 percent. The average is 8.1 percent excluding war years.

(Millions of dollars unless otherwise indicated)

Calendar year	Estimated U.S. production of movable goods (1)	Total exports of U.S. merchandise (2)	Ratio of exports to movable-goods production (3)	Military-aid exports from United States (4)	Net U.S. Government grants other than military-aid shipments (5)	Net U.S. Government loans <sup>1</sup> (6)	Sum of cols. 4, 5, and 6 (7)	Col. 2 minus col. 7 (8)	Ratio of col. 8 to col. 1 (9)
			Percent						Percent
1909	17,437	1,701	9.8					1,701	9.8
1914	20,599	2,071	10.1					2,071	10.1
1915	47,210	7,750	16.4			39	2,328	5,383	11.4
1921	33,396	4,879	13.1				-30	4,409	13.2
1923	44,853	4,091	9.1				-91	4,182	9.3
1925	48,341	4,819	10.0				-27	4,846	10.0
1927	48,035	4,759	9.9				-46	4,805	10.0
1929	53,502	5,157	9.6				-38	5,195	9.7
1931	32,885	2,378	7.2				-21	2,399	7.3
1933	25,326	1,647	6.5				7	1,640	6.5
1935	34,133	2,243	6.6			( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	2,243	6.6
1936	( <sup>2</sup> )	2,419	( <sup>2</sup> )				-1	2,420	( <sup>2</sup> )
1937	44,853	3,299	7.4			( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	3,299	7.4
1938	( <sup>2</sup> )	3,057	( <sup>2</sup> )				1	3,056	( <sup>2</sup> )
1939	41,671	3,123	7.5				15	3,108	7.5
1940	47,671	3,984	8.3				51	3,883	8.1
1941	64,267	5,020	7.8	( <sup>3</sup> )	932	391	1,323	3,697	5.8
1942	89,345	8,003	9.0	( <sup>3</sup> )	6,304	221	6,525	1,478	1.7
1943	99,851	12,842	12.9	( <sup>3</sup> )	12,738	109	12,847	-5	
1944	105,617	14,377	13.6	( <sup>3</sup> )	13,845	231	14,077	240	2.8
1945	101,411	10,309	10.2	( <sup>3</sup> )	6,542	1,019	7,561	2,748	2.8
1946	101,622	9,950	9.8	( <sup>3</sup> )	2,343	2,701	5,044	4,906	4.8
1947	123,931	15,160	12.2	( <sup>3</sup> )	1,940	3,907	5,847	9,313	7.5
1948	139,957	12,532	9.0	( <sup>3</sup> )	4,194	1,024	5,218	7,314	5.2
1949	125,911	11,936	9.5	( <sup>3</sup> )	5,207	652	5,859	6,077	4.9
1950	144,762	10,142	7.0	282	3,484	156	3,922	6,200	4.3
1951	165,120	14,879	9.0	1,065	3,035	156	4,256	10,623	6.4
1952	171,785	15,049	8.8	1,997	1,960	420	4,377	10,672	6.2
1953	182,743	15,952	8.6	3,511	1,837	218	5,566	10,066	5.5
1954	175,966	14,981	8.5	2,255	1,647	-93	3,809	11,172	6.3
1955	193,061	15,421	8.0	1,256	1,865	302	3,423	11,908	6.2
1956	263,406	18,940	9.3	1,757	1,696	626	4,078	14,862	7.3
1957	209,866	20,630	9.8	1,355	1,613	963	3,931	16,699	8.0
1958	201,221	17,704	8.8	1,534	1,611	963	4,117	13,507	6.8

<sup>1</sup> Covers changes in both long- and short-term claims of the U.S. Government on foreign countries.  
<sup>2</sup> Not available. (Prior to 1940, estimates of production of movable goods have been prepared only for years covered by a census of manufactures.)  
<sup>3</sup> Not available. (See note 2.)  
<sup>4</sup> Less than \$50,000.  
<sup>5</sup> Military aid shipments under the war and postwar lend-lease and Greek-Turkish aid programs are included in col. 5.  
<sup>6</sup> Excluding U.S. subscriptions of \$323 million in 1946 and \$3,062 million in 1947 to capital of International Bank and Monetary Fund.  
 Source: Prepared from basic data of the Department of Commerce, June 1958.

DEPLETION

Allowance for a wasting asset

As a result of legislation which I introduced in 1954 to raise the depletion allowance on the 49 principal minerals to 27½ percent, such depletion allowance was raised by the Senate Finance Committee and approved by the Congress on 35 metals, minerals, and materials.

The 27½-percent depletion was retained on oil and gas wells and raised from 15 to 23 percent on 35 minerals.

Depletion is the percent of net profit from the net income tax because of a wasting asset.

Excerpts of Senator Malone's testimony before the Ways and Means Committee of the House in 1951:

Two principles encourage investments

"The two important principles encouraging venture capital to engage in the hazardous business of drilling oil wells in untried areas, and sinking shafts and driving tunnels where no commercial mineral has ever been known to exist, are the depletion allowance and the tariff or import-fee structures.

"The percentage-depletion allowance provides a reasonable method for the return of the capital investment, provided oil or mineral is discovered—if none is discovered the capital is lost—that is the gamble miners and oil drillers take.

"The tariff or import fee, providing a principle for fair and reasonable competition in the importation of products from the sweat-

shop countries of Europe and Asia, assures investors that their capital will not be destroyed as soon as the emergency is ended.

Emergency saves oil and mineral industries

"While the administration is fostering the imports of petroleum and minerals from foreign, generally strategically indefensible sources, the domestic industry has only been saved from a severe depression by the rapidly increasing domestic demand through the present emergency.

"Another factor which has kept the domestic oil and mineral industries searching for new sources of supply was the existence of the percentage depletion allowance.

Threat of removal disastrous

"Mr. Chairman, the continual threat of the removal or manipulation of either one of these factors—that is to say, the depletion allowance, which makes possible the return of capital investment, or the tariff or import fee structure, which provides for fair and reasonable competition between imported and domestically produced goods—the very threat of the removal keeps venture capital out of the business since there can be no confidence in a congressional principle which is continually under fire."

INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Sec. 613. Percentage Depletion:

(a) General rule: In the case of the mines, wells, and other natural deposits listed in subsection (b), the allowance for depletion under section 611 shall be the percentage,

specified in subsection (b), of the gross income from the property excluding from such gross income an amount equal to any rents or royalties paid or incurred by the taxpayer in respect of the property. Such allowance shall not exceed 50 percent of the taxpayer's taxable income from the property (computed without allowance for depletion). In no case shall the allowance for depletion under section 611 be less than it would be if computed without reference to this section.

(b) Percentage depletion rates: The mines, wells, and other natural deposits, and the percentages, referred to in subsection (a) are as follows:

- (1) Twenty-seven and one-half percent—oil and gas wells;
- (2) Twenty-three percent: (a) sulfur and uranium; and (b) if from deposits in the United States—orthosite (to the extent that alumina and aluminum compounds are extracted therefrom), asbestos, bauxite, beryl, celestite, chromite, corundum, fluorspar, graphite, ilmenite, kyanite, mica, olivine, quartz crystals (radio grade), rutile, block steatite talc, and zircon, and ores of the following metals: antimony, bismuth, cadmium, cobalt, columbium, lead, lithium, manganese, mercury, nickel, platinum and platinum group metals, tantalum, thorium, tin, titanium, tungsten, vanadium, and zinc.
- (3) Fifteen percent: Ball clay, bentonite, china clay, sagger clay, metal mines (if paragraph (2) (b) does not apply), rock asphalt, and vermiculite.
- (4) Ten percent: Asbestos (if paragraph (2) (b) does not apply), brucite, coal, lignite, perlite, sodium chloride, and wollastonite.
- (5) Five percent: (a) Brick and tile clay, gravel, mollusk shells (including clam shells and oyster shells), peat, pumice, sand, scoria, shale, and stone, except stone described in paragraph (6); and (b) if from brine wells—bromine, calcium chloride, and magnesium chloride.
- (6) Fifteen percent: All other minerals (including but not limited to, apatite, barite, borax, calcium carbonates, refractory and fire clay, diatomaceous earth, dolomite, feldspar, fuller's earth, garnet, gilsonite, granite, limestone, magnesite, magnesium carbonates, marble, phosphate rock, potash, quartzite, slate, soapstone, stone (used or sold for use by the mine owner or operator as dimension stone or ornamental stone), thenardite, tripoli, trona, and (if paragraph (2) (b) does not apply) bauxite, beryl, flake graphite, fluorspar, leipolite, mica, spodumene, and talc, including pyrophyllite), except that unless sold on bid in direct competition with a bona fide bid to sell a mineral listed in paragraph (3), the percentage shall be 5 percent for any such other mineral when used, or sold for use, by the mine owner or operator as riprap, ballast, road material, rubble, concrete aggregates, or for similar purposes. For purposes of this paragraph, the term "all other minerals" does not include (a) soil, sod, dirt, turf, water, or mosses; or (b) minerals from sea water, the air, or similar inexhaustible sources.

CRITICAL MINERALS

The 1953 Malone-Aspinall Mineral Purchase Act, Public Law 206, 83d Congress, 1st session, "To encourage the discovery, development, and production of tungsten, manganese, chromite, mica, asbestos, beryl, and columbium-tantalum-bearing ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes"

Declaration of policy

SEC. 2. It is hereby recognized that the continued dependence on overseas sources of supply for strategic or critical minerals and metals during periods of threatening world conflict or of political instability within those nations controlling the sources of supply of such materials gravely endangers the present and future economy and security of the



United States. It is therefore declared to be the policy of the Congress that each department and agency of the Federal Government charged with responsibilities concerning the discovery, development, production, and acquisition of strategic or critical minerals and metals shall undertake to decrease further and to eliminate where possible the dependency of the United States on overseas sources of supply of each such material.

Sec. 3. In accordance with the declaration of policy set forth in section 2 of this Act, the termination dates of all purchase programs designed to stimulate the domestic production of tungsten, manganese, chromite, mica, asbestos, beryl, and columbium-tantalum-bearing ores and concentrates and established by regulations issued pursuant to the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, shall be extended an additional two years: *Provided*, That this section is not intended and shall not be construed to limit or restrict the regulatory agencies from extending the termination dates of these programs beyond the two-year extension periods provided by this section or from increasing the quantity of materials that may be delivered and accepted under these programs as permitted by existing statutory authority: *Provided further*, That the extended termination date provided by this section for the columbium-tantalum purchase program shall not apply to the purchase of columbium-tantalum-bearing ores and concentrates of foreign origin.

Sec. 4. In order that those persons who produce or who plan to produce under purchase programs established pursuant to Public Law 774 (Eighty-first Congress) and Public Law 96 (Eighty-second Congress) may be in position to plan their investment and production with due regard to requirements, the responsible agencies controlling such purchase programs are directed to publish at the end of each calendar quarter the amounts of each of the ores and concentrates referred to in section 3 purchased in that quarter and the total amounts of each which have been purchased under the program.

Approved August 7, 1953.

The Malone-Aspinall Act of 1953 and its extension in 1956 simply fixed a Government purchase price at a figure in each case that the Interior and Insular Committee felt was enough above the world price to make the difference in the wages, taxes and the general cost of doing business here and in the chief competing nation on each product.

Extension of the Malone-Aspinall 1953 Mineral Purchase Act, Public Law 733, 84th Congress, "To provide for the maintenance of production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purpose"

That this Act may be cited as the "Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956."

Approved July 19, 1956. Expires December 31, 1958.

The House nullified this legislation in 1957 through failing to appropriate the necessary funds to carry out the purpose of the Malone-Aspinall Mineral Purchase Act.

New mineral purchase legislation, S. 4036, passed by the Senate July 11, 1958, failed in the House August 21, 1958

While the Malone-Aspinall 1953 Mineral Purchase Act, as extended in 1956 to December 31, 1958, it was rendered inactive in 1957 and 1958 when the House refused on three separate occasions to go along with the Senate in appropriating the necessary funds.

The Senate recognizing that the House had effectively stopped the purchase of these minerals and that such action would result in closing the mines, many of which would be very expensive to reopen, introduced new legislation with the objective of keeping the

mines operating pending a sound national policy under which production might continue.

[S. 4036, 85th Cong., 2d sess.]<sup>2</sup>

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

June 30, 1958

Mr. Murray (for himself, Mr. Malone, Mr. Church, Mr. Watkins, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Alcott, Mr. Bible, Mr. Barrett, Mr. Goldwater, and Mr. Chavez) introduced the following bill, which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

A bill to stabilize production of copper, lead, zinc, acid-grade fluorspar, and tungsten from domestic mines

THE 1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT VERSUS THE 1930 TARIFF ACT

Since the 1934 Trade Agreements Act (so-called Reciprocal Trade Act) was extended and all special legislation providing for the production of such minerals either failed to pass the House or was rendered inactive by it through failure to pass the necessary appropriation—most of the mines have, in fact, closed and this Nation is dependent upon foreign sources for many of the critical minerals without which it cannot fight a war or live in peace.

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act transferred the constitutional responsibility of the Congress, article I, section 3, to regulate foreign trade to the President, the executive branch, with the power to extend that authority to Geneva where it now resides with 36 foreign competitive nations continuing the job of dividing the American markets among themselves through the complicated multilateral trade agreements.

The Constitution, article I, section 8, says that "The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises. \* \* \* To regulate commerce with foreign nations."

Two forces are at work dividing American markets with foreign nations. The State Department, representing the executive, through bilateral trade agreements; and Geneva through the GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) regulations.

The GATT regulations provide that such foreign nations do not need to keep their part of the agreements as long as they are short of "dollar balance" payments—and they can show that they are short of such payments until the American wealth and markets are equally divided among them.

If the 1934 Trade Agreements Act were to be repealed or not renewed the constitutional responsibility would revert to Congress and the Tariff Commission, an agent of Congress, would adjust the flexible tariff under section 336 of the 1930 Tariff Act, entitled:

Sec. 336. Equalization of costs of production:

(a) Change of classification or duties: In order to put into force and effect the policy of Congress by this Act intended, the Commission (1) upon request of the President, or (2) upon resolution of either or both Houses of Congress, or (3) upon its own motion, or (4) when in the judgment of the Commission there is good and sufficient reason therefor, upon application of any interested party, shall investigate the differences in the costs of production of any domestic article and of any like or similar foreign article. In the course of the investigation the Commission shall hold hearings and give reasonable public notice thereof, and shall afford reasonable opportunity for parties interested to be present, to produce evidence, and to be heard at such hearings. The Commission is authorized to adopt such reasonable procedure and rules and regulations as it deems necessary to execute its functions

under this section \* \* \*. If the Commission finds it shown by the investigation that the duties expressly fixed by statute do not equalize the differences in the costs of production of the domestic article and the like or similar foreign article when produced in the principal competing country, the Commission shall specify in its report such increases or decreases in rates of duty expressly fixed by statute (including any necessary change in classification) as it finds shown by the investigation to be necessary to equalize such differences. In no case shall the total increase or decrease of such rates of duty exceed 50 percent of the rates expressly fixed by statute.

(b) Change to American selling price: If the Commission finds upon any such investigation that such differences cannot be equalized by proceeding as hereinbefore provided, it shall so state in its report to the President and shall specify therein such ad valorem rates of duty based upon the "American selling price" (as defined in section 402(g)) of the domestic article, as it finds shown by the investigation to be necessary to equalize such difference.

NO SPECIAL LEGISLATION NECESSARY

With the tariff adjusted upon the "equalization of costs of production" provision of section 336 of the 1930 Tariff Act the American investors and workmen would be back in business; and no special legislation would be necessary.

Under the 1930 Tariff Act the Tariff Commission, an agent of Congress holds the necessary hearings and adjusts the flexible tariff to equalize the costs of production. The Congress takes no action, unless it should not agree with the findings of the Commission.

Under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as amended the State Department acting for the Executive can trade all or any part of an industry to a foreign nation or nations to further a foreign policy.

THE EASTERN HEMISPHERE

Political, economic, and raw materials—  
73 nations

In 1955, I went behind the so-called Iron Curtain and stayed 2½ months.

I not only inspected all of the Balkan countries, Austria, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, and Yugoslavia, but inspected manufacturing plants and mines in each of the Russian 16 Soviet Socialist Republics from Leningrad in the north to Tiflis in the south, and from the Ukraine in the west to beyond Novosibirsk, east in Siberia.

As a result of such inspections I have no hesitancy in saying that not only can the Eastern Hemisphere be made self-sufficient in the production of the 77 critical materials for war or peace but Russia itself can do likewise within the area under her control.

Further, as I announced on my return from Russia in 1955, there will be no successful revolt, and that all of the power in the Eastern Hemisphere has moved to Russia.

There are two hemispheres, Western and Eastern, and two world powers, the United States and Russia. There are 42 nations and entities in the Western Hemisphere and 73 in the Eastern Hemisphere.

The work here describing the 73 nations of the Eastern Hemisphere, including mineral and general raw material resources, and the political and economic structure of each is the most recent data and information available. It is not as complete as the comparable reports on the Western Hemisphere but includes the best available data and information.

The accessibility of the necessary mineral and general raw material resources is often the measure of the political and military power of a country in world affairs.

On that basis alone the United States and Russia have the greatest future potential.

<sup>2</sup>S. 4036, 85th Cong., 2d sess., passed by the Senate but failed in the House.

Availability of such materials marked the rise and fall of the colonial empires of history. Colonialism indicates the control by a stronger nation of a weaker nation's markets.

The control and loss of the markets of the countries of South America and a substantial part of what is now the United States marked the rise and fall of the Spanish colonial empire.

Britain's Navy held the British, French, Belgian, and the Netherlands colonial empires together for several hundred years. Colonialism ended with the domination of the British fleet by airpower at the end of World War II; they have been riding on momentum and the support of this Nation since that time.

#### CITATION BEING AWARDED TO ROBERT VANCE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, this afternoon, Robert C. Vance, editor and publisher of the New Britain, Conn., Herald, is being honored in his home town by the Department of the Army in appreciation of his patriotic civilian service.

Mr. Vance is deservedly receiving a citation for the important role that he and his newspaper played in promoting and encouraging a mutual understanding between the residents of the New Britain area and the personnel of the Nike command post there.

Mr. Vance's effort on behalf of the Army is no surprise to those who know him. He and the New Britain Herald have teamed up to bring a long list of outstanding accomplishments to their community.

Mr. Vance has never considered it a duty to perform public service to his readers. Instead he has always felt that it was a privilege, and has acted accordingly.

I personally am proud of the fact that I have been a close friend of Bob Vance for many years. I am pleased that the Department of the Army has seen fit to honor him publicly for his outstanding work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RANDOLPH in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Eastland	Lausche
Anderson	Ellender	McClellan
Bartlett	Engle	McGee
Beall	Ervin	McNamara
Bennett	Frear	Mansfield
Bible	Fulbright	Martin
Bridges	Goldwater	Monroney
Bush	Green	Morse
Butler	Gruening	Morton
Byrd, Va.	Hart	Moss
Byrd, W. Va.	Hayden	Mundt
Cannon	Hill	Murray
Capehart	Holland	Muskie
Carlson	Hruska	Neuberger
Carroll	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson	Frouty
Church	Javits	Proxmire
Clark	Johnson, Tex.	Randolph
Cooper	Johnston, S.C.	Robertson
Cotton	Keating	Russell
Curtis	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Dodd	Kerr	Scott
Douglas	Kuchel	Smith
Dworshak	Langer	Sparkman

Stennis  
Symington  
Talmadge

Thurmond  
Wiley  
Williams, N.J.

Williams, Del.  
Young, N. Dak.  
Young, Ohio

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

#### AMENDMENT OF BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1094) to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments, on page 2, line 13, after the word "thereof", to strike out "such amounts as may be necessary" and insert "\$8,675,000,000"; and, after line 14, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective on July 1, 1959.

So as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Bretton Woods Agreements Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:*

"SEC. 16. (a) The United States Governor of the Fund is authorized to request and consent to an increase of \$1,375,000,000 in the quota of the United States under article III, section 2, of the articles of agreement of the Fund, as proposed in the resolution of the Board of Governors of the Fund dated February 2, 1959.

"(b) The United States Governor of the Bank is authorized (1) to vote for increases in the capital stock of the Bank under article II, section 2, of the articles of agreement of the Bank, as recommended in the resolution of the Board of Governors of the Bank dated February 2, 1959, and (2) if such increases become effective, to subscribe on behalf of the United States to thirty-one thousand seven hundred and fifty additional shares of stock under article II, section 3, of the articles of agreement of the Bank."

SEC. 2. Section 7(b) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act is amended by striking out "of \$950,000,000", and by striking out "not to exceed \$4,125,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$8,675,000,000".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective on July 1, 1959.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I rise to explain and justify the increases in the financial resources of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International

Monetary Fund which are contained in Senate bill 1094, which would amend for that purpose the basic Bretton Woods Agreements Act.

In these days of trial and trouble, when we are continually called upon to meet international crises and domestic problems, and when we are conscious of past shortcomings and future dangers, it is, indeed, a pleasure now and then—and this is one of those occasions—to tell a story of success. This bill relates to two highly successful international financial institutions—the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund.

The International Monetary Fund has had a steady record of success in promoting international monetary cooperation and wiser foreign-exchange practices. It has solved several major financial crises abroad by providing short-term financial assistance to countries which are members of the Fund. In 12 years of operations, the Fund has made temporarily available to 36 different countries about \$4.1 billion.

Mr. President, I think the educational value of the International Monetary Fund is one of its most important virtues, although it is an intangible and does not show up on any balance sheet of any kind. The advice which the Fund gives to the countries which borrow from it, and answers to requests for information made by the countries as to internal practices, constitute one of the most valuable aspects of the entire operation. If the free world is ever to come to an intelligent and efficient use of the capitalistic system the Fund will be one of the principal reasons therefor.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development is likewise a success. The Bank is now in its 12th year of operation. It has made loans of more than \$4 billion in 49 different countries and territories. Its operations helped in the reconstruction work after World War II, and the Bank has now become one of the important means of financing the free world's economic development. Loans by the Bank are currently running at the rate of about \$700-\$800 million a year. The Bank's reputation is of the highest quality. It has been able to borrow large sums of money from private enterprise, and it has never had a default on any of its loans.

Mr. President, I hesitate to go into the somewhat intricate details of the organization and operation of these two financial institutions. Members of the Senate have before them a print which contains the message from the President of the United States urging these increases in the resources of the Fund and the Bank, together with a special report of the National Advisory Council of our Government, which contains a wealth of detailed information and statistical data explaining the operations of the Fund and the Bank and justifying the increases in their resources. In addition, members have available the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations on the bill. In addition to these materials, the



staff of the committee has available in the Chamber voluminous documentation on the activities of the Fund and the Bank, and copies of the annual reports which have been rendered by the President to the Congress on their operations.

In addition to the written materials which I have cited as informative about S. 1094, the activities of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund are well known to Members of this body, some of whom participated in the formulation of the articles of agreement governing the two institutions, and some of whom have attended, as members of the United States delegation, every annual meeting of the Boards of Governors of the Bank and the Fund. Thus, we have more than a casual acquaintance with this subject.

I believe this bill is warmly supported on both sides of the aisle. With the exception of one minor matter to which I shall refer in a moment, I believe there is no controversy about the bill. No one appeared before the committee in opposition to the bill, and the committee heard well-informed and persuasive witnesses in support of the bill, representing farm, labor, and business groups in the United States.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a short colloquy?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the able Senator from Arkansas and I have been members of both the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Foreign Relations, which handle these matters and have handled them for many years. In fact, we were both members of the Committee on Banking and Currency when the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund were established.

Is it not a fact that these institutions have done an outstanding job, and that we have not heard any complaints with respect to their operations?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Indiana is entirely correct. I have never heard a really serious complaint about their operations. These organizations have been blessed with extraordinarily able management, in my opinion. They started out with the correct policies. There have been no defaults. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has had no defaults. Though there have been a few cases of minor failures to abide by the conditions prescribed by the International Monetary Fund, I think there has been nothing of a serious nature. The program has been a very great success.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not also a fact that when moneys have been loaned either by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development or by the Export-Import Bank private investments have increased very materially? In fact, I think the figures show that private investment in the countries concerned has increased about three times over comparable previous years.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not have the exact figures in mind, but the activities of the Bank have had a very beneficial

effect upon private industry. Not only has assurance been given to private industry, but by means of education of the financial managers of the various countries with whom business has been done there has been created a much better climate for private industry.

Mr. CAPEHART. And this process has encouraged and helped private industry both in the United States and in the other countries, rather than hurt it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Senators will recall that the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund were established on the initiative of the United States. Our participation was authorized by the Congress in 1945 through the adoption of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act. Although back in 1945 we knew that the first task of the two institutions would be to assist in the recovery from the havoc wrought by World War II, it was clearly seen then that the Fund and the Bank would become financial institutions of major importance to the ever more interdependent economies of nations in the free world. The United States took the lead in establishing the Fund and the Bank and by our participation during the 12 years since we have retained that leadership. As is well known, the national quotas agreed upon for the Fund and the subscriptions to the stock of the Bank were fixed by considering the size of the international trade, the national income, and the monetary reserves of the members. Contributions to the organizations are thus determined on a kind of approximation of ability to pay. Policies of the Bank and the Fund are determined by a system of weighted voting which closely reflect the financial stake of each country in the institutions.

The functions of the International Monetary Fund have remained constant but its business has varied greatly over the years. In the period immediately after World War II, drawings against the Fund to meet balance-of-payments deficits were large. A few years later, however, such drawings fell to a low level. It was not until the Suez crisis of 1956 and 1957, with its profound dislocations in trade, that the true worth of the International Monetary Fund was again appreciated. In 1956 drawings against the Fund amounted to \$693 million and in 1957, \$977 million. The largest beneficiaries of the Fund's resource at this time were Great Britain, France, India, and Japan.

The operations of the Bank have shifted from concentration on post-war reconstruction loans to Europe to the making of loans to less developed areas of the world. The Bank has made 60 percent of its loan commitments for two major purposes; the construction of electric power installations and the development of transportation facilities, such as harbors, railroads and highways. The Bank's loans are of the very hard variety and they complement the efforts being made through the Mutual Security Program to assist other countries in economic development.

Mr. President, I shall take a moment to describe how the Bank and the Fund work. First, I would call attention to the fact that they are both free world institutions. With the exception of Yugoslavia, which seems to have a foot in both worlds, all 68 members of both institutions are outside of the Communist group of countries. With respect to both the Bank and the Fund, it has not been necessary for the United States to appropriate funds toward the operating expenses of the organizations. Both the Bank and the Fund have paid for their administration and personnel out of the fees which they have charged for their services. As I mentioned earlier, those countries which have contributed the most financially, to the Bank and the Fund have the most to say in the determination of their policies. The United States, being the largest contributor, has more to say than anybody else. Thus, there can be no question in these two institutions about other countries having undue power in disposing of assets contributed by the United States.

The International Monetary Fund operates as a kind of pool of currencies. When a member country suffers a crop failure or some other economic emergency, it may buy from the Fund the hard currency it needs, for a short period of time, usually between 3 and 5 years, by selling its own currency to the Fund in exchange. Later, when the crisis has passed, the country which has drawn on the Fund must replace its own currency sold to the Fund and must do so with gold or a convertible currency, such as dollars. In this way the Fund's resources are made whole.

The Fund's resources are protected against inflation through the method of fixing a par value for the currency of each country which has been paid into the Fund, and countries are obligated to keep their currency in the Fund within 1 percent of its par value. If the currency of a country depreciates, the Fund calls in more currency from that country. This same system applies to the currency resources of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The International Monetary Fund has a little over 400 employees, slightly under half of whom are Americans.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development is in the business of lending capital for development purposes in member countries. It makes these loans to governments and to private enterprise. If it makes a loan to private organizations in a certain country, that country must guarantee repayment. The Bank gets its money, which it lends, partly from capital subscribed and paid in by the members and partly from the private money markets through the sale of the bonds of the Bank to private investors. In recent years the Bank has obtained most of its resources by the sale of its securities, 60 percent of which have been sold in the United States. The Bank now has about 580 employees, 45 percent of whom are American citizens.

Mr. President, the proposal before the Senate in S. 1094 amounts to this in

simplified terms: It is proposed to increase the resources of the International Monetary Fund by 50 percent and to increase the capital of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development by 110 percent. The Fund, after these increases, will have resources of about \$5 billion, of which gold and dollars will amount to about \$2.3 billion. Under the articles of the agreement of the Fund, a member must pay 25 percent of its increased contribution in gold and the balance in its currency. This means for the United States a payment of \$344 million in gold and \$1,031 million in dollars. The dollar payment of the United States will be in the form of non-interest-bearing notes, to be drawn upon by the Fund if necessary, but meanwhile no cash will be paid by the United States. All of the other countries which are members of the Fund will increase their quotas by at least 50 percent. Some of the smaller quota countries will have a higher percentage of increases and Canada, Germany, and Japan, because of their relative prosperity and increased importance in international trade, will have increases of larger than 50 percent.

It is proposed that the U.S. subscription to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development be increased by 100 percent, from \$3,175 million to \$6,350 million. No part of the increase in the U.S. subscription will be paid except to meet some future default of the Bank's obligations. No such default has ever occurred in the past. Thus, the increased liability of the United States will be a contingent liability and a fairly remote contingency at that. The quotas of other members of the Bank will also go up correspondingly, so that the authorized capital of the Bank will increase from \$10 billion to \$24 billion. Larger than 100 percent increases in the Bank's subscriptions for Canada, Germany, and Japan have been agreed upon for the same reasons which I just mentioned in the case of the increased quotas of these countries in the Fund. The subscription of Canada to the Bank will be increased from \$325 million to \$750 million, of Germany from \$330 million to \$1,050 million, and of Japan from \$250 million to \$666 million.

I wish to emphasize that these increases in the resources of the two financial institutions are the only changes which are contemplated by this legislation. There will be no change in the method of operations of the Bank and the Fund, no change in membership, and no change in the policies of the organizations.

The primary reason for the increasing of the resources of the Bank and the Fund is that the world has greatly changed in the 12 years since they were established. Twelve years ago the Bank and the Fund were untried institutions looked upon with some skepticism and even hostility. We did not know how they were going to work out. Now we have a record of solid achievement on which to plan for the future.

Economic conditions in the world and the resources of the member countries have greatly changed since the original

quotas for the Fund and the shares in the Bank were fixed. For example, the total of free world imports has increased from \$27 billion in 1937 to about \$100 billion in 1958. Trade in the free world, which is roughly four times what it was when the Fund was established, surely needs a larger stabilization mechanism. The national income and monetary reserves of the member countries since the inception of the Fund fortunately make possible such an increase. The salutary trend toward greater convertibility of the free world's currencies also puts us on notice that there may be increased demands on the International Monetary Fund, because now that exchange restrictions are diminishing, the variations in balances of payments are likely to be greater.

At the end of 1958 the Monetary Fund had gold resources equal to \$1,532 million and \$792 million in U.S. dollars. Against these assets there were commitments to sell \$911 million worth of currency; that is, possible demands on the fund. This total of resources is clearly inadequate to contain the exchange aberrations which could occur over a period of international crisis. The Suez crisis alone in 1956 and 1957 gave rise to drawings on the Fund in the neighborhood of \$1.6 billion.

It would be hard to argue that the 50-percent increase in the resources of the Fund is precisely right. Considering the size of the national incomes of the members and the magnitude of current world trade, the increase ought to be larger. On the other hand, the members desire to continue the principle that each of them will increase its quota by the same percentage. If the percentage becomes too large, some of the same countries will be unable to carry the burden. Thus a compromise has been arrived at between the foreseeable needs of the Fund and the ability of members to contribute additional resources.

The increase in the capital of the Bank is brought about because without it the Bank will soon run into difficulty selling its bonds in the private money market. This can be seen by examining the attitude of the U.S. private investors on this point. U.S. investors care more about the backing of the U.S. Government of the Bank's bonds than they do about any other backing. The portion of the U.S. subscription to the Bank, which is pertinent here, to meet obligations of the Bank now amounts to \$2,540 million while the Bank now has \$1.8 billion of its bonds outstanding. The Bank has been issuing bonds at the rate of \$497 million in 1957 and \$663 million in 1958. At this rate, the funded debt of the Bank will exceed the amount of the U.S. backing sometime in the next 2 years, depending on the volume of loans made by the Bank. American investors are therefore beginning to ask about an increase in the size of U.S. Government guarantee.

The need for an increase in the capital of the Bank can also be seen if one looks at the needs of the world for development capital. These needs, in the underdeveloped areas of the world alone, are greater than any resources which are in sight. India alone can probably use outside

capital to the extent of between \$500 million and \$1 billion annually for the next few years. Estimates of total outside capital needed in underdeveloped countries annually range from \$2.5 billion to \$10 billion. Now the Bank cannot begin to meet this need by itself. Private investment and bilateral lending by the industrialized countries, including the United States, will be necessary to make up the difference. The Bank's important contribution through its prime, gilt-edged loans in the fields of electric power, transportation, industry, agriculture and forestry, general development, and communications is badly needed.

Mr. President, I turn now to the part of the bill which has given rise to a difference of opinion. The question is whether the impact of the bill on the U.S. Government expenditure budget shall be placed on the fiscal year 1959 budget or the fiscal year 1960 budget.

The President said in his budget message of January 19, 1959, with respect to the International Monetary Fund:

For the additional U.S. quota in the International Monetary Fund, this budget includes \$1,375 million as supplemental new obligational authority and as estimated expenditures in 1959. Of this amount, \$344 million is to be paid in gold, and the balance of \$1,031 million is to be paid in the form of noninterest-bearing Treasury notes.

The President, in his budget message of January 19, 1959, said with respect to the increased subscription to the International Bank:

The anticipated subscription to the International Bank of \$3,175 million in the fiscal year 1959 is included in the budget as new obligational authority but not as an expenditure, because it will be in the nature of a guarantee fund. On the strength of guarantees from all its members, the Bank is able to sell its bonds to private investors.

In other words, the increase in the U.S. subscription to the International Bank almost certainly would have no effect on the expenditure budget of the United States in fiscal year 1959 or fiscal year 1960.

The Committee on Foreign Relations has decided that the bill should be amended by providing that the increases in the U.S. contribution to the Fund and Bank should become effective on July 1, 1959; in other words, to affect the fiscal 1960 Government budget.

Administration witnesses put great stress in their presentations on the need for the United States to continue its leadership in the activities of the Fund and the Bank. If the United States decides to increase its quota in the Monetary Fund this will encourage other countries to follow suit. The Committee on Foreign Relations agrees. The committee took notice, however, of the fact that the increased U.S. quota in the Fund shall not, under the agreement with the other members, become effective unless the Fund determines that members having no less than 75 percent of the total of quotas have consented to increases in their quotas. Although the United Kingdom has begun to move toward increasing its quota, and although two Latin American countries have approved the increase, there was little evidence presented to the committee that



the rest of the 75 percent of the total of quotas will be fulfilled prior to the fall of 1959.

There would appear to be nothing in the offing to cause extraordinary demand on the resources of the Monetary Fund over the next few months. Administration witnesses made some vague references to the Berlin situation as possibly causing economic difficulties in the future, similar to the Suez crisis. It is hard to see how the effects of Berlin could be like those of Suez, but even assuming that such an effect were identical, the prospects now are that negotiations with the Russians over Berlin will be just getting started by the end of fiscal year 1959. Hence, dangerously heavy drawings on the Fund before July 1, 1959, would seem to be most unlikely.

In view of these facts about the foreseeable operations of the Fund and the long time which will be required for the other countries to make sufficient contributions to the Fund to cause an expenditure of the proposed increase in U.S. quotas in the Fund, the Committee on Foreign Relations thought it unreasonable to add these sums to the fiscal year 1959 budget, which is already at least \$12 billion in deficit.

Thus the committee proposes to continue the U.S. leadership in the Bank and the Fund by deciding now to increase our contributions, but the committee proposes to postpone any harmful effect on the U.S. budget until the fiscal year 1960, because the increased U.S. contributions will not be accompanied by a budget expenditure prior to fiscal year 1960 anyway. I asked Mr. John J. McCloy, representing the American Bankers Association, and a former President of the International Bank, about this course of action when he testified. He said that he saw no real objection to this move.

Mr. President, in conclusion I should like to express the sincere hope that the Senate will approve these increases in the financial resources of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. These institutions have proved their worth. They will be able to do what we want them to do in the future only if they can receive this increased backing from the Government of the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Donn in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

#### PROTOCOL OF AMENDMENT TO CONVENTION ON INTER-AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from executive C, 86th Congress, 1st session, a certified copy of a protocol of amendment to the convention on the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences, which protocol was opened for signature at the Pan-American Union in Washington, on December 1, 1958, and that the protocol, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

#### To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of a protocol of amendment to the convention on the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences, which protocol was opened for signature in the Spanish, English, Portuguese, and French languages at the Pan American Union in Washington on December 1, 1958. The protocol was signed in behalf of the United States of America on January 7, 1959.

I transmit also the report of the Acting Secretary of State regarding the protocol for the information of the Senate.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 19, 1959.

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Acting Secretary of State; (2) protocol of amendments to the convention on the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Francis F. Healy, to be a member.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas C. Mann to be the representative of the United States of America on the Commission on International Commodity Trade of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am pleased that this nomination has been reported. Mr. Mann is a very able, conscientious, honorable and dedicated public servant, who lives in my State. I am very pleased to attest to his fidelity to any service he may be called upon to render.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the nominations confirmed today.

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

#### 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.

#### AMENDMENTS TO THE BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENTS ACT OF 1945, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1094) to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I favor the increases in the funds which are sought. I should like to point out one additional reason why the increases are vitally important, not alone to the safety of the United States as it engages in international lending activities, but very importantly to the taxpayers of the United States in terms of the foreign aid program of the United States. By these lending operations a very important, productive investment can be made by the people of the United States toward relieving themselves of as much of the responsibility for foreign aid as possible.

Secondly, and very importantly, this effort to increase especially the funds available to the International Monetary Fund has a very important and real bearing on such disturbances as are now apparent in Bolivia, and, therefore, can contribute very directly to the peace of the world. I say that for this reason: It is widely believed—and I think with great reason—that the disturbance in Bolivia was principally caused by the break in the market in tin, which is Bolivia's primary export. The break was caused by the raid on the tin market by the Soviet Union. The economy of the free world is susceptible to this kind of influence. The Soviet Union is aware of that fact. In short, by failing to break the price level of inter-

national commodities at a particularly sensitive time and at a particularly sensitive point it is possible. The Soviet Union knows it can affect the economies of countries, particularly underdeveloped countries, very adversely.

It has been truly said that in one afternoon of a commodity price break enough value can be wiped out to soak up all the aid we have given to a particular country for 10 years.

In the case of tin, the Russians hit the market and thereby there was created a very serious economic dislocation in Bolivia. That, I believe, was responsible principally for the tension which resulted in Bolivia, and which flared up as a reaction to an article in *Time* magazine, although its real basis lay in economic causes.

The Russians are aware of this fact, of course. We were attacked by them in this instance. I say attacked, Mr. President, as we were also attacked in the case of residual fuel oil. We were attacked by Soviet Russia's spot sale in an effort to break markets in the Scandinavian countries. These efforts on the part of the Soviet Union have had very serious effects. That is the way the Soviet Union has been operating in connection with these commodities, and other commodities also.

What can the International Monetary Fund do about it? In the first place, it can lend money to a particular country to enable that country to carry itself through such an economically depressed period and through the price situation created by the Soviet Union in its price-breaking operations. A country such as Bolivia or Chile, or any other country so affected, can carry itself through until the law of supply and demand again reasserts itself. When that time comes and the Soviet Union is, of course, unable to supply the needs of the world, the users of the particular product again return to the main source of supply, if meanwhile the country in question can carry through.

In that way the Fund can make a very real contribution toward the peace of the world and help avoid the kind of dislocation and tension and upset which we saw happen in Bolivia. Therefore this is a very important aspect of the International Fund, because the Fund is ideally suited for carrying through that kind of operation. It cannot do it unless we increase its resources. Therefore it is extremely important in terms of the whole cold war that the increase be provided.

In this connection let me say that I speak from my own experience. I have the honor, under authority of the NATO Parliamentary Conference, to be Chairman of its Economic Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I have the honor to be Chairman of the Economic Committee of the NATO Parliamentary Conference,

which is composed of representatives of the 16 members of NATO.

In the committee we have dealt with this problem. We have had made a study of the question of international commodity prices, and how the U.S.S.R.'s efforts in this field can literally destroy underdeveloped countries. We have come to the conclusion—although the conclusion has not yet been actually incorporated into a resolution—that the soundest procedure is to enable the country itself to carry through the swing when a damaging price situation affects it, for if it can carry through the low point, it will again be able to come out on top. This turns out to be one of the most priceless services which the Fund renders. So much for the Fund. I think it is extremely important for the American taxpayer to realize how vital in the cold war it is. For the reasons I have just given this increase in the resources of the Fund, which is a most valuable asset to the economy of the whole free world and its stability, should be authorized.

Now about the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. There is no question that there exists a tremendous deficiency in international capital—both public and private—to do the job of assisting underdeveloped areas.

If we continue to invest privately and publicly by way of the foreign aid programs for underdeveloped areas, year after year, and go on developing them year after year, as is now being done, we will end up in about two decades from now with ourselves having improved our standard of living by 50 percent, but the underdeveloped areas will be able to improve theirs by only 30 percent. That is completely unacceptable to them. We have the words of their spokesmen in the United Nations and elsewhere to that effect. Yet, unacceptable in this case as it may be, they may not of necessity turn to our system; they may turn to the Communist system. Let us not forget that 2 out of 3 people in free Asia live in India. They face the competition of Communist China on their doorstep. The whole effort of the free world to win the support of its underdeveloped areas could go down the drain unless we determine to do now what needs to be done; and what is needed is greater investment, public and private.

Why do we need the Bank? Why cannot private investment take care of everything?

I think it is true that private investment has been successful, and efforts to promote it have had no more ardent friend in Congress, both in the Senate and in the other body, than myself. I joined with Representative Vorys in developing the private investment guarantee program. I have sponsored an amendment, under which a comprehensive study of private investment is being made by Undersecretary of State Douglas Dillon. But private investment cannot do all the work because it cannot supply what is called the infrastructure—the roads, ports, sanitation and other fundamental public works. So the International Bank for Reconstruction and

Development is essential to supply the infrastructure. Its loans are more acceptable in the neutralist nations than in others.

Now we come to the big question: Do people like or dislike the United States? Are they grateful for the money which we give them under our foreign aid programs?

Mr. President, it is time we grew up. We naturally like it but it makes no vital difference whether the people are grateful or not. It even makes no vital difference whether they like us or not—although certainly we want to be liked. I think educational, cultural and sports exchanges, tourism, and similar efforts will help us materially in that regard, as will better information programs. But that is not the fundamental point. The fundamental point is that the other nations should take the free world's way of attaining economic development and national life. If they will do that, we will have won what it is essential to win in the free world.

The work done by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development is our work. It is helping by taking some of the load of making the effort to win the cold war a success off the American taxpayers in a most effective way. I can think of no single thing which will do the American taxpayers more good in terms of economizing in the cost of Government and in terms of winning the peace, than our passing this bill.

I shall not go into the question of the fiscal year to which the funds should be charged, or anything like that. That is strictly a political issue. It makes no substantive difference which way it is settled, although I shall support the Republican position on that question. The vital matter is that we shall do it and that we shall know why we are doing it and that the American taxpayer shall realize it.

I do not think there is anything he as an individual could do more effectively than to support what we are doing, both in terms of the struggle for peace and the effort to effect, as much as we can, economy in government in our foreign aid programs.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I oppose the committee amendment, known as section 3 of the bill. The purpose of the amendment is to throw into the 1960 budget the cost of the bill; whereas the administration had recommended that it be taken care of in this fiscal year. I regret to say that this has been recognized or labeled by many authorities as a political decision, and that partisan political influences have brought about the decision of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which I think is hardly in keeping with the high traditions of that committee. Therefore I object.

The matter is discussed in the *New York Times* this morning by Arthur Krock, known to many as the dean of political writers in this community, and certainly one of the shrewdest, sharpest observers on the Washington scene for



a great many years. In discussing the matter, he wrote in part as follows:

The Democrats understand it perfectly, and this explains to a great degree why they are voting into the budget for fiscal 1960 certain items the President wants charged to fiscal 1959 and which could just as well be charged to either. They have attacked his on-paper balance for the next fiscal year as phony bookkeeping to begin with; dependent on revenues he knows will not be collected and economies he knows will not be made; and inadequate for essential foreign and domestic security, anyhow.

#### THE DEMOCRATIC STRATEGY

But, fearing that nevertheless the President may be able to persuade the electorate that he proposed an attainably balanced budget for the fiscal year of 1960 that was adequate for all basic needs they are doing what they can to demonstrate the contrary. One effective way is to charge items to the 1960 budget that the President wants charged to the current one, but at the same time to show that the sums they granted were the sums he himself requested. This was the method employed yesterday when the Foreign Relations Committee approved the transfer from the Treasury to the International Monetary Fund of \$1,375 million, the amount named by the President. And adding this to the budget for the next fiscal year terminated its already headline balance—phony or otherwise. This strategy the Democrats will repeat as often as possible.

#### THE ADMINISTRATION'S VIEW

The estimate of the deficit in the budget for fiscal 1959 is already \$11,500 million without the Monetary Fund item; it can be larger and probably will be. The administration's economic theory is that, this deficit being already so large, no harm will be done if it is larger—

I shall speak of that in a moment, because I agree with that statement—

and, since the domestic economy and the stability of the dollar at home and abroad will be vastly strengthened by the triumph of the balance principle in the budget for fiscal 1960, whatever can be charged currently should be. The Democrats attack this course as fancy bookkeeping for which 1960 politics is the real animation, and they are proceeding accordingly.

Mr. President, that is a rather strong indictment. There is great merit in the administration's request that this item be included in the budget for 1959, when it is already well known that we will have a very large deficit, one which will probably be upward of \$12 billion. I believe it can be said this deficit is already largely financed by the Federal Government and largely without recourse to the banking system. That is due to a series of reasons which I shall not now outline.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 5 more minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. It is a fact that because we started the fiscal year with a very large cash balance, and for other reasons, the deficit this year will not have been financed through the banking system to any appreciable extent. Thus the monetary and inflationary aspects of it are not so serious this year and have been discounted. Moreover the psychological effect of the deficit for the present fiscal year has been discounted to a

large extent. Everyone has known for a long time that there will be a deficit on the order of \$12 billion; so the psychological effects have been discounted.

It is also true that we have been talking about the desirability of a balanced budget for the fiscal year 1960. The President has submitted such a budget. I think that the reception of this budget by the public at large, judging by what reliable indexes indicate, has been very favorable and has tended to restore confidence in the Government, in the fiscal system, and in the American dollar. Therefore, why should any steps be taken at the present time which would dislodge the confidence which has been placed—replaced, we might say—in the dollar, because of the fact that we have discounted the 1959 effects of the deficit and have rallied confidence on the basis that a balanced budget will occur in 1960?

This is a matter of concern to both parties. Both of them should claim credit for a balanced budget. The Congress, which is heavily controlled by the Democratic Party, certainly must take the responsibility for unbalancing the 1960 budget, if it is unbalanced.

Therefore, I do not see why they are so anxious to unbalance it, as evidenced by the current situation regarding the second committee amendment, namely, section 3 of the bill.

So I beg the Democratic Members of the Senate to think of their responsibility in this matter, and to consider the fact that if the 1960 budget is unbalanced by deliberate action, such as by means of this committee amendment, which would be done purely and simply, as Arthur Krock has pointed out, for the purpose of unbalancing the 1960 budget—the responsibility for that will rest directly upon their heads. I beg them to reconsider the matter, and either to withdraw the amendment or vote it down, so that the amounts carried in the bill will go into the 1959 budget.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut consider placing the entire Krock article in the RECORD? I notice that the article contains a number of references to me and I believe it would be rather flattering to have the entire article placed in the RECORD. Of course, I notice that Mr. Krock has made a great deal of a statement I made—namely, that I “did not understand.” I used the words “I do not understand.” As a matter of fact, I understand; but he does not understand. When a Yankee says, “I do not understand,” he is simply trying to be charitable. Or sometimes he means “I do not agree.”

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, out of deference to my friend, the Senator from Vermont, I did not request that the entire article be printed in the RECORD. But if it is his wish to have it printed in the RECORD, I now ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I concur in the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DODD in the chair). Is there objection?

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

#### THE WARRING FACTORS IN THE BUDGET FIGHT (By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 18.—The President might have lifted one eyebrow, and Republican National Chairman Alcorn both, on reading a statement made to the press yesterday by Senator AIKEN, Republican of Vermont. After the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which AIKEN is a member, in approving the President's request for an increased subscription to the International Monetary Fund, charged the sum to the Federal budget for 1960 instead of to the current fiscal year's (as the President also had requested), the Vermont Senator said:

“I can't understand why 1960 should be sacred \* \* \* that we have to balance the budget that year if we can't ever balance it again.”

The President has explained over and over that he is fighting for a balanced 1960 budget to dispel growing doubts at home and abroad of the stability of the dollar, and to discourage in good years the easy resort to deficit financing that is acceptable in bad. And, since also he has not accepted the proposition that the budget could never again be balanced, it is curious that AIKEN still fails to understand the President's explanation. If the Senator had said he wasn't impressed with it, that would be comprehensible.

#### ALCORN'S SPECIAL INTEREST

Chairman Alcorn has a special interest in another aspect of the fiscal 1960 budget-balancing effort by the administration. It is apparent that the Republicans believe their next national ticket will be importantly aided by the concurrent showing of a balanced budget, or of a determined effort to attain one that failed only because of Democratic resistance. AIKEN may reject this consideration on the ground, surprising in the case of a professional politician, that it is partisan and political. But again it is curious he does not understand it.

The Democrats understand it perfectly, and this explains to a great degree why they are voting into the budget for fiscal 1960 certain items the President wants charged to fiscal 1959 and which could just as well be charged to either. They have attacked his on-paper balance for the next fiscal year as phony bookkeeping to begin with; dependent on revenues he knows will not be collected and economies he knows will not be made; and inadequate for essential foreign and domestic security, anyhow.

#### THE DEMOCRATIC STRATEGY

But, fearing that nevertheless the President may be able to persuade the electorate that he proposed an attainably balanced budget for the fiscal year of 1960 that was adequate for all basic needs, they are doing what they can to demonstrate the contrary. One effective way is to charge items to the 1960 budget that the President wants charged to the current one, but at the same time to show that the sums they granted were the sums he himself requested. This was the method employed yesterday when the Foreign Relations Committee approved the transfer from the Treasury to the International Monetary Fund of \$1,375 million, the amount named by the President. And adding this to the budget for the next fiscal year terminated its already headline balance—phony or otherwise. This strategy the Democrats will repeat as often as possible.

#### THE ADMINISTRATION'S VIEW

The estimate of the deficit in the budget for fiscal 1959 is already \$11,500 million without the Monetary Fund item; it can be larger

and probably will be. The administration's economic theory is that, this deficit being already so large, no harm will be done if it is larger; and since the domestic economy and the stability of the dollar at home and abroad will be vastly strengthened by the triumph of the balance principle in the budget for fiscal 1960, whatever can be charged currently should be. The Democrats attack this course as fancy bookkeeping for which 1960 politics is the real animation, and they are proceeding accordingly.

Nor did the President get any help yesterday from the Republicans on the Foreign Relations Committee. Senator LANGER was registered in the negative, but he was merely following his line of opposing all foreign economic aid. There was no objection of record, however, from Republican Senators WILEY, of Wisconsin; CAPEHART, of Indiana; or CARLSON, of Kansas. And AIKEN voted with the Democratic majority because, as he said, he couldn't understand the reasons for not doing so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President—

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, does the Senator from Texas wish me to yield to him?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; I simply wish to determine whether it will be possible to have the yeas and nays ordered on the question of agreeing to the second committee amendment.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Illinois desires to have the yeas and nays ordered on the question of agreeing to section 3, the second amendment. I wonder whether it will be possible to have the yeas and nays ordered on that amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been demanded on the question of agreeing to section 3, the second committee amendment. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were not ordered. Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I renew my request for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand there is no controversy regarding the committee amendment in section 2. Has that part of the amendment been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first committee amendment will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Foreign Relations was, on page 2, in line 13, after the word "thereof," to strike out "such amounts as may be necessary," and insert "\$8,675,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next committee amendment was, on page 2, after line 14, to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective on July 1, 1959.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Upon what question were the yeas and nays ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays were ordered on the question of agreeing to the second committee amendment.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut will state it.

Mr. BUSH. Is the Presiding Officer referring to section 3 of the bill, on page 2? Is that the second committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, in section 3.

Mr. BUSH. It does not include the amendment in section 2, does it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, it does not.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President—

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, for the moment, I shall not discuss either the merits or the demerits of the bill.

At this time I wish to call attention to what I consider to be the irregular manner in which the bill has been brought before the Senate. I refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for yesterday, on page 4484, from which I read the following:

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 98, Senate bill 1094. I announce that there will be no debate on the bill this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1094) to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments.

Farther down in the same column on the page we find that the Senator from Texas made an additional unanimous-consent request, as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the bill has been reported almost unanimously from the committee, with perhaps one vote against it.

I have discussed the bill with the minority leader, who desires to make a statement on it tomorrow, and with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the time be divided between the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the minority leader, and that the vote be taken not later than 3 o'clock p.m.

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

In agreeing to this I asked whether the bill and its report was available. I was assured that it was available. I quote further from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for yesterday.

If they are—

Meaning the bill and the report— available tonight, I have no objection.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that the bill in regard to which this unanimous consent was given did not then exist; there was not then such a bill; there was not then such a calendar number. On yesterday's calendar, the last number is 97. This bill was not on that calendar. There was no such calendar number as 98; and at the time the consent was given there was no bill and no report available for the Senate.

Mr. President, I make the further point that the bill in question was not even in the Senate at the time when it was supposedly read by the clerk. If any bill of this number was read, it was only a dummy bill, not the bill as reported by the committee.

Therefore, I make the point of order that the unanimous-consent request, as agreed to, was not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is now before the Senate. The point of order should have been raised yesterday, at the time when the bill was brought up.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The point was made yesterday; and on yesterday I was assured that the bill was available. I accepted that assurance in good faith.

Furthermore, Mr. President, when the Members of the Senate hear the clerk supposedly read a bill, they have every right to believe that the bill is actually before the clerk. But I make the point of order that the bill was not actually read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill was not actually read; but the RECORD shows that the bill is now before the Senate and that the Senate is operating under a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The RECORD shows that the bill was read only by title; but I say that the bill itself was not only not read to the Senate, it was not even in the Senate. Anyone is at liberty to take exception to that statement if you wish. It cannot be denied.

I make the point that the bill was not actually read, that the assurances given were not correct, and that the bill is not now in order.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I turned in the bill on yesterday. I do not know what the Senator from Delaware has in mind.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I think all of us will agree that the bill itself was not in the Senate last night when it was made the order of business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, to what page of the RECORD does the Senator from Delaware refer?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I refer to page 4484 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for yesterday. The request made by the Senator from Texas was for consideration of the bill; and then the clerk supposedly read the bill. I make the point that this bill was not then in the Senate Chamber and, therefore, could not have been read then.

In making this point, I say to the majority leader, I realize that a motion to have the Senate consider the bill could now be made. But I think this is



an irresponsible manner in which to bring up a bill which involves more than \$1 billion. This bill deserves more consideration.

The bill was originally introduced in the Senate on February 17. The bill was considered by the Foreign Relations Committee to be of sufficient importance to warrant the holding of 3 days of hearings. Yet, before the bill and its report was printed and was available, the majority leader obtained unanimous consent to have the Senate consider the bill—which, as I have said, involves more than \$1 billion; and he reached out into thin air and picked out some projected calendar number and some imaginary bill. I think the bill involved is highly important. Regardless of whether the point of order is sustained or is not sustained, I am calling attention to the irresponsible manner in which a bill of this importance was handled.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the bill has been printed; and I think the statements made by the Senator from Delaware about irresponsibility are entirely uncalled for. The Senator from Delaware does not know what he is talking about. He should restrain his language.

There is no secret about the bill. It has been in the committee for a long time. The basic legislation has been on the statute books for 12 years.

So, Mr. President, to pretend that the bringing up of proposed legislation of this sort involves irresponsible action, when we have had complete hearings, and when the bill is an administration bill, I believe is entirely uncalled for.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President—

Mr. EASTLAND. If such a point of order or such an objection is valid, should not it have been made yesterday?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator from Delaware had paid attention to his duties on the floor, he would have been here and would have objected yesterday. Why does he raise such a point today?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have the floor; and the time used by the two Senators should not be taken out of the time available to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Delaware has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Delaware an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I was here yesterday, the reason why I make the point of order today is that on yesterday I was given assurance that the bill and the report was available. Otherwise, I would have objected.

I know the bill has now been reported; but the bill was not ready last night; it

was on the way to the printer. However, in answer to my question last night, I was given to understand otherwise.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All that the Senator from Delaware had to do was go to the desk and read the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The bill was not at the desk. I repeat that we then had every reason to expect that the bill was in the Senate, when the calendar number of the bill was read and when the bill was reported by title.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was here. The bill was handed in at the desk by me either during or shortly after the morning hour yesterday.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But there was then no such number as Calendar No. 98. And the bill and report were not available to us as Members of the Senate. It was not here until this morning.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. President, at that time there was no such number as Calendar No. 98, and at that time no bill of that calendar number was available in the Senate. I was given assurance otherwise. I said:

If they are available tonight, I have no objection.

But after the Senate adjourned a few minutes later I found they were not available.

The Senate may consider the bill at this time, if it wishes to do so; but again I say this is an irresponsible manner in which to consider a bill which involves more than \$1 billion.

I also point out that the bill, as reported by the Senator from Arkansas from the committee, has an effective date of July 1, 1959. So there will be nearly 4 months before the bill will be effective, after it is passed. Why this urgent rush. Why are we suddenly confronted with a request for unanimous consent to have the Senate take up a bill—which involves, as I have stated, more than \$1 billion—before the bill and report was even printed.

You may be familiar with the bill, but I have not seen it until just a few minutes ago.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield the Senator from Texas whatever time he may need.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the most regrettable thing I have seen happen in the Senate in a long time is the statement by the Senator from Delaware. No one has given the Senator any assurance that has not been kept.

The Senator was present when the unanimous-consent request was made. It was made with the approval of the Senate's minority leader, who has been silent, but I ask him to testify it was agreeable. The bill is designed to implement an administration proposal, and the administration wanted to have it taken up. I made the statement that the bill would not be debated until the report and the record of hearings were on the desk of each Member. I asked

for the calendar number from the clerk and the number was given to me. I motioned the bill up by calendar number and I asked unanimous consent at that time that the Senate proceed to its consideration. I did not state that I had a report I could hand to the Senator, although if the Senator had wanted one he could have gotten it, because it was available.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I beg the Senator's pardon. It was not available until this morning.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understood the Senator from Arkansas to say he submitted the report shortly before.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The bill was at the desk from the morning hour yesterday and the report was in preparation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I was advised after the Senate adjourned that both had gone to the printer and it would be necessary to go to the printer to get them. They definitely were not available as I had understood they would be.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The statement I made was that the Senator was standing on the floor, and I asked unanimous consent and the Senator did not object. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] asked the Senator if he desired to object, and he said:

No. I was merely trying to find out what the agreement was.

The Senator from Illinois then said:

The agreement was that a vote be had not later than 3 p.m. tomorrow.

The Senator from Delaware then asked:

What is the calendar number?

The Senator from Illinois then said:

It will be Calendar No. 98. The reports will be available in the morning.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I ask the Senator to continue reading.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Delaware then asked:

The bill has not even been reported?

The Senator from Illinois then said:

It has been reported, but it is not on today's calendar.

The Senator from Delaware then asked:

Is it printed?

And the Senator from Illinois said:

It is printed.

The Senator from Delaware then asked:

Will the bill and the report be available?

The Senator from Illinois said:

I think they are available now.

Then the Senator from Texas said:

Nothing will be taken up until the bill and the report are available.

That is true. Nothing was taken up.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Will the Senator continue reading?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. When the bill came to the floor this morning, I asked the proper officers of the Senate at 10:30, "Do you have on the desk

of every Member the report and the bill?"

That answer was in the affirmative.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No, I am not going to yield until I finish the statement.

The Senator was in the Chamber and heard all of that presentation. Now the Senator undertakes to criticize his own leader and to criticize the chairman of the committee for bringing up a bill which has been brought up in the regular order. The report is here for the Senator. The Senator can read it, can smell it, can touch it, or do anything he wants with it. I say nothing has happened which was not in accordance with correct procedure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I desire to read the rest of the colloquy, which the majority leader did not read, and which follows immediately thereafter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If they are available tonight, I have no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If they are available, there is no objection.

That was the basis of my agreement and I say again, they were not available last night, and that statement cannot be challenged. The bill had been ordered reported; that is true. The report was filed; that is true. But the bill and the report were filed with the clerk late last night, and were on their way to the printer. They were not available to us as Members of the Senate until sometime this morning.

I say again that the unanimous-consent agreement was given on the assurance that they were available, but they were not available at that time.

Perhaps I was too gullible in accepting the assurances so readily last night, but I will be protected properly the next time when unanimous consent is asked.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes without having the time charged as a speech on the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the only parliamentary problem which occurred to me last night was that the printed calendar did not contain the number 98 which was assigned to the pending bill. I am advised, however—and I made a point of going to see the Parliamentarian about it early this morning—that the procedure followed is proper. I wanted to ascertain whether under those circumstances a bill might be subject to a point of order. I understand it is the practice and within the rule that when a bill has been reported it is assigned a calendar number. Notwithstanding the fact that the bill did not appear on the printed calendar—which obviously was printed the night

before—the bill still bears the number assigned to it, and therefore is quite in order.

I had some doubts about that, but I satisfied myself on that point with the Parliamentarian himself.

The rest of the colloquy, of course, must speak for itself.

I wish to make only one further comment, Mr. President, which is that I am of the belief there is urgency about this bill. The remarks I am going to make on the bill will be predicated in large measure upon urgency, and that is one reason why I shall resist section 3 of the bill. I do so after a long session with the Secretary of the Treasury and others who feel very deeply about the bill.

In all other respects the record is quite clear.

I must say, in behalf of the majority leader, that when we discussed the matter the day before, he did say the bill would not come up until the bill and the report and the hearings were available. I think he gave the Senate that assurance.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In that colloquy, the Senator is aware of the fact that I said—and I quote my exact words—

If they are available tonight, I have no objection.

The Senator from Illinois then said—and I quote his exact words—

If they are available, there is no objection.

I think the Senator will agree that no objection was made, with the clear understanding that the bill and the report would be available last night. I think the Senator from Illinois will concur in what I have said, that they were not available for the Members of the Senate last night, and we could not get them unless we went to the Printing Office for them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I can concur, with the observation that I had so much material on the subject which kept me so busily engaged I was not concerned about the bill or the report or the record of the hearings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I can understand the Senator's attitude from his position. I am speaking from my position. I asked if the report and hearings would be available to me and the other Senators last night. We had a right to think they would be available. I think the Senator will agree that even though it may be within the rules to reach out into the future and pick a number for tomorrow, it is not usually done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute, under the same conditions.

It is interesting to note that not a day goes by when some fine parliamentary point does not present itself. Frankly, I never encountered this problem before. There was no number 98 on the calendar.

I understand, however, it is clearly within the rule to assign a number when the bill is reported, and it does not have to be a number printed on the calendar the day before in order to qualify the bill to take that number.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will not delay the discussion. The Senator is correct. The numbers are assigned. That is perfectly proper. However, the Senator has confirmed what I previously said. This question has not arisen before, because this is the first time since I have been in the Senate that I have had the experience of a majority leader on either side trying to reach out into the future and obtain unanimous consent to consider a bill involving any amount of money on the following day, under limited debate, especially a bill involving \$1¼ billion, when such bill is not printed and does not have a calendar number. This is the first time, to my knowledge, that has been done. I repeat what I said earlier: It is an irresponsible manner in which to conduct the affairs of the Senate and a reckless way to spend a billion dollars of the taxpayers' money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill, S. 1094, Calendar No. 98, was reported yesterday. By unanimous consent the bill was taken up. Under the rule, upon objection, a bill must lie over 1 day. The bill having been taken up yesterday by unanimous consent, which in effect operates to waive the rule, it is properly before the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield the Senator from Texas whatever time he may require.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think this is a typical attempt to try to confuse the issue.

In the first place, I am informed that the bill was filed at the clerk's desk during the morning hour yesterday.

In the second place, I am informed that the complete report was given to the printing clerk about 7:30 o'clock last evening, and was available for anyone who wanted to see it, if anyone wanted to see it.

I did not state it was available. I said we would not debate the bill last evening. I stated that before we debated it we would see that the bill and the report were available for each Senator. But I asked the minority leader, since this was a very important administration measure, when he wanted it taken up and how long he thought it would take to discuss it. The minority leader told me he did not think the total discussion would require more than 2 hours. I asked him to explore that



matter with Senators on his side of the aisle, and he did so. When he came back he told me 2 hours was enough. I called the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and asked him how much time he would like.

During all that time I was engaged in debate on the floor. An aid came to me and said that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations was in agreement with the suggestion made to me by the minority leader, that 2 hours was ample time.

I suggested that the Senate meet at 11 o'clock today, and that there be 3 hours of discussion. I did not know whether the report was available. No Senator asked me or the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee to see the bill or the report. Evidently Senators did not have enough interest last night to read it. The bill and the report were available this morning. Senators have had ample opportunity to read them since the Senate met at 11 o'clock. They will have ample opportunity to read them between now and the time the vote is taken.

If anyone has broken faith, I do not know who it is. I told the Senator I would not bring this bill up for debate until the report was available. I did not know whether it was available or not. I did not say it was available.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will yield, he said he would not bring the bill up until the report was available. That is true. He also said there would not be any debate last night, which indicates he was aware of the fact the report was not available.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I was not aware of the fact the report was not available. I knew we would not debate the bill last night. I told all Senators they could leave, that they did not need to stay. We did not plan to discuss the bill. We merely wanted some bill made the unfinished business.

If the Senator says this is the first time a measure has been brought up before a report has been made available, or the first time a bill has been brought up before the calendar was printed, the Senator has been around the Senate for a long time without knowing what has happened, because that frequently happens. Except with respect to appropriation bills, many times the leadership can make an agreement on bills. We did agree in this case, and the agreement was carried out pursuant to what the minority leader recommended.

If the minority leader did not talk with the Senator, I did not know it. I thought he did, because I saw the two Senators talking with each other. I thought the Senator approved of what was happening.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I did approve of what was happening, subject to the assurances which I accepted as being reliable.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Did the Senator ask to see the report last evening?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I did, immediately after the Senate adjourned, but when I found the bill and

report were not here it was too late to raise the point at that time. However, I definitely did try to find a copy of the report last night, and it was not available.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am informed that it was given to the printing clerk about 7:30 p.m.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If it had been filed, it had gone to the Printing Office. I say that it was not available to me, and that I tried to get it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I withdraw the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, and yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I rise to support the increased U.S. contributions to the International Monetary Fund and to the International Bank.

These are the offspring, Senators will recall, of the conference at Bretton Woods, N.H., in 1944. They are now among the oldest and most reliable of the free world's institutions.

For 12 years, each has discharged its functions with a high order of effectiveness and with surpassing responsibility. Now, for the first time since the adoption of the Bretton Woods agreements, the 68 member nations have agreed—agreed unanimously, I might add—that the present subscription levels are no longer adequate if the economic ills and crises of the future are to be faced realistically.

It was proposed that contributions of most members to the Fund be increased by half. For the United States, this means an increase of \$1.375 billion—from \$2.75 billion to \$4.125 billion. As for the Bank, subscriptions in most cases are to be increased 100 percent. This means an additional liability to the United States of \$3.175 billion. However—and I hope my colleagues will note this point—only the first figure, the increase of \$1.375 billions to the Fund—will have any budgetary effect. Our additional obligation to the Bank will simply be a standby guarantee against future contingencies. Not one cent of this new money is intended to be called up for use in the Bank's operations. But it will serve to reassure the investors who buy the Bank's bonds and, in effect, to double their protection.

I scarcely need point out that this legislation was intended to be genuinely bipartisan in character. This is substantially still the case, although only this week an amendment which I regard as highly political has been attached to the bill. But I would rather not at this time divert the attention of my colleagues from the urgency of the measure by dwelling on that matter.

It is my feeling that the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank perform a service that is seldom seen in its true perspective. Just as the United Nations labors to ease political strife and to settle political squabbles, so do these two agencies strive to mitigate the economic stresses and strains of 68 nations. These are ambitious objectives. However, as I have already said, the achievement marks of both the Fund and the Bank are high, indeed.

In considering this measure, we should remember that most of the work done by the Fund and the Bank is in behalf of the so-called underdeveloped countries. In fact, the Bank has confined its operations to Asia, Africa and Latin America. In the context of the great Soviet challenge, this is an important point to remember.

In November of 1957, Mr. Khrushchev threw down the glove to a group of American visitors. "We declare war on you," he said, "in the peaceful field of trade."

One year later, the Soviet premier's delegate said this to the Asian-African People's Solidarity Conference at Cairo:

We do not need profits, privileges, controlling interest, concession of raw material sources. We do not ask you to participate in any blocs, reshuffle your governments, or change your domestic or foreign policy. We are ready to help you as brother helps brother, without any interest whatever, for we know from our own experience how difficult it is to get rid of need. Tell us what you need and we will help you and send, according to our economic capabilities, money needed in the form of loans or aid \* \* \* to build for you institutions, for industry, education and hospitals \* \* \* our only condition is that there will be no strings attached.

Mr. President, I submit that this spurious Soviet declaration could, in substance, be set forth in good faith by the International Bank and the Monetary Fund together. The functions of these sibling organizations differ, but they work to the same end—to strengthen the economies of the non-Communist countries of the world. We must see to it that these functions are never curtailed by the lack of operating funds.

It might be useful to examine these functions. The World Bank was initially a lending agency at the service of countries whose first need was to rebuild facilities that had been destroyed by the war. Since then, the reconstruction phase of its career having ended, the Bank has become a major source of development capital for the economically less developed countries of the world. In the past 10 years, its lending rate has just about tripled.

The construction of electric power facilities has been perhaps the Bank's single greatest preoccupation. Indeed, such projects have accounted for about one-third of its loans. This high priority on power is understandable when you consider that in all of Africa, for example, there are barely 6 million kilowatts of electric power. Another third of the operating funds have been devoted to the improvement of ports, harbors, railways and highways. Most of the remainder has been spent on agriculture, especially reclamation; and industry, with special stress on steel production. In 12 scant years, the World Bank has granted more than 200 loans totaling more than \$4 billion. This money has been spent on more than 600 projects by 49 countries.

I doubt that any Member of the Senate would dispute the fiscal and procedural policies of the World Bank. They are eminently sound. Loans are extended only to member countries, or in some cases to a government whose application

is guaranteed by a member country. Each transaction with a private business must be guaranteed by the government of the country in which the money is to be spent. As the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury reminded us last week, a period of intense study, survey and negotiation must precede every such loan.

Most of the Bank's funds derive from the subscriptions of its members and from the sale of its own bonds to investors. The greatest part of the funds used to finance its projects come from the bond sales. In fact, only 20 percent of the Bank's total capitalization is even available for operations. The balance is held in a fund that guarantees the bonds.

According to the Secretary of the Treasury, bond issues in the amount of \$1.8 billion are currently outstanding. They are issues in dollars, sterling, Swiss francs, German marks, Canadian dollars, and Dutch guilders. They are bought in substantial quantities for investment purposes by numerous private interests, both here and abroad. Some issues have been bought outright by foreign countries, who view the bonds as a good investment of their monetary reserves.

The appeal of the World Bank's bonds to investors is easily explained, I think. First of all, the impeccably high standards of the Bank's operations have given the stamp of merit and reliability to all of its transactions. Furthermore, investors know that behind the bonds stands a guarantee in the form of subscriptions of the member countries. This guarantee is represented by the uncalled 60 percent of the Bank's capital. Never in the Bank's history has it been necessary to call up any of it. And we must all hope that it never will be necessary.

Although the Bank is lending somewhere between \$700 million and \$800 million annually, last year it borrowed only \$660 million. Now it seems certain that the lending rate will quicken before it slows down. Indeed, we hope this will be the case. Yet unless even more investors are persuaded to buy the Bank's bond issues, the current rate will not be maintained. Thus, the bonds must continue to be held in the highest regard by investors.

This, I am confident, will always be the case, so long as the margin of the guarantee fund is such as to inspire confidence.

The bill before the Congress seeks to allow the United States, in concert with the other free world countries, to increase its contribution to this contingency fund, as well as endorsing the proposal to increase the Bank's capitalization to \$21 billion. As already noted, the bill would double the U.S. commitment. This is precisely the increase expected of all other members, except for Germany, Japan, and Canada, whose capital subscriptions are being raised to more realistic levels.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will pass this measure with a resounding majority. What the World Bank has contributed—what it will contribute to the future—is a unique service that could not be duplicated elsewhere. Private

corporations have neither the will nor the means to undertake the kinds of projects that the Bank encourages. Moreover, the epithet of colonialism could not in any logic be applied to so selfless and international an institution as the World Bank. What we stand to gain from its achievements, besides the knowledge that we have helped others, is an effective, pretested rebuttal to such phony Soviet claims as the one I have just quoted. And as for ourselves, I think we might be approaching a time in which our own prosperity may increase only as fast as we and other strong nations can enrich the economies of those who are less fortunate.

I turn for a moment to the International Monetary Fund. The central purpose of this organization is to extend short-term loans of convertible currencies to member nations whose foreign exchange has dwindled. The Fund is definitely not in the business of bankrolling poorer countries over a long period of time. However, it can help a member over a rough spot, such as a seasonal dip in the economy. This allows the member state to avoid extreme measures such as imposing import quotas, for example. As a result, the cause of international trade is served.

The 68 member states have unanimously proposed an increase in the Fund's working capital. The present quotas are judged no longer realistic. First of all, they are based on data for the period preceding the Bretton Woods Conference. Among the determinants were prewar foreign trade, national incomes, and monetary reserves. Aside from this, the U.S. quota was set at \$2.75 billion.

Since the time of the Bretton Woods Conference, we have experienced a period of extraordinary growth in many parts of the world. Figures arrived at then have been revised far upwards. The traffic in the trade routes is heavier, the amount of currency in circulation vastly greater. Yet great expansion can also produce great fluctuation—in foreign exchange earnings—and reserves, for example. It also produces a corresponding need for ready capital.

Mr. President, I regard the proposal to increase the Fund's quotas to realistic levels as absolutely essential. The needs of today cannot be measured by yesterday's standards.

The International Monetary Fund is more than just a short-term credit institution. For many nations it is a vital crutch in their recurring times of need. For others—those with a tradition of wealth and durability—the Fund is a unique and equally vital insurance against future dips and turns. For all, it provides a line of credit that permits the matching up of exports with imports.

It should perhaps be made clear that the Fund's assets never really change. Whenever a member borrows a sum of hard currency, he deposits with the Fund an equal sum of his own soft currency. So the transaction is actually a sale of one kind of currency for another convertible type. When the term of the loan has expired, the member simply repur-

chases his own currency with gold or convertible funds.

Mr. President, we have all seen what the Marshall plan contributed to reinvigorating the currencies of Western European countries. Some of them, Belgium and Holland for example, having once drawn upon the Fund themselves, now see their own francs and guilders being borrowed by other countries in need of foreign exchange. I think both we and they can take considerable satisfaction in this development. I submit that it makes even clearer our duty to bring the reserves of the International Monetary Fund into line with the needs of all its members.

I conclude by saying that this is not a giveaway. This is a business transaction between nations, for their own preservation. Today the President is conferring with the representative of Great Britain. In this critical hour, when the free nations are facing the challenge of Khrushchev, it is well for us to strengthen our very vitals in this way.

Mr. DIRKSEN. 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. 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.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time consumed in the quorum call be charged equally to both sides.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no objection.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the pending bill which proposes to increase the U.S. contribution to the International Monetary Fund and to the World Bank. I believe that this organization has proved its worth during the 12 years it has been in existence. It has contributed immensely to the great increase in world commerce and to the business which has been done among nations. It has also contributed greatly to the U.S. economic system. It has been of great help in developing the so-called undeveloped nations of the world. In fact, about one-third of all the loans made by the World Bank have gone for the construction of public utilities in such countries, which have borrowed money, without which they could not have made further progress.

Although the amount involved seems very large, to the limit of \$8,675 million, which is imposed upon it by the bill, we must understand that this is not all expense; it does not represent money actually paid in by the United States, because to a great extent the bill merely provides for a guarantee of the loans, just as we guarantee loans for certain programs in the United States.

The point at issue with reference to the increased contribution on the part



of the United States to the fund and to the bank is when it shall be made available. Three principal witnesses appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations. They were Secretary Anderson, of the Treasury; Assistant Secretary Dillon, of the State Department; and Mr. McCloy, representing the American Bankers Association and also the Chase Manhattan Bank. None of these witnesses made a very convincing argument for making the additional contribution available immediately. Therefore, the committee amended the bill so that it will be available at the beginning of the next fiscal year, July 1. Had the administration given any convincing evidence that these funds would be needed during the next 3 months, I, for one, would have been glad to make the contribution available immediately.

So much has been said on this point that I should like to read into the RECORD excerpts from the testimony of the witnesses who came before the committee. The first is an excerpt from the testimony of the Secretary of Treasury, Mr. Anderson. The excerpt I shall read appears at page 21 of the printed hearings:

The CHAIRMAN. What has been the trend in the last 6 months of the drawings on the Fund? Have they been going up or going down during the past 6 months?

Secretary ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I don't have it on a 6-month basis. My judgment is that they have gone off slightly below the past 2 years; they have not been as severe.

The CHAIRMAN. They have decreased since the time of the Suez crisis?

Secretary ANDERSON. Yes, that is correct, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Suez produced almost a panic, did it not? The requirements for foreign exchange were very extraordinary, were they not?

Secretary ANDERSON. Well, you really had two things happen. You had the Suez situation, and you had the exchange crisis which developed in 1957.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that not largely brought on by Suez?

Secretary ANDERSON. It was certainly influenced by Suez.

The CHAIRMAN. Your chart No. 1 indicates there has been a very substantial drop in the requirements on the Fund since 1957.

Secretary ANDERSON. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. I wonder if you have more current information than that chart shows.

Secretary ANDERSON. We do have it. It is still turning down.

As of the end of 1958, \$1,400,000 was left in the International Monetary Fund for use in the current year. I understand that at present more than \$1 billion is available, and there seem to be no indications of emergencies occurring in the near future which would require larger amounts.

I for one would not want to have the United States make contributions to any of these funds if it were necessary to borrow in order to do so. I would not want to put the \$400 million in gold into the fund prematurely; in fact, I would want to wait until the very last minute when that could be done, and when it was shown conclusively that it was needed. I believe we should give the authority to do so at as early a date as it seems likely that the funds will be needed.

Under Secretary of State Dillon, so far as I know, did not comment on the pending question as to when the fund should be made available. He favored the bill, as did the other witnesses.

Mr. McCloy, representing the American Bankers Association, as well as the Chase Manhattan Bank, had this to say, on page 103 of the hearings, in response to a question by the chairman, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]:

The CHAIRMAN. So it is extremely important in that.

One other aspect of that is this: Do you see any compelling necessity that this increase in the funds—the International Monetary Fund is part of this; you have already commented, I believe, on the Bank—but for the Fund itself, is there any compelling necessity that this increase be made available within the next 3 months? Is there that kind of urgency?

Mr. McCLOY. I don't anticipate any emergency within the next 3 months that I can say makes it impelling that you do it.

Then there was further colloquy between the chairman and Mr. McCloy. Mr. McCloy ended his statement on this matter at the middle of page 104, again saying that he did not see any need for the contribution to be made at this time.

The House bill as it has been reported to the House makes the funds available immediately. The bill as reported to the Senate by the Committee on Foreign Relations makes the contributions available on July 1.

It is obvious that if the Senate bill were passed as is, and the House retained the present language of the House bill, the matter would go to conference. I have advised top administration officials that if they can produce a more convincing argument or reason for making the contributions immediately available than the reasons their witnesses gave before our committee, I will be receptive to whatever evidence they might adduce. It was my advice, for what it was worth, that they should not seek to have a fight made on the Senate floor, where they were almost certain to be defeated, and as a result, the Senate would almost be bound to maintain an adamant position when the bill goes to conference. I think it is all right to speak against the bill and say why the proposal of the Treasury, the White House, or any other agency of the Government should not be adopted. But I am sorry we shall have a yea and nay vote on the amendment, because I have no doubt what the outcome will be. My vote will have to be based on the evidence presented so far. It may be that in due time the administration will be able to produce evidence which will convince the committee of conference that the money ought to be made available immediately, or at least before July 1.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time remains to each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has 37 minutes remaining; the Senator from Illinois has 32 minutes remaining.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I appreciate that I probably am the only remaining speaker on the bill on this side of the aisle. We have been trying

to take care of the requests of a number of Senators who are officially away from the Chamber for a short time at the Pentagon. I had indicated that the Senate might vote as early as 2:30, although the time limit as set by the unanimous-consent agreement is 3 o'clock.

I have had informal discussions with various Senators with respect to pressing the case against section 3 of the bill, which places the burden in the fiscal year 1960 instead of the fiscal year 1959. It might be gathered from that statement that the primary consideration here is a budget consideration. Yet with me that is not so at all. The primary consideration, in my judgment, is to do those things which are reasonable, as requested by the Secretary of the Treasury, who is the governor and our representative in this matter, because I believe his evaluation of the situation in the world and of the responsibility of this bank and this fund must transcend my own judgment, unless I can refute the contentions which he makes.

On occasion it has been said—and we make the necessary political discounts—that there has been a lack of leadership in this administration. Mr. President, if anything demonstrates leadership, I believe it is the very measure with respect to the International Bank and the International Fund, which came to use from the President. I believe the record shows that as early as August 18 of last year the President sent a 3-page letter to the Secretary of the Treasury. First, the Secretary inquired of the President. Then the President sent him that long letter, indicating how anxious he was to get something done in this field, so as to increase the necessary capital and authority, so that the Bank would be assured of the means and resources by which to carry on its good work.

Incidentally, I wish to say to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT] that the report which accompanies the bill is an excellent one. It is at once readable, and I think it is quite fair. Normally I am in favor of the bill. But I do take exception to section 3, the amendment written into the bill by the committee, which does not appear in the House version of the bill.

But the chronology is fairly well established, namely, that this effort began in August of last year; then, on the 28th of the same month, the President wrote to the Secretary, and said he should go to the international conference in New Delhi, India, and that there he should propose these increases; and in the letter the President said that the Secretary should ask for "prompt consideration."

The President did not say that the Secretary should wait until the end of the fiscal year. Instead, the President asked the Secretary to request prompt action from the representatives of the 68 countries, or from all the representatives in attendance at that conference in India. I think that demonstrates the leadership of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury in this field.

The months of August, September, and October were then given over to the vari-

ous consultations; and in October the Secretary went to New Delhi, India. In the speech he made there, he said—and in my judgment this statement by him constitutes the key to the matter:

The importance of this matter will be so evident as to create a sense of urgency.

Mr. President, the one who has to administer this program, the one who has the fiscal burden of our country on his shoulders, who is a dedicated spirit, in my book, was so anxious, that the delegates and all others present got a sense of urgency.

Obviously, there does not have to be urgency if the committee says, "Wait until the beginning of the fiscal year and waste 12 or 14 weeks."

My friend, the Senator from Vermont, says no need was demonstrated. No need was demonstrated in October 1929, when the house of cards fell in and the Nation was overnight engulfed in a depression, notwithstanding the fact that the New York bankers had been here, testifying that there was no danger and no foreseeable difficulty. The developments at Suez could not be foreseen, although they resulted in a drain of nearly \$1 billion on this organization in connection with the exchange crisis of 1956 and 1957.

Crises do not come on the installment plan. Suddenly they arrive in all their naked fury; and if one does not have the resources required in order to deal with them, one is in trouble.

That is the point the Secretary of Treasury made at the New Delhi Conference. Furthermore, he made it to me, in my office. He has made this point because he is concerned about this matter.

The cold print of recorded testimony taken before a committee does not always reveal such concern. But the Secretary is deeply concerned; and he came to us, to lay this matter before us; and I became concerned, because I thought there was a contagious quality about his concern.

So unanimous action was taken at the conference in India; and on December 21, it was followed by the executive report of the Governors, and the resolutions came in; and on December 22 the Governors approved.

This is the resolution which was adopted by the Governors who administer this matter for 68 countries:

Since it is in the interest of the Fund and its members that the contemplated increases be expedited, the members are invited to comply as soon as possible with the procedures for notice and payments.

This matter does not apply to us alone. There is a 75-percent participation provision. In a few moments I shall discuss it.

But there was the statement of the Governors, those who must administer this program, which the committee report says this has been well handled, and that the operation is efficient and is substantial—and it is.

So the Governors said:

To comply as soon as possible with the procedures for notice and payments to the Fund—

Under the resolution.

Then came February 12, when the President delivered his message; and on February 17, the bill was introduced. On March 9, the hearings were held.

So there is the story, beginning in the middle of August, when the President and the Secretary of Treasury requested prompt consideration; and thereafter the convention or the conference in New Delhi, India requested prompt consideration; and the Governors in their resolution asked that this matter be given attention "as soon as possible" and asked the members to comply.

So this is not a budget consideration or question. Instead, this is a matter of a world operation and a question of whether it has the necessary resources.

The second committee amendment—and it is one thing I am interested in—would put this authorization into the fiscal year 1960. It is now March 1959. Following this month will come April, May, and June—3 months. In 3 months the world could go to the devil in a handbasket; it has done so before.

I do not want to see our country abandon and forfeit its leadership under a dedicated President and a dedicated Secretary of the Treasury, who have come with anxious hearts to say to us, "Give us this in 1959, and do not make us wait for 14 weeks, because we cannot look over the bill and see what might happen."

The world is full of fever, and events move with great acceleration. We cannot take any chances in that connection.

The committee recommends, by means of its second amendment, that the authorization be put into the fiscal year 1960. The committee's argument is that the bill itself manifests a continuing interest on the part of the country and our abiding interest in the operations of the Bank and the Fund. The committee included in the hearings a table. I do not have the slightest doubt that the table is accurate and authentic, so far as it goes. The purpose of including the table was to show that the demands have been receding somewhat, and that if we measure this matter on the basis of so many million dollars a week or so many million dollars a month, predicated on the past, perhaps we could make out satisfactorily.

But, Mr. President, that is not the story. In this world, events are not particularly predicated upon how quiet this fiscal demand has been in the last 12 months. When the demand begins, it develops and increases very rapidly. And when we do not have the resources, we cannot move in with expeditious action.

What is the problem with respect to the Fund? The Secretary told the committee that on the 1st of January of this year it had a \$2.3 billion balance in golden dollars. That is exclusive of Canadian dollars, German marks, British sterling, and that kind of fund. Look at the arithmetic involved: \$2.3 billion; and standby commitments were \$900 million. So the amount is reduced to \$1.4 billion. The golden dollar need has been expressed by the committee, and particularly on page 3 of its report.

Now every country that is a member of the Fund has drawing rights. Those drawing rights cannot be denied to them. Those drawing rights add up to about \$1 billion. So when we get through, we have available for all other demands, not \$1 billion, or \$1 billion plus. We could have available, for another emergency situation, \$400 million.

That is less than half the amount committed in the Suez and the exchange crises—\$400 million.

Those are the figures the Secretary gave to me. They become pretty impressive when we consider the rights of countries to draw on the fund, and the standby commitments, and the standard that it requires golden dollars to do the job, because they are what are in demand.

The actual cash demands in the years 1956 and 1957, according to the statement I received from the Secretary, had been \$1.4 billion. I do not know that the statement conforms to everything that was said to the committee, but I got the information yesterday afternoon, because I wanted to be sure the information was current.

I asked all manner of questions, in the hope I would get the whole story. I certainly would not be making a fight against a committee amendment if only a budget consideration were involved. I would make a fight, but I would not carry it to the very end. But this is a different situation, because the leadership of the United States of America is here involved. I do not want it to be felt that we had done our duty when we passed a bill and then said to the 68 countries, "Throw your marbles into the pot. We are going to wait 14 weeks before we do it." We are not going to fill the need on that kind of doctrine.

That leads me to the question of participation, on which I shall have something to say. There is a provision in the Bretton Woods Agreement that there is to be 75 percent participation before the fund can use the increased money. It was said there could not be a 75 percent participation except some time late in the year. There will never be such a participation if the world's leading Nation says, "Gather around, all you Governors. Throw your marbles in the pot right away, so we get 75 percent participation, but while you are doing that, we are going to wait until the end of the present fiscal year, and we are going to wait 12 or 14 weeks in which to do it."

Is that great leadership? I have heard some speeches made around here about the need for dynamic leadership; the need for bold, fresh action. Bold action. This is no bold action, in my book, if we are going to let the world sit at the well and say, "We do not think you need that money. We do not think there is going to be a crisis. Jack McCloy cannot see anything ahead. Therefore, based on such testimony, we are not going to make the money available."

Not by my vote will that position be assumed. An isolationist tag was put on me for a long time. My distinguished colleague knows about it happening in the days we served in the House together. I have learned a few things, I hope. But I want to be sure that my country, by



action of the Congress, is not going to lose its leadership, by waiting until the beginning of the new fiscal year. Why not give the money? It may cost a little in interest—\$342 million. A little interest will have to be paid on it. But I would rather have the assurance that this \$1,350 million, out of which \$450 million is in gold, will be there if Secretary Anderson needs it. We hear speeches made on the floor of the Senate about waste and extravagance in foreign aid. We had to reconstruct the whole financial structure of Turkey at one time, when inflation was rampant. Through the instrumentality here in question we were able to move into Turkey, and we got a pretty fair job done, according to Secretary Anderson. That is a job for this instrumentality and what is made available through it.

Mr. President, there are many possibilities. I do not like to talk about them. I never like to speculate too much about what is over the hill. Many speeches concerning Berlin have been made on the floor of the Senate. There have been many indications as to what the administration ought to do. Well, the President spoke up. I thought he made a masterful address to the country. It brought a degree of hope and comfort and assurance to the people.

Let us talk not only about Berlin, but about the efficacy of our defense posture and where our responsibility lies in the foreign aid field.

There does not have to be a shooting war in order for tensions to develop that shake every chancellery in the world and every exchange. What is involved, in the Bank, is economic development; and, in the Fund, a goal of stabilizing and protecting the currencies of countries and keeping them on a sound basis. An excellent result has been accomplished. That is the delicate thing. That is the thing that can be sunk overnight, when someone rocks the boat. It happened in 1929. It was the president of the National City Bank who proclaimed to the world that everything was ducky, and overnight we went into the cellar.

Mr. President, I do not want to be in the position of having to apologize. I am not going to reproach my conscience by saying, "Well, you had an opportunity to give Secretary Anderson what he asked for with an anxious heart, and you did not do it. You said, in effect, 'All you 68 members throw your marbles into the pot. We will wait until the end of the fiscal year.'"

That is not leadership, in my book. That is why the amendment takes on considerable importance. I do not want Ecuador and Guatemala to say, "We led the way for the great country to the north, because we had already consented." I am not going to forfeit our leadership. We have struggled too long for it. If it is to be my vote alone that will be a vote for eliminating the committee amendment when it is offered, it will be at least that much.

So here is an accent on emergency by the President of the United States. Here is an accent on urgency by a very distinguished Secretary of the Treasury,

who comes to Congress from a busy office and talks with Members and says, "I need this." I feel it was done under deep obligation, especially after I talked to many representatives in India last fall.

Can we be accused of boldness? Maybe it is a bold delay, but I do not want to be charged with it. If ever there was a time when we could demonstrate some dynamic quality, I think this is the time for the Congress to do it, for an institution and fund which, by the admission of everybody familiar with it, have done an efficient job and a forthright job. That is what the committee said.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the first place, can the Senator advise me where the requirement rests that one-fourth of the payment be in gold? Is that in the original Bretton Woods agreement?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think it is in the original Bretton Woods agreement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is in the original Bretton Woods agreement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is there a determination that the gold shall be at the present value of \$35 an ounce?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know about that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think so. The gold was evaluated at that rate, and must be maintained at that rate insofar as the Fund is concerned.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The distinguished chairman of the committee has served in the House, and was serving about the time the gold was so evaluated, as was also the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. I always think of the rather ironic way in which history rises up. This is sort of a lineal descendant of the old stabilization fund, when we raised the price of gold by taking a few grains out of the gold dollar, and we discovered the \$1.8 billion of the increment so gained was not necessary, for the stabilization fund then in being and so it was used for the creation of the International Fund which we have today.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That was a part of the original funds.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So history repeats itself, while we are in Congress in another body.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Let us assume that during the life of the agreement the price of gold should change again.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I must confess I have not carefully examined the language in the agreement to the point of understanding that there is any provision for a modification of the gold price.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If I may, I should like to invite the Senator's attention to page 23 of the hearings, where this matter was discussed by the Secre-

tary of the Treasury. Would the Senator like to have me read that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Secretary said:

Yes, there is a fixed basis in that all of the countries are required to declare a par value at some time, and this par value is related to either gold or dollars.

Now thereafter it undertakes an obligation to maintain that its currency will not fluctuate from that par by more than 1 percent. If it does fluctuate, the country has to put in new currency if it goes down, or the country takes back currency, if the value of the currency goes up.

In other words, it is related directly to the par value of all currencies and related to the gold at the rate established, \$35 an ounce.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It would appear that if the value of the currency were to go down the country would have to reimburse the Fund.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The country would have to put in more currency.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It does not appear clear as to what would happen if the price of gold should appreciate and there should be an increment, to which the Senator from Illinois alluded. If there should be such an increment after the gold was in the Fund, presumably the Fund would get the benefit from it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not sure. I rather think that benefit would redound to the country, because the Fund is expressed in terms of dollars.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have a further question with regard to a different aspect of the matter.

I notice in the statement submitted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, on page 116 of the record of the hearings, it is stated:

The United States would have to make a gold payment in the amount of approximately \$344 million. The remainder of slightly over \$1 billion would not actually be expended from the U.S. Treasury until needed by the International Monetary Fund to meet a situation where a great demand would be made for loans by member countries.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is a callable fund.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is a callable fund.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The countries put demand notes into the Fund. Whenever the Fund has need for the money, it can call upon the Treasury to deliver the dollars.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The reason for inviting attention to that matter is that if the statement in the American Farm Bureau Federation presentation is correct, it becomes relatively less material as to what is the effective date, whether it be now or July 1. If the Treasury cannot be required to put up the money until the Fund needs it, then the date is less important.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite correct. Is the question addressed to me?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is addressed to either Senator. I am happy

to have the comment of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is a question, when does the need arise?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. I certainly do not believe there is any reasonable chance that any of this money would be needed before July 1.

With respect to that part which is in gold, there is little prospect it will be needed until a real crisis develops, at least of the nature of the Suez crisis. Even with regard to the Suez crisis, which took place in the biggest year we have ever had, for the entire 12 months only \$977 million was used. All we are talking about is a delay of 3 months.

As the Senator from Illinois pointed out, there is in the Fund roughly a billion dollars now free and uncommitted, not subject to standby or any other commitment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then it seems to me the major point to be considered is whether there is some value, for moral or diplomatic reasons or for reasons of negotiation, in having the act become immediately effective.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The passage of the bill would certainly be sufficient action to convince any reasonable person that so far as we are concerned this has been agreed to and the money will be available on July 1. I think that is the only leadership needed.

I do not believe that the further act of making available money, which could not be used until 75 percent of all the contributors also subscribed would in itself be of great value. That procedure will take some time. Only two countries have completed such action, and they are relatively small countries in Latin America. No major country has completed action.

The result would be that if we turned over the gold to the Fund, the Fund would hold the gold in its possession until 75 percent of the rest of the subscribers had also made available their gold and agreed to put up their total subscriptions.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, in conclusion, I should like to comment that it seems to me the date is relatively less important, so far as the Treasury is concerned, if the Treasury is not going to have a demand until the money is actually needed, since there will be no impact on the Treasury. I think there is some value in having the legislation become effective as soon as possible, for the moral force, if we are going to support the program at all.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there is an answer to the problem. I recall a session I had with a chief of state in Asia. When we had discussed matters rather thoroughly, we got around to the question of aid, and he asked, "Has the money been appropriated? Is the money on the shelf?"

These countries know a good deal about our budget procedures. We are dealing with 68 countries and a 75 percent provision, so we have to have that much participation before the increased fund will come into use. It will be said,

"Well, we passed a bill." The question then will be, "Where is the money?" Other countries will say, "Well the United States is in no hurry about putting up the money. Why should we be in a hurry?"

That pushes the program on and on and on. Perhaps instead of its being accomplished next fall, it will be the following year before these resources will become available. That in itself is an argument to sustain my judgment that the amendment should be taken out of the bill.

I allude again to the committee report. It is said that what the Bank does is an efficient operation. It is said that it is successful. It is said that they have built up strong reserves. It is said, "Gold and dollars are the important elements." It is said, "Gold and dollar composition might be at low levels at any particular time." And the committee report says, "The Fund could not now meet a demand of comparable scale to 1957 in the event of a similar future crisis."

I do not wish to have our country put in that hole, Mr. President, because the demands might be greater than ever before.

This is not a budget problem. This is not a political problem. This is not a case of trying to move the money from one year to another to make one budget or another look better. No, there is a far more compelling reason behind the procedure, and it is the urgency which has been expressed for 6½ months, from August of last year until now, by the President, by the Secretary of the Treasury, and by the governors from these various countries who administer the Bank and the Fund operation. All of these gentlemen are in agreement and are asking for expeditious action, yet it is proposed that the Senate shall say to them, "Wait awhile."

Under those circumstances I do not want to wait. That is why I am against the committee amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the clerk of the committee has handed me a copy of the articles of agreement of the International Monetary Fund. Article IV is headed "Par Values of Currencies," and reads as follows:

SECTION 1. Expression of par values: (a) The par value of the currency of each member shall be expressed in terms of gold as a common denominator or in terms of the U.S. dollar of the weight and fineness in effect on July 1, 1944.

That, of course, would be \$35 an ounce.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Paragraph (b) reads as follows:

All computations relating to currencies of members for the purpose of applying the provisions of this agreement shall be on the basis of their par values.

Section 2 reads as follows:

Gold purchases based on par values: The Fund shall prescribe a margin above and

below par value for transactions in gold by members, and no member shall buy gold at a price above par value plus the prescribed margin, or sell gold at a price below par value minus the prescribed margin.

That probably provides the answer.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the problem which arises is that a number of countries never did succeed in establishing the par value of their money.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may need.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the provisions of the resolution adopted by the Board of Governors of the International Fund relating to the 75 percent requirement.

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

2. None of the increases in quotas proposed in paragraph 1 of this resolution shall become effective unless:

(i) The member concerned has notified the Fund in writing that it consents to the increase in its quota; and

(ii) The Fund determines that members having not less than 75 percent of the total of quotas on January 31, 1959, have consented to increases in their quotas; and

(iii) The requirement is satisfied of a minimum aggregate increase in subscriptions, contained in the resolution of the Board of Governors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development entitled "Increase of \$10 billion in Authorized Capital Stock and Subscriptions Thereof," recommended by the executive directors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate long.

I think it is quite evident from the discussion which has already taken place that there is no real purpose to be served by making the actual dollars or gold available to the Fund at this time. The action of the Congress in passing the legislation assuring that the money will be made available on July 1 is sufficient, I believe. That will be in ample time. In fact I think the need might well not arise until much later than that. However, I do not wish to make the effective date any later, because of a situation which might arise.

There is one source of confusion which I should like to clarify, if possible. It relates to the figures which the Senator from Illinois used with regard to the need for money in 1957 and 1956. Those figures related to a full year. I invite the attention of Senators to page 7 of the committee report, which I think makes quite clear the fantastic improbability of any need for our contribution arising before July 1.

It will be noted that the figure for the full year 1957 was \$977 million. Today there is on hand, free of any commitments, \$1 billion. So for the next 3 months there will be available \$1 billion in gold or dollars. That represents three or four times the rate at which the



money was used during the period referred to, even during the Suez crisis. So I think it is quite unrealistic to make a case based upon the argument that the money is needed by the Fund.

The only real argument which the Senator from Illinois suggested—although he thought it was so weak that he did not choose to rest his case upon it—is based upon the effect of a balanced or unbalanced budget in 1960. The argument on the part of the administration is that it wishes to create confidence in the dollar by having a balanced budget. Therefore it places everything possible in this year's budget, on the theory that confidence in the dollar will not be affected if this year's deficit is \$12 billion, \$15 billion, or even perhaps \$20 billion.

It seems to me that that reasoning is entirely without merit. I believe the U.S. Government to be a continuing body, just as I believe the Senate is. Whether \$12 billion or \$15 billion is in this year's budget, and 2 or 3 billion in next year's is not a matter which will affect seriously or substantially, or at all, the confidence of ourselves or our friends abroad in the stability of the dollar. I cannot see that it makes the slightest difference whether the budget deficit is much larger this year and much less the next year. If the total is the same, it makes no difference whether all or a part of it is shifted from one year to the other.

That is the substance of the argument. I do not believe that any serious minded person is convinced that there will be any use for the \$344 million in the fund before the 1st of July. If there is any case to be made, it is on the basis of the question of confidence in the dollar. I am unimpressed by any such argument. I am quite willing to leave the question to the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I undertook today, in discussing this matter, to implement the need and to put it on that basis, and also to indicate the deep concern of the Secretary of the Treasury, who is the fiscal administrator and the Governor of the Fund and the Bank, so far as U.S. representation is concerned. That weighs very heavily with me.

I hope I do not trespass on the rules of the Senate when I allude to a statement which appeared on the news ticker, but I think it is so pertinent that I ask the indulgence and forbearance of the Senate if I do trespass. It reads:

In the House, meanwhile, a Democratic leader sharply criticized the proposal to delay until July 1 the contribution to the Monetary Fund.

Chairman BRENT SPENCE, of the House Banking Committee, warned that "it would not be a good thing" to delay the contribution in view of the present world crisis.

That is the very issue before the Senate. The parliamentary situation is that this matter will be offered as a committee amendment, since it appears in the bill. I have indicated my opposition to the amendment, and I hope the argument commends itself to all Senators.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to repeat that the evidence presented before the Committee on Foreign Relations was not convincing or conclusive. If the House passes the bill in the form reported by the committee, the subject will then be in conference, and the evidence which may be forthcoming in the meantime can be presented to the conference of both Houses. If the evidence is conclusive, I for one will be glad to have the date set forward. But until such evidence is presented, I feel I should stand by the committee's recommendation, because there were no votes against the committee bill as reported.

Mr. HOLLAND. I support the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, and will vote to uphold the committee report, with the definite understanding that in conference, if the officials who handle this complicated matter are able to make a case and a showing of urgency about the matter, the situation can be ironed out in accordance with that showing.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the rest of the time on behalf of the proponents of the bill, and to ask for a quorum call preceding the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the second committee amendment, which inserts, on page 2 of the bill, a new section, section 3. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask that the question be restated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the second committee amendment, which inserts, on page 2 of the bill, a new section, section 3.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If

present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay," and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 25, as follows:

## YEAS—58

Aiken	Hart	Murray
Anderson	Hayden	Muskie
Bartlett	Hill	Neuberger
Bible	Holland	O'Mahoney
Byrd, Va.	Humphrey	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Proxmire
Cannon	Johnson, Tex.	Randolph
Carroll	Johnston, S.C.	Robertson
Church	Kefauver	Russell
Clark	Kennedy	Smith
Dodd	Kerr	Sparkman
Douglas	Langer	Stennis
Eastland	Lausche	Symington
Ellender	Mansfield	Talmadge
Engle	McClellan	Thurmond
Ervin	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Frear	McNamara	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Green	Morse	
Gruening	Moss	

## NAYS—25

Beall	Curtis	Morton
Bennett	Dirksen	Mundt
Bush	Dworshak	Saltonstall
Butler	Goldwater	Schoeppel
Capehart	Hruska	Scott
Carlson	Javits	Wiley
Case, S. Dak.	Keating	Williams, Del.
Cooper	Kuchel	
Cotton	Martin	

## NOT VOTING—15

Allott	Hartke	Magnuson
Bridges	Henning	McCarty
Case, N.J.	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Chavez	Jordan	Smathers
Gore	Long	Yarborough

So the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 73, nays 10, as follows:

## YEAS—73

Aiken	Engle	Monroney
Anderson	Ervin	Morse
Bartlett	Frear	Morton
Beall	Fulbright	Moss
Bennett	Green	Mundt
Bible	Gruening	Murray
Bush	Hart	Muskie
Butler	Hayden	Neuberger
Byrd, Va.	Hill	O'Mahoney
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Prouty
Cannon	Hruska	Proxmire
Capehart	Humphrey	Randolph
Carlson	Jackson	Robertson
Carroll	Javits	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Scott
Church	Keating	Smith
Clark	Kefauver	Sparkman
Cooper	Kennedy	Stennis
Cotton	Kuchel	Symington
Curtis	Lausche	Wiley
Dodd	Mansfield	Williams, N.J.
Douglas	Martin	Young, N. Dak.
Dworshak	McClellan	Young, Ohio
Eastland	McGee	
Ellender	McNamara	

## NAYS—10

Dirksen	Langer	Thurmond
Goldwater	Russell	Williams, Del.
Johnston, S.C.	Schoeppel	
Kerr	Talmadge	

## NOT VOTING—15

Allott	Hartke	Magnuson
Bridges	Henning	McCarthy
Case, N.J.	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Chavez	Jordan	Smathers
Gore	Long	Yarborough

So the bill (S. 1094) was passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Bretton Woods Agreements Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:*

"Sec. 16. (a) The United States Governor of the Fund is authorized to request and consent to an increase of \$1,375,000,000 in the quota of the United States under article III, section 2, of the articles of agreement of the Fund, as proposed in the resolution of the Board of Governors of the Fund dated February 2, 1959.

"(b) The United States Governor of the Bank is authorized (1) to vote for increases in the capital stock of the Bank under article II, section 2, of the articles of agreement of the Bank, as recommended in the resolution of the Board of Governors of the Bank dated February 2, 1959, and (2) if such increases become effective, to subscribe on behalf of the United States to thirty-one thousand seven hundred and fifty additional shares of stock under article II, section 3, of the articles of agreement of the Bank."

Sec. 2. Section 7(b) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act is amended by striking out "of \$950,000,000", and by striking out "not to exceed \$4,125,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$8,675,000,000".

Sec. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective on July 1, 1959.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, earlier in the day a colloquy occurred with respect to the availability of the bill, the report, and the printed hearings. I think it was the result of a misunderstanding more than anything else.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] was correct, in that the full text of the report certainly was not available yesterday. It did become available later, and the report was in full form, I believe, about 7 or 8 o'clock that night, while the Senate was still in session. I think it should be said in behalf of the Senator from Delaware that, with respect to what was filed at 12:30 that day, he is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The fact of the matter is—and I checked this with the bill clerk—that a dummy bill was filed with the bill clerk early yesterday with the statement that the real bill had been reported and the bill clerk was requested to hold the dummy bill until the real bill was received from the committee.

About 7:30 o'clock last night the real bill was obtained from the committee,

together with two pages of the proposed report, again with the request that they be held, and the promise was made that as soon as possible the full report would be forwarded. That was 7:30 last night.

The Senate recessed at 7:38 o'clock last night. At 8 o'clock the bill clerk was still waiting for the report. It had not come, and he went home. I understand the Committee on Foreign Relations, after writing the report, some time around 8 o'clock, sent it to the Government Printing Office. Therefore it was not available, even from the bill clerk.

The point I make is that the bill was not available to me, as a Member of the Senate. I think the majority leader should recognize that point and admit that he was in error.

I emphasize that at the time the unanimous consent was obtained to consider the bill and limit debate, the bill and the report were not available as we were led to believe. It was not on the calendar, even though it had been assigned a number. The bill clerk did not even have a copy of the bill or the report. If I am in error, I ask any member of the Committee on Foreign Relations to contradict me. You all know that I am right.

I think the RECORD should show that the bill and report were not available at the time the unanimous consent was given. Yet the consent was obtained only on the statement that they were available. They were not available in time for any Member of the Senate to obtain copies last night.

I do not question the fact that the majority leader may have thought he was correct. I am making no accusation. I think this is a misunderstanding on his part. I do know I was unable to obtain a copy of the bill and report when the Senate adjourned last night. I checked again an hour ago, and I was told that the bill clerk himself did not receive the report before he went home which was around 8 p.m. last night.

This bill calls for expenditures of over \$1 billion yet it is being steamrolled through the Senate without the Members having had an opportunity to even read it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I did not say that the report was available last evening. I stated that I would not bring the bill up for debate last evening, or until a copy of the report was on each Member's desk.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct but I gave consent only based on that understanding.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The report and printed hearings were available before the bill was brought up for debate.

All I can testify in connection with the time when the report was filed is that the clerk and the chairman of the committee told me that the bill itself—not a dummy bill—was turned in at the desk during the morning hour yesterday. The first few pages of the report were also turned in at the desk at the same time. The final, complete report was given to the Senate printing clerk between 7 and 8 o'clock last evening.



I am informed that if I or any other Senator had asked for a copy of the bill after the morning hour yesterday or a copy of the full report between 7 and 8 o'clock last evening a copy would have been furnished. No Senator asked me for copies of either, and, so far I was aware, no Senator had requested such copies from anyone. If anyone had told me that he wanted a copy of the report, I would have personally delivered it to him last evening. When I made my request for the consideration of the bill today, I asked the minority leader to write his own ticket. I asked him to confer with the Members on his side of the aisle and to tell me how much time he wanted, and when he wanted it brought up, because it is an administration-sponsored bill. He told me what he wanted. I complied with his request. When I made my request I said there would be no action taken on the bill last night.

I am well aware of what the Senator has said about wanting the report to be available. I was informed by the clerk of the Committee on Foreign Relations that he personally gave the full report to the printing clerk about 7:30 o'clock, and that carbon copies of the report were available at the committee from that time on.

The only statement of the majority leader was that he would not ask the Senate to take any action on the bill in the way of debating it last night, and that when he did ask it he would see to it that the report and the hearings were available to every Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. When consent was given last night I said, with reference to the bill and the report: "If they are available tonight, I have no objection." That is my exact statement last evening. It was only with the clear understanding that they would be available, that I agreed. Then I went to the appropriate place to get the report, and it was not available. I have great respect for the majority leader, but I am sure no one will maintain that we are supposed to get copies of reports from him. It would be ridiculous to say that he carries all these reports with him. We have regular paid bill clerks for this work.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The chairman of the committee had the report. It had been given to the printing clerk, and copies were available at the committee office. The Senator from Delaware is beclouding the issue. I never had the report. I did not give it to anyone. I did not give the Senator the assurance that I had the report last night, and the Senator from Delaware knows it. I feel the Senator has gotten all the headlines he can get out of the matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am not interested in headlines. This is very irregular procedure to proceed to take up a bill which has not been printed. At the time the motion was made to take up this bill last night neither the bill nor the report were here.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I heard the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] ask the Senator from Delaware if he had any objection. I believe the RECORD

shows that he was asked if he had any objection and that the Senator said he would have no objection if the report was available.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. If the report was available—but it was not available as I was led to believe.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The report was available last night. The chairman of the committee filed it last night. It is true that the report was not printed and put on each Senator's desk. However, no one assured the Senator from Delaware that it would be.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It may be a misunderstanding, but I can assure you it will not happen again. When the next unanimous-consent agreement is asked for, I will clearly understand what is happening.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I merely wish to add that Dr. Marcy concurs in what the majority leader has said, and I believe that is in agreement with what the Senator from Delaware has said. The full report of the committee was not filed at noon, but a carbon copy of the full report was available, according to Dr. Marcy, the clerk of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. At about 7:30 o'clock last night.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It was available sometime around 7:30 o'clock. There is apparently some misunderstanding, which is unfortunate. However, I trust that it will leave no scars and that the balm of Gilead will prevail, so that when the next request is made, our distinguished friend will treat it generously in the interest of the convenience of all Members.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I assure the Senator that I will consider the next request on its merits and I also assure him I will know what we are doing. This will not happen again.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: The Senator from Delaware and I have just conferred with the clerk of the Committee on Foreign Relations. We have concluded, as a result of this conference, that early last evening, around 7:30, a typed copy of the report was given by the clerk of the committee to the printing clerk. The Senator from Delaware told me that he had asked the bill clerk if he had received a copy of it. He had not. In effect, the clerk of the committee took a copy of the report to the printing clerk, and it was not made available to the bill clerk. In effect, the Senator from Delaware was talking about one man regarding the report, and the clerk of the Foreign Relations Committee was talking about another. One was the bill clerk and the other was the printing clerk.

I do not care to reflect on the Senator from Delaware or on any employee of the Senate. The fact is that the report was made available to the printing clerk at approximately 7:30, and that is about the time, I may inform the Senator from Delaware, the Senate adjourned. I wanted to make this statement for the RECORD.

I yield now to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Texas has said.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I deeply regret there has been any misunderstanding.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senate adjourned about 7:38. The colloquy took place around 7:20 to 7:30. The Senator from Texas said the report was available, had I talked to the clerk of the committee. I did go to the appropriate place in the Senate. It was not available where it was supposed to be. The printed reports and bill were not available here in the Senate until this morning. I wanted them last night. The committee clerk had sent the report to the Printing Office and it did not get back until this morning. I was correct when I said the report was not available to me, or to any other Senator who wanted it, last night. Presumably we could have gone to the Government Printing Office, and gotten it, but if we had, there would have been no reports available today for anybody. I am sure that this was a misunderstanding. But I am sure also that the Senator from Texas will agree that a bill and report in the hands of the printers is not considered as available for Senators to take home and study.

As I said earlier this morning, when I gave my consent last night it was with the clear understanding that a copy of the report and the bill would be available to me for study overnight.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I regret very much that was not the case. Had I known the Senator did not have the report available, or that he desired it, I would have made it available, because I am told there was an extra typed copy. I did not know the Senator made that request.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Whether there was an extra typed copy I do not know, but I do know that at the desk, where we normally get bills and reports, the report was not available at the time we adjourned. In fact, the bill and the report were not available until this morning, because the report was sent to the Printing Office last night.

I recognize that there is a basis here for this misunderstanding to have developed, and we can both be more careful the next time.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, having been present when the committee considered the amendment suggested by the chairman, and having heard the short explanation of it, I would say it was not satisfactory, even though I made no objection to the reporting of the amendment. I will say further that after hearing what the gentleman in the House had to say, and also having been in communication with the Department, I felt it was my duty to vote with the minority leader in relation to his suggestion.

I give this explanation, because ordinarily I vote for the committee report. I wish to say, in explanation, that the amendment came up within the last few minutes. It was not even before us or discussed except, as I have said, in

the last few minutes. After hearing the argument of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, and the explanation given in the other House, and also having the statement made to me that was made by the people downtown, I voted as I did. When I asked the question on the telephone, "Is it important that this amendment be defeated?" I was given the answer, "Yes; because of the world situation today we do not know when it will be necessary to have the funds necessary."

#### WEST URGED TO TAKE FRESH INITIATIVE IN BERLIN CRISIS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there is no topic which is of more vital concern at this hour than the matter of American foreign policy and the national security measures which we have taken or have not taken or should take. This of course refers directly to the Berlin crisis. The visit of Prime Minister Macmillan in Washington, just after his talks with Chancellor Adenauer, President Charles De Gaulle, and Prime Minister Diefenbaker, is another significant step in strengthening the world alliance in the face of the grave Communist challenge in Berlin.

Mr. Macmillan, who is scheduled to arrive at noon today, deserves a warm welcome. He should be applauded for his recent trip to Moscow, where he presented with candor, courage, and, I dare say, imagination, the position of the West. His example of courage and forthrightness is worthy of emulation. I believe the talks this coming weekend between President Eisenhower and the British Prime Minister will go a long way toward solidifying our position in Berlin.

Some time ago, in addressing a meeting in Washington, I had this to say about Mr. Macmillan:

The entire world is indebted to the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Macmillan, for his visit to the U.S.S.R. and his talks with the Soviet leaders. Prime Minister Macmillan has again demonstrated those great qualities of character which have marked the British people through their great history. With characteristic British good manners, he has consulted with Soviet officials in a spirit of understanding and patience which reveals great courage and statesmanship. He has exemplified friendliness to the Russian people, courtesy and proper diplomatic conduct to the Soviet officials. He has patiently explored areas of possible agreement between the Soviet and the Western nations. He has been conciliatory without appeasement. He has been firm and resolute without being stubbornly obstinate.

The British through their Prime Minister have demonstrated what we mean when we say firmness and negotiation are not in any way contradictory.

At the very time that our own leadership seems to be faltering and the Secretary of State was stricken down with serious illness, thereby limiting the role of American leadership, we see again the advantage which comes from being associated with our NATO partners.

Mr. President, that statement, made some 3 weeks ago, is still very true. We are indeed indebted to the leadership which has been exemplified by the Prime Minister of Great Britain. I for one, as

a Member of the Senate, salute and thank him and commend him.

In his address to the American people last Monday, the President rightly insisted on both firmness and our willingness to negotiate. I am gratified that he is now willing to go to the summit, if this seems justified by the foreign ministers' conference. The gravity of the Berlin crisis necessitates that we enter into face-to-face talks with Russian leaders, but to do so only after the most careful preparation.

The willingness to negotiate is only the beginning, not the end, of a responsible policy toward the German situation. Our major problem now is to develop a viable negotiating posture in concert with Britain, France, and West Germany. To enter into talks with the Russians, either at the foreign ministers' level or heads of state level, ill-prepared or disunited, is to invite humiliation and even disaster.

I am therefore gratified at the reported progress of the four-nation working group in Paris on drafting Western negotiating positions for the forthcoming talks with the Soviet Union.

Of course I am disturbed that the administration has been so tardy in grappling with the substance of the negotiation. This is indeed no new position for me, because over the past 3 or 4 years I have stated again and again what I thought was the importance of our preparing alternative proposals with which we could confront the Soviet Union on questions relating to central Europe, Berlin, and Germany.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. How much additional time does the Senator from Minnesota desire?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to have 10 additional minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. How much time remains on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen minutes remain.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield 10 additional minutes to the Senator from Minnesota. I give notice that I have already agreed to yield 2 minutes to the minority leader.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Our tardiness seems to reflect both a dangerous lack of imagination and an unbecoming timidity for the acknowledged leader of the free world. But that is as of yesterday. Today I say that I am pleased that our Government is taking anew the leadership in preparing for these important conferences.

In our policy toward German reunification, for example, the administration adhered doggedly to rigid positions which have helped produce the present stalemate. We all believe, of course, that genuinely free elections are the best means of creating a united and democratic Germany. I say it must be firm American policy that we not abandon this objective—I repeat—not abandon this objective. We should concentrate our present efforts on those measures which will produce a climate in which free elections will eventually be possible.

The East Germans, faithfully following instructions from their masters in the Kremlin, have been advancing ideas for the reunification of Germany on their own terms. Specifically, they have put forth a series of demands to be met by West Germany as the price for confederation. The East Germans have proposed the end of military conscription in the Federal Republic, the renunciation of nuclear weapons, and an end to Bonn's outlawry of the Communist Party. These lopsided demands are patently fraudulent. They are about as honest as the Bavarian sausage that was advertised to be half rabbit and half horse—one rabbit to one horse.

However, instead of simply assuming a posture of righteous indignation when such one-sided demands are made, would it not be better for us to encourage the West Germans to make some hard but reasonable counterdemands as the price for reunification? It is right and proper for the Bonn government to take the initiative in such matters. The Soviets have encouraged the Federal Republic to make counterproposals. I gather they have done so because they feel that we might restrain the Federal Republic, or attempt to restrain the Federal Republic, from entering into that kind of negotiation. However, we have nothing to lose, and perhaps much to gain, by imaginative Western overtures. Perhaps the West Germans could seize the initiative by making counterproposals, such as the following, as the price for confederation, and thereby prepare the way for true unification by free elections.

For example, why not a proposal requiring guarantees for a free press, freedom of movement, and freedom of religion in East Germany, as is now the case in West Germany? This would mean the free circulation of Western books, periodicals, and newspapers, as well as free cultural exchange between East Germany and the West.

I recognize that it does not include what are called free elections, but it is preparing the way in the appropriate steps for the kind of freedom which makes possible free political choice and, ultimately, free elections.

Second, why would it not be proper for, let us say, the West German Republic to require, as one of its requests and demands, that all political parties compete openly for the support of the electorate in both of the German areas, West Germany and East Germany?

Third—and I believe this is a very important point—it should be required that the People's Police be stripped of their inordinate political and military powers.

If East Germany expressed even a willingness to move in either of these directions, a new basis for the possible settlement of the German problems and the larger issues of European security might well be laid.

I fully recognize that there will be those who will say that these conditions will under no circumstances be met by East Germany. My answer is that we will never know until we at least lay them on the table and offer them as constructive, thoughtful proposals.

In a crisis as serious as the one we now face, there is no substitute for



imagination and new ideas. Indeed, many Senators have suggested the consideration of such proposals as the theory of disengagement which was advanced by Mr. Kennan, and the withdrawal or withdrawing of the troops of both the East and the West. Also, proposals have been made for the consideration of some aspects of the Rapacki plan, as advanced by the Polish Foreign Minister. All of these proposals might well be studied and considered.

I only offer the admonition that whatever is considered should be done with meticulous care. It must constantly be kept in mind that there are no short-time, short-run, immediate answers to these grave, perplexing, long-range problems. Negotiations will require persistent patience. They will require a willingness to endure almost unbelievable, tedious discussions of long duration.

I, therefore, hope and pray that no attempts will be made to find quick solutions which will ultimately or later be regretted because of ill-considered action or ill-advised consideration.

I would be less than honest if I did not say that I remain somewhat unconvinced by the President's calmly reassuring words that our defense position is thoroughly adequate to any possible requirements in the Berlin situation. We know that our national security is not and should not be a partisan matter. But genuine bipartisanship in foreign policy does not mean that the loyal opposition silently acquiesces in all policies advanced by the administration.

It is true that many Democratic Senators have questioned the adequacy of our military shield for the present crisis. It is also true that a substantial number of defense experts in our universities and other research centers have challenged the administration's claims of military adequacy.

Furthermore, the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who refers to himself as an Eisenhower Republican, only last Sunday is reported to have charged the administration with giving a higher priority to a balanced budget than to adequate defense.

Only yesterday, Wednesday, March 18, a distinguished Washington columnist, Marquis Childs, reported that Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Army Chief of Staff, believes that the defense budget should be increased by \$5 billion a year to meet minimum security requirements.

Mr. President, if it were only the generals and admirals who were asking for more money for their respective services, one might be inclined to regard their appeals less seriously. But the fact is that several independent commissions, such as the Gaither Commission and the Rockefeller Panel, as well as many civilian defense experts in the universities and other research centers, are saying the same thing.

The fact that a disturbing number of competent American military observers believe that the administration's emphasis on a balanced budget has seriously jeopardized the Nation's defense capacity cannot be dismissed lightly. Our conventional military strength, they maintain, is at such a

dangerously low level that we are virtually forced to rely on nuclear retaliation.

The administration, in its attempt to "get a bigger bang for a buck," has maneuvered itself into a perilous position where our only choice may be between surrender and suicide. The President's remark, hopefully an unstudied remark, at his last press conference about the inability of the United States to fight a ground war in Germany seems to be a backhanded confirmation of what many military analysts have been saying for several years. In any event, his words were hardly reassuring to our NATO allies or, for that matter, to the American people.

Mr. President, I should like to commend to the Senate for serious study the preliminary report of the Draper Committee, which was published yesterday. Among other things, this distinguished panel recommended a long-range program of about \$2.4 billion a year for military aid abroad. It recommended an immediate increase of \$400 million in President Eisenhower's military aid request of \$1.6 billion for fiscal 1960, this increase to be primarily for the NATO area. This is a most significant recommendation and must be carefully reviewed in light of the current crisis.

We can negotiate effectively only from a position of strength. This is a singularly unpropitious time to reduce the level of our Armed Forces. This is the time for firmness on basic principles and flexibility in tactics. I hope that the Macmillan mission will help to weld the united strength we need to grapple effectively with the crisis in Berlin.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement to which I referred, about the crisis in Berlin, and about what is meant by negotiations and standing firm, which was delivered in Washington, D.C., some 2½ weeks ago, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT ON BERLIN BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY BEFORE THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN, WASHINGTON, D.C.

We live in a time of continuous crisis. We have been numbed by screaming headlines about Suez, Quemoy, Baghdad, and Budapest. Now we are in the middle of the Berlin crisis. This is not just another international crisis. It is probably the most serious and fateful problem faced by the United States and the free world since the end of World War II.

We all know what is at stake in Berlin—the two things we value most—peace and freedom. A false move or a serious miscalculation could be the spark that would ignite a nuclear holocaust. If free West Berlin falls, it is not inconceivable that West Germany would eventually follow, and if West Germany falls, the nightmare of a new tyranny would sweep over all of Europe.

Berlin is the focal point in the mighty struggle between Communist tyranny and the free world. The situation is fraught with danger. But I believe that firmness, wisdom, and solidarity with our closest allies will give us the strength we need to meet the challenge posed by Mr. Khrushchev's thinly disguised ultimatum which falls due on May 27.

In my remarks about the seriousness of the Berlin crisis, I would like to make a few general observations in the interests of understanding. I do not want to say or do anything that will make the job of the executive branch any more difficult than it now is. In fact, I seriously considered whether I should say anything at all in public on so delicate an issue. I hope my comments will help to clarify the situation in its deepest and broadest aspects.

A sound policy toward the Berlin crisis will require all the patience, understanding, and courage we can muster. I urge our President to tell the American people what we are up against.

If the American people understand the depth of the crisis, I believe they will be willing to pay the price to save West Berlin. We know that peace and freedom are indivisible and that both are at stake in Berlin. And if freedom is snuffed out in Berlin, the cause of freedom and justice throughout the world will suffer.

#### WHAT THE COMMUNISTS WANT

It seems to me that the Soviet Union wants three things in Europe and has created the Berlin crisis as a lever to gain them:

1. The Soviet Union wants the three Western Powers to get out of West Berlin. It ultimately wants the entire city to be under complete Communist control.
2. She wants to use the Berlin crisis to force the Western Powers to negotiate an all-German settlement favorable to the Soviet Union. She prefers a united Germany tied closely to the Communist bloc. She will settle immediately for two Germanys. In other words, the status quo with East Germany the Communist state under firm Soviet control and influence. The least acceptable alternative that the Soviet appears willing to consider is a neutralized and denuclearized Germany which she hopes eventually to swallow up, by one means or another.

3. The Soviet Union sees in the Berlin crisis an opportunity to split the Western alliance. We must never forget that the primary objective of Soviet policy in Europe is to weaken NATO and to divide the United States from her allies. We cannot permit any of these Soviet objectives to be fulfilled. It is inconceivable that we would retreat from West Berlin. To do so would be to forfeit world leadership and in fact to become a second-rate power. I am convinced that the Soviet Union prefers to gain its political objective in Europe without nuclear war, and I know that the United States and our allies want to avoid a nuclear Armageddon.

We should make every effort to avoid getting into a position where we would be required to use force first. I am sure our Government will do everything possible to avoid a provocative or hostile act. We should, however, make it crystal clear that we will not be forced out of Berlin, nor be denied access to or in any way accede to any effort to starve into submission the West Berlin population. It must be clearly understood by Moscow and East Germany that we are prepared to take any action necessary in support of these policies and commitments.

#### U.S. POLICY OF RESOLUTE FIRMNESS

Last November I stood in West Berlin with its able and courageous mayor, Willy Brandt. I vowed then, and I vow today, to support a policy of firmness, to uphold the right of France, Britain, and the United States to maintain garrisons in West Berlin until a legitimate peace treaty is signed.

This is the position and policy of our Government. We can all be grateful that we do not stand alone. Britain, France, and the 12 other members of the NATO alliance stand with us. We will not surrender. We will not be pushed out.

What does standing firm mean? It does not mean holding fast inflexibly to old positions which have helped to produce the present unhappy stalemate. The real issue, said Walter Lippmann recently, is "whether to stand pat on positions that have become untenable or to move to new positions from which the Western allies can recover the political initiative." Standing firm means that we must match our firmness with imagination, courage, and a willingness to negotiate with the Soviet Union. It means firmness in our fundamental position and flexibility in our strategy and tactics. Standing firm and willingness to negotiate are not, as some people suggest, contradictory policies. They are two elements in any viable policy in the Berlin crisis. We must stand firm in order to negotiate effectively. And we must have solid bases for negotiation if we want to stand firm.

It is imperative that the best minds of our country—those persons qualified as experts on the problems of central Europe and Germany as well as Soviet policies and tactics—be called upon at once for intensive consultation directed toward policy formulation.

In the weeks between now and May 27, we, in concert with our allies, must explore every possible honorable means of negotiation that can ease this crisis and point in the direction of a just and equitable settlement.

It is not enough just to negotiate and talk. We must have clearly in mind the objectives we seek, and the means and ways of achieving those objectives without bargaining away the rights of others, or in any way weakening our own security.

The Berlin crisis is both a danger and an opportunity. It is a danger to world peace if we display signs of weakness, indecision, or appeasement. It is an opportunity if we recognize the sharpness of the crisis and proceed to explore every means of peaceful settlement, not only of the Berlin and German situation, but indeed the relationships between the United States, its allies, and the Soviet Union in all of central Europe. Wise, prudent, and courageous statesmanship is needed now as never before. We must be prepared to follow the course that may be tedious, frustrating, and characterized by insults, threats, and abuses for months to come. The war of nerves has been intensified.

In this struggle, the victory will come to those who clearly understand the relationship between power and principle, maneuver and objective. We cannot afford to be found wanting in any of these.

Make no mistake about it, a policy of firmness with negotiation, is the only policy that will avoid surrender on the one side, and minimize the risks of war on the other.

#### COOPERATION WITH ALLIES AND RESTRAINT URGED

We must act in harmony with our allies, Britain, France, and West Germany. This means more than coordinating our pronouncements about standing firm. It means hammering out a unified policy and strategy to give us strength for bargaining, and to undergird our determination if negotiation should break down.

If we had worked a bit closer with our allies and had strengthened the consultative process within NATO during the past 5 years, perhaps we would be in a better position than we are today. But let bygones be bygones. If we ever needed the wisdom, strength, and counsel of trusted allies we need them now.

#### THE MACMILLAN VISIT TO THE U.S.S.R.

The entire world is indebted to the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Macmillan, for his visit to the U.S.S.R. and his talks with the Soviet leaders. Prime Minister Macmillan has again demonstrated those great qualities of character which have

marked the British people through their great history. With characteristic British good manners, he has consulted with Soviet officials in a spirit of understanding and patience which reveals great courage and statesmanship. He has exemplified friendliness to the Russian people, courtesy and proper diplomatic conduct to Soviet officials. He has patiently explored areas of possible agreement between the Soviet and the Western nations. He has been conciliatory without appeasement. He has been firm and resolute without being stubbornly obstinate.

The British through their Prime Minister have demonstrated what we mean when we say firmness and negotiation are not in any way contradictory.

At the very time that our own leadership seems to be faltering and the Secretary of State was stricken down with serious illness, thereby limiting the role of American leadership, we see again the advantage which comes from being associated with our NATO partners.

France under the leadership of DeGaulle displays new strength and firmness. Chancellor Adenauer rightly insists that Germany be a part of the European community and not separated from the stream of democratic and free institutions.

British statesmen explore every area of negotiations, and the President of the United States, speaking for the American people, reminds friend and foe that we will not retreat, appease, or fail to fulfill our commitments.

Yes, these are dangerous days and the situation is explosive. But these are also great and challenging days where spiritual and brainpower may save us from the dangerous alternative of the use of firepower.

The alternative to war is peace and it is in the pursuit of peace that we will find our greatness and fulfill our destiny.

MARCH 2, 1959.

#### OIL IMPORTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is most unfortunate that while we deal with the vitally important increases in the U.S. contribution to the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank we face the problems of an Executive order establishing mandatory restrictions on oil imports. For this order is an unfortunate development in our international trade and is hurting our relations with friends abroad, including Canada and Bolivia. Indeed, it may tend to weaken the economies of some of the very countries which the proposed increase in the International Monetary Fund is meant to promote and strengthen.

Yesterday Senator AIKEN led a chorus of objections to this recent order establishing mandatory import quotas on petroleum and petroleum products. I wish to join him in expressing my concern about this order after I and a number of other Senators had called attention to the serious domestic problem that would be created for home owners and apartment dwellers who we said may well have to pay higher fuel bills, unless the sellers exercise self-discipline. I had hoped at least that the imports of residual fuel oil would have been exempted from the order, since over one-third of the homes and apartments in the Northeastern States are heated by oil and heating costs represent up to 4 percent of the cost of living.

At a time when we are doing our utmost to keep prices down in every area,

it seems particularly unfortunate to get into a course of action which gives the chance of increased living costs for so many families. Indirectly, fuel oil price increases would affect every one of us for part of the price of each product we buy reflects the cost of fuel used to heat the factories, generate the electricity and run the machines used in manufacturing.

The justification given for this order and for its provision in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension Act is national security. The domestic oil industry has put out statistics to point up how the discovery of new reserves has lagged behind U.S. oil production, and that therefore it is necessary to encourage exploration in the industry domestically. Is it not paradoxical that we should use up our own oil reserves at an increased rate supposedly in the interests of national security instead of conserving our reserves and using foreign oil while it is readily available? The contradiction becomes even more marked when the exclusion also applies to Canadian oil to which none of the national security arguments about vulnerability of sealanes can apply.

To a large extent, the reasons given to justify this order are similar to those given to support the 27½-percent oil depletion allowance. This provision also was supposed to foster oil exploration and the growth of reserves for national security reasons. However, the result of this allowance has been to give important tax concessions to a limited sector of the economy and has led to a growing sentiment in Congress to reduce this special benefit.

A restrictive move of this type, which appears strongly protectionist to the rest of the world, is particularly regrettable right now when we are spending billions of dollars abroad to develop economies, particularly in the underdeveloped areas of Africa, the Middle East and South America, many of which are oil producers.

In light of the protests already received from a number of nations in opposition to the mandatory restrictions, I sincerely hope that the President will reconsider the terms of this order or at the very least, its amendment in order to exempt from its provisions residual fuel oil. Also, I hope every seller of oil contemplating price increases will think about it many times before imposing such increases on the people and the national economy.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—EN- ROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESO- LUTION SIGNED

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

H.R. 2294. An act for the relief of the Ellis Timber Co.; and

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.



### UNEMPLOYMENT IN DEPRESSED AREAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 99, S. 722.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 722) to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment, and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am prepared to ask the Senate to remain in session as late today as Senators may wish to stay in order to discuss the bill, and to have the Senate meet tomorrow to discuss it further. I have talked with the minority leader about the matter. I am not aware of how much discussion is desired. If need be, we shall be glad to have a Saturday session to accommodate Senators who wish to make speeches on the bill.

I hope we may have an understanding that there will be no votes on the bill for the remainder of this week, and that we will try to reach a vote on the bill sometime late on Monday.

There is also a resolution providing funds for the Joint Economic Committee, as to which I have given notice that it is planned to call it up on motion as soon as action has been concluded on the bill now before the Senate.

If there are no Senators who desire to discuss the bill, there will be no need for a Saturday session, or, for that matter, a Friday session. If the minority leader will canvass Senators on his side of the aisle, I will speak with the Senator having the bill in charge, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and will try to estimate how much discussion is desired, and will be guided accordingly.

I have had several inquiries as to when a vote on the bill may be expected. If it is possible to do so, I should like to enter into an agreement that there will be no votes this week, and try to arrange to vote on the bill on Monday next.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I had expressed to the majority leader the hope that after this evening the Senate could go over until Monday, and that we could come in early on Monday and agree upon a certain amount of time for debate on each amendment, and then on the bill, and to finish action on the bill on Monday. That would give Senators a chance to catch up with the work in their offices. I am frank to say that these days get pretty long when committees are in session and Senators try to be on the floor and also in committees. I think Senators are entitled, in the interest of better and more effi-

cient work, to have their weekends free to get the decks cleared.

I hope the majority leader will press for agreement to his unanimous-consent request. I told him it was entirely agreeable to me. I utter the hope that there will be no objection to it. The bill has been available to Senators for some time. The report and the hearings also are available. A similar bill has been before the Senate previously. I think it would be an ideal situation if an arrangement could be made so that the weekend could be free for the benefit of all Senators.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Would it be agreeable to the minority leader if the Senate met tomorrow, so as to give Senators an opportunity to speak if they desired to do so; and if Senators desired to speak longer, a session could be held on Saturday, with the understanding that there will be no votes during the remainder of the week, and that an attempt will be made to reach an agreement for a limitation of time on amendments and on the bill, to be effective following the morning hour on Monday?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am agreeable to that; or the unanimous-consent request could be proposed now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of the minority leader and myself, and with the approval of the Senator in charge of the bill, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I submit a proposed unanimous-consent agreement and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed agreement will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

*Ordered*, That, effective on Monday, March 23, 1959, at the conclusion of routine morning business, the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of the bill, S. 722, the area redevelopment bill, and debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

*Ordered further*, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois that what has been proposed is that the Senate have tomorrow in which to discuss the bill. If any Senators so desire, the Senate will be asked to meet on Saturday so that they may discuss the bill. We should like to have an understanding that there will be no votes either on Friday or Saturday, so far as the leadership can control the voting.

It is proposed, further, that at the conclusion of the morning hour on Monday, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill with a limitation of 1 hour of debate on each amendment, and that at the conclusion of the disposition of all amendments there be a limitation of debate of 2 hours on the bill.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This arrangement is completely satisfactory to me. I think it provides ample opportunity for discussion and debate. May I inquire of the majority leader whether it is his intention to have the formal discussion of the bill begin this afternoon?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. At any time that is agreeable to the Senator from Illinois. Senators may speak as long as they desire today, tomorrow, and Saturday. On Monday, the limitation of debate would be in effect.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. In the best interests of all Senators, I feel that a Saturday session should be eliminated. I do not think it is necessary to have one. As the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, having an understanding of the bill, and knowing the Senators who are opposed to it and the Senators who favor it, I think it would be most unfortunate to have a Saturday session in order to consider the bill, particularly when there will be the rest of today and all day tomorrow to discuss it; and then to debate it under a unanimous-consent agreement on Monday. If the agreement shall be entered into, there will be 1 hour for debate on each amendment. That means, of course, that any Senator can offer all the amendments he wishes and take 1 hour on each amendment. But I think it would be unfortunate to have the Senate meet on Saturday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no desire for a Saturday session unless some Senator desires it.

Mr. CAPEHART. I ask that the unanimous-consent agreement be changed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It does not provide for a Saturday session. I simply made the statement that the Senate would meet if any Senator desired to make a speech on the bill on Saturday.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, so far as the proponents of the measure are concerned, I feel certain that we will not take a disproportionate share of the time to conclude our argument. I should like the majority leader to know that I did give every opportunity to the minority to offer amendments. I am reassured by the statement of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] that he probably will not prolong the discussion to great length. But if he has a large number of amendments which he intends to offer, I shall be very glad to come in on Saturday and listen to him with great interest and attention.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL  
12 O'CLOCK NOON TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until noon tomorrow.

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

THE SENATE AND THE CAUCUS—  
DEMOCRACY OR TYRANNY IN  
THE SENATE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in recent weeks the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] has discussed in this Chamber, on two separate occasions, the function of leadership within the Democratic Party in the United States Senate. He has presented a number of suggestions which he contends would improve the machinery through which this leadership is exercised, and has declared that implementation of these ideas would result in increased party responsibility and accountability of individual Members.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at the outset of his speech?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I merely desire to say to the Senator that I have read his speech. At the very outset, I wish to say that it is an extremely constructive speech. I shall listen to it carefully. But I wanted to make one minor—perhaps the Senator would consider it a major—suggestion at this point, where I think it would be more constructive.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Wisconsin did not permit me to begin my speech before he rose and asked me to yield. What does he want me to do?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I simply asked if the Senator from Oregon would yield at this point.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield, but I must say that it is very early in my address to yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I recognize that it is early. I think the Senator will make a fine, constructive speech. I am delighted that he is doing so. The reason I asked him to yield is that at the outset of his speech the Senator from Oregon said that I had "declared that the implementation of these ideas would result in increased party responsibility and accountability of individual Members."

At this point I wish to make clear that the principal purpose of the argument I made for a caucus and for my other suggestions was to try to secure more democracy in the Senate in our party—in other words, for an opportunity for all Senators to have something to say, in some way, about our policy and our program.

Incidentally, I think that in having such greater democracy, we would also secure a greater degree of party responsibility and accountability.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, before the Senator from Wisconsin makes his third speech on this subject, I should like to make mine, if I may.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Certainly.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I wish to be permitted to deliver some portion of my speech before the Senator from Wisconsin comments for a third time on the question.

I intend to point out that, good though the intentions of the Senator from Wisconsin may be regarding democracy in the Senate, I fear that the proposals he has made in his two previous speeches would point back toward tyranny in the Senate, toward what the late, great Senator Bob La Follette, Sr., of Wisconsin, has described as "King Caucus." To that point I shall address my remarks today.

Mr. President, one of the suggestions of the Senator from Wisconsin deals with the caucus. Today, I wish to consider briefly that particular proposal and all its implications.

The Senator from Wisconsin has asserted—and has done so very ably—that we should have more Democratic Party caucuses, and that such caucuses should be used to formulate party policy. He has stated that he does not desire a binding caucus, and would not himself be bound by the decisions of a caucus. He has indicated, however, that he believes that the majority leader's actions should be ruled by expression of the will of the majority, as evidenced by vote or discussion; and he suggested that if the majority leader disagrees with the position of the majority, he should step aside.

Mr. President, so that the RECORD be clear on these points made by the Senator from Wisconsin, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the text of the exchange of views between the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and me, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 9, 1959, on pages 3565 and 3566.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGEE in the chair). Is there objection?

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

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to obtain some information from the Senator from Wisconsin.

I gather that the Senator from Wisconsin is seeking more democracy in the Senate. I, too, should like to see more democracy in the Senate. When the Senator says that "the formulation of such an overall budget and fiscal policy to support the passage of a particular bill is an appropriate, in fact an indispensable, function of a party caucus," what does he mean? Does he mean that the party caucus should take a vote?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think it would be desirable if the party caucus could take a vote, although that would not be essential.

Mr. NEUBERGER. How would a policy be formulated unless the caucus took a vote? Suppose the party met in caucus for 3 hours. Unless the caucus took a vote, how would a policy be formulated?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am sure the junior Senator from Oregon has been present at meetings at which policies have been formulated without a vote. I do not pretend that in connection with something as important and controversial as the policy we are dis-

cussing, agreement can inevitably be reached without a vote. However, it is possible to obtain an expression from most of the members present, which shows what the general sentiment is. I agree that if a precise expression of sentiment is desired, there must be a vote; but not always.

The point is that a caucus is a desirable way to find out what the Democratic Party in the Senate thinks—whether or not it favors a balanced budget, for example. Suppose there were a vote on that question. It seems to me that would be a precise, logical, understandable subject on which there could be a vote.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Let us find out what the Senator is really talking about. I have read very carefully his speech of several weeks ago. I have been quite unable to determine just what policy the Senator wishes. First, I should like to ask this question: Does the Senator honestly believe, and will he state for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that 64 men can meet and formulate a policy without voting upon it? The Senator used the word "formulate."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Under most circumstances, I think that is probably correct. Under most circumstances, it would be necessary to have a vote. However, as I previously stated—and I think it is perfectly sensible and consistent—there are certain subjects with respect to which a vote would not be necessary. If we had a caucus on some question like the Berlin crisis, I think it is perfectly understandable that it would be possible to obtain some kind of consensus that would be unanimous, without a vote. It may be that such circumstances are rare.

The distinguished Governor of a great State—not the State of Wisconsin—told me that whenever his administration had a bill or proposal which was considered to be essential, a caucus of the party in the State legislature was always called. He told me that never once did the party lose a vote on the floor. He said that it was not a matter of voting or binding the members of the caucus, but rather a matter of explanation, a question of all members of the party understanding what the position of the leadership was, and being informed as to the situation.

I agree that under many circumstances it would be desirable to have a vote.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to pursue the inquiry a little further. The Senator is shifting the scenery on us. I am not talking about the Governor of a State, or a State legislature. I am talking about the language in the Senator's own speech. What I wish to know is how a Democratic Party caucus would formulate a policy on the budget, for example, or on other fiscal questions, without voting on such a policy. I wish the Senator would explain that to me.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I will tell the junior Senator from Oregon that we probably would have a vote upon it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is fine. There would be a vote. After the vote is taken, what is the situation? Let us assume that the vote might be to hold the line at \$77 billion, or that \$3 billion or \$4 billion should be added to the budget. That is a purely hypothetical situation. After the vote is taken, is the majority leader bound to carry out the policy which has been formulated?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should say that the majority leader can and should call a caucus whenever he thinks the situation is such that the party should reconsider or modify its position. I believe that the majority leader should not exercise his powers as the head of the party in the Senate unless he is reflecting the majority opinion of the Democratic Senators in caucus.

Mr. NEUBERGER. So the majority leader should carry out the policy which has been



formulated, to use the Senator's own words. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIER. That is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. What about individual Democratic Senators? What about the other 64 Senators, including the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER], the junior Senator from Oregon—

Mr. PROXMIER. Let me say, in that connection, that I think the majority leader has every right—and this has been the practice in many State legislatures—to disagree with the position taken by the majority of members of his party. However, what he does under such circumstances is to step aside. He no longer acts as majority leader. The assistant majority leader takes over. He directs and leads the majority position on the floor. The majority leader votes in any way he desires. His conscience is not imposed upon. He votes according to his conscience. He is free to do so, as are all other Senators.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Does the Senator believe that when a caucus takes a vote in formulating a policy, that vote should be binding on members of the caucus?

Mr. PROXMIER. I do not.

Mr. NEUBERGER. On February 23 the Senator cited to us with great approval the policies followed by the Democratic Party under Majority Leader John Kern, when Woodrow Wilson was President.

Mr. PROXMIER. At the time I did so. I believe I said that it would be unwise for us to follow the practice of binding members in caucuses.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Let me read what the Senator said:

"I think Senators can hardly do better than go back to the period from 1913 to 1916 and consider how the Democratic majority operated; and it was a thin majority at that time. It was a majority which did not have the vast superiority we now have, a superiority, virtually, of two to one. The majority at that time was very close. It was also a majority having dissident groups, just as ours has, perhaps more so.

"The majority of that time was a majority confronted with a tremendously difficult situation, including a change in the Presidency. But it was a majority which fulfilled its responsibility by passing some of the most significant legislation this Nation has ever seen. The entire New Freedom program of President Wilson was passed in the period from 1913 to 1916. There were not occasional caucuses; there were frequent caucuses. The Democratic Senators operated as a unit. The Democratic leader, John Kern, who was a splendid majority leader, took his direction from the unified decision of all Democratic Senators."

The Senator goes on to cite with glowing approval that every Democratic Senator in that period, unless I am mistaken, was bound by the decision of the caucus.

Mr. PROXMIER. I have said that. I have also said that I did not believe that under the present circumstances it would be practical, possible, wise, or necessary for the Democratic caucus to so bind Senators.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Why, then, did the Senator say we should take a lesson from that period?

Mr. PROXMIER. Because they used the caucus. While I do not approve of everything they did in caucus, I approve of the general fact that all Senators should have an opportunity to express their position on the question of the leadership position, because the leadership position expresses the opinion of Democrats as a whole. I took exception to the technique that was used to bind all Members.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is it not possible that the technique was at the root of the success that was achieved?

Mr. PROXMIER. That is possible. However, there have been caucuses which have been effective without binding the Members. We

had caucuses in the legislature in Wisconsin. We held them at weekly intervals. Toward the end of the session we held them daily. As a result, every Democratic pledge in the platform was introduced as a bill and was voted on by the legislature, and every one of them was supported by a majority of the Democrats. However, they were not bound under those circumstances.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I have read the Senator's earlier speech with interest, and I have read his present speech with interest.

Mr. PROXMIER. I thank the Senator for reading my speeches. That is a real compliment.

Mr. NEUBERGER. It is commendable that this issue should be discussed by the Senator. However, I believe—and I hope my mind will be changed—that although the Senator hopes to have more democracy in the Senate, I feel that a return to a caucus system which would bind all Members would result in infinitely less democracy in the Senate. I believe it to be a system which the great liberals like the elder La Follette, from the Senator's State, and George Norris, who was the greatest modern Senator, and perhaps the greatest Senator of all time, have denounced as "King Caucus." I am saying this from memory, but George Norris, I believe, many times was critical, in speeches on the floor of the Senate and before civic bodies, of what he described as "King Caucus." I hope the Senator from Wisconsin is not proposing to take us back to what the illustrious liberals of the past fought so strenuously against.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have no quarrel with the right—and even the responsibility—of the Senator from Wisconsin to express his opinions regarding the nature and operation of the internal organization of the Democratic Party in the Senate, nor do I dispute his contention that it might be desirable to have more frequent caucuses or conferences by our party. I have previously expressed the latter position on the floor of the Senate.

However, I think that the attitude which the Senator from Wisconsin has adopted with respect to the caucus, places him in the position of urging adoption of a system designed to better secure party responsibility, but rejecting, as repugnant to individual conscience, the very factor—namely, a binding commitment—which makes this system effective. In essence, the Senator from Wisconsin suggests adoption of the type of party organization and operation which is in effect in a number of Western countries operating under the parliamentary form of government—for example, Great Britain; but he would provide for elimination of the discipline which makes the method workable. I, myself, do not propose such discipline; but I emphasize that without it, the recommendations of the Senator from Wisconsin become both unfair and unworkable.

Furthermore, I believe that the procedure outlined by the Senator from Wisconsin would place a heavy restriction on the majority leader, without imposing a similar responsibility upon the members of our party in the Senate.

Mr. President, what does the proposal of the Senator from Wisconsin with regard to caucuses actually mean?

#### NONBINDING CAUCUS IS INEFFECTIVE

The efficacy of the caucus as a method of formulating party policy has histori-

cally rested with its ability to bind its members. Weakening of this power tends to erode the cohesive effect of these meetings. While the nonbinding caucus may perform a valuable function, by providing an opportunity for discussion and receipt of information, the nonbinding caucus can achieve only infrequent success in uniting behind a particular bill the party's widely diversified membership. The tendency to submit to the group more vague proposals, in order to arrive at language which would be acceptable to a majority of the members, would result in broad, but meaningless, policy statements.

This quality of the caucus is apparent in the experience of parliamentary countries. For instance, between 1946 and 1952, the British Labor Party suspended party discipline of this nature, with the idea of improving morale and teamwork. A number of serious violations of this discipline occurred; members were expelled; and the binding rules were restored.

I share the conviction of the Senator from Wisconsin that each Senator's fundamental duty is to his conscience. But I suggest that when the Senator from Wisconsin urges that all Democratic Senators play a part in the formulation of policy, through participation in the caucus, he ignores the responsibility which such participation would entail if his plan were to be effective.

The nature of the Senator's oversight is indicated in a statement made by Senator Fessenden in 1867:

You may not go into a consultation—call it a caucus or what you will—where the implied obligation is that the question under consideration is to be settled by a majority, and not only debate but vote, and then, finding yourself in a minority, say "I am not bound."

#### POLITICAL SCIENTISTS FAVOR BINDING CAUCUS

If we accept the view that a Senator's conscience is his final guide in matters of legislation, thus eliminating the possibility of a binding caucus, the caucus becomes merely a discussion group, and cannot be the effective instrument for the formulation of policy which the Senator from Wisconsin claims it to be.

It is true, as the Senator from Wisconsin has stated previously, that a number of students of government have in recent times urged increased use of the caucus as a means of formulating policy in a manner which will insure a greater degree of party responsibility. But they invariably point out that, to be effective, such meetings must be binding.

For example, the distinguished political scientist, Dr. George B. Galloway, of the Library of Congress, in his study "Congress and Parliament", dealing with the American and British systems of government, reported that:

Party organization in Parliament is evidently much more tightly knit and strictly disciplined than in Congress. The Parliamentary Labour Party's rigid code of discipline may sometimes stifle the public expression of honest differences of individual opinion, but these find an outlet in the private meetings of the PLP. If revived in Congress with power to bind its Members,

the party caucus could go far toward clarifying party policy.

Dr. Galloway, in summarizing his comparison of the Congress of the United States and the British Parliament, suggested that one of the lessons which Congress might learn from Britain was the value of a binding caucus. Dr. Galloway stated:

More responsible and effective party organization in Congress could be developed by tightening up the internal organization of the congressional parties in both Houses, through the merger of their various leadership groups, the holding of frequent meetings of the entire membership of each party in each House, the adoption of party standing orders, including provision for binding caucus decisions, and the assumption of majority party responsibility for planning and guiding the legislative agenda, making committee assignments, and selecting committee chairmen. Party discipline could be strengthened by reviving the party caucus with binding decisions, the skillful use of patronage and promotions for the faithful and committee demotions for the disloyal, and the expulsion of serious offenders from the congressional parties.

A close student of British political parties, R. T. McKenzie, has noted that the British system since 1867 has resulted in increased rigidity in party relationships and decreased individual freedom.

The Senator from Wisconsin has previously declared that in considering the function of leadership in the Democratic Party in the Senate, we could "hardly do better than go back to the period from 1913 to 1916 and consider how the Democratic majority operated." The Senator from Wisconsin declared that:

The majority of that time was a majority confronted with a tremendously difficult situation, including a change in the Presidency. But it was a majority which fulfilled its responsibility by passing some of the most significant legislation this Nation has ever seen. The entire new-freedom program of President Wilson was passed in the period from 1913 to 1916. There were not occasional caucuses; there were frequent caucuses. The Democratic Senators operated as a unit. The Democratic leader, John Kern, who was a splendid majority leader, took his direction from the unified decision of all Democratic Senators.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Yes, Mr. President; I am happy to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. I happened to be in the Congress during the years 1913 to 1917, as a Member of the House of Representatives.

The first important measure taken up was the Underwood tariff bill, which was based upon recommendations made by President Wilson. We asked the Republicans to go away, and to take their time about coming back, until the Democrats could agree upon the terms of that bill.

That was a very remarkable measure because Republican protective tariff laws had been in effect practically since the Civil War. It was the first time a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President could make a change in tariff policy.

We met for days in a Democratic caucus—under what conditions? Under

the conditions that we would be bound by what a majority of the caucus agreed upon. A Member could be excused from that obligation only if he had previously made to his constituents, pledges concerning some particular item in the bill.

That is why the Louisiana Democrats, who were opposed to reducing the tariff on sugar, were able to vote against that part of the bill and still remain good Democrats, because they had previously pledged themselves to their people that they would carry on. With that exception, everyone was bound. The result was, when we finally brought the bill to the floor, that numerous amendments were offered on the Republican side. They were all defeated, and the bill was passed just as it had been approved by the Democratic caucus.

In the Senate, in 1917, rule XXII was adopted as the result of a binding caucus on the Democratic side and a binding caucus on the Republican side. In that caucus it was agreed that the Senate would adopt a limitation on debate. If the Senator will read the proceedings, he will see that a Senator, who was absent when the caucus was held, sought to amend the proposed rule. He withdrew his amendment when told that a rule, providing that two-thirds of those present could bring debates to an end, had been agreed to in both caucuses.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the able Senator from Arizona, who, of course, is in a better position to make an observation, based on his own knowledge and wisdom, on this particular period in our history than is any other Member of Congress, because, if I am not mistaken, he has served in both Houses longer than has anybody else in the entire chronicles of the Congress.

As I recall, the late Senator Norris told me he protested against this particular method of binding members of a caucus on a tariff bill. In the various biographies of the late Senator Norris, one of which I was privileged to coauthor, these objections of Senator Norris are mentioned.

I thank the Senator from Arizona for bringing out what happened in that particular period of American history.

Mr. President, I believe that it is very important to note that during the period which the Senator from Wisconsin recommends as a model for the Democratic Party in the Senate to follow today, the legislative caucus was revived, and decisions made with respect to legislative action were binding upon the entire membership of the party and controlled their votes. However, the Senator from Wisconsin has asserted that he does not wish a binding caucus of this nature.

Mr. President, of course, the binding quality of the caucus I have cited has been confirmed by the Senator from Arizona, who has just discussed this question on the Senate floor out of his own experience and service at that time.

Mr. President, in connection with this discussion of caucuses and the necessity of insuring that they be binding if they are to be employed effectively in the formulation of policy, I think it is of interest to note the remarks of the Senator

from Wisconsin on February 23 when he called to the attention of the Senate the report "Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System," prepared by the committee on political parties of the American Political Science Association. At that time he said:

"What is perhaps the most authoritative statement by outstanding professional experts on this subject was made by the committee on political parties of the American Political Science Association in a report in 1950 entitled "Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System."

The Senator from Wisconsin then read to the Senate the following recommendation from the report:

Whether they be called caucuses or conferences, more frequent meetings of the party membership in each House should be held. Otherwise there can be no real discussion of party positions and no real participation in or check upon the decisions of the party leadership. Without such discussion and participation, efforts to make party operations more responsible will be futile.

The Senator from Wisconsin then declared:

Mr. President, let me repeat that quotation because I believe it is extremely important that the Democratic Members of the Senate recognize that the words I have quoted are the considered judgment of the top political scientists.

And then the Senator from Wisconsin read in the Senate that particular quotation again, for emphasis.

In his remarks following this reference to the APSA report, he urged more regular caucuses as a method of aiding policy formation by the leadership but indicated that he would not be bound by any vote taken at such meetings.

Mr. President, I recall this language today so that I may inform the Senate of that portion of the committee's recommendation with regard to the caucus which the Senator from Wisconsin curiously neglected to quote.

I should like to read to the Senate the entire text of the APSA recommendation dealing with caucuses or conferences. This recommendation appears on pages 60-61 of the report, as published as a supplement to the September 1950 issue of the American Political Science Review, in the chapter entitled "Party Organization in Congress." The report states:

Whether they be called caucuses or conferences, more frequent meetings of the party membership in each house should be held. Otherwise there can be no real discussion of party positions and no real participation in or check upon the decisions of the party leadership. Without such discussion and participation, efforts to make party operations more responsible will be futile.

That is the part the Senator from Wisconsin quoted. Now I proceed, and I am quoting again:

There is no formula to tell how often a caucus or conference should be convened merely to discuss matters and how often it should be held for the purpose of voting upon a position binding on the members. Nor is it possible to prescribe in other than general terms either the conditions under which a party membership may be released from



abiding by a caucus decision or the consequences to be invoked upon those who disregard the decision without release. Three points, however, are rather clear.

The first is that a binding caucus decision on legislative policy should be used primarily to carry out the party's principles and program. Such a decision should not be used merely to support the views of the President or of congressional party leaders when their views do not rest on stated party policy, except in exigencies affecting the public record of the party.

The second is that members who generally stand behind the party program should have reason to know that their service is appreciated by the party leadership. Rewarding party loyalty is a proper way of fostering party unity. On the other hand, when Members of Congress disregard a caucus decision taken in furtherance of national party policy, they should expect disapproval. They should not expect to receive the same consideration in the assignment of committee posts or in the apportionment of patronage as those who have been loyal to party principles. Their conduct should be brought before the eyes of the public. Their voters are entitled to know about it.

The third is that the party leadership committees should be responsible for calling more frequent caucuses or conferences and developing the agenda of points for discussion.

Mr. President, the report to which the Senator from Wisconsin has referred in a previous speech does, indeed, recommend more frequent caucuses. But it also states that the caucus should be binding on individual Senators with respect to decisions on legislative policy to carry out the party's principles and program.

Mr. President, I do not favor a binding caucus. I am pleased that the Senator from Wisconsin also holds this view, although I wish he had not quoted so selectively from ASPA documents. But what would be the effect of a nonbinding caucus with regard to the formulation of policy in the manner suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin?

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator when I reach the next page of my prepared text. I should like to finish through one paragraph on page 6 before I yield.

#### RESTRICTS LEADER, BUT NOT MEMBERS

In his discussion on the Senate floor March 9, the Senator from Wisconsin indicated that he thought the Democratic Party caucus should be binding upon the majority leader but nobody else. This was the purport of his statement that the majority leader should step aside as majority leader when the caucus formulates a policy with which he is in disagreement. No other Senator should be bound to this extent, according to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Consider, for a moment, the implications of such a proposal. Let us suppose that the Democratic Party caucus formulates a policy against high Federal price supports on corn and cotton. If the majority leader is in disagreement with this policy, he must step aside. What if all 10 Democrats on the Agriculture and Forestry Committee likewise disagree with the policy of the caucus? Must they step aside, too? The Senator from

Wisconsin evidently thinks not, for he has said repeatedly that no Senators should be bound by the caucus, save and alone the majority leader.

Yet, who has greater control over farm price support legislation, the majority leader or the chairman and all the Democratic members of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee? In other words, the majority leader could not defy the policy adopted by the caucus on farm policies, but all the Democratic members of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee could do so.

Apply this same reasoning to proposed civil rights legislation. If the Democratic caucus formulates a policy favoring strong civil rights bills, the majority leader must step aside if he is in disagreement, according to the program outlined by the Senator from Wisconsin. But what about the Democrats on the Judiciary Committee, where the fate of civil rights bills is decided? Are they free to defy the policies "formulated" by the caucus, to use the word of the Senator from Wisconsin? What, then, has he accomplished, if he binds LYNDON B. JOHNSON and lets 63 other Democrats, no matter how powerful or strategic they are on various committees, repudiate the policies of the Democratic caucus virtually at will?

I am now happy to yield to the able Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I should like to repeat what I said before, when the Senator from Oregon started his speech. I think it is a constructive speech. I think the tone is excellent. I very much appreciate that, because this whole type of discussion and controversy could easily become a discussion of personalities, which would be most unfortunate.

I should like to say that of course it appears to be a contradiction to be arguing for a caucus on the one hand and arguing against a binding caucus on the other. It is true, as the Senator from Oregon very well stated, that outstanding political scientists who have favored more caucuses have also, by and large, favored binding caucuses. It is true that throughout most of the 19th century and the 20th century in the Senate there were generally binding caucuses.

I do not think, however, the fact that one rejects binding caucuses necessarily means one cannot have any kind of a caucus for effective and democratic organization, to give some sort of direction and influence to the leadership.

I should like to point out that in the report of the Committee on Reorganization of the Congress, the La Follette-Monroney committee report, there was a great deal of consideration of this matter. In the first place, they recommended that some instrumentality be established to enable the platforms of the two parties to be put into effect. They recommended party caucuses emphatically and distinctly and said that these would be useful. They also recommended policy committees. However, they had to cope with the difficult problem of how one can have an effective influence on a policy committee or on a caucus and still not have it binding upon

the membership. This is the recommendation they came up with:

On issues where party policy is involved the decisions of these policy committees would be formally announced in proceedings of Congress, and formal records would be kept of such decisions. No member of either party would be required to follow such announced party policy except as he chose to do so. Each member would be free to vote as he saw fit, but the record of his action would be available to the public as a means of holding both the party and the individual accountable.

I recognize, of course, that this particular recommendation is directed toward policy committees. It seems to me it would be constructive, helpful, and perfectly possible to have that kind of recommendation carry over for the caucus itself.

I should like to point out to my good friend from Oregon that this is a practice which is followed in many State legislatures. In my own State legislature in Wisconsin we had frequent party caucuses, weekly or even daily, toward the end of the session. These caucuses were not binding, but they did instruct the leadership. They were very effective. We had a very large number of platform promises, all of which were approved by the caucus, introduced and supported by a majority of Democrats.

I realize this is a long interruption, but there were some very interesting and challenging statements made by the Senator from Oregon, and I should like to comment on some of them at this time.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield further to the Senator at this time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator asked, "Who has greater control over farm price support legislation—the majority leader or the chairman and all the Democratic members of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee?"

I think, so far as the overall policy is concerned, speaking in terms of whether we have a farm bill, for instance, it can be said that the leadership does—that the majority leader would have a greater influence. I think it is possible that if all of the Democrats on the Agriculture and Forestry Committee would get together—which I think is most unlikely—they could prevail. The fact is, however, that the leadership of our committee generally tends to come to the majority leadership to learn whether a farm bill in the session is a practical possibility. That decision is generally a leadership decision. Of course, the outstanding Democrats on the committee are consulted.

I think that policy decision as to whether we should have a farm bill now is the kind of decision which might be made by a caucus.

There is one further point I wish to make. The Senator from Oregon says:

What, then, has he accomplished, if he binds LYNDON B. JOHNSON and lets 63 other Democrats, no matter how powerful or strategic they are on various committees, repudiate the policies of the Democratic caucus virtually at will?

I am sure the Senator from Oregon indicated, as he said in a previous part of his speech, that I do not intend to

bind LYNDON B. JOHNSON. It is very important to note that I do not intend to bind any individual as an individual. I intend only to bind the majority leader, as such. If he disagrees with the policy which has been formulated, he has the same right as any other Senator to speak out and vote against the position of the majority. But I suggest, under those circumstances, that the majority leader step aside and that the assistant majority leader act in his stead.

Mr. NEUBERGER. What if the assistant majority leader does not agree with the policy "formulated" by the caucus proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is an easy decision. This is not something impracticable or starry eyed. It is a problem which we have in the Wisconsin Legislature, and a problem which is encountered in other legislatures. The chairman of the committee or some other leading Democrat could step into the position of leader for the time being.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Suppose the chairman of the committee disagrees? The question I am asking the Senator goes to the root of the proposals which he has brought before the Senate. It is the Senator from Wisconsin who has raised the entire question. The Senator from Wisconsin, in previous speeches and discussions on the floor with other Senators, has proposed a caucus in which Democratic Party policy will be "formulated." He has admitted that this policy would have to be determined by a vote.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It would have to be determined in some cases by a vote of the Democrats in the caucus.

Mr. NEUBERGER. It would have to be decided upon by a vote. Obviously we could not tell how 64 Senators felt with respect to a highly complex question, unless there were a ballot.

After the ballot is taken in the Democratic Party caucus, if the majority leader is in disagreement with the policy thus "formulated" the majority leader shall step aside, according to the Senator from Wisconsin.

The point I am emphasizing is this: It seems to me that the Senator from Wisconsin has brought before us nothing that gets at the root of what he claims to seek, because substantive legislation comes only from the standing committees of the Senate.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. This is probably the most foolish thing I have ever done since I was elected to this body. I am intervening in a discussion between two good friends, with whom I am almost always in accord. In the end, I shall probably find myself berated by both of them.

However, I suggest to my good friend from Oregon that it does not seem to me to be feasible in any way, in the present condition of the Democratic Party, to have a binding caucus.

I say to my good friend from Wisconsin that I do not think he ever thought

we could have a binding caucus, because our party is not in a position of adequate unity. So it would not make the slightest sense to try to bind any individual. Therefore I suggest, with all deference to my very good friend from Oregon, that perhaps he is creating a straw man and knocking him down. I do not believe anyone wishes to have a binding caucus in the Democratic Senate majority as it exists today.

On the other hand, I must say that I agree with my friend from Wisconsin that it would be very helpful if we could talk these matters over with the leadership a little more freely than the present procedures make possible.

Next week there will come before us the question of temporary unemployment compensation legislation, a subject of vast importance to my State. I should like to have the opportunity to present my views and those of 17 other Senators from States which are equally concerned with this problem, one of them being the State of Oregon. In that way we could determine whether or not it would be possible or feasible to have the majority of Democrats support legislation providing temporary unemployment compensation.

However, that is not a feasible method of procedure. I have had conferences with the majority leader on the subject. He has been very kind and considerate. He has agreed to meet later with a group of Senators who feel as strongly as I do.

But all this is not in accordance with normal procedure. With all deference to my friend from Oregon, I believe it would be a good thing for party morale, and for the formulation of party policy in accordance with the party platform, if we had a regular mechanism, such as our friends across the aisle have, for considering these questions.

I do not believe the Senator from Wisconsin ever had in mind—although he may inadvertently have used some language which might be construed as pointing in that direction—that any of us should be bound by what is done in a caucus.

I note the presence in the Chamber of my good friend, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. He and I agree upon many questions, but we also disagree on many others. I should not wish to go into a caucus where I would be required to sustain the position of the Senator from Florida if I disagreed with it.

With all due deference to my good friends, let me say that probably it was quite unwise for me to take the floor. However, I believe my friend from Oregon is pressing my friend from Wisconsin a little further than he ever intended to go.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am very happy that the Senator from Pennsylvania has made this contribution to the discussion.

But let us presume that there is a party caucus on the question of unemployment compensation legislation; and let us assume that the Democratic Party caucus favors greatly expanded unemployment compensation benefits. I am sure the Senator from Pennsylvania would be pleased by such action. I am sure the Senator from Oregon would like

to see unemployment compensation benefits expanded. Oregon happens to be a State which, unfortunately, has had rather high unemployment rates in recent years.

Let us assume that the majority leader is in disagreement with the policy agreed upon by the caucus. Under the formula presented to us by the Senator from Wisconsin, the majority leader must then step aside.

Mr. CLARK. I think not. However, I will let my friend from Wisconsin speak for himself. I did not so interpret his remarks.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In reply, let me say that in most cases the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the majority would be together. There would be a few cases in which they would not be. When they were not together, I think we would find an accommodation, a far greater understanding, and a better degree of unity, if my suggestion were adopted. However, there is the possibility to which the Senator from Oregon has referred, that the assistant majority leader might be in disagreement with the caucus. I am sure that in most cases the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] would support the position of the majority. In a few cases, perhaps, neither the majority leader nor the assistant majority leader would. In such a case perhaps the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, might assume the leadership. It would not matter how far down in seniority we might have to go. Eventually we would find a Senator who could act as floor manager.

Under most circumstances there would be an opportunity for the leadership and the members of the majority party to get together and agree on policy. I believe that under many circumstances—perhaps under most circumstances—the decision of the caucus would be that there should be no party policy. I think that would be a constructive decision to arrive at. We would come from the caucus with far greater understanding, and with a recognition of the fact that we do not expect to direct our leadership, because there is too much division in the party.

It seems to me that the Senator from Oregon is inventing a hypothetical situation which is not likely to occur very often. Such a conclusion, as I have stated, is in line with the practice which is followed so frequently in other legislative bodies, and with very great success.

I conclude this part of the colloquy by saying that I think we could get together, in the first place, by beginning with the party platform. With respect to many bills, we might decide that we do not wish to formulate a policy. We might decide, in a few cases, that certain bills are of sufficient importance to the country, the Democratic Party platform, and our promises that we should have a party position. Under such circumstances there would be extensive discussion to see if we could arrive at a consensus as to the timing of the legislation, and,



roughly, what our position should be. We would not have any detailed bill formulated. That is a committee project. But I believe that if we were to follow such a procedure, Senators would have far better understanding, and there would be a greater degree of unity. I believe the country would have the benefit of more positive legislation, and certainly more representative of all Democratic Senators and therefore of the interests of the country as a whole.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the scenery has been shifted very rapidly since the earlier recommendations were made. I have based my remarks today on earlier speeches made by the Senator from Wisconsin. In his earlier speeches, including some television programs which were transcribed and distributed on our desks, he very sharply challenged the decision taken by the Democratic Party leadership as being out of step with the views of a majority of Democratic Senators.

Now he says that there would be very few situations in which the leadership and the majority of Democrats would disagree.

Mr. PROXMIRE. My answer to that—

Mr. NEUBERGER. Please let me finish. There have been a number of long interruptions.

Secondly, in his earlier speeches the Senator from Wisconsin constantly referred to the caucus as a place where the party policy would be "formulated."

Now he tells us that there would be very few instances where the caucus would make policy. Then I am told by both the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin that I misunderstand the situation if I interpret the earlier remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin to imply that the majority leader must step aside if he is in disagreement with the decision formulated by the caucus. In that connection let me quote the language of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin which appears in the RECORD of March 9:

Let me say, in that connection, that I think the majority leader has every right—and this has been the practice in many State legislatures—to disagree with the position taken by the majority of members of his party. However, what he does under such circumstances is to step aside. He no longer acts as majority leader. The assistant majority leader takes over, and he directs and leads the majority position on the floor. The majority leader votes in any way he desires. His conscience is not imposed upon. He votes according to his conscience. He is free to do so, as are all other Senators.

That is what I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. Let us assume that the majority leader does not agree with the decision of the caucus to expand unemployment compensation benefits. Under the formula presented by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin—and I have quoted his exact words—the majority leader would step aside. May I ask which committee has jurisdiction over legislation dealing with unemployment compensation? I believe it is the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The senior Senator from Virginia is chairman of the Committee on Finance. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Committee chairmen have great power and authority in the Senate, unless I am mistaken.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Does the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia have to step aside, as the chairman of the Committee on Finance, if he is in disagreement with the decision of the caucus to expand unemployment compensation benefits?

Mr. CLARK. Let me answer the Senator's question in this way. We have no rules of germaneness in the Senate, and the Senator from Oregon is therefore speaking in the time of the area redevelopment bill. I do not object to it. But I say—and I believe he and I are in accord on this point—that a rule of germaneness in the Senate would be a good thing.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Wisconsin, in two lengthy speeches in the Senate, spoke when other proposed legislation was pending. If there is to be a rule of germaneness, it should apply to 98 Senators, not merely to 1.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to add at this point, in order to clear up the situation, that on both occasions when I spoke there was no proposed legislation pending. I have checked the matter with the Parliamentarian, and I have been informed that no proposed legislation was pending on either occasion.

Mr. CLARK. To get back to the question of the Senator from Oregon, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is opposed to the area redevelopment bill, and voted against it in committee. He stepped aside and turned the bill over to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to manage it on the floor. That is what the Senator from Virginia should have done, and I honor him for doing it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That was after the bill had been reported by the committee. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I must say that my good friends certainly shift the scenery very quickly. What I am asking about is the consideration—

Mr. CLARK. The Senator asked me about the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am asking about what would happen in a certain situation. Let us take the question in proper sequence, to see what the Senators' proposal means. We have arrived at the situation where the majority leader has stepped aside because the Democratic policy caucus has voted for expanded unemployment compensation.

Mr. CLARK. No; I have not gotten that far yet. I have never suggested that we should have a binding vote on unemployment compensation legislation. I believe we should have a caucus in which to talk it over, but not a binding vote.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In other words, the Senator from Pennsylvania is in disagreement with the Senator from Wisconsin that the conference should formulate party policy in caucus, and that can be determined only by a vote.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Not a binding vote.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Pennsylvania says he does not favor a vote on it, but the Senator from Wisconsin says a vote should be had on it.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Oregon—and I am sure he will excuse me for saying it—is apparently putting words in our mouths. I have never said that we should have a binding commitment on unemployment compensation bills, for example. I believe we should take the sense of the caucus. The Senator from Wisconsin will speak for himself, but I am sure that neither he nor I favor binding votes in a caucus, to bind all Members of the Senate.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Wisconsin has said in speeches and discussions that policy should be formulated—those were his exact words—by the Democratic Party caucus. He has said that a vote would be desirable. He said that if the majority leader does not agree with the decision taken by that vote, he should step aside. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if that is not correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What I said was that the caucus should formulate policy. When I said that, I meant of course that the caucus should decide first whether or not it wanted to formulate policy on particular issues or whether the Senate policy committee or the majority leader should do so.

The whole argument that I am making is that we should have a regular, systematic opportunity for all Democrats to meet together, preferable weekly, but at least monthly, so that we can decide.

Mr. CLARK. Just as the Republicans do.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. So we could decide at regular intervals whether we should attempt to influence our leadership, or whether we merely want the leadership to explain to us what it was doing, and why. I do not mean that on every bill the Democratic caucus should say what the leadership position should be, but I believe it should have an opportunity if it chose to do so to use its inherent authority.

Mr. NEUBERGER. May I ask the Senator from Wisconsin a question on that point?

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I first answer the questions the Senator has asked me, or has implied I should answer, when he turned to the Senator from Pennsylvania to make further statements? The first question, I believe, was whether it was not true that when I spoke on television about this situation and discussed it that I said there were many serious disagreements with the majority leader. I said there were serious disagreements, but I did not say many serious disagreements. I am convinced that on some of those serious disagreements the caucus might come to a position which might contradict the position of the majority leader.

In the second place, the Senator from Oregon implied that I should answer the question of how I square my statement that the Democratic Party caucus should make policy with my present statement that in few instances it would make policy. I say regular caucuses would give Democrats the opportunity to make policy when they chose to do so.

To begin with, I suppose in many cases the Democrats meeting in caucus would decide that the policy committee or the leadership should make the decision, and that all the Democrats together should not try to arrive at a united position.

The third question the Senator from Oregon has asked, has already been answered.

Mr. NEUBERGER. When the able Senator from Wisconsin read the report of the American Political Science Association, or at least excerpts from the report, dealing with a responsible two-party system, he repeated one paragraph twice. It was the paragraph which recommended more frequent party caucuses, and in which he lauded the top scientists who made the recommendation. Why did he not read the next paragraph which made a recommendation for binding party caucuses and the disciplining of dissenters from the caucus?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am delighted that the Senator should raise that point. I did say that in the 1913-16 period caucuses were binding. I made no pretense that I was reading the entire quotation from the American Political Science Association report.

Mr. NEUBERGER. It was in the next paragraph.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I said, "Whether it be called a conference or a caucus, every Senator should be given an opportunity to express himself." I believe that what the Senator has read indicates that the American Political Science Association feels that caucuses would be desirable whether members vote to bind other members or not.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The only thing I can say is that, in the report, the political scientists take a definite stand on binding caucuses, and even state that members should be disciplined who dissented from the caucus.

I am simply pointing out to the Senator that he quoted extremely selectively from this report, which he himself heralded so lavishly in his speech before the Senate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think this is one of the exceptions which somehow seems hard for the Senator from Oregon to understand, namely, how I can agree with some persons on some part of their position and not agree on another part.

As to the part of the proposal made by the distinguished political scientist that there should be caucuses, the scientist made sense. I think the compromise made by the La Follette-Monroney committee that kept this part, that is, holding caucuses, and provided the pressure of publicity to secure unity from those caucuses also made sense.

Mr. NEUBERGER. But the Senator does not recommend that we have binding caucuses.

Mr. PROXMIRE. No; I made it clear that I disagreed with the proposal to have binding caucuses, as I do now. The distinguished Senator from Oregon has repeatedly talked about there being no need for a caucus. The Senator from Pennsylvania and I have asked for a democratic—with a small "d"—caucus. That is a very important distinction. We do not ask for a caucus binding on anyone's conscience.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Except that of the majority leader.

Mr. PROXMIRE. No; we say that the majority leader can step aside and speak in any way he wishes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I emphasize again that substantive legislation comes from the standing committees of the Senate. The majority leader can be asked to step aside, perhaps, but in the end it is the standing committees of the Senate where legislation originates. They still have the same personnel and the same membership.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Oregon on February 23 said:

I think there should be more party caucuses.

Today he started off by saying, in the body of his speech, that he favors more party caucuses.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I do not deny that. I have said it a number of times. I say that the Senator from Wisconsin has come before the Senate on his own initiative and has taken the lead in discussing this matter. He has proposed a situation in which the Democrats would have a caucus which was binding on only one man, namely, the majority leader. That seems to indicate very clearly to me that the Senator from Wisconsin has no really specific proposal for "democratizing" the procedures of the Senate.

COMMITTEES ORIGINATE SUBSTANTIVE LEGISLATION

The Senator from Wisconsin and I share a fervent interest in Federal aid to schools. I am pleased to be in allegiance with him on this very important issue. Let us presume that the Democratic Party caucus formulates a policy favoring Federal aid to schools. I trust a Democratic caucus would do that. What, then, happens? Will the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare forthwith report a bill providing for Federal aid to schools? If it does not do so now, why would it do this after such a policy had been formulated by the Democratic Party caucus? According to the concept of the caucus advanced by the Senator from Wisconsin, not a single member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is bound to report a bill for Federal aid to schools, even after such a policy has been formulated by the party caucus which he advocates.

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I answer the Senator from Oregon at this point?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Certainly.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The situation which has obtained, in the very brief time I have been in the Senate, both in the Committee on Banking and Currency and in the Committee on Agriculture and

Forestry is, on the relay big measures, that the initiative, by and large, has been taken, according to my understanding, by the leadership. Perhaps that is as it should be. The leadership indicates when they want a farm bill or a housing bill. I think that is perfectly proper. It is necessary to have leadership in the Senate.

My proposal simply is that the Democrats, meeting in caucus, should have an opportunity to decide whether they want to influence the majority leader on a particular decision. It may be that although the majority leader wants a farm bill or a housing bill, the Committee on Banking and Currency or the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will decide that he will not get it. That would still be true.

I would not modify the powers of the standing committees, but I should say that the opportunity or the power to make policy, which, by and large, resides in the majority leader, could properly be shared and democratized by all Democrats meeting in caucus.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin mean policy with respect to substantive legislation? I think that is a key question.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think it is a key question, as I tried to indicate in my second speech. This is a policy which I think the caucus could make fruitful, but which largely is not being made now at all. For instance, in fiscal policy, the Committee on Banking and Currency may report a housing bill. It is very difficult for all members of the committee, in all conscience, as Democrats and as Senators, to relate the bill to the Nation's total financial responsibility.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Does the Senator say that the caucus should make policy in the fiscal realm?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think that might be a good area which the caucus might like to consider. I favor it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Would the caucus vote on it?

Mr. PROXMIRE. At the beginning of a session, particularly since the Democrats have an overwhelming majority in the Senate, a great responsibility attaches to us. I think we should give very careful consideration to the President's budget. On the basis of such consideration, I think we could reach a conclusion as to whether we favored a balanced budget at some level, at least tentatively.

Mr. NEUBERGER. How would the caucus reach such a conclusion? The Senator said earlier he did not think the caucus should vote on such matters. How would he have the caucus reach such a conclusion?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I did not say we should not vote. I said perhaps the caucus would want to vote; perhaps it would not. I think the caucus would reach a conclusion as it would on any other issue.

Mr. NEUBERGER. By voting on it?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No; not necessarily, but by studying the matter with great care; by listening to all the discussion in good faith; and then perhaps deciding by a vote, if that is necessary.



Mr. NEUBERGER. Now, at least, the Senator is talking about reaching a vote. The scene has been shifted again. First he would vote; then he would not vote; now he would vote again.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The scene has not been shifted one bit.

Mr. NEUBERGER. How do 64 Senators decide questions of fiscal policy, unemployment compensation, Federal aid to schools, or even when they should go out to lunch, unless they vote?

Mr. PROXMIRE. First, it must be decided if there is a consensus.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Now we are coming to votes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There could very well be a situation such as existed when the majority leader was elected this year. It was obvious to everyone that he was the unanimous choice, so without objection, he was elected. Technically, there had been a vote.

I think the caucus might reach a decision as to a balanced budget. There may be some persons who say we should not have a balanced budget.

Mr. NEUBERGER. One minute the Senator from Wisconsin is in favor of voting. The next minute he is not in favor of voting. The next minute he quibbles whether there should be a voice vote or not. We might even have an electrical device for recording votes, such as is used in some State legislatures.

But when the Democratic caucus has formulated the policy, to quote the Senator's own words, how can that policy be substantively translated into a bill by a standing committee of the Senate when only the majority leader is to be bound by the policy thus formulated?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The way that would be done is this: The party would decide in caucus what the position should be. That position is participated in by the members of the committee. The members of the committee may or may not agree with it. I would hope that the position of the majority of the Democrats would have some influence. If it would not have any influence, there would be no way to get favorable recommendation by the committee, any more than if the majority leader had no influence on the committee, he could not get the committee to make a favorable recommendation.

I submit that the decision, the vote, the determination of all the Democratic Senators in caucus, would be persuasive with many Democratic Senators, including myself. I might often disagree with the decision of the caucus; but on occasion I would find that perhaps I should reexamine my position, or perhaps I should change it. The decision of the caucus would have great influence on me, and I think it would be a salutary influence.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In other words, in the caucus a vote would be taken. Suppose the vote taken in the caucus were on a measure dealing with schools. What would happen in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to which such proposed legislation is referred? Many Federal aid-to-school bills have been referred to that committee; but, unless I am mistaken, very few of those

bills, if any, have emerged from that committee. Does the Senator from Wisconsin expect that the policy formulated would change their minds?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think it might. I think it would have great influence with them. It certainly would with me. If not, it would fail—just as the position of the majority leader fails, although very rarely.

My position is that that policy would have a chance to work, just as it does in State legislatures, and just as it has in the past in the Senate—although frequently in the Senate, as the Senator from Oregon has so ably pointed out, those caucuses have been binding.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Wisconsin said: "Under no circumstances would I consider myself bound by the unit rule in any vote of the caucus."

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Wisconsin also said: "I have stated that the purpose of the caucus was to give guidance to the leadership and to let the leadership know how the rank-and-file Democratic Senators feel."

That has been the whole emphasis of the remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin—namely, that the leadership must step aside. But we have standing committees, and committee chairmen, and there are 63 other Democratic Senators. However, according to the entire emphasis of the speech of the Senator from Wisconsin, there is to be no stress or duress on them to follow the policy thus formulated.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Oh, I think there would be enormous influence on them to follow that kind of a policy. Of course there would be—just as in the case of any democratic body—enormous influence.

If the 64 Democratic Senators voted 40 in favor versus 24 opposed, on the question of having the committee report to the Senate an aid-to-education bill, the bill still might not be reported by the committee; but I think that would be a tremendously strong and very constructive weapon in the direction of getting the bill reported, and passed, too. It would constitute a real moral force on the committee.

Mr. NEUBERGER. If the Democratic caucus voted to endorse the 27½-percent depletion allowance in the case of the oil companies, would the Senator from Wisconsin be influenced by that vote?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Of course not. Often I would not agree.

Mr. NEUBERGER. A few minutes ago the Senator from Wisconsin said the decision of the caucus would have great impact on him.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It would have impact on me.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Except on the issues on which the Senator from Wisconsin has convictions.

Mr. PROXMIRE. No. There are issues on which I have deep convictions; and no doubt other Senators are in a similar position. Perhaps I would reexamine my position, although it would be very unlikely that I would change it on the depletion allowance.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In other words, the Senator from Wisconsin would expect to have Senators bound, except upon issues on which they have very deep convictions.

Does not the Senator from Wisconsin think the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. EASTLAND] has very deep convictions on civil rights legislation?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, very deep convictions; and I respect him for that.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Does not the Senator from Wisconsin think that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has deep convictions on deficit spending? He is chairman of the Finance Committee.

In other words, the caucus would have relatively little impact except on some minor issues on which Members did not have strong feelings.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me make clear that I do not say I would change my position.

However, it seems to me that it would have tremendous influence on whether I would vote to report the bill. I think I would be very much persuaded to vote to report even a bill which would go sharply against my convictions, if a majority of the Democratic Senators wanted the bill reported. I think in that case I would vote to report it, although I would fight it on the floor of the Senate. Perhaps I would fight against it, but I think I would be very much influenced by the decision of such a caucus.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In other words, if the Democratic caucus formulated a policy, then, no matter whether the Senator from Wisconsin was in disagreement with the policy, he would vote to report such a bill to the Senate, would he?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have not said that. I have said that I probably would be greatly persuaded, and I would most likely vote to report the bill. There might be a few instances in which I would not vote to report the bill to the Senate.

But I think this would be an excellent way in which all Democratic Senators would have a voice on the policy. I think the majority leader has that power now. When the majority leader—whom all of us respect and like a great deal—comes to us, and says he wants a particular bill reported from committee, I think a majority of us say "Certainly." Those Senators may not favor the bill; and when the bill comes up on the floor of the Senate, they may speak against it, and may vote against it. But the majority leader has enormous prestige and influence.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In other words, the Senator from Wisconsin believes we should have a caucus in which we would vote—

Mr. PROXMIRE. Neither the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] nor I have ever said we should not have a caucus in which a vote is taken. We have said it would not be binding. I repeat that it would not be binding.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thought the Senator from Wisconsin said we would vote very seldom.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I said perhaps the caucus would not vote.

Yes; I think the initial caucus would rarely vote. I think during the first year, at least, we would vote on a few—perhaps on many, perhaps on none; but my guess is that we would vote on only a few.

I do not think these things are always fixed and always the same. One begins with a certain kind of institution; and it changes considerably.

I think this one would change as the Democrats found it could be used as an instrument.

Mr. NEUBERGER. How would it be used as an instrument—by voting on party policy?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Indeed it would.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is somewhat different from the position previously taken by the Senator from Wisconsin. I gathered then that he did not favor voting on party policy.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I do not think that contradicts my earlier position at all.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Well, I believe the Record will show as to that.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Certainly; I think it will, too.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the majority leader cannot originate substantive legislation. That can be done only by the standing committees of the Senate. What is accomplished if the majority leader must step aside, but if the substantive committees remain the same?

Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin wishes to assist those of us who strive for greater democracy in the Senate, I suggest that he use his great talents to see correction of the seniority system. This, in my opinion, would be a far more useful goal than a return to "King Caucus." Let me explain why.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I prefer to continue at this time. I have already yielded a great deal.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Very well; fine.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, under the seniority system, service as committee chairmen—with their vast authority and power—is virtually denied to the Senators representing the great two-party States where is centered the political vitality of the Nation. New York, for example, may pay over 20 percent of Federal taxes, but New York rarely has a Senator who is committee chairman, under either Democratic or under Republican majorities. This is because New York's healthy two-party political system seldom leaves a Senator in office long enough to enable him to acquire sufficient seniority to attain the chairmanship of a major Senate committee.

#### SYSTEM PENALIZES TWO-PARTY STATES

Thus, the seniority system penalizes the States with political vitality; it rewards the States where one-party politics is often in safe control.

I believe that by challenging the seniority system, the Senator from Wisconsin would be doing far more to democratize the Senate than by his recom-

mendations that we consider a return to the discredited caucus of the past.

Mr. President, this is no new proposal with me. In the New York Times magazine for April 7, 1957, I contributed an article in which I questioned the wisdom of the seniority system, especially in its denial to the great two-party States of their rightful major role in Senate proceedings, and I suggested that there be efforts to relate committee assignments in Congress far more to geography and to specific State problems than to seniority; to permit committee members to elect chairmen by secret ballot, rather than by having this decided only by seniority; and to encourage real two-party political competition in all the States. I ask unanimous consent that the article containing my views on this subject be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit A.)

#### PRINCIPLES VERSUS PERSONALITIES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the recent speeches of the Senator from Wisconsin have been widely portrayed in the press as an attack upon the majority leader of the Senate, Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas. In addition, there have been many public charges that the Senator from Texas uses retaliatory measures against Senators who do not heed his wishes or demands.

I cannot comment upon the experience of others. However, I wish to emphasize that I, myself, have encountered no such circumstances. I believe I have voted quite consistently on the liberal side of most issues—especially the civil-rights question, which is so controversial here in the Senate.

Furthermore, in 1957, we in the Senate had a very heated argument over appropriations for the U.S. Information Agency. The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] had presided over an investigation of USIA and he was determinedly opposed to the size of the appropriation requested by the Eisenhower administration for the Agency. The Senator from Texas urged me strenuously to support his position on this issue. After listening to all the evidence, I came to the conclusion that the request of the administration was reasonable and fair. On the yea-and-nay vote, I believe I was the only Democratic Senator who voted for the administration's funds, and against the position taken by the majority leader of the Senate.

#### CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISM BENEFICIAL

Surely, this was a situation in which retaliation might be forthcoming, if such were the customary practice of the Senator from Texas, as has been alleged by some.

Although I had pending many legislative matters of importance to my State, there was no instance in which they were not duly scheduled for the Senate Calendar. The majority leader may be given to the vindictiveness charged by his critics; but I have not experienced it, even under circumstances in which I differed quite spec-

tacularly, and alone among Democratic Senators, from the views of the majority leader.

I think it is extremely important, Mr. President, that any discussion of democracy in the U.S. Senate be confined to the issues involved, and not be permitted to degenerate into an ad hominem attack on any one person. Liberalism has been responsible for many great advances, because it has been confined to principles; it has been kept above personalities.

One of the reasons why I have made this address here today is that the Senator from Wisconsin came before the Senate with this proposal, which involves very great criticism of the Democratic leadership, and suggested a party caucus. Yet when it was all narrowed down, the discipline involved descended on only one man, the majority leader. He had to stand aside if he was in disagreement with the policy formulated by the caucus. The other 63 Democrats, no matter how powerful or strategic their position, were not to be touched in any way. They did not have to stand aside. They did not have to abandon a single perquisite, a single ounce of authority or power. It seems to me this kind of proposal is not a practical one to change procedure in a great legislative body like the United States Senate.

When a Senator confines the whole impact of a policy drawn up by 64 persons to one man, what kind of a proposal is that? Again I say our legislation, substantively, is drafted and passed upon and sent to the Senate by the standing committees of the Senate. What kind of proposal is it that says to one man over there in the chair on the aisle, "If you were in disagreement with the policy formulated by our caucus you, Mr. Majority Leader, step aside," and that the other Members are free to go their own way on it and to exercise whatever power or authority they have? The standing committees are the same. The chairmen are the same. The special committees are the same. Nothing has been changed except that one man, the majority leader, has to step aside. That is the reason why I put this particular paragraph in my address, and I repeat it:

I think it is extremely important, Mr. President, that any discussion of democracy in the United States Senate be kept on the issues involved, and not permitted to degenerate into an ad hominem attack on any one person. Liberalism has been responsible for many great advances because it has been confined to principles; it has been kept above personalities.

Mr. President, I do not hold with those who say that public discussion of the organizational machinery of the Democratic Party in the Senate is improper and that such debate should take place only behind closed doors. Such matters are of importance to the entire Nation. I believe that the recent speeches of the Senator from Wisconsin and the comments which they have stimulated, including my own, represent a healthy interchange of ideas. Constructive criticism offered with a genuine desire to



stimulate reassessment of existing practices and procedures is beneficial to the democratic process. It is in this spirit that I offer my comments today.

I am pleased they could be presented in the open arena of the Senate rather than behind the locked doors of a party caucus.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. My good friend from Oregon has asked me, in substance, why I do not spend my energies on the seniority system, to which he objects. I would call the attention of my good friend from Oregon to the fact that on February 23, the junior Senator from Wisconsin stood up on the floor and this is what he said:

Later today or tomorrow an order will be entered which will automatically pass this body designating new chairmen of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. President, I object to this order. I object because its passage will mean that the chairmen of 10 of the 15 major standing committees of the Senate will be from the 11 States of the Old South.

I make this objection without any derogation of the excellent character and the obvious competence of the Senators who will assume these chairmanships.

Under the entrenched Senate custom of seniority these Senators are automatically entitled to their chairmanships.

Mr. President, I think it is time this body took a clear, open-eyed, public look at the consequences of following seniority on committee chairmanships.

Then I went into specific objection to the seniority system. I pointed out how and why I wanted it changed.

My good friend from Oregon is an excellent writer. He is one of the greatest in the country. He is recognized throughout the country as an extremely able writer. His article in the New York Times has made a great contribution. However, I think in all honesty he would have to agree that there is a great difference between writing an article for the New York Times and coming on the floor of the Senate, before Senators one likes and respects, and disagreeing with a system that has given some of them great power. That fact should be recognized. I welcome the Senator from Oregon in this battle on the seniority system, which has been limiting and undemocratic.

I should like to say also that my good friend from Oregon twice read a paragraph the implication of which was that I had engaged in an ad hominem attack on the majority leader. I have done everything I could, and I think if my good friend from Oregon will read my speeches he will be constrained to agree—though perhaps not—that I have stated I admired the abilities of the majority leader. I have stated that he is a man of outstanding character and integrity. I simply disagree with a system which has centered so much power in the hands of one man. This is in no way in derogation of the majority leader, and I do not see how it can be construed as an attack on him.

I should like to make one more point. The Senator from Oregon has said that the gist of my argument is that the majority leader is singled out as the man whose prerogatives alone should be limited by the caucus. It should be underlined and emphasized that the majority leader, as the Senator from Texas, would be perfectly free to speak and vote his conscience under the proposal I make. But the majority leader as such, by the very nature of the title he bears, is representing the Democratic Party in the U.S. Senate. I do not see how we could possibly have any kind of policy formulated by a caucus and have the majority leader, acting as the majority leader, carry out a policy which disagreed with the ideas of a majority of the Democrats.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Wisconsin has just referred to the fact that he protested on the Senate floor the confinement of committee chairmen to a comparatively small number of States. I presume he means, from the position he has taken, the chairmen of committees are extremely powerful. Am I correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. I protested against the seniority system which permitted that. I made what I thought was a moderate proposal that the policy should be modified.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator does not think that committee chairmen should step aside if they are in disagreement with the position taken by the caucus, does he?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No; only if one section of the country has more than 50 percent of the chairmanships.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Wisconsin thinks the majority leader should step aside when he is in disagreement with the caucus, does he?

Mr. PROXMIRE. We cannot have a majority leader who is supposed to represent a majority disagreeing with that majority after a majority of the Democratic Party has decided in caucus how it should act. I do not see how he can do that and act as the majority leader.

Mr. NEUBERGER. But the Senator from Wisconsin does not think the chairmen of the committees in that particular situation would have to step aside, does he?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct. I should like to conclude by saying to my good friend from Oregon that in his initial statement he made one of the finest inversions I have ever heard of. Voltaire, who said, "I disagree with everything you say, but I will fight to the death for your right to say it." In that speech the Senator from Oregon seemed to agree with the need for more caucuses, but seemed to think I had no right to break out on the floor, in view of the fact that I had commended the majority leader and, in effect, had bitten the hand that fed me.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I regret that the Senator has raised this issue again. I did not intend to discuss it today or to allude to it, but inasmuch as the Senator

from Wisconsin has mentioned this issue I think it ought to be referred to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is fine.

Mr. NEUBERGER. After the initial speech of the Senator from Wisconsin on February 23, I had some research made in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as to what was said since the Senator from Wisconsin became a Member of the Senate. I will make the statement, without fear of successful contradiction, that no Member of the U.S. Senate in any comparable period of modern times for which records are available, so lavished praise on another Member of the United States Senate, as the Senator from Wisconsin did with respect to the present majority leader of the Senate, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. I am sure the Senator would not deny that.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Of course I deny it. Of course I deny it. In the first place, neither the Senator from Oregon nor the Senator from Wisconsin has been here since the beginning of the Senate. When I came to the Senate there were Senators from all States praising the majority leader, and he deserved the praise. I do not begrudge the majority leader that praise.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Was it one-tenth as much as the praise of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Of course, and the Senator from Oregon knows he is beating a dead cat.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Why did the Senator bring that issue to the floor, if it is a dead cat? The Senator raised the issue. I did not raise it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am raising it because my good friend from Oregon has now at least resurrected Voltaire. Having inverted Voltaire—having said that he would literally fight to the death against my right to say something, although he agreed with it—he now says he disagrees with my position on the caucus. That is the burden of the Senator's speech, which ends with a very fine paragraph to say that my speech was desirable, it was a healthy interchange of ideas, and the criticism was constructive.

I am delighted that my good friend from Oregon has at last taken that position, which I think is the correct position for a great liberal from Oregon. I commend the Senator and thank him.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in conclusion I should like to read an excerpt from the book entitled Robert M. La Follette, written by Belle C. La Follette and Fola La Follette. The excerpt is from page 473 of the book.

In a signed editorial entitled "King Caucus," he [La Follette] protested that this method of legislation meant that the bill would be debated "behind closed doors" where secret votes could be taken which would be considered binding upon all Democratic Senators when the measure came before the Senate. Bob thought revising a tariff bill or any other bill in party caucus was secret control of legislation. "Trades, deals, dicker and corruption thrive best in the dark," he said. "To take the public business into a corner to be transacted under a seal of confidence is the first step toward public betrayal," he wrote.

That is an excerpt from page 473 of the biography of the great liberal Senator from Wisconsin, whose portrait was recently unveiled, along with those of four other great Senators chosen from the annals of our country.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I rise to commend the Senator from Oregon for keeping his good disposition throughout the discussion. I am happy to see the Senator defend the majority leader and express his viewpoint. I hope the Senator will continue, in the months to come, to keep his temper in good shape.

One of our famous writers said at one time that trouble was like hot weather, it sours milk and sweetens apples. The Senator from Oregon has had some trouble, as have some of the rest of us occasionally, with respect to his health. I was anxious this afternoon that the Senator not overdo himself in exertion on the floor.

I wish to commend the Senator from Oregon for keeping his disposition good, as has the Senator from Wisconsin. I commend the Senator further for speaking out as to what he believes is best for the Senate. I am happy the Senator's health is good enough that he feels competent to engage in this sort of discussion.

After a few years of experience, I advise the Senator to take care as to how he exerts himself, and to be sure he keeps the sweet good nature he has displayed today.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from New Mexico, whom I admire so greatly, for commenting so generously about my disposition. I wish to tell the Senator that I would not undertake this task today—what might be called a self-imposed assignment—unless it were within the discretion, wisdom, and permission of my doctors.

I have found, since returning to the Senate, there is one way to fulfill a complete legislative calendar, and I think the Senator from New Mexico may be interested in this, so I will state it before I conclude.

My doctors advise me to live a normal life and to maintain a normal schedule, but not to overdo it. I have found that I can undertake all of the legislative tasks which come to me if I curtail the innumerable social events which are foisted upon every Member of the Senate—the institutional banquets, the cocktail parties and receptions every evening, and being asked to take delegations to Statuary Hall, to the Capitol Dome, and all around the Capitol grounds. By doing away with the so-called fringe responsibilities I find I can attend to my real legislative responsibilities.

I certainly appreciate the consideration for my health voiced by the Senator from New Mexico. And I again want to thank the Senator for his generous comments about my disposition. After one has had the experience and ordeal

I have had, one is really not angry with anyone. I certainly am not.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### EXHIBIT A

[From the New York Times magazine, Apr. 7, 1957]

A SENATOR'S CASE AGAINST SENIORITY  
(By Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon)

WASHINGTON.—Although I have served in the Senate only since January 1955, it has become my firm conviction during this period that seniority should not continue to be the sole determinant of congressional sovereignty and influence as reflected in committee chairmanships and committee assignments. As I see the question, seniority is wrong on three fundamental counts:

(1) It attaches little or no significance to the special abilities and experience of an individual, but only to the duration of his service.

(2) A committee chairman never can be removed, even if the national interest is jeopardized by his continuance in that post.

(3) Seniority rewards those States with one-party systems and, conversely, penalizes States in which two robust and equally matched political parties fight it out at the ballot box.

The reasons for these objections to seniority are so obvious, it seems to me, that they can be regarded as practically self-explanatory. What can be said for a method of operating Congress that will give an ordinary layman with long political tenure a greater opportunity to serve on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy than a famous nuclear physicist who might come newly to House or Senate? A man may be a leader of the bar in his State, but will he attain the Judiciary Committee if he lacks seniority? Senator THURSTON MORTON, of Kentucky, was President Eisenhower's Assistant Secretary of State, but the inexorable rule of seniority has given him a seat on the District of Columbia Committee rather than on the Foreign Relations Committee, where his training in the State Department could be put to practical use.

After their defeats for the Presidency, both Thomas E. Dewey and Adlai Stevenson were surrounded by rumors of senatorial ambitions. Why should men of their distinction and oratorical gift not aspire to the Senate Chamber? Yet, it later was reported that they had decided against essaying the humble and unrewarding roles of freshmen Senators. Surely the decision of men of their caliber not to try for the Senate was a loss to the whole Nation. Under a similar system in England, Winston Churchill would have had to be content with back-bench status after he dropped out of Parliament for a time and thus relinquished his seniority.

In these days of crisis, Government must be flexible to meet new situations. The earth is moving at a mad pace. Emergencies are omnipresent. Never so true was the couplet from James Russell Lowell's "The Present Crisis":

"New occasions teach new duties,  
Time makes ancient good uncouth."

Yet the congressional rule of seniority is the direct antithesis of this. It is rigid, inflexible, and unyielding—particularly in the vital realm of committee chairmanship. An isolationist may head the Armed Services Committee at the height of American involvement in a worldwide conflict, and in that post he stays if seniority put him there. If seniority installs a foe of conservation as chairman of the committee charged with protecting America's dwindling supply of natural resources, draft horses and wain-ropes cannot drag him out of this seat. And

if the allies or beneficiaries of special interests become the heads of key committees responsible for regulating those same special interests—well, that is seniority.

Ought Congress be laced into such a straitjacket? If Senators can be trusted to pass on matters as crucial as war and peace, why is it unsafe to let them pick their own committee chairmen?

This is not to claim that able men of integrity rarely rise to congressional dominance through the seniority system—far from it. For instance, Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, an ardent conservationist at the age of 80, presides today over the Interior Committee. I have been amazed at the details concerning fiscal matters known to Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, 79, who wields the gavel in the vital Appropriations Committee.

But the point is that, even if Senator MURRAY were not so ardent a conservationist and if Senator HAYDEN possessed far less familiarity with the Federal budget, they still would head the Interior and Appropriations Committees, respectively. Their qualifications are secondary to their seniority. I wonder if this is a wise set of priorities, particularly when we consider that men critically ill have ruled strategic committees for years in absentia. As long as breath remained in their bodies, the seniority rule could not be breached. They had to retain their chairmanships.

Furthermore, under such an arrangement, seniority often becomes an end in and of itself. Electorates are told that they must keep in office a certain individual not necessarily because he is sound on the burning issues confronting America and the rest of the world, but simply because he has so much seniority on deposit in Senate vaults.

In 1954, when I ran for the Senate as a Democrat in a State which had not elected a Democratic Senator for 40 years, my opponent was an incumbent Republican who, through the inexorable workings of the seniority process, had become chairman of the Interior Committee. This is the most powerful Senate committee in dealing with problems affecting the Western States. The special advantages and benefits to Oregon of my opponent's seniority became a leading issue of the campaign. Indeed, at times it subordinated all other issues.

I shall never forget a conversation I had with an enlightened and able editor of a small-town daily newspaper whose support I was seeking. This man is an internationalist and a fervent defender of civil liberties. I cited to him my opponent's rollcall votes in the Senate against ratifying the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, against extending reciprocal trade, against point 4, against any moves toward rebuking Senator McCarthy, against confirming such appointees as CHESTER BOWLES and David E. Lillenthal, against positive Federal action in the realm of civil rights.

"Everything that you charge about your opponent's voting record is undoubtedly true," said the editor, whom I long have respected and admired. "I can't defend that record. Yet I still would hate to see our State lose all that valuable seniority in the U.S. Senate, as well as on some of its most important committees."

And, near the climax of the campaign, this internationalist, liberal-minded editor endorsed for the Senate an isolationist and adversary of civil rights.

I am convinced that such incidents are by no means uncommon. Yet an endless and self-serving circle is thus created. A one-party State produces seniority for its Senators because they serve without serious challenge to their tenure. Then, this seniority is relied upon as an all-persuasive argument for continuing the State's one-party standing.



This constitutes my principal complaint against the seniority system. It provides an argument and shield for people who fear the real workings of democracy. Despite all our vaunted devotion to the two-party system, grassroots competition between strong political parties is virtually unknown in approximately half the States of the Union. In fact, the absence of genuine political competition in so many States may be at the root of the undue emphasis on prolonged tenure in office. Such tenure is inevitably a byproduct of one-party rule.

Occasionally some of the one-party States may be breached by a Presidential nominee of the other party who possesses overwhelming personal popularity or glamour—Franklin D. Roosevelt or Dwight Eisenhower, for example. In some distressing cases, as with the religious bigotry of 1928 directed against Alfred E. Smith, a one-party State may reverse itself.

But these exceptions seldom register any lower on the ballot. Mr. Hoover, once, and Mr. Eisenhower, twice, successfully invaded much of the Deep South. Yet they brought to victory with them not a single Republican Senator from that region. Mr. Roosevelt carried Oregon decisively four times, but the State never elected a Democratic Senator on such occasions. For offices like U.S. Senator or the governorships, no fewer than 28 States may be regarded as nearly impregnable strongholds of one party or the other. These are the States which ascend most often to dominance in Congress under the seniority system.

What is a one-party State? I admit the term is susceptible to no hard and fast definition. Yet some specific standards of measurement are possible.

I have based this measurement on Senate seats because they are generally the offices fought over the hardest and national significance is most likely to attach to the results. I have gone back only to 1914, when some States first began to experiment with the direct election of Senators. Prior to that time all Senators were chosen by State legislatures, with railroads and timber companies and steamship monopolies often more influential in the choice than the will of the electorate.

With this in mind, I believe it is fair and accurate to describe as a one-party State any in which one party has held, since 1914, a preponderance of senatorial election victories of 3 to 1, or more.

I find that in 28 States the nominees of one party have regularly won Senate seats in 3 elections out of 4 or better. This is considerably more than half the States of our Nation. Some of these one-party States, especially in the South and Southwest, have been traditionally Democratic. Other States, particularly in New England and in the Corn and Wheat Belts of the Middle West, have been steadfastly Republican.

In only 20 of the States have Senate seats been divided somewhat evenly between the two parties since the direct election of Senators began to replace the appointment method. They are: Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

It is true that these States today hold 5 chairmanships among a total of 15 permanent Senate committees. But it also is true that the chairmanships belong to the five among the two-party States that are the closest to being one-party States. In this category in New Mexico, whose senior Senator serves as chairman of the Public Works Committee, New Mexico has had its senatorial seats occupied by Democrats for a 13 to 5 supremacy during the past 43 years. This is narrowly below the 3 to 1 ratio which would

add New Mexico to my list of one-party States.

Furthermore, States where the two parties are as closely matched politically as New York and Illinois have not held major Senate chairmanships for a considerable number of years, despite their vast populations and their importance to the national economy. I can think of no more compelling reason for modifying the seniority rule than the manner in which seniority must inevitably discriminate against great two-party States such as these.

Fortunately, there has been some slight recent erosion of seniority. This has occurred not in the disposition of committee chairmanships, but in the place where reform ought logically to begin—in the assignment of new Senators to committee seats.

Some weeks ago, Representative STEWART L. UDALL, of Arizona, in an able defense in this magazine of the seniority rule, stressed the change in the method of committee assignments as a hopeful sign that seniority is losing its ironclad aspects. I agree with his satisfaction over this development. However, Representative UDALL neglected to point out that this curtailment of seniority has applied thus far to only one of the two major political parties.

Upon becoming Democratic leader of the Senate in 1953, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON laid down the policy that no member of the party, regardless of his seniority, would receive a second top committee seat of his choice until every Democratic Senator had been given at least one such assignment. Up to that time, senior Senators had monopolized nearly all the prized committee posts. Newcomers were relegated to minor committees, which usually meant Rules or Post Office or District of Columbia. This is still often the fate of junior Republican Senators, because the Johnson doctrine has yet to spread across the center aisle after 4 years of operation.

Immediately after their elections, Senators MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, and STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, were seated by the Democrats on the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees, respectively, because of their long backgrounds in those fields. Senator WAYNE MORSE of Oregon, who once taught international law, received a Senate Foreign Relations Committee place from the Democrats even while he was still an Independent. Yet no Republican seat on the committees operating in the realm of diplomacy has gone to Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER of Kentucky, even though he has come to the Senate fresh from experience as President Eisenhower's Envoy to India.

Two years ago I entered the Senate as a freshman and was assigned by the Democratic leadership to the Interior and Public Works Committees, both vital to natural-resource management in my Pacific Northwest constituency. By contrast, Senator CLIFFORD CASE, of New Jersey, an Eisenhower Republican who entered the Senate with me, has been given only such typically minor berths as Post Office and District of Columbia because members of his party senior to him had laid claim to all the committee chairs of his preference.

What is to be done about this whole thorny question of seniority in Congress and of the penalty it imposes upon two-party States?

Stubborn issues rarely respond to easy or pat solutions. However, I have three specific remedies to propose:

(1) Relate committee assignments in Congress far more to geography and to specific State problems than to seniority.

(2) Permit committee members to elect a chairman by secret ballot, rather than having this decided only by seniority.

(3) Convert as many of the present one-party States as possible into two-party States.

Let me explain what I mean by the first proposal.

The people of the State of New York pay about 20 percent of all the taxes collected by the Federal Government. There should always be one Senator from New York on the Finance Committee, where taxation matters are decided. The Agricultural Committee should be balanced as fairly as possible among members from the cotton States of the South, the grain States of the Middle West and the specialty-crop States on both seacoasts. This balance does not prevail today. Among the committee's 15 members there is not one Senator from the immense rural area between the Great Plains and the shores of the Pacific Ocean.

It is my belief that, once assignment to committees has been removed from the realm of seniority, it soon will follow that each committee will be able to elect its chairman. In the Senate committees on which I serve, the chairman thus selected undoubtedly will be the same Senators who have occupied the head chair through seniority. But this would not be automatically the case in every committee, and the two-party States would find themselves at least participating in the choice; their total exclusion from such decisions might end.

My third suggestion may seem illusory and farfetched. How do you change a one-party State into a two-party State? Let me offer my own State as a prime demonstration that the feat can be accomplished.

While Franklin Roosevelt was President, only three States—Maine, Vermont, and Oregon—failed to elect Democratic Senators or third-party Senators allied with the Democrats. The last Democratic Senator from Oregon had been elected in 1914, the last Democratic Governor in 1934, and two of Oregon's four Houses seats had never in history been won by Democrats. Today, Oregon has two Democratic Senators, a Democratic Governor, and three out of its four congressional seats are occupied by Democrats.

The significant feature of Oregon's emergence from entrenched one-party status is the circumstance that two out of three Democratic senatorial victories have occurred in 1954 and again in 1956. Oregon never elected a Democratic Senator during the 12 years that the White House was occupied by Franklin D. Roosevelt, most popular of Democratic Presidents. Paradoxically, Oregon today has two Democratic Senators who were elected during the 4 years that the White House has been the residence of Dwight D. Eisenhower, most popular of Republican Presidents.

What was responsible for this?

The principal ingredient in the political upheaval in Oregon has been the refusal of the Democrats to be daunted by the deeply rooted political monopoly of the Republicans. Democratic leaders in every Oregon county decided there was no valid reason why Oregon should be the exclusive property of the Republican Party. Spirit and persistence accounted for the change.

I discuss Oregon merely as a case in point. There are other one-party bastions and they, too, can be carried by a formidable political assault. Pennsylvania, with a 14-to-4 preponderance of Republican senatorial victories throughout its modern history, is succumbing to change. JOSEPH S. CLARK, JR., is the first Democratic Senator from Pennsylvania in many years. And, now that President Eisenhower himself has twice breached many of the Democratic redoubts in the South, his party is looking southward for victories at other levels on the ballot.

Any invasion of a political stronghold, be it Republican or Democratic, is to the eventual advantage of democracy and progressive government. As one-party citadels fall, seniority will lose much of its attraction and influence in Congress. And as seniority is gradually modified, there will be less temptation for a State to continue suppliantly in

the clutches of one political party. Both of these changes will help the Nation—inside the Halls of Congress as well as far beyond the Capitol dome.

#### LIMITATION OF DEBATE—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order previously presented to the Senate today in connection with the pending business be entered with respect to the time limitation; that there be no votes on Friday or Saturday and that we begin the time limitation on Monday at the conclusion of the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### ORDER FOR CONVENING ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGEE in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No order has been entered for the time of convening on Monday, I believe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes on Monday it convene at 12 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this colloquy be printed in the RECORD after the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT IN DEPRESSED AREAS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 722) to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). The pending business is the bill relating to unemployment in depressed areas.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, we of the 86th Congress are now considering one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before us. We are approaching the hour when we must decide what program, if any, is to be undertaken in an effort to pump new life into the areas of chronic unemployment which are constituting a drag upon our Nation's prosperity and which are undermining our national security. We are nearing a showdown on the question of whether this coun-

try—the richest, most powerful, and most highly industrialized in the world—is capable of dealing with her own economic sore spots. We soon must give one of two answers—either that America is strong and resourceful enough to impart new vitality into regions of lingering or mounting joblessness, or that our Nation is powerless or at least unwilling to cope with the problem and to offer hope to the millions of Americans now living in the affected areas.

Mr. President, in my addresses to the Senate during the past week I have stated what I believe to be the wiser course. I sincerely feel that only the most forceful and most comprehensive plan of action is adequate to come to grips with this national problem. And I feel with equal sincerity that there is only one piece of legislation now before the Congress which embodies such a plan—namely, Senate bill 722, the Area Redevelopment Act, introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from Illinois for permitting me to address this body at this time in regard to the proposal before the Senate. His profound work of legislative ingenuity and insight, which has now been approved by the Committee on Banking and Currency, is in my estimation the most practicable, most feasible, and most reasonable approach to this grievous situation that has yet been suggested. So I compliment the distinguished Senator from Illinois on the excellent work he has performed in connection with this legislation. I compliment him for the diligent and untiring effort he has put into the creation of this legislation and into the hearings which have been conducted upon it. I feel that before many days Congress, in its good judgment, will present this legislation to the President for his signature.

Mr. President, before I direct my remarks to the provisions of S. 722, I should like for a little while to discuss again the need for legislation to provide Federal assistance to areas suffering from substantial and persistent unemployment. There is in my State much suffering and hardship, and I am concerned about the desperation and the despair which generally prevails in regions where unemployment has persisted at its worst for many months. Little children are hungry. They and their parents, having exhausted unemployment compensation payments, live upon a meager allotment of surplus commodities. They are without hope. Lawlessness is on the increase as fathers have begun to steal food and clothing for their families. Men have roamed from State to State in a fruitless search for employment, and others have become too destitute to afford travel away from their habitats. During the course of the field hearings which I conducted in West Virginia 2 weeks ago, by authorization of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, I received testimony about the desertion of families by husbands in order that the wives and children might become eligible for State welfare assistance.

I would be remiss in my duty were I not to express my gratitude to the chairman

of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency and to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization, for having made it possible for this subcommittee to go into West Virginia and conduct field hearings there, thus enabling my people to present pertinent testimony for the record. I believe that hearings in the field serve a very useful purpose. I am of the opinion that they are needful; and I want my people to know that I feel we are indebted to the chairman of the subcommittee and to the leadership of this body for making it possible for the subcommittee to go into the area and obtain first-hand information concerning the need for legislation of this nature. We learned some disturbing things.

Some schools are bankrupt because of the number of free lunches being too great, and within the next 30 days, one of the school principals of Raleigh County, my home county, testified more schools will close their lunch programs unless additional help is forthcoming. Over half of the lunches served in some of the schools are free lunches. In many of the schools, over 50 percent of the students have unemployed parents, and the remaining parents are employed only a part of the time. Is it any wonder, Mr. President, that some of our school surveys show that children in these depressed areas are below average? Let us ask ourselves this question: What do we think of if we are hungry? We think of something to eat. My subcommittee was told that some of the unemployed men have turned to moonshining to earn money.

I have mentioned these facts once or twice already on the floor of this body, but I think the people should know that such conditions exist in our own country, where warehouses are bulging as they bulged in the days of Joseph, and where there is the highest standard of living in the world. I think it is important that the country become aware of the fact that there are people living in our Nation who are hungry, ill-clothed, and poorly sheltered. We talk a great deal about giving millions and billions to our friends around the world, whose national debts, when combined, do not equal our own national debt. When we give assistance to other countries, we are exemplifying the Christian attitude. At the same time, it is most important that we be aware of the pockets of poverty, privation, suffering, and hunger within the boundaries of this America which we love so much.

For this reason I have spoken of the situation again and again. Today I again call to the attention of the country, the President, and others in the executive branch these facts, which trouble me, and which trouble my senior colleague [Mr. RANDOLPH] and other Members of this body.

Hundreds of small businessmen have closed their stores and shops due to slumping sales and mounting debts. We have heard again and again that economic conditions in the depressed areas are as bad as those which afflicted our Nation during the depression of the early thirties. Mr. President, of course,



this situation is not general throughout the Nation, as it was a quarter of a century ago. But where it exists, it is, in many instances, as bad. I came up the hard way, Mr. President, and I lived in those days of the depression. I wore tennis shoes in the snow.

There are children living today in West Virginia who have had no shoes to wear in the snow.

In late December I visited the mining town where my father used to load coal.

I talked with some of the families there. It hurt me deeply to see the equipment being brought out of the mines, to see the abandoned machine shop, to see the idle tippie in a community where mines still could produce good coal. I visited the company store where I used to work, and the inventory of goods was almost completely depleted. During the depression we sold a great deal of food and clothing in that store, but it is practically a closed operation now. Everything in the community is on the downgrade. The houses are sinking and deteriorating. Many of the windows in the houses are boarded over, and everything is in ill repair. The houses in that community have not felt the touch of a paint brush in many summers. The very atmosphere seems to be weighted down with dread and hopelessness and bleak despair.

The people have exhausted their unemployment compensation payments. The only food available in home after home which I visited was "mollygrub," the term used for commodities distributed from Government stockpiles of food surpluses accumulated under the price support program. I visited one family in which there were 9 children, and I was told by the husband and father that the family had received, as a 30-day supply of rations, 6 pounds of butter, 6 pounds of rice, 40 pounds of meal, and 5 pounds of flour. That amount of food had to do for 90 meals.

Christmas had just passed, and family after family spoke of Christmas baskets of food that had been donated by local unions and people in other communities, but Christmas baskets were gone. Through the generosity of others, these poor families had been granted a brief respite in their fight against hunger.

Mr. President, I have seen more penury and more privation and more hopelessness and more despondency and more want in 1958 than I saw in the early 1930's. Then I did not see idle tipples, and company stores closed down or open only perhaps an hour out of every 24 hours, or 1 day a week. I cannot begin to describe the lowered morale which exists in these depressed areas. It is a lower morale than I, as a lad, witnessed in the same communities a quarter of a century ago.

Mr. President, little children feel this bleak atmosphere of despondency and lowered morale. Men who are unemployed feel it and they try to find something to take their minds off their helpless, distressed situation. Some of them turn to drink, and it is a very poor substitute. But it is no escape from reality; it is only an escape from the frying pan into the fire. Now and then one will

commit suicide. These are people with pride and people who do not want to be humiliated. These are people who have given of their fortunes, some of them of their children, in order that this country might be a free land, and that it might continue to be the hope of the world. They are good citizens. I should very much regret their seeing this proposed legislative fail of passage or receive a Presidential veto. I wonder what they would then think of the Government which they have served valiantly and for which they have given much.

As I have already said, these are people with pride. They love their country. They love their Government. They love their State. They love their communities. They love their families. They are people who do not want to be humiliated. Yet they see their children doing without clothing and doing without food, and eating out of garbage cans.

What is this situation doing to the children? Childhood is such a sensitive time. The little humiliations through which a child goes rankle in that child's bosom, and as it grows to manhood or womanhood, the child who has experienced humiliation, unfairness, and want grows up with a bitterness and a resentment against society. He will then go out and commit crimes. Immorality is bred by poverty and unemployment:

I took a piece of plastic clay  
And idly fashioned it one day

And as my fingers pressed it still  
It moved and yielded to my will

I came again when days were past,  
The bit of clay was hard at last.

The form I gave it, it still bore,  
And I could change that form no more.

I took a piece of living clay  
And gently formed it day by day,

And molded with my power and art  
A young child's soft and yielding heart.

I came again when years were gone,  
He was a man I looked upon.

He still that early impress wore,  
And I could change him nevermore.

Mr. President, there are many thousands of little pieces of human clay growing up in these depressed communities. I am sorry to say I feel that unless we do something, and do it quickly, precious time will be lost. The time will come when these children will have grown into maturity and when they will have been hardened against the society which denied them the necessities of life.

Mr. President, as I recall these homes of extreme poverty, I think I see the explanation for the retarded educational development of many of these children. They cannot absorb the rudiments of mathematics and they cannot concentrate upon the fundamentals of science, when they are preoccupied with the distressing conditions surrounding their home life and when they have a gnawing in their stomachs.

My senior colleague and the House Members of the West Virginia delegation and I sat down this morning to a breakfast of "mollygrub," consisting of butter, flour, meal, dried milk, and rice. As I tried to partake of that food, I thought

of my own two daughters and of how discouraging and sad it would be were they forced to depend upon such a meager ration for life itself. Then I thought of the many children who perhaps are not so fortunate as my own children, and who go day after day wanting enough food, and better food with which to fill their little stomachs. There are many children in West Virginia, and in other States, who will go to bed hungry tonight, children who went to bed hungry last night and who went to bed hungry a month ago last night.

So, Mr. President, warped personalities, crime, retarded physical development, declining morality, blighted mentality, and lowered morale are parts of the vicious chain of unemployment and poverty. These are the humanitarian aspects of the problem, but they are the things which so often fail to be adequately considered and properly developed in legislative bodies such as this. Not that the members of legislative bodies are out of tune with the needs of human beings, not that they are unsympathetic; but in the mad rush of things our thoughts are so often concentrated upon the effect that this or that will have upon the budget, the effect that it will have upon the national debt, the effect that it will produce in this direction or that direction, or in some other direction. Too often, the more important things are overlooked, such as the effect upon the personality, character, attitudes, mores, morale, and so on. Yet, these are, after all, the more important things, the things that shape men's souls, encourage their love for fellow creatures, strengthen their faith in fellow human beings, underlie and undergird their respect for the laws of society, and provide the anchor of their trust in Government. These are the things that are effaced and eroded when boys and girls are reared under conditions that deny them food, clothing, and opportunity, and which confront them daily with humiliation, frustration, and despair.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield to my distinguished colleague from West Virginia, a Member of this body who has joined in cosponsoring the bill; one who is just as much concerned with its passage as I am; one who has diligently worked to bring it to fruition.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It is with reluctance that I interrupt the compelling presentation of my sincere colleague. I do so at this time to emphasize what he has so well said in the Senate. But I desire to reinforce the argument which he is so effectively bringing to our attention.

Figures are important. But in this instance the Senator from West Virginia is attempting, and is doing it splendidly, to clothe the figures with faces. Silver dollars have two sides. One side is the side which is used as an exchange in the marts of trade. But turn the dollar over and search out its human side. There must be a human side to each and every dollar. Surely we will find these values to which my esteemed colleague

from West Virginia calls attention. Let us search out these human values and make them our own. There will then be additional votes in this body for S. 722.

I express the hope that on the morrow individual Senators, who have other commitments at this hour which are legitimate and are understood, will have the opportunity to read what the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia has been saying and to evaluate further the import of his presentation.

I commend the Senator from West Virginia. I have often done so, not simply for the sake of saying pleasant words, even though the Bible tells us that pleasant words are as a honeycomb, breath to the soul, and health to the bones.

The Senator from West Virginia is speaking about the souls of men, women, and children—yes; about the bones of little boys and girls.

I appreciate the Senator's allowing me to interrupt him at this point.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank my colleague.

The Bible says:

A word fitly spoken is like apples of gold in pictures of silver.

My colleague spoke fitly when he indicated that there are human faces, human desires, human aspirations, human dreams, and ambitions back of these statistics.

It was Emerson who said:

Not gold, but only men can make a nation great and strong;

Men who for truth and honor's sake stand fast and labor long;

Real men who work while others sleep, Who dare while others fly.

They build a nation's pillars deep And lift them to the sky.

We are considering legislation which deals with men; legislation which will affect the lives of our people; legislation which will enable them to use their talents and their energies to achieve the best that is within them.

Our people ask nothing more than the opportunity to labor honestly and to provide for their loved ones, and to give of their best to the upbuilding of their country.

At this point, Mr. President, in order to convey a better impression of the economic picture of at least one depressed area, I wish to read a few passages from testimony which was taken 2 weeks ago in West Virginia by the Banking and Currency Committee's Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization. In giving his evidence to our subcommittee, the Governor of West Virginia, the Honorable Cecil H. Underwood told of the suffering of many unemployed families; and then he said:

In some areas of our State, the entire economy is almost at a standstill; in others, it will shortly come to such an impasse, unless we take immediate and positive action. We are not in a general depression; instead, we are in an era of unparalleled change. In fact, we are in an industrial revolution \* \* \* West Virginia is faced today with the stark aftermath of rapid technological advance, primarily in the coal industry. The entire State has been affected, it is true, as evidenced by a 10-year decline in population.

But this change in mining practices is fundamental. Economic forces beyond man's control dictated this transformation. Had coal taken any other course, it would no longer be in the competitive fuel market. \* \* \* We must accept the cold fact that industry in this State, as elsewhere, will continue to improve production and reduce manpower needs proportionately. \* \* \* The first sharp increase in current unemployment occurred in November 1957. This trend continued to deepen during the winter months, reaching its peak in May 1958. Since that time, unemployment has gradually decreased. In the last 20 months, more than 50,000 workers in West Virginia have exhausted their regular unemployment benefits. Since the beginning of the Temporary Unemployment Compensation program, June 27, 1958, more than 36,000 workers have qualified for its benefits. More than 18,000 persons have exhausted these temporary payments.

The Governor's explanation as to the source of the problem was echoed by Dr. Henry L. Ash, director of the West Virginia Department of Employment Security. Dr. Ash testified that the number of coalfield jobs is no longer adequately reflected by figures on coalfield production; and he said:

To me two things are crystal clear about the coal industry in West Virginia. The first of these is that coal will remain a very vital part of our economic life in this State; the second is that mechanization has and will continue to decrease the number of employees needed. To me this is not an argument against mechanization, but a fact to reckon with. Mechanization or automation, whichever you choose to call it, has been a significant force in our economy. We have a scientific Frankenstein yet to be harnessed. We cannot and would not stay mechanization. We must learn and act to live with it and enjoy the fruits of man's ingenuity.

Finally, I should like, Mr. President, to read a few sentences from the testimony of Dr. Leo Fishman, head of the department of economics at West Virginia University. Dr. Fishman pointed out that the unemployment rate at Morgantown—the location of the university—is now 18 percent. Then he said:

The extensive and protracted unemployment in Morgantown is in large measure the result of deep-rooted structural changes in the national and world economies. These changes have led to a sharp restriction in output and employment in the basic industry of the Morgantown area, namely the bituminous coal industry. Simultaneously, technological advances in bituminous coal mining, desirable though they may be from other points of view, have aggravated the situation by causing employment to drop even more sharply than output.

The bills now being considered by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency for the purpose of alleviating conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically depressed areas differ more in detail than in principle. My own preference is for Senate bill 722, introduced by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS. It impresses me as the one which is most carefully drafted and most likely to achieve the results for which it is intended.

There we have the opinion of the man who is regarded as perhaps the most learned economist in West Virginia. He believes that only a measure as forceful and imaginative as Senate bill 722 can approach being an answer to today's

serious economic need. I believe that his judgment should be taken into consideration by each of us as we ponder this most vital legislation.

Mr. President, the provisions of the bill have, of course, been carefully studied in the committee, and they are explained in the committee report, which is available to all Members of the Senate. But I wish to refer to them here.

Under the provisions of Senate bill 722, there will be established, within the executive branch of the Government, an Area Redevelopment Administration. Such Administration shall be under the direction and control of an Administrator appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. To advise the Administrator in the performance of functions authorized by the act, an Area Redevelopment Advisory Board would be created. The Board would consist of the Administrator as Chairman, and the Secretaries of Agriculture; Commerce; Defense; Health, Education, and Welfare; Interior; Labor; and Treasury. Also on the Board would be the Administrators of the General Services Administration, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Small Business Administration, together with the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

The Administrator would appoint a National Public Advisory Committee on Area Redevelopment, composed of 25 representatives of labor, management, agriculture, and the public in general. This Committee would make, to the Administrator, recommendations relative to the carrying out of his duties under the act.

The Administrator could also call upon representatives of interested governmental departments and agencies, together with representatives of transportation and other industries, including agriculture, for the purpose of conferring about problems creating unemployment or underemployment.

In the act are set forth certain criteria whereby the Administrator would be guided in designating certain areas as industrial redevelopment areas and rural redevelopment areas. The Administrator would have access to pertinent studies, information, and data collected or compiled by departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, State, and local governments, universities and land-grant colleges, and private organizations.

The Administrator would be authorized to make loans to industrial redevelopment areas for the purchase or development of land or facilities, including machinery and equipment, for industrial usage. Loans could also be made to such areas for the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or enlargement of factory buildings for industrial use. Such financial assistance could not be extended for working capital or to assist establishments relocating from one area to another when such assistance would result in substantial detriment to the area of original location, by increasing unemployment. A revolving loan fund of \$100 million would be created for these purposes,



these funds to be borrowed by the Administrator from the Treasury.

In the making of such loans the Administrator would determine that the project involved would be reasonably calculated to provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment, and no loan assistance would be extended unless the financial assistance applied for was determined not to be immediately available on reasonable terms from private lenders or other Federal agencies. The Administrator would advance such loans only after making a determination that a reasonable assurance of repayment existed. Loans would be made for periods of up to 30 years; and the Administrator would be permitted to extend such loans for a period of not to exceed 10 additional years, if such extension or renewal would aid in the orderly liquidation of such loan. The loans would bear a low interest rate, a rate that would not be greater than the current average yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities, plus one-half of 1 percent per annum, of which one-fourth of 1 percent per annum would be allocated to a sinking fund to cover losses on loans. This would result in a rate of about 4½ percent. Such loan assistance could not exceed 65 percent of the aggregate cost to the applicant; and a minimum of 10 percent would be required to be supplied by the State, or any instrumentality, or political subdivision thereof, or by a community or area organization, in the form of equity capital or loan capital. Nongovernmental sources would be required to provide not less than 5 percent of the aggregate cost of the project. The security for Federal financial assistance would be subordinate to the liens securing other loans made in connection with a project.

A similar \$100 million revolving loan fund, created by borrowing from the Treasury, would provide loans to projects in rural redevelopment areas.

A third \$100 million revolving loan fund, such moneys being borrowed from the Treasury, would be created for the purpose of making loans to areas needing construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities. These moneys could also be used in financing the purchase or development of land for public facility usage. These loans would carry an interest rate of one-quarter of 1 percent per annum above the rate equal to the rate of interest paid by the Administrator on funds obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury. These loans would mature not later than 40 years after the date such loans were made.

It is obvious that certain redevelopment areas throughout the country would be unable to qualify for loans for public facilities, thus excluding the possibility of their undertaking certain industrial projects. In these instances, the Administrator would be authorized to make grants if he found that the project would provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment in the area, and if such financial assistance would improve

the opportunities in such area for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial plants.

A \$75 million appropriation is authorized by the bill for the purpose of making such grants.

The Administrator would be authorized to provide technical assistance to redevelopment areas, and for this purpose appropriations are authorized by the bill in an amount not to exceed \$4½ million annually. Such technical assistance would include studies evaluating the needs of, and developing potentialities for, economic growth of the areas.

Other important features of this bill are the vocational retraining provision and the subsistence payments provision. The bill provides for the vocational training or retraining of unemployed individuals residing in, or who were last employed in, redevelopment areas. The Secretary of Labor would determine the needs and cooperate with the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and with existing State and local agencies in charge of existing vocational training programs for the purpose of assuring that the facilities and services of such agencies were made available. When additional facilities or services are needed in the redevelopment areas to meet the vocational training needs, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, after having been advised by the Secretary of Labor, would give assistance, including financial assistance when necessary, to the appropriate State vocational educational agency in the provision of the necessary additional facilities or services.

Under section 17(a) of S. 722 the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Administrator, would enter into agreements with States in which redevelopment areas are located, under which the Secretary of Labor would make payments to such States for the purpose of enabling the States to make weekly retraining payments to unemployed individuals not entitled to unemployment compensation and who were undergoing vocational training and retraining under the act. The original bill provided that these payments would be made for a period not exceeding 13 weeks, but I introduced an amendment in the committee to extend the payment to a maximum of 16 weeks, and the amendment was adopted. Such payments would be made only during the period in which the individual was receiving vocational training or retraining under the act.

Ten million dollars is authorized by the bill for the subsistence payments. The Secretary of Labor and the Administrator are authorized to prescribe the necessary rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of the section.

Mr. President, S. 722 would achieve the humanitarian ends which we all desire—but it would do it, not through a giveaway program, but through a sensible, practical effort, an effort to revitalize the entire economy of the blighted sections. S. 722 goes deep into the heart of the American philosophy of govern-

ment, for it is sound, hard-headed and businesslike. S. 722 would support private enterprise and community growth and rehabilitation. S. 722 would create wealth, not just spend it. The bill would cut down the inflationary process and promote productivity. It would not hand out government largesse, but would, instead, have the Government serve as a banker with insistence upon getting its money back, with interest.

It is my sincere belief that S. 722—instead of being a big spending bill, as some have called it—actually would save money in the long run for the American Government and the American people. Think of the staggering sums now being paid out across the Nation for unemployment compensation benefits and the other heavy expenses that are incurred when the solvent citizens must support the insolvent. During 1958 alone, the amount spent to support the unemployed was well over \$4 billion. That figure includes \$3.5 billion paid through State unemployment compensation programs, \$318 million in the Federal temporary unemployment compensation program, \$81 million in the two unemployment programs for veterans, \$452 million in payments to unemployed Federal workers, and almost \$230 million in payments to unemployed railroad workers. There is still more cost—an amount almost impossible to calculate—in the added burden which joblessness places upon other welfare programs not directly connected with unemployment.

Therefore, if the redevelopment program of S. 722 is put into effect, each new job created by it will mean a saving to the taxpayers, through a lessening of the tremendous expense of unemployment compensation and other welfare programs. It would mean a saving for the public, for industry, for government, and for the Nation as a whole.

To illustrate the inroads of unemployment compensation costs, I should like to read a paragraph from testimony which was gathered in my own State of West Virginia 2 weeks ago in public hearings of the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization. In the opening testimony of the series of hearings the Governor of West Virginia said:

During the calendar year of 1958, West Virginia paid unemployment compensation benefits totaling nearly \$59 million. Payments in this volume have a marked effect on the department of employment security trust fund, and on the State's industry. During the month of January of this year (1959), 12,225 workers filed initial claims and drew their first unemployment payments. These disturbing numbers indicate the lingering effects of our industrial change and point even more dramatically to the need for a permanent solution.

Do these words not show part of the crushing burden of unemployment? And would it not be preferable for the taxpayers of America to join in a loan program to stimulate new jobs, rather than continue to support, with no hope of getting their money back, the expenses incurred through unemployment and welfare payments. To me, it seems just plain good common sense to reason that it is better to give men a chance to work,

rather than support them when they are out of work.

Mr. President, S. 722 would permit the Federal Government to help distressed areas to help themselves. It is important to our national welfare, because it would enable those depressed areas which have sound economic potential to transform themselves into productive communities enjoying a standard of living comparable to that enjoyed by the country as a whole. No longer would these vital human resources be wasted. I do not say that this bill is a panacea nor do I maintain that its beneficial results would immediately accrue on the day of its passage. The effectiveness of the measure will depend, in considerable part, on local initiative in the communities affected. The people in the depressed areas, in the final analysis, will have to help themselves, but this measure provides the key whereby the door to risk capital may be secured.

Throughout the field hearings which I conducted, I heard testimony again and again which expressed the need for long-term, low-interest capital. I can point to page after page of testimony in the printed hearings stating that risk capital—long-term, low-interest-rate capital—is simply not available to the people of West Virginia. In our State of West Virginia we do not have a single bank with total resources of \$100 million. I am informed that 80 percent of the banks of West Virginia have total resources of \$5 million or less.

This bill is needed to provide the financial resources with which persons in these communities, who have determination, resourcefulness, and imaginative vision, can lift themselves up by their own bootstraps. S. 722 provides the bootstraps. I contend that it is a good piece of legislation which, if properly administered, will help in the long run to remove these economic eyesores and prevent them from becoming malignancies on the body politic.

It will be an investment in America, an investment in productivity, an investment designed to bring economic life and vigor to areas that are blighted, an investment which will give new hope to despondent peoples.

Carlyle once said these words:

Our grand business undoubtedly is, not to see what lies dimly at a distance, but to do what lies clearly at hand.

Surely the moral conscience of the country, its economic health, our world prestige, and our duty to our own people demand that S. 722 be passed—and quickly.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the junior Senator from West Virginia for one of the most moving addresses I have ever heard. It is made from a background of a wealth of personal testimony indicating the seriousness of the unemployment situation in his own beloved State of West Virginia.

The junior Senator from West Virginia and his colleague [Mr. RANDOLPH] have been most helpful in this entire effort. As the Senator stated, from time

to time he and his colleagues conducted hearings in West Virginia on this issue.

As appears from page 1042 of the hearings, that there was introduced into the testimony a report filed by Dr. Laird, of Montgomery, which I find most impressive, and which I should like to read, after which I wish to ask the Senator from West Virginia a question or two about it. I believe Dr. Laird is in charge of the Laird Memorial Hospital at Montgomery. He filed a report which reads as follows:

On December 8 a man was brought to the hospital in a state of absolute collapse. He was hardly more than a skeleton covered with skin. The emaciation was absolutely shocking. The diagnosis was starvation. He was almost completely dehydrated. After 24 hours' hospitalization, he was still weak and almost helpless, even though intravenous feedings were being administered. A few days after admission he died. The cause of death was recorded as starvation.

I ask the Senator from West Virginia if Dr. Laird is regarded in West Virginia as a reliable witness and a man of probity.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Dr. William R. Laird is regarded as one of our foremost citizens, one of our finest medical men, and one of our truly great West Virginians.

He has sacrificed a great deal for his State and his people. He is a doctor who has contributed much of his own personal fortune to the building of medical clinics and institutions. Throughout the years I have known him I have found him to be one of the most highly respected, admired, and revered men in West Virginia, not only among members of the medical profession, but throughout the entire citizenry.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator say that there is no possibility that he would exaggerate the situation or misstate this particular case?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. He would not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was also impressed by other testimony. Among such testimony I find that of Mrs. T. R. Fulton, a social worker in the Monongalia County Health Department, at Morgantown, W. Va. I read from her statement, beginning on page 1333 of the printed record of hearings:

I have known about 700 children in the health department. I work only one-third of a week, and half of that time is in clinic. I have been in those homes, and these are the things I see: People living in houses without heat, houses without roofs, houses without utilities. I see children going to school without shoes and without warm clothing. I see houses and homes where children have nothing to eat except surplus commodities and the canned goods which their parents put up in the summer that they got from the fields and the bushes.

I know the schools can tell you how many children are going on the free-lunch program and how many can't get on it because they haven't money in the free-lunch program to take care of it.

Senator BYRD. Has the situation deteriorated from, say, what it was 2 years ago, 3 years ago?

Mrs. FULTON. It has deteriorated badly. This is as bad as I saw in 1932 and 1934 in Baltimore. This is the first time I have seen children actually without shoes in the snow. It is worse.

I see illness untreated because of persons who are so ashamed of having no money they are not willing to ask a doctor, who has given him more than he should of medical care, for more medical care. They can't get operations, and they can't get medicine. I know this is true.

I see young people leaving school because they are embarrassed at how they look and what happens to them. I see them wanting to get work and not being able to find it. I see them trying to get in the Army, and they can't get in the Army. They can't pass the physical tests. They are so hungry and they have been without proper food so long they just don't meet any of the eligibilities.

I see fathers leaving home and bad things happening to their families while they hunt for work. If they are lucky enough to work, then there isn't near enough money to move a family of 6 or 7 or 8 to a new town where the rent is 10 times as much. There isn't enough money to pay for room and board and to send something home to take care of the wife and children.

And when you add to this that our legislature hasn't appropriated enough money to any of our public assistance programs that we can give them enough to eat and enough to manage on, and when you add to that, that this county is so poor that the United Fund can't make its goal, and there is no voluntary money, you see people in very bad circumstances.

You can take what I say and multiply it by five with the public health nurses who visit all the time. They have been in 15 times as many homes as I have been in. And we know, because we see every week children whose illness stems more from being hungry than from any functional disease.

May I ask if Mrs. Fulton is regarded as a competent witness?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. She certainly is. She is a very reputable person and a witness who, I believe, gave the committee very telling testimony. It was a privilege to have had the opportunity to hear this lady speak, out of the great storehouse of her experiences.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We tend to become insulated here in Washington. There is poverty all about us, but it is hidden from us. A great deal of the publicity which has issued from the official departments downtown has been to the effect that we are rapidly getting out of the recession, and that there are no real human problems with which we must deal. An attempt is being made to more or less anesthetize the conscience and awareness of the American people.

I wish every Member of the Senate could have been present tonight to listen to the able Senator from West Virginia. It is true that those who are not physically present usually read the RECORD, and they will know second hand, at least, something of the very moving testimony which the Senator has produced.

I wish that this message might in some way be brought to the attention of the President of the United States. I can remember when the President of the United States made a most eloquent plea in 1946 for the extension of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, to aid the children and families of the allies who had suffered during the war. It was a very humanitarian move on the part of the President. At that time my wife happened to be a



member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, and UNRRRA, as it was called, was under very severe fire.

The present President of the United States, then Commander in Chief of the Armies, left his sick bed, where he had come down with the flu, to give eloquent testimony as to the need for UNRRRA. I believe it was his testimony which was largely successful in obtaining the authorization and the appropriation from Congress.

So there is no question that the President of the United States, if he could be reached, would be found to have a warm heart. But unfortunately the President of the United States is surrounded by people who are not alert to these conditions—people with either hard hearts or impenetrable ignorance.

I hope the message of the Senator from West Virginia may get to the President, and that marked copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may be sent to him with the plea "Please read the statement of the Senator from West Virginia."

I hope the financial reporters who like to say that we are now in the 11th month of recovery may study the speech of the Senator from West Virginia. It is true that things began to look up last April; but the question is, How far have they gone?

There is a great deal of unemployment not only in West Virginia, but also in Kentucky, as the noble Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] will shortly testify, I am sure. From the coal mining regions of my own State of Illinois and from Pennsylvania, as well as from a multitude of other localities all over the country, this testimony is coming in. I hope those who at the moment are unconvinced may read and may study and may investigate. If they do that, I am sure they will become convinced.

As the Senator from West Virginia was making his very eloquent speech, my mind turned back to the English poet Thomas Hood, who a century and a quarter ago tried to penetrate the conscience of Victorian England with his account of the suffering of the working people of England. In his "Song of the Shirt" he spoke of the woman who had to work so hard and was paid so little that she virtually was starving to death. I was reminded of the lines with which Thomas Hood tried to pierce the conscience of England:

O God! that bread should be so dear,  
And flesh and blood so cheap!  
In poverty, hunger, and dirt,  
And still with a voice of dolorous pitch,  
Would that its tone could reach the rich,  
She sang this "Song of the shirt!"

I congratulate the Senator on one of the finest addresses I have ever heard in what promises to be a magnificent senatorial career.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank my beloved and delightful chairman of the subcommittee for the kind things he has said concerning me. It does not matter a great deal whether I am heard or not. I am doing the very best I can to bring to the attention of this body the facts concerning conditions as they exist in the depressed areas in West Virginia. Words do not adequately portray these conditions. I have some pic-

tures. They are on the table behind my desk. I trust that Members of the Senate will look at them during the remaining days that we are considering the bill. They are pictures of abandoned machine shops, deteriorating houses, idle coal tipples, and so on. They are pictures of families who are without food now and without any hope of adequate sustenance in the future.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky, one of the authors of the pending bill, who represents a State which, like my own, is suffering from unemployment and privation.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation for the very forceful and compelling argument the able Senator from West Virginia has made this afternoon in support of S. 722. Like him and others, I can bear witness to the conditions in the mining sections of West Virginia which he has so movingly described with sadness this afternoon, because the same conditions exist in the eastern area of Kentucky, the section in which I live.

I am saddened that the Senator found it necessary to speak as he did, but I am glad that he emphasized the human aspects of the present persistent unemployment and want and suffering and hunger, which actually exist. I think it is very difficult for many people in this country to realize that these conditions exist. They do exist. I have seen them in recent months in eastern Kentucky and in some parts of western Kentucky.

I know that what the Senator has said this afternoon is true. I know the Senator will agree that even if there were a general economic recovery in the coal-producing areas of our country, these conditions would not be completely solved.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. My reason for my joining as a cosponsor of the bill under the able direction and leadership of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and choosing this bill in preference to the administration bill, is that I know it will take a bill of at least the sweep of this measure to make any impact upon such areas as the Senator from West Virginia has described this afternoon.

Therefore, I join others in commending the Senator upon a true presentation of the condition in his State, comparable to conditions which exist also in many other States in the Union.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. I should like to say, in regard to the comment that was made a few minutes ago by the Senator from Illinois, that I agree with him, and I believe that the President of the United States, were he to view with his own eyes the conditions I have described, and were he to be confronted with them as some of us have been confronted with them, would understand. I think he is a man of compassion and understanding.

I join with my colleague in feeling that the President may be surrounded

by persons who perhaps are not in tune with the situation, and who really think that some of the things we are saying are exaggerated. The statements I have made are not exaggerations. They are statements of fact, as I have seen the conditions.

I trust that in the hours which lie just ahead, the Senate and the House of Representatives will act to pass S. 722, and thus make it possible for the President to have the opportunity to sign it.

The President is very strong in his support of the mutual security bill, legislation which will provide assistance to other countries. As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs for 6 years, I recognize the need for our country to give assistance to some of the other countries of the world. But I cannot believe that it is necessary for the United States to continue to pour out its fortune in 64 countries, as it did in the last year. I feel very strongly that the time has come when we should give attention to those areas in our own country which are just as badly in need of assistance as are some of the countries which are the recipients of our foreign aid moneys.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of my remarks the names of the persons who appeared during the 3 days of field hearings in West Virginia, and who gave testimony to the subcommittee.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I express my gratitude to those fine leaders and citizens of West Virginia, the men and women who came from all walks of life, from industry, agriculture, and the ranks of labor, and who spoke out of their hearts to the subcommittee. I know that they spoke with confidence that this great body would respond, as I am hopeful and as I feel certain it will respond within a very short time, by enacting S. 722, the area redevelopment bill.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I join with those who have commended the very great, humanitarian, heart-warming speech which the junior Senator from West Virginia has given today. The subject matter of Senate bill 722 is one which has been worked on by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] since I first came to the Senate as a very junior Senator 2 years ago. He has been unrelenting and unremitting in his efforts on behalf of this type of legislation, because he knew then, as we know now, that such legislation is necessary in all areas of the country.

There are areas in my State of Colorado which are not nearly so desperate as those in the depressed areas of West Virginia or Pennsylvania or other States. The bill does not really cover some of the areas of my State which need help. My point is not that Colorado does not need help; but Colorado is perhaps more fortunate than the other States whose conditions have been described to us by both

the distinguished Senators from West Virginia.

Although the bill does not specifically apply to my State, I know of the suffering, poverty, unemployment, and heart-breaking conditions of many people throughout the Nation. I sincerely hope that there will be such an overwhelming vote for the passage of the bill that the executive department will recognize the importance of it to the people of the Nation.

I again commend the very able and clear presentation made by the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I share the hope which has been expressed by the able Senator from Colorado that the measure will pass by such an overwhelming majority that it will impress itself in such a manner upon the Chief Executive of the Nation that he will not hesitate to attach his signature to it. I appreciate the fact that even though Colorado has not experienced the kind of suffering which the people of West Virginia are undergoing, nevertheless the Senator intends to support the measure.

I feel very strongly that if there were not a single unemployed person in West Virginia, I would support legislation of this kind, because I am, first of all, a Senator of the United States; and if there is suffering anywhere in the country which contributes to the weakened security of the Nation, I should help to alleviate it. I do not feel that simply because suffering and unemployment may be confined to a few areas, we should not be mindful of the fact that the country as a whole is affected.

The bill is important to the security of our Nation. It is important to the national defense. If people are to defend themselves, they must have the heart and soul, the backbone and courage, to do so. If they are hungry and have lost confidence in their Government, they will not have the determination and the will-power which are so necessary to stand firm when the chips are down.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will my colleague yield again?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I gladly yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senators who have spoken, all conscious of the problem we face, and working cooperatively to bring about a sensible solution, have demonstrated a togetherness which I hope will be reflected in a substantial majority early next week when votes on amendments and the vote on the passage of the bill will be taken.

It has been indicated that the President, if the matter is properly brought to his attention, will respond affirmatively. I shall only reinforce what certain Senators have so well said that this is more than a West Virginia problem, more than an Illinois problem, more than a Kentucky problem. It begins, to a very considerable degree, to spread to other areas of the country. The President himself recognizes this fact, because he has invited at least eight Governors to a conference next Monday concerning the matter of unemployment. He apparently believes serious problems are com-

ing to the surface, and to an extent which he had not recognized before.

So I say to my able colleague from West Virginia that we hope the ground swells are moving in, not to blow this subject out of proportion, but to bring it into true focus.

Mr. President, those of us who are here will long remember the speech of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. We shall recall his graphic portrayal of existing conditions. In his presentation of them, he has not overstated the case. He has submitted to the Senate factual evidence, in no wise exaggerated.

The lights will be dimmed in a few minutes in this Chamber. A speech such as that which Senator ROBERT BYRD has given tonight will keep aglow this forum. Let us leave here with a determination to secure the passage of S. 722.

When the doors are closed this evening, the words which the junior Senator from West Virginia has spoken will not be closeted. These sentiments will linger to stimulate and challenge.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his compliments. I do not feel that I deserve them.

I have only done my best, and in doing my best, I have done my duty.

I yield the floor.

#### EXHIBIT 1

Anderson, E. W., mayor, Princeton, W. Va.  
 Anderson, Harry, managing director, Beckley (W. Va.) Chamber of Commerce.  
 Angotti, S. J., for the mayor, Morgantown, W. Va.  
 Arnold, Gilbert E., Terra Alta, W. Va.  
 Ash, Henry L., director, West Virginia Department of Employment Security.  
 Beacom, J. Patrick, city director, Fairmont, W. Va.  
 Bean, Ralph J., president, Senate of West Virginia.  
 Bennett, Hunter, attorney, Weston, W. Va.  
 Bozman, A. S., Retail Business Bureau, Morgantown, W. Va.  
 Bragg, L., Raleigh County, W. Va.  
 Brown, Bonn, attorney, Elkins, W. Va.  
 Brown, Charles H., Kingwood, W. Va.  
 Chambers, Howard B., sheriff, Mingo County, W. Va.  
 Chenoweth, Rev. R. J., Methodist Church, Oak Hill, W. Va.  
 Clary, Lt. Marshall, Salvation Army, Morgantown, W. Va.  
 Clemens, Clifford, Marion County, W. Va.  
 Comstock, Jim, Richwood, W. Va.  
 Cook, Rev. Dr. Alvin J., West Virginia's Governors Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.  
 Crislip, Don, executive director, West Virginia's Industrial and Publicity Commission, accompanied by Stanley Higgins.  
 Cuppett, Herbert G., recording secretary, Local 13200, United Mine Workers, Morgantown, W. Va.  
 Cutilp, Dock, Webster Springs, W. Va.  
 Davis, Dustin F., general manager, Mountain State Fabricating Co., Clarksburg, W. Va.  
 Dean, Summers I., Huntington District Labor Council.  
 Douglas, Gus, assistant commissioner of agriculture, State of West Virginia.  
 Eavenson, Donald, president, Local 13200, United Mine Workers, Morgantown, W. Va.  
 Egbert, Thomas R., director, Department of Public Assistance, West Virginia.  
 Eichelberger, Glen, councilman, Davis, W. Va.  
 Enrico, Gasper, Morgantown, W. Va.

Evans, Joseph, Grafton, W. Va.  
 Ferris, Si, Rowlesburg, W. Va.  
 Field, John A., Jr., tax commissioner, State of West Virginia.

Fishman, Dr. Leo, professor of economics and finance, West Virginia University.  
 Frankel, Harold, mayor, Huntington, W. Va.

Fulton, Mrs. T. R., social worker, Monongalia County Health Department, Morgantown, W. Va.

Garrett, A. I., Charleston, W. Va.  
 Gillespie, Forest B., Raleigh County, W. Va.

Gills, J. P., Bluefield, W. Va.  
 Gilmore, Clarence H., mayor, Davis, W. Va.  
 Glover, Charles S., Marion County, W. Va.  
 Goldman, Phil, president, Elkins (W. Va.) Independent Development Corp., Elkins, W. Va.

Haddad, M., Summersville, W. Va.  
 Hamilton, Pat R., Oak Hill, Fayette County, W. Va.

Hartong, John C., Mageday Electric Products Corp., Beckley, W. Va.

Hash, Mrs. John W., president, Kanawha Welfare Council, Inc., Charleston, W. Va.  
 Hechler, Ken, a Representative in Congress from the State of West Virginia.

Henderson, Virgle, Morgantown, W. Va.  
 Henderson, W. K., Marion County, W. Va.  
 Henry, Andrew L., Greater Fairmont (W. Va.) Development Association.

Horvath, Nick J., field representative, District 50, United Mine Workers.

Housman, B. B., Bluefield, W. Va.  
 James, Ernest W., mayor, Clarksburg, W. Va.

Johnson, J. T., commissioner of agriculture, State of West Virginia.

Johnson, Truman, Northern West Virginia Coal Association, Fairmont, W. Va.  
 Kennell, Richard, West Virginia State labor commissioner.

Lewis, Raymond, District 17, United Mine Workers.

Lightburn, Miss Mary D., employment counselor, western office, West Virginia Department of Employment Security.

Linger, C. B., Terra Alta, W. Va.  
 Manchin, A. James, Webster Springs, W. Va.  
 Martin, Ray L., Raleigh County, W. Va.

McCartney, James E., managing director, chamber of commerce, Morgantown, W. Va.  
 McCoy, J. E., Bluefield, W. Va.

McSpadden, M. L., West Virginia Department of Employment Security.

Miller, Harry, Manheim, W. Va.  
 Over, Orville F., city manager, Clarksburg, W. Va.

Pantoplus, Clarence, Mageday Electric Products Corp., Beckley, W. Va.

Pauley, Harry R., speaker, House of Delegates, West Virginia.

Polan, Dr. L. M., Polan Industries, Inc., Huntington, W. Va.

Prince, Elmer W., city manager, Morgantown, W. Va.

Randolph, Jennings, a U.S. Senator from the State of West Virginia.

Russell, Thomas W., editor, the Sentinel, Grafton, W. Va.

Sellman, Marc, president, Nonpartisan Association, Clarksburg, W. Va.

Shannon, Mary, Huntington, W. Va.  
 Smith, Calvin, administrator, City Hospital, Grafton, W. Va.

Smith, Robert, Richwood, W. Va.

Smith, S. G., county commissioner, Kanawha County, W. Va.

Smyth, Howard, Morgantown, W. Va.

Spencer, Sterling, Richwood, W. Va.

Spiker, Lynn, Lewis County agricultural agent, Weston, W. Va.

Squires, Ray, president, Lewis County Court, Weston, W. Va.

Stanley, Miles C., president, West Virginia Labor Federation, AFL-CIO.

Stout, Allen L., secretary, Parkersburg, W. Va., Building Trades Council.

Thurmond, Walter R., Charleston, W. Va.



Titler, George J., president, District 29, United Mine Workers.  
 Trembly, C. E., Terra Alta, W. Va.  
 Trotter, James F., president, Northern West Virginia Coal Association, Fairmont, W. Va.  
 Tsutras, Frank G., managing director, Tug Valley Chamber of Commerce, Williamson, W. Va.  
 Underwood, Cecil H., Governor, State of West Virginia.  
 Urbanlak, Cecil J., president, District 31, United Mine Workers.  
 Van Gilder, Merl, Marion County, W. Va.  
 Walker, C. E., president, Raleigh County, W. Va., Educational Association.  
 Williams, Delbert E., West Virginia branch manager, Small Business Administration.  
 Winkler, Grant, Webster Springs, W. Va.

During the delivery of the speech of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia on the area redevelopment bill:

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I very much appreciate the courtesy of my friend from West Virginia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may appear at the end of the prepared address of the Senator from West Virginia.

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia has just made an outstanding and very moving address on the pending bill, for which I should like very much to commend him. He has said so eloquently what some of the rest of us feel about this measure that I can be quite brief in my remarks.

Both political parties have endorsed the principle of aid to areas of heavy and chronic unemployment in their platforms. The President has endorsed the objective. The Congress last year passed a bill by decisive majorities.

So the issue is no longer one of principle or objective. The issue is one of detail—of the means to the end on which there is broad and general agreement.

The question is whether S. 722 is soundly conceived and properly drawn.

I submit that it is an excellent bill. It will do the job for which it is designed. It is an economical bill, which will save the taxpayers more money than it will cost. In its details, it has been improved over the bill we passed last year, and some adjustments have been made to meet some of the objections stated in the President's veto message.

Mr. President, this bill means perhaps as much to Pennsylvania as will any bill which will come before the Congress this year. To us, it is the difference between giving hope to our hard-hit communities or condemning them to wither away.

The question is whether we appropriate some Federal money—most of which is in the form of loans to be paid back—or whether we tell these communities that it is national policy to let them become ghost towns.

I say, let us preserve these communities and their homes and schools and churches. Let us avoid the enormous social waste of forcing people to pull up stakes and leave. Let us save the heavy

economic cost of unemployment compensation and public assistance in these islands of distress.

Mr. President, Pennsylvania does not come to the United States like a mendicant, cup in hand, asking for a handout. Quite the contrary, Pennsylvania appeals to you today as a Commonwealth whose people are undertaking heroic measures of self-help and whose State government is setting the pace for all of the States of the Union in its own appropriations to assist in developing industry.

Our communities have raised millions of dollars by popular subscription and payroll deductions which have literally built our funds dollar by dollar. Our Commonwealth has appropriated \$10 million of State funds, and the Governor has asked for \$10 million more in the budget now pending before the legislature. But this combined effort has not been enough—and will not be enough—to fill the employment vacuum created by the decline of the coal industry, the decline of the textile industry in the North, and the loss of jobs through increased output per worker in such basic industries as steel. The Federal Government has a responsibility too.

The Governor of Pennsylvania, the Honorable David L. Lawrence, has presented to both the Senate and the House Banking and Currency Committees a full report on the problems of Pennsylvania's unemployment areas and on what our Commonwealth and its people have done to help ourselves.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the statement of Governor Lawrence submitted to the House committee this week, which brings up to date the testimony presented earlier to the Senate committee, be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

STATEMENT OF GOV. DAVID L. LAWRENCE  
OF PENNSYLVANIA

First, I want to thank the subcommittee and its distinguished chairman, Mr. PATMAN, for this opportunity to present the Pennsylvania position on Federal area redevelopment legislation.

In the short time I have been Governor of Pennsylvania, I have presented statements before committees of the Congress three times—once on the desperately needed housing and urban renewal legislation, and now, for the second time, following my recent appearance before the Senate committee, on the equally desperate need for legislation on Federal aid for area economic redevelopment.

There is nothing pending before the Congress of greater direct importance to Pennsylvania than the proposals for Federal aid on urban redevelopment and area redevelopment of our distressed areas, the latter of which is the subject of your hearings today.

In preparing this statement I have reviewed the provisions of the area redevelopment bills introduced by the eminent chairman of your parent committee, Mr. SPENCE (H.R. 3505) and Mr. FLOOD (H.R. 3466). I note that they are identical with respect to all major points, and I want to endorse them wholeheartedly. I note, also, that they take the same line as the bill introduced by Senators DOUGLAS and CLARK and a very large number of their colleagues from both parties.

Pennsylvania is proud that two of her own leaders in the Congress, Senator CLARK and Representative FLOOD, have taken so aggressive a role as proponents and authors of this program, and that others of our Pennsylvania congressional delegation are identified with proposals which, while differing on major and minor points, nonetheless are solidly behind the need for Federal legislation in this matter.

I do believe, however, that the provisions of the legislation as proposed by Mr. SPENCE and Mr. FLOOD (carried also in the Douglas-Clark bill) are to be preferred, and this statement is in support of those provisions and the action program that would ensue from them.

We cannot emphasize too strongly our concern with Federal area redevelopment legislation. Such a program is vital to the economic well-being of our Commonwealth. Today, Pennsylvania has more than its share of areas of chronic economic distress. It faces no greater problem than finding a cure for this long-term unemployment.

The passage by Congress of a Federal area redevelopment program during the previous session was most encouraging to the people of Pennsylvania. The President's veto was a bitter disappointment. We hope the Congress will pass a really effective bill in this session, and that the President will see his way clear to sign it.

Pennsylvania is no Johnny-come-lately in the matter of the distressed area problem. It has lived with it for a long time and is still living with it. Over 500,000 workers are jobless; 11 percent of its labor force is unemployed. This in a State that ranks second in manufacturing and the production of coal and third in population.

Even in 1957, a year of national prosperity, one-fifth of our people lived in areas of substantial labor surplus.

When things are bad nationally, they are worse in Pennsylvania.

Why? For two reasons:

First, the long term decline in our basic industries has left communities and workers stranded.

Second, we're a heavy manufacturing State, and heavy manufacturing was hardest hit in the recent recession.

Coal was king, but no more. Thirty years ago, production of anthracite was at its peak; 150,000 men were at work. Last year, only 20,000 jobs were left. But hard coal is still the hard core of the economy in these northeastern counties. There is little agriculture, and not enough plants where a man can work. The switch from coal has cut away the economic base.

Bituminous coal forms the rest of our coal picture. Production has held up better than anthracite. Yet employment here also has consistently declined. Mine mechanization and the growth of surface or strip mining has resulted in the output of more coal with fewer workers. Our central and southwestern counties, which comprise our bituminous area, continue to be depressed. This chart shows the radical decline in jobs in the entire coal industry.

What has happened to coal has happened to railroads. Railway shop and maintenance employment was the backbone of communities such as Altoona, Renovo and Dunmore. The arrival of the diesel engine and heightened competition from other sources drastically reduced employment.

We have also lost 60,000 jobs in the textile industry. And 36,000 in the steel industry in the last 8 years, thanks to modernization of steelmaking processes.

As you can see, we have lost jobs in our four major industries during a period of rapid economic and population growth for the Nation as a whole, and not enough new industry has come in to take up the slack.

Since the beginning of the recent recession 11 additional areas in Pennsylvania—6

of them major metropolitan areas—have been classified as areas of substantial labor surplus. This brings to 23 the number of areas so classified.

This map, showing the location of these classified areas, also shows other smaller areas which would qualify as areas of substantial labor surplus. Only 9 of Pennsylvania's 67 counties do not have a labor surplus.

Of the 23 classified areas, 12 would qualify for assistance under this legislation.

These 12 areas are:

Major areas: Altoona, Erie, Johnstown, Scranton, Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton.

Smaller areas: Berwick-Bloomsburg, Clearfield-Du Bois, Lewistown, Lock Haven, Pottsville (Schuylkill County), Sunbury-Shamokin-Mount Carmel, Uniontown-Connellsville.

Unemployment in these areas runs as high as 24 percent in Uniontown and Connellsville—one out of every four workers. The severity of unemployment in each of these areas is shown on this chart. (Charts omitted in RECORD.)

Pennsylvania's disproportionate unemployment has cost the Federal and State taxpayers billions of dollars. Between 1950-58 \$1.6 billion was paid out in unemployment benefits, and another billion dollars was doled out in public assistance.

A substantial part of these payments went into these hard-hit communities. Only one-sixth of the labor force lives in these areas, yet 30 percent of all payments went to them.

Unemployment compensation and public assistance in our 12 major areas alone totaled \$558 million. If unemployment in these areas had been reduced to 3 percent of the labor force, \$306 million in unemployment compensation benefits and \$67 million in public assistance payments could have been saved. Thirty-one million dollars of this \$67 million came from the Federal Government.

It costs far less to create new jobs by one-time investments than it does to underwrite joblessness by continuing subsidies.

As you can see from these figures, the unemployment bill in our State alone for the last 5 years could have financed the Douglas bill for the entire country.

It is for all these reasons that Pennsylvania is here making a plea for Federal aid for area economic redevelopment. It is for these same reasons that Pennsylvania is already deeply involved in a program of self-help on this same problem. Pennsylvania does not believe it would be proper to come here with this plea without being willing to carry her share of the burden, and without having, first, done her best to lick the problem on her own.

Avoiding tedious detail, here is the story of Pennsylvania's effort to cope with the problem of distressed areas:

1. Between the end of World War II and September of 1956, 52 Pennsylvania communities financed the construction of 151 factory buildings costing \$54 million that in normal times employ 31,000 factory workers. They did it with a combination of mortgage loans from banks and funds raised in local subscription drives. Virtually all of these plants are in distressed areas;

2. Beginning in September 1956, the State, itself, through the new Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority, joined with distressed area community groups, banks and insurance companies, in more of this same kind of financing. Since that time they have jointly financed, or are in the process of financing, 77 additional plants and plant expansions, costing almost \$30 million, creating just over 13,500 new factory jobs; in this period of just under 3 years, the State has appropriated \$10,200,000 for these industrial loans, and another \$10 million appropriation for the same purpose is presently before the general assembly in my recommended budget;

3. We now have 43 slum-clearance-urban-redevelopment authorities, created by Pennsylvania municipalities and counties to eliminate urban blight. Most of them are in our distressed areas, where tax revenues have not been adequate to maintain modern facilities and services, and where unemployment and underemployment has left us with extensive residential blight. The State makes cash grants to these local authorities for slum clearance work. Since 1949 the State has appropriated \$12 million toward this work, \$8 million of it during the past 3 years. My present budget recommendations propose another \$10 million for the purpose. We are most grateful for past Federal aid in this program, each State and local dollar being matched 2 to 1 with Federal funds; we have made an earnest plea that the Federal program, which broke down last year, be resumed, expanded and made a continuing thing upon which municipalities can count for the next several years;

4. We have almost 100 communities—most all of them in our distressed areas—at work, under the Federal urban planning assistance program, making comprehensive planning studies to eliminate the results of topsyturvy growth, slums and the like, and make themselves efficient and attractive for industrial expansion and better living.

But these efforts have not been enough. In coal, in railroading, in steel technological and market changes are displacing more and more of our people from employment. There is a grave shortage of job opportunities for on-coming youth. Even where production rises substantially, as in steel, fewer workers are required. We are attracting many new industries. We are no longer losing industries, except in rare instances. But we continue to lose jobs in our existing basic industries. And our gains in new jobs coming directly and indirectly from expanding and new industries is simply not enough to balance our job losses and pull us out of the red and on the way toward our complete, State-wide economic redevelopment.

We are completely convinced that we shall achieve that goal, in our distressed areas and statewide, only with a special program of Federal aid of the type Messrs. SPENCE and FLOOD have projected. Their proposals deal directly with the practicalities of the problem, as we see that problem.

We note with real interest that this is not a program for urban centers of economic distress alone. It is also a rural program. Most of our agriculture in Pennsylvania is prosperous. But not all of it. We have many areas where a rural population, once hard at work at lumbering and farming, now finds itself in the low-income levels mentioned in the proposed bills, and without the alternative job opportunities new industry can provide. Yet, industry has not come into those areas. We believe the provisions for industrial loans proposed for such rural redevelopment areas will create the incentives and inducements that will bring industry to such areas.

Accordingly, I have these specific comments on major provisions of the legislation:

1. The bills I am discussing provide \$100 million for industrial loans in urban redevelopment areas and a like sum for such loans in rural redevelopment areas. This proposed \$200 million will at least assure an all-out attack on the problem. Too often in Federal programs of the past we have done "too little too late," with the result that precious Federal tax dollars have been dissipated in ineffectual projects and programs. If the Federal Government is to enter this field, it should do so on an adequate basis. Further, the wisdom of the \$200 million of funds that would be available under this legislation assure that there will be continuity in the program over the initial years when it will meet its severest test; funds in this amount remove the danger of

uncertainty stemming from year-to-year appropriations during that period.

2. We especially endorse the provision that Federal industrial-loan assistance be limited to 65 percent of the cost of projects, with the balance from other governmental, private, or civic sources. As I have indicated, our own communities and the State itself have done and stand ready to do their share of financial participation in this type of industrial financing.

3. We have found, too, that our banks, within the limits of their resources and regulatory requirements, will enter into industrial financing in distressed areas. We think the provisions of the legislation that require private financing to be used wherever and to the extent available are extremely wise; the provisions for subordination of Federal loans, both as to repayment and security, will tend to assure the maximum flow of private investment funds into this redevelopment program.

4. In the State community bank type of industrial financing we have under way in Pennsylvania, we have found that the low interest rates on the nonbank segment of the financing of a given project has been a very real, tangible factor in encouraging companies to enter our distressed areas with new production facilities. We are, therefore, highly encouraged to see that the proposed legislation would establish an interest rate policy providing this same kind of inducement factor.

5. I do not believe that the distressed areas of Pennsylvania can finance the public facilities they need in order to attract and accommodate industry without special Federal aid. Their declining revenues have left them without the tax base, the tax revenues, or the private borrowing capacity to do that financing. They are doing and will do what they can. For the rest, they are in dire need of access to the new source of credit and liberal borrowing terms that would be available in the \$100 million authorized for public facilities loans under the proposed legislation—and they will need, also, access to the \$75 million authorized for outright Federal grants for public facilities;

6. Almost by definition, the problem of our distressed areas is a problem of people transferring from occupations in declining industries to occupations in types of industrial and business pursuits for which they are not trained. I therefore heartily endorse the provisions of the legislation looking toward special Federal assistance in vocational training and retraining.

7. I have referred to the planning and urban renewal activities under way in a very large number of our Pennsylvania distressed area communities, and the extensive problem of residential and other blight they face by virtue of their past and present economic difficulties. The limitations of the present Federal urban renewal program, in its emphasis on the residential aspect of the matter, present a roadblock to full and adequate urban renewal in these communities. They have areas of industrial and commercial—as well as residential—slums that need to be cleared. And in many instances the reuse of these areas can and should go into sorely needed new industrial and commercial projects. We are therefore highly pleased to see these limitations lifted, as to distressed areas, under the proposed legislation.

At the outset of this statement I trust I made clear that unemployment is a desperate problem in Pennsylvania, not only now, when we have such an enormous volume of recession unemployment, but chronically, over the years, because of readjustments in our basic industries.

Pennsylvania is a very large and great State faced with a problem that is beyond the power of private enterprise and State and local government to solve alone. It is part and parcel of our American system that people



and areas caught up in the throes of such a situation turn to their Federal Government.

But Pennsylvania is not alone in this. I note that the record of the hearings on this matter carry accounts of distressed areas in other parts of the Nation—in sections of the South, in New England, in Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, West Virginia.

In all sincerity, I suggest that the sum of these problems in the several States adds up to a problem for the Nation itself, and a most proper object of concern for the Congress and the executive branch. Moreover, it is not a new problem. For several years there have been bills and hearings on the matter in the Congress.

The Nation is late in getting around to the problem of her distressed areas. In the meantime, those areas create a heavy drain on the financial resources of State and local government. They involve enormous losses in wasted manpower and unused resources. Most of all, their plight brings intense misery and suffering to thousands of people, through no fault of their own, misery and suffering from which they cannot possibly escape in their own in sufficient numbers to solve the problem.

For all these reasons this legislation has our wholehearted endorsement. But may I also thank its authors and this committee for the realistic hope they have given us that finally distressed areas may be about to receive Federal assistance on their problem.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a tabulation of public assistance benefits paid in 12 areas of chronic labor surplus in Pennsylvania.

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

Total amount of public assistance benefits paid in 12 Pennsylvania chronic surplus labor areas by source of funds—State and Federal, 1953-58

	Total	State	Federal
1953	\$23,380,000	\$11,924,000	\$11,456,000
1954	26,485,000	15,096,000	11,389,000
1955	30,699,000	17,191,000	13,508,000
1956	29,291,000	15,524,000	13,767,000
1957	30,681,000	15,954,000	14,727,000
1958	33,192,000	17,260,000	15,932,000
Estimate of benefits which would have been paid annually if unemployment had been reduced to 3 percent of the labor force	17,746,000	9,494,000	8,252,000
Estimate of total amount which would have been saved if unemployment had been reduced to 3 percent of the labor force	67,252,000	35,985,000	31,267,000

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this table, prepared by the Director of the Bureau of Employment Security, shows the cost of public assistance in the past 6 years, with an estimate of the savings which would have been achieved if the rate of unemployment had been 3 percent. The savings to the Federal Government would have been \$31 million, and to the State \$36 million.

The \$31 million saved for the Federal Government in these 6 years alone would, according to the estimates of the Commonwealth, have amounted to more than the prospective volume of loans which would be available to Pennsylvania under the pending bill—and I repeat that these loans are ultimately no cost

at all, because they would be repaid, with interest.

Moreover, this comparison of cost and savings does not take into account the annual return to the Federal Government in increased income taxes from the economic activity that is created.

I can summarize this section of my remarks, Mr. President, by saying these figures prove what is really self-evident: That there is no economic waste greater than unemployment. It is a burden on our economy. It is a burden on public budgets at every level—Federal as well as State and local. It is a burden on our whole society. When we pass a bill that creates jobs through loans, we are passing a bill which represents true economy and a net gain in every way. S. 722 is that kind of bill.

Mr. President, I now want to turn briefly to some of the arguments that have been used against this bill, and I take as my text the minority views contained in the committee report signed by six of our distinguished colleagues. With all due respect, these minority arguments just do not stand up under analysis.

The distinguished minority argues, first, that the bill discriminates in favor of only a few of the unemployed of the United States. The answer is, of course it does. It should. The area redevelopment bill has never been conceived as a measure to relieve all unemployment in the United States. When national unemployment levels reach as high as 6 percent or more, as during this recession, obviously measures of general application must be taken.

But after national measures are taken, and unemployment nationally is reduced to a minimum level, there will still be areas which have unemployment at recession and depression levels, because of local circumstances. These areas were depressed before the recession. They were depressed during the recession. They will still be depressed after the recession is history. Their problem is chronic, not temporary. This bill is designed for that specific problem of localized, chronic unemployment. It cannot be dealt with except through such a special measure.

Second, the minority report presents cost estimates ranging up to \$5 billion. This figure is ridiculous. It is based upon assumptions which were thoroughly refuted in the hearings. I only wish that my able colleagues had either attended or read the hearings before they lent their names to any such inaccurate figures.

They arrived at their total by multiplying three figures—\$10,000 to \$15,000 per job, 65 percent as the Federal share, and 390,000 jobs to be created. All three of these figures are wrong. The \$10,000 to \$15,000 figure includes working capital and inventories, which the bill clearly and specifically excludes from Federal help. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has found the aggregate cost of land and buildings to be slightly over \$2,000 in the projects which we have aided. While S. 722 would permit assistance also for machinery and equipment, the extent to which loans for this

purpose would be sought is problematical.

The 65 percent Federal share which the minority uses as a flat figure is a maximum, not an average. I would expect that this maximum would rarely be utilized, and the average would be far lower. Again, our experience in Pennsylvania shows that private capital normally can be found for 50 percent of the land and building cost of these projects. Moreover, States and local communities would continue to participate for a part of the remaining 50 percent.

Finally, the 390,000 figure includes every single new job required in a community to reduce its unemployment to 6 percent. This ignores the fact, which was fully discussed in the hearings, that industrial jobs automatically create service and other non-industrial jobs at a ratio in the neighborhood of 1 to 1.

When one re-computes the cost of the basis of sensible figures, drawn from the testimony, one comes out in the neighborhood of the \$100 million provided in S. 722 for industrial areas. This figure may turn out to be slightly on the low side, but remember that the fund revolves, and repayments will be coming in to offset future requirements. Certainly, the \$100 million will suffice for a considerable period of time to come, after which we can re-appraise the situation.

With an appropriation of \$10 million, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has assisted in the creation of 13,500 jobs in 77 new plants. This shows how a little money can go a long way.

In any case, the minority will have to concede that if the \$100 million is too little, as they contend, the more limited figure provided by the Administration bill would be even less adequate.

Third, the minority contends that we are including communities suffering not from chronic, but from cyclical, unemployment. They also object that the criteria for eligibility are arbitrary.

I admit that the criteria are a bit arbitrary. They have to be, because we do not want to place the Administrator in the position of having to use his own judgment in deciding who should and should not be included. We feel he should be relieved of that kind of pressure.

But the so-called arbitrary standards are very well designed to distinguish between areas which are temporarily distressed and those which are chronically distressed—which is our purpose. These standards reflect one of the major adjustments made in the bill to bring it more closely into accord with the Administration views. We adopted the Administration's own formula, with some modification.

Fourth, the minority views, on page 41, discuss a project for relocating a plant, as though this would be a typical project. This appears to be a subtle trap for the unwary. Everyone who has studied the bill knows that the bill is not intended for plant relocation—the money would not be used for that purpose, and the legislative history is perfectly clear on that point.

Fifth, the minority argues that the bill's basic defect is that it runs counter to the precepts of the private market mechanism. That market mechanism, it is held, should allocate industry among locations, and if that means ghost towns in Pennsylvania or Massachusetts or perpetual rural poverty in the Appalachians and the Ozarks, then so be it.

This, of course, is a legitimate philosophical position. It happens to be in disagreement with the expressed view of the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, the executive branch of the Government, and the legislative branch as expressed in our action last year. It is an obsolete philosophy, but I suppose it can be honestly held.

If the market mechanism worked perfectly to serve human welfare, this bill would never have been introduced. Every time this body attempts to deal with any aspect of the social evils of unemployment and poverty, we are interfering with the private market mechanisms. But if the private economy left to itself does produce social evils, then it is the business of an intelligent, self-governing society to improve on that private economy. I dread to think what this Nation would be like if we refrained from all such action.

Sixth, the minority repeatedly suggests that any growth brought about in the unemployment areas would be at the expense of other areas. But this is not the case. What we are talking about in this bill is promoting additional new growth in the economy. Our economy should not be static. It should be constantly growing. This bill will help it grow faster, and steer some of the new growth into areas where the most idle resources exist. Resources otherwise wasted would be put to work.

Finally, the minority speaks of duplication of the Small Business Investment Act. There is no duplication. That act is of national application. For reasons which I have stated, the areas of chronic unemployment need to be dealt with through an act of local application. To the extent to which the Small Business Investment Act does succeed in assisting the depressed areas, of course, the Area Redevelopment Administration will be relieved of that much burden. I hope it will help some. But we all know it will not solve the problem by itself.

Mr. President, this bill is not a bill for handouts. It is a bill to make the free-enterprise system work.

It is not socialism. It is free enterprise in action.

It is not charity. It is a bill to help people help themselves.

It would create wealth. It would eliminate doles.

When we bind up social and economic wounds, we help the whole body of the patient, the whole economy. No blood is taken away from any other part.

We are utilizing the brains and ingenuity and know-how of the American people to create something that did not previously exist.

So I say, Mr. President, this is a bill in the tradition of America. It is a free enterprise bill. It is a bill which should pass, and pass by a resounding majority.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE LATE WILLIAM (BILLY) McNICHOLS, OF DENVER

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, last week one of the great and respected citizens of Colorado, William H. (Billy) McNichols, Denver city auditor from 1931 to 1953, passed from this mortal scene. Requiem high mass was sung last Wednesday; and more than 800 persons from all walks of life paid their final respects to this man, who played such a prominent part in the political and business life of Denver and of Colorado.

At this time, I desire to pay my tribute to Billy McNichols as a kindly man, a conscientious public servant, a sincere fighter, and a dynamic individualist.

He was the father of Stephen L. R. McNichols, present Governor of Colorado, and of the Governor's secretary, William H. McNichols, Jr. He took great pride in the activities of his sons. His sage political advice was heeded by many who have held high positions in the political life of Colorado.

The Right Reverend Monsignor Gregor Smith expressed it well at the funeral service, when he said:

The fact that Governor McNichols is such a fine Governor indicates that he had a fine father \* \* \*; and never was a father prouder of his son.

For more than two decades, Billy McNichols was city auditor in Denver. He was known as "the watchdog of the treasury." He was a careful guardian of the public funds, and that often entailed battles with mayors of Denver, for he believed it was his duty to protect the money of the taxpayers.

Ill health forced his retirement in 1953, after an illustrious career in public office.

Billy McNichols was 84. He was a native of Iowa. At an early age he came to the booming mining camp of Aspen, Colo.; and he resided there for many years. Before moving to Denver, in 1909, he was treasurer of Pitkin County.

He served as secretary of the Colorado Senate, as a member of the State land board, as deputy State auditor, and as deputy Colorado secretary of state. For many years he was secretary of the Denver Democratic club. He was past grand exalted ruler of the Elks, and he was active in the Knights of Columbus.

Billy McNichols had a distinguished career as a public servant. But, more than that, he was a trusted and valued friend of many, many thousands of people of Colorado.

His death leaves a great void in my home State of Colorado. I will be among the many who will miss the kind and wise guidance of my long-time friend, Billy McNichols.

Through these years of service to the people of Denver and Colorado, he had the wise and patient counsel of his faithful wife, who aided him in his steadfast course for the common good. I and my family join with the rest of Colorado's congressional delegation in expressing to Mrs. McNichols, their sons and their daughters, our deepest and most sincere sympathy in their hour of grief.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the

RECORD, following my remarks, an article entitled "Watchdog" Billy McNichols Leaves a Host of Friends."

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

[From the Denver Post, Mar. 7, 1959]

#### "WATCHDOG" BILLY McNICHOLS LEAVES A HOST OF FRIENDS

(By John Buchanan)

Memories—so many of them stood in line to wait their turn—rushed through our mind this week when we learned of the death of William H. McNichols, former auditor of our city.

Watchdog of the city pocketbook, Mr. Mac, Uncle Billy.

These and other words came to mind. Warm friend. Treasured hours of conversation. Gay fighter. Dynamic individualist. Shrewd politician. Proud husband and father. Idealist. Truth teller. Conscience perched on the shoulder of city government. Conscientious public servant, who gave much of himself and his life to the stream of good government.

It was just a little more than a dozen years ago when on our first day as a city hall reporter we walked through the third floor double doors with the name "auditor" on the transom.

Mr. Mac smoked a cigar. And on the scales of physical appearance he outweighed them all that day: handsome, piercing eyes, gay smile, tweed suit of fibers imported from his Irish homeland, venerable white mane.

This was the giant in public office who kept close watch on city affairs.

It never ceased to be a thrill to a reporter to find, someday, Mr. Mac sniffing the air like the veteran watchdog that he was, sensing an issue that demanded his action.

It usually meant strong black headlines that marched through the composing room until they found their place on page 1 of our paper.

Just as carefully as Mr. Mac sniffing for issues, city hall reporters learned to sniff for the blue smoke of his ever burning cigar as they approached the auditor's office.

A thin, Indian-summer haze drifting from the inner office meant that the gears of city government were in mesh, and running smoothly. Thick, blue smoke meant—ere you stepped across his threshold—that the signals of a fight were being lifted.

He was never more alert; his wit never sharper; his step never brisker; his verve never higher, than during these battles, when the watchdog came roaring out of his door, biting and slashing at the things which had offended his credo.

He could "work with" as well as fight, and he did both with Mayors Stapleton and Quigg Newton.

He had many a tussle with the impatient, young Newton. Newton thought the world of him. On meeting in the halls, or at affairs of state, Newton would often place his hand on the auditor's shoulder and ask: "How are you, Billy?"

We remember when we first learned that Newton, a political neutral, finally registered as a Democrat.

We rushed up to Mr. Mac's office to obtain a quote from him on the fact that the man with whom he'd often tussled was now a member of the McNichols party.

He drew a couple of puffs on his cigar, and a smile crept over his lips.

"Well, he joined the right party."

Where do a reporter's memories stop on a man like Billy McNichols? They don't, and of course they never will.

A great personal loss. A great loss to his host of friends. But the beginning of a legend.



### INTERVIEW WITH ISRAEL'S AM- BASSADOR ABBA EBAN

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, a distinguished statesman, one of the world's great orators, and certainly one of the foremost thinkers of the day on the international scene, is Israel's spokesman to the world, Abba Eban, Ambassador to the United States, and Israel's permanent representative to the United Nations.

On Friday, March 20, Ambassador Eban will speak in Denver. I sincerely regret that I cannot be in Denver on that occasion, not only to meet the Ambassador personally, but also—as always—to receive the benefit of his great brain.

I am informed that Ambassador Eban is about to leave the United States to return to Israel. That is very significant, to me, in the light of recent international events, which always—or, at least, recently—have been foreseen by Ambassador Eban.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a television broadcast, entitled "Celebrity Parade," which is an interview with the Israeli Ambassador by Mr. Joseph McCaffrey, one of the distinguished newspaper, radio, and television men of the Nation's Capital.

I make this request because in the interview there are set forth Ambassador Eban's vision and prophecy in regard to what is happening today in Iraq and what is happening to Nasser. I believe the interview will be well worth the reading of all Members of the Senate and all Members of the other body, as well, and also all others who have access to the RECORD.

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

#### CELEBRITY PARADE

(Interview with the Israeli Ambassador by Mr. Joseph McCaffrey)

Mr. McCaffrey. Good afternoon. Welcome once again to Celebrity Parade. It's indeed a privilege and an honor to have as our guest today one of the world's outstanding diplomats, Mr. Abba Eban, who is the Israeli Ambassador to the United Nations and the United States. Mr. Ambassador, nice to have you here.

Ambassador EBAN. Nice to be here, Mr. McCaffrey.

Mr. McCaffrey. I think probably before we start talking we ought to take a look at the map of Israel and I think our listeners will get a better understanding of the problems your country faces. Here is Israel, which is bordered by Jordan for 330 miles; by Egypt for 165 miles; Lebanon, 49 miles; and bordered by Syria for 47 miles. I've always thought, Mr. Ambassador, that of all the tinder spots we have in the world today, that probably the one that might explode into a great war might be the Middle East situation. I was just wondering, in your opinion, how tensions along Israeli borders lessened, let us say, in the last year.

Ambassador EBAN. Mr. McCaffrey, I don't believe that the Arab-Israeli conflict is the most dangerous of those that confront the world today. The recent crisis over the Formosa Strait, the present tension over Berlin, are, I think, more crucial for world peace. There will not be any world war arising from Israel's relations with her neighbors, nor do I think there will be a local war. On our frontiers, which are embattled and tense,

there has been more tranquillity in the past year than ever before. Since the Sinai campaign there has been relative quiescence—an occasional eruption at a dangerous point, but nothing to indicate that any of the governments concerned plan any sustained renewal of conflict.

Mr. McCaffrey. Mr. Ambassador, is this because perhaps there is lessening of hostility on the part of your Arab neighbors?

Ambassador EBAN. Well, there is no evidence of a lessening of hostility. Their leaders still articulate the dream of our extinction. But I think that thoughtful Arabs must be increasingly impressed with the manifest spectacle of our permanence and stability. I doubt if any intelligent Arab, any man of capacity, could really believe that we are going to disappear.

Mr. McCaffrey. Well, is Nasser the focal point of Arab hostility, in your opinion?

Ambassador EBAN. Yes; but whether he believes it or not, it is he who articulates and expands and exploits the hostility to Israel, and it is his constant agitation on that sphere that keeps the Arab-Israeli conflict alive.

Mr. McCaffrey. It seems to me, on the basis of what we have seen in the last 12 months, let us say, that the Arabs are having trouble among themselves. Is it possible for the Arabs to ever unite against Israel on that one particular issue?

Ambassador EBAN. Well, I think you are quite right there. The tensions between the Arab States, themselves, have recently been far more acute than their tension with us. They have been so busy jumping at each other's throats that they have hardly had any time for preoccupation with us. The issue there is a simple one. Shall each Arab State and each Middle Eastern State have a right to its free and separate existence, or shall they be forced under the domination of Cairo? That is the issue which now agitates the Arab world, and the Arab world is so absorbed in that historic issue that it seems to have its attention diverted from us. The only things that unite them, unfortunately, are negative objectives, such as hostility to Israel. But, at present, I should say that their disunity, the fear of Nasser on the part of his neighbors, these are so acute that they show no signs of cooperating for any purpose, even a negative purpose, such as an assault upon Israel.

Mr. McCaffrey. This might not be a diplomatic question to ask a diplomat, but do I gather, then, that you think that Nasser is bound to fail eventually?

Ambassador EBAN. I think that in the last 6 months, especially since the crisis of the summer, it has been revealed that Middle Eastern States are not desirous of being swallowed up in a Nasserist empire. There has been one success for this concept of Arab union—Syria has celebrated its union with Egypt. I think it's rather like the kind of unity that our ancestor Jonah celebrated with the whale, and the gastric rumblings from Damascus and Cairo prove that the digestion has been neither smooth nor effective. But in Tunis, in Libya, in Sudan, in Jordan, in Lebanon, even in Iraq, one finds resistance to this concept of other states giving up their sovereignty to Nasser and being preoccupied by that position. Feeling also the dangers perhaps of a one-sided alinement in international politics with the Soviet Union, Nasser has fallen into troubles and there is a kind of torment and anguish about his policy today.

Mr. McCaffrey. How much influence has communism in the Middle East, would you say, in your appraisal?

Ambassador EBAN. Well, communism has an easy arena in which to play amongst the impoverished, depressed Arab masses. But the issue isn't so much communism, it's the tendency of Arab States, in their revolt against Western control, against the memories of imperialism, to exploit the great

power conflict, and to enter into these very close alliances and acts of collusion with the Soviet Union. I think it's relations between the Arab Government and the great powers which are of greater importance than the question of communism within Arab States themselves.

Mr. McCaffrey. Of course, one of the many trouble spots in the Middle East is that the Arabs are afraid the Israelis will attack them and the Israelis are afraid the Arabs will attack them. On the basis of what happened in 1956, when Israel did move out, isn't it your thinking that perhaps the Arabs might have reason to fear Israel?

Ambassador EBAN. Well, we did not start a war in 1956. They started a war in 1948. They maintained it ever since. In 1956 they intensified it by blockade and by commando raids, and the Sinai expedition was our reaction to this intensification of a state of war which they have maintained continuously the whole time. They need have no fear that we will initiate conflict. We are prepared to renounce state of war, and indeed to enter into peace treaties immediately, based upon the existing territorial structure of all the states of the Middle East.

Mr. McCaffrey. Mr. Ambassador, looking back now for almost 2½ years, do you regret the Sinai campaign, or do you think there have been some benefits accruing to Israel from it?

Ambassador EBAN. I think the position has cleared since then and has improved. I think the legend of Nasser's military superiority has been destroyed, and not only Israel but other states in our area breathe more freely. We have open access now to the continents of Asia and Africa through the Gulf of Aqaba. There is a more peaceful situation near Gaza than there was before, and the world has awakened, I think, to the genuineness of Israel's grievance, surrounded by these hostile neighbors. I think there have been tangible gains for Middle Eastern stability since the Sinai expedition.

Mr. McCaffrey. Isn't there still a segment of public opinion in Israel that advocates preventive war, even at this point?

Ambassador EBAN. Well, there is no authoritative policy in that direction. Those who advocate either war or expansion have been repudiated by more than 80 percent of our people in its previous elections, and I think would be repudiated again. We are prepared for peaceful consolidation based on the existing territorial and political structure.

Mr. McCaffrey. We have been talking about the military threats involved in the Middle East, but actually, isn't the great threat of Israel in the Middle East its economic threat? As Israel progresses and improves living conditions, isn't that a threat to the existing states in the Middle East where the Arab is pretty downtrodden?

Ambassador EBAN. Well, perhaps backward, reactionary governments might see a threat in our social dynamism. But surely for the peoples of the Middle East the spectacle of our social and economic and cultural progress should be an encouragement to them. Perhaps we set an example which they could well emulate, and if not in the Arab world, at least throughout Asia and Africa there are States who see a great hope, a great vision, in Israel's swift, purposeful, dynamic advance in the social and economic fields.

Mr. McCaffrey. Whenever we talk about the problems in the Middle East, we come to the problem of the some 900,000 refugees from Israel. Let me ask you first a very general question. Let us say that overnight we could solve the problem of the 900,000 refugees. Would that immediately bring sweetness and light to the Middle East?

Ambassador EBAN. I think it's the other way about, Mr. McCaffrey. If the Arab States wanted peace with us they would not see any advantage in artificially maintain-

ing this refugee problem, because they, with assistance from the world community and some assistance from Israel, could easily solve it in their huge territories with their abundant supplies of water and oil and manpower, and with their priceless gift of Arab societies in which these refugees could be loyally integrated. The maintenance of the refugee problem is a result, a consequence of their refusal to make peace. I think it could be solved, but its solution requires a subjective change of attitude on their part.

Mr. McCAFFREY. What, in your opinion, could be done to solve the refugee problem?

Ambassador EBAN. I think the solution lies along the road which your own Government and most other Western governments, and the Government of Israel have for long upheld—the resettlement of these refugees in the expanding economic labor markets of the Middle East in the Arab countries to which they are akin and loyal, and not their forcing back into Israel, to which they are alien and hostile.

Mr. McCAFFREY. Your Government has made a series of offers over the years to sit down and talk this problem over, haven't you? In fact, just recently, I think, you have made some offer?

Ambassador EBAN. Yes, we have made progress in our compensation offer, and we would also contribute to a resettlement program. But what is needed is a decision by Arab governments to stop obstructing these solutions.

Mr. McCAFFREY. Do you think the day is coming when they will stop obstructing the solutions, or do you think it is to their political advantage to maintain the refugee problem as an active and continuing sore point?

Ambassador EBAN. Well, they seem to take the latter view. I think it's a wrong view and that the rest of the world is getting tired of the artificial perpetuation of the problem and would like to see it solved, but I see no immediate light on the horizon.

Mr. McCAFFREY. Many people say that the refugees are the problem of Israel because Israel had caused the refugee problem.

Ambassador EBAN. Well, our answer is that the problem was not caused by the establishment of Israel, it was caused by the attempt to destroy Israel by force. It was the result of a war. If there had not been a war, there would not have been the refugee problem, and therefore those who caused the war, namely the Arab governments, are responsible for the creation of the problem.

Mr. McCAFFREY. Let's talk a little about Israel, itself. I noted the other day, for example, that Meyer Levin, the author, is living now in Israel where he is completing a novel. What is this great attraction that Israel has?

Ambassador EBAN. I think it's the sense of growth. The feeling that everything is in its beginning, in its infancy. A kind of exhilaration which must have existed in this country in the early period of your national formation. The sense of being rooted in the future. The swift expansion of agriculture, industry, culture. To see something being born and grow has a special thrill which does not belong to the contemplation of societies which are already firmly established.

Mr. McCAFFREY. Actually, you are not a native. You came from South Africa, I believe, and then London.

Ambassador EBAN. Yes; I would say that 80 or 90 percent of our population are immigrants. As you walk the streets of our cities and villages, three out of every four people were not there on that immortal and incomparable day when our independence was proclaimed 10 years ago.

Mr. McCAFFREY. Many people say, Mr. Ambassador, that Israel can never be self-supporting, and especially because there are so many people moving in there almost every year, every month, for that matter. Will the

day come when Israel could be self-supporting?

Ambassador EBAN. I always avoid using the word "never" in political and historical processes. We are progressing toward self-support. The gap in our balance of payments is growing less. To give an example, our population has increased by 29 percent in the last 10 years—in the last 7 years—whereas our production, the national product, has increased by 76 percent. People are not simply consumers—they are also producers. They are the best raw material that a nation can have. In the short run they may be a burden, but, as I think your own people can testify, no country that has ever accepted immigration has failed to be strengthened by immigration. In the modern world absorptive capacity is not a function of space. It depends on the industrial and scientific development of a nation. There are other peoples in Europe, Holland, Belgium, Denmark, which have created a high standard of living: Switzerland, on small areas; and I think we can follow their example.

Mr. McCAFFREY. One out of every nine Israelis is an Arab, and the Arabs are reproducing about twice as fast as the Israelis. Is the Arab minority a problem or potential problem in Israel, Mr. Ambassador?

Ambassador EBAN. I hadn't realized that they were increasing at such a fast rate. They are not a problem. They have equal rights before the law. They have a higher standard of economic development and educational and social progress than their neighbors in Arab countries. I don't think they form a real problem.

Mr. McCAFFREY. In your opinion, and again, perhaps not a diplomatic question to ask a diplomat, but do you think the United States is doing as much as it can, or as you believe it should, to ease the Middle East tensions and perhaps aid your country?

Ambassador EBAN. We are very grateful to the United States for its massive infusion of aid into our economy, society, and culture. I think the United States supports the integrity and independence of Middle Eastern States. Perhaps that policy could be given greater publicity and solemnity but we think the United States is a stabilizing element in our region, both by supporting the integrity and independence of States, including Israel, and by these very enlightened programs of economic and social assistance.

Mr. McCAFFREY. Is there still more or less an arms race in the Middle East?

Ambassador EBAN. There is, I am afraid, but we are no longer being left behind. We are finding easier access now to the equipment that we need. The Western Powers especially are much more responsive than they used to be to our requests. And I think that we have now a strong deterrent power and a good defensive posture, although we should like to have to devote less of our resources than we do to military progress.

Mr. McCAFFREY. Is your military budget reaching a point where it is a drain on your economy?

Ambassador EBAN. It is a drain but I was relieved to hear that even in a country as great as yours you face that problem. We would like to see it reduced but we can see no early possibility of reducing it.

Mr. McCAFFREY. Let me ask you this, Mr. Ambassador. As a diplomat, do you believe that diplomacy is keeping up with modern, atomic-age weapons of war, or do you think diplomacy is being left behind by space and all these other things?

Ambassador EBAN. I think, unfortunately, the great discoveries in nature, the new forces that have been liberated and revealed, have not yet been brought under a system of international restraints. The greatest task which faces international diplomacy is to establish control of law and a system

of accepted restraints over these vast forces. That has not yet been done, and I think it's the greatest task which faces the United Nations. Disarmament, control of outer space, control of nuclear energy. The great task of diplomacy today is to meet the challenge of the scientific revolution.

Mr. McCAFFREY. You are an Ambassador to the United Nations and of course a very keen observer at the U.N. There seems to be, unfortunately, I think, a growing segment in America that is disillusioned with the United Nations, that think it hasn't done enough, that it has been rather impotent. What is your appraisal of the United Nations?

Ambassador EBAN. I can understand a feeling of frustration, as you listen to these long, tedious, sometimes hostile speeches. But there ought to be a sense of perspective, I think, Mr. McCaffrey. It took a long time for tribes to develop into villages, villages into cities, and cities into states, and what we are trying to do in the United Nations is to establish community attitudes between sovereign states. I think there is growing up a habit of intercourse, of responsibility, of mutual accountability, in which you can see the seed of a system of law founded on justice and peace, and therefore in the long perspective I believe that such an attitude of disillusionment is not justified.

Mr. McCAFFREY. A hypothetical question: Where would we be today in this modern age if we had no United Nations or a counterpart to it?

Ambassador EBAN. Well, we'd be sitting down, working out a method of creating it, because with all its defects you do need a universal platform in which all states confront each other on a basis of sovereign equality. You need a parliament, you need a bridge, and I think that with all its imperfections that it is an indispensable part of our world and one of the restraints which pulls us back from the abyss of disaster.

Mr. McCAFFREY. We're now in what someone calls the "delicate balance of terror." Do you believe that the world can avoid an all-out atomic war, Mr. Ambassador?

Ambassador EBAN. I think so. I believe that the very facts of the scientific revolution are a safeguard against war, for good or for ill, but in any case irrevocably science has placed us on a crossroads from which two roads converge, the one leading to catastrophe and the other to abundance. I think the sheer desire of the human race for survival will act as a brake upon the policies of the atomic powers and that this instinct of self-preservation, if nothing else, will hold us back from the abyss. Now, if we can produce a period of tranquility, perhaps a more affirmative opportunity for diplomacy will be created. But I think that in the long run the scientific revolution will turn out to be a benefit to our generation and will not be the source of doom.

Mr. McCAFFREY. As an interested observer, do you believe that the present visit of Mikoyan may lessen cold-war tensions?

Ambassador EBAN. I think that any process of mutual intercourse between the atomic power is vital and I think any understanding by them of each other's policies and attitudes and preoccupations is a contribution, although one shouldn't exaggerate by thinking that the basic conflicts between them will be alleviated by such encounters.

Mr. McCAFFREY. You are basically a very optimistic man, aren't you?

Ambassador EBAN. I am, and I am optimistic not only as an individual but as an Israeli. As we look back over the past 10 years, we divide our problems into two categories: Those problems that we have solved in the past, and those that we are going to solve in the future.

Mr. McCAFFREY. Of course, optimism seems to be inherent in Israel. All Israelis are very optimistic that their troubles with the



Arabs are going to work out all right. Looking back over your very brief history, do you hold this optimism that everything eventually will work out all right?

Ambassador EBAN. I think so. Nobody would have imagined 10 years ago that this little community of 650,000 would now be over 2 million. Nobody who looked at our landscape then would have envisaged the transformation that has come over it since. And I think that with time and patience the Arab States will get used to our existence and will awaken to the sheer compulsion of the future to be shared with us in peace.

Mr. McCaffrey. Speaking domestically, and forgetting your borders and the problems involved there, what would you say is the one great need in Israel today?

Ambassador EBAN. Well, the great need is to find economic resources with which to integrate our growing population. We now have renewed immigration from central and eastern Europe and the greatest concern of our government now is to maintain economic dynamism with which to absorb the great blessing of this new infusion of manpower into our economy, society, and culture.

Mr. McCaffrey. For many years there have been Israeli bonds sold here in the United States. How helpful have they been to your economy, Mr. Ambassador?

Ambassador EBAN. Quite indispensable, indispensable. Without that \$360 million of capital investment we should have never been able to make these advances, the advances which have earned such international applause throughout the 10 years of our existence, and applause which reached its climax during the anniversary celebrations last year.

Mr. McCaffrey. Mr. Ambassador, could I ask you one more question? What are your own personal plans? There has been some talk that you probably will be leaving us within the year.

Ambassador EBAN. Mr. McCaffrey, there are no such things as indiscreet questions, there are only indiscreet answers. My present plans are to continue with my work. Tomorrow I hope to be discussing these matters with the Secretary of State. Then I shall be at the Soviet Embassy with Mr. Mikoyan, and so my work continues. There is an election in Israel at the end of October or early November, and I do not exclude the prospect that I might there seek some broader sphere of responsibility, but there is nothing officially decided in that connection as yet.

Mr. McCaffrey. We'll endorse you. You say that tomorrow you will be meeting with Secretary Dulles. Have you found, as an individual, that you have received cooperation on all the levels that you have worked with here in this country?

Ambassador EBAN. Yes. Whether or not we always agree on the fundamental points, we do agree that we have always found a courteous reception and our discussions with your Government are always conducted on a high level of intellectual and moral sympathy.

Mr. McCaffrey. I thank you very much. I've enjoyed this chat a great deal. Very glad that you dropped around.

Ambassador EBAN. Thank you very much.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and, at 7 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m., the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 20, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 19, 1959:

##### IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of section 8298, title 10, United States Code. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law:

##### SECOND LIEUTENANT TO FIRST LIEUTENANT

###### Line of the Air Force

Fletcher, William E., 48326A.  
 May, Curtis D., 29583A.  
 Field, Edsel R., 29582A.  
 Simmons, Albert P., 29830A.  
 Tollefson, James L., 29584A.  
 Hanson, Jack L., 48328A.  
 Teague, Rely R., 48327A.  
 Yates, Mannifred, 31909A.  
 Nummon, Guy A., 2d, 29600A.  
 Twark, John M., 29598A.  
 Turoski, Richard F., 29599A.  
 Todt, William E., 48329A.  
 Carbaugh, Carol C., 48333A.  
 Smith, Thomas J., 3d, 48331A.  
 Mulhauser, Harvey, 48330A.  
 Stewart, William M., 3d, 48332A.  
 Tobiason, Kenneth F., 48334A.  
 Stone, Charles H., 29601A.  
 McLaughlin, Daniel P., 29703A.  
 Evans, Donald L., 48337A.  
 Hejde, Daniel I., 48336A.  
 Morgan, Clark R., 48339A.  
 Jefferis, Joe A., 48340A.  
 Carwile, Elford L., 48343A.  
 Taylor, Edward G., 48341A.  
 Philler, William J., 48344A.  
 Dean, William F., Jr., 49664A.  
 Hornbarger, Harold A., 48342A.  
 Mease, Robert D., 48345A.  
 Greseth, Benoyne S., 29734A.  
 McComb, Leo E., 29735A.  
 Luttrell, James H., 48346A.  
 Bendell, Donald D., 29695A.  
 Slater, David A., 29736A.  
 Peterson, Allen B., 29737A.  
 Beasley, Billy J., 29912A.  
 Hand, Harry E., 48347A.  
 Plumb, Glenn E., 48348A.  
 Barker, Ronald L., 48349A.  
 Van Leuven, Dean R., 29602A.  
 Pladars, Zigurds, 48350A.  
 Gangol, Anthony J., 29603A.  
 Volz, Donald H., 48351A.  
 Ford, Tim C., 29604A.  
 Sakry, John F., 48355A.  
 Stallings, Joe B., 48356A.  
 Gober, James L., 48353A.  
 Flentje, Stanley K., 48357A.  
 Williams, Tony G., 29605A.  
 Coryell, Kendrick S., 48359A.  
 Terrell, James E., 48358A.  
 Dally, James H., 29738A.  
 Jackson, George G., 29739A.  
 Van Zandt, Richard D., 48360A.  
 Applebaugh, Robert G., 29696A.  
 Brug, Walter J., Jr., 29740A.  
 Sibson, Donald A., 29744A.  
 Freund, Thomas C., 29741A.  
 Sweeney, James E., 29743A.  
 Jassmann, Franklin E., 29742A.  
 Grosh, Karl H., 48361A.  
 Moore, Hayden C., 48363A.  
 Trapp, John C., 48362A.  
 Willis, Arthur R. D., 48369A.  
 Moss, Carlton H., 48370A.  
 Walker, Donald E., 48371A.  
 Miller, Edward D., 29697A.  
 Wiltse, George A., 29746A.  
 Hering, David J., 29747A.  
 Weibel, Donald L., 29745A.  
 Land, Charles P., 29748A.  
 Toljanic, Anthony J., 48373A.  
 Schnucker, Paul H., 48374A.  
 Weseman, Henry E., 29607A.  
 Brown, Bevan H., 29608A.  
 Kerr, Henry F., Jr., 48376A.  
 Knox, Lawrence E., 48378A.  
 Marler, Donald D., 29704A.  
 Sidwell, Edward N., 48381A.  
 Hollis, Donald R., 48379A.  
 Davis, Frank R., 29698A.  
 Musgrove, Richard W., 48382A.  
 Hanks, Kenneth G., 48383A.  
 Stewart, Robert A., 29230A.  
 Denson, Lee A., Jr., 29045A.  
 Schwartz, Marvin F., Jr., 29211A.  
 Ackerman, Don E., 28984A.  
 Park, Robert E., 29183A.  
 Kelly, John D., 29130A.  
 Cecil, Robert S., 29020A.  
 Anderson, B. Conn, Jr., 28987A.  
 Aiser, Donald J., 28986A.  
 Wallace, Bruce M., Jr., 29249A.  
 Studdard, Otis P., 29234A.  
 Fiske, Andreus A., Jr., 29190A.  
 Tucker, Richard P., 29242A.  
 Flaherty, Dundas I., 29067A.  
 Kamm, John M., Jr., 29125A.  
 Gollehon, George B., 29082A.  
 Smith, Richard E., 29224A.  
 Johnson, Douglas S., 29122A.  
 Hallisey, Alfred J., 29097A.  
 Warren, Richard H., 29251A.  
 Daleski, Richard J., 29036A.  
 Waters, Joseph P., 29252A.  
 Ernst, Fred H., 29061A.  
 Dunsavage, William P., 29054A.  
 Kirchgessner, Thomas E., 29132A.  
 Chavarria, Charles N., 29022A.  
 Beyer, Robert C., Jr., 28999A.  
 Schoep, John C., 29210A.  
 Stockham, Leo W., 29232A.  
 Maio, Armand D., 29155A.  
 Stroface, Joseph F., 29233A.  
 Cannon, Howard R., 29018A.  
 Eggert, Duane C., 29057A.  
 Holmquist, Harold G., 29112A.  
 Tindall, John B., Jr., 29240A.  
 Buckelew, Jesse W., 29011A.  
 Hanna, Hugh E., Jr., 29100A.  
 Armstrong, Spence M., 28990A.  
 Parent, Edward J., 29182A.  
 Denezza, Eugene J., 29043A.  
 Olson, James K., 29180A.  
 Wetzel, Robert, 29258A.  
 Nicolais, Mario A., 29175A.  
 Missier, Charles W., 29168A.  
 Robertson, Charles W., 29200A.  
 Dowell, Richard P., 29053A.  
 Dwyer, Michael J., Jr., 29055A.  
 Smith, Perry M., 29223A.  
 Jacobson, Ralph H., 29118A.  
 Ross, Thomas E., Jr., 29203A.  
 Niles, William H., 29176A.  
 Krutz, Robert D., 29135A.  
 Mayer, Irwin B., 29159A.  
 Karas, John, 29127A.  
 Berger, Lawrence W., 28998A.  
 Lake, Jerome G., 29137A.  
 Brandt, Thomas C., 29006A.  
 Smith, Mark E., 3d, 29222A.  
 Dander, Vernon A., 29037A.  
 Peterson, Clifford D., 29186A.  
 Harris, Lyell F., 29105A.  
 Flood, Donald T., 29069A.  
 Olds, Ernest A., 29179A.  
 Reinhardt, Thomas E., 29197A.  
 Schaefer, John E., 29207A.  
 Black, William H., 29000A.  
 Collins, John B., 29026A.  
 Shortridge, James C., Jr., 29220A.  
 Head, Richard H., 29106A.  
 Van Ry, Charles D., 29244A.  
 Kamp, James J., Jr., 29126A.  
 Werbel, Jerome H., 29256A.  
 Fleming, Raymond J., 29068A.  
 Davis, Joe R., 29038A.  
 Lewis, Reed H., 29144A.  
 Hamm, Charles R., 29098A.  
 Dougherty, Joseph M., 29051A.  
 Detore, James V., Jr., 29047A.  
 Spaeni, Herbert H., Jr., 29226.  
 Alexander, Michael H., 28985A.  
 Wolverton, James R., 29267A.  
 George, Benjamin W., 29079A.

- Sheridan, Robert B., 29218A.  
 Young, Romain A., Jr., 29270.  
 Leonard, George F., 29142A.  
 Filbey, Hugh L., 29066A.  
 James, Edward C., 29120A.  
 Torrey, Charles C., 29241A.  
 Bryant, Richard G., 29010A.  
 Gromek, John M., 29089A.  
 Quinn, Matthew J., Jr., 29194A.  
 Van Vonderen, Vernon R., 29245A.  
 Erl, James P., 29059A.  
 Lyle, Roger H., 29150A.  
 Mushalko, George, 29172A.  
 Shannon, William C., 29213A.  
 Loggins, Aaron B., 29146A.  
 O'Hara, Mark A., Jr., 29178A.  
 Curtis, Charles G., 29034A.  
 Wilson, Powell J., Jr., 29266A.  
 Haddad, Albert G., 29093A.  
 Lynch, George P., Jr., 29151A.  
 Koerkenmeier, Leo J., 29133A.  
 Sager, Walter C., 29204A.  
 Rosenhauer, George L., 29202A.  
 Sharkey, Jack J., 29214A.  
 Buddle, James W., 29012A.  
 Petch, Kenneth M., 29185A.  
 McChristian, Lester S., Jr., 29160A.  
 Johnston, Jerry R., 29123A.  
 Faurer, Theodore M., 29063A.  
 Noonan, David J., 29177A.  
 Colman, Thomas M., 29027A.  
 Sheehan, Leo J., 29217A.  
 Zehnder, Robert E., 29271A.  
 Faust, Donald O., 29064A.  
 Green, Merrill A., Jr., 29086A.  
 Boshoven, Bernard W., 29003A.  
 Burhans, Edmund D., 2d, 29015A.  
 Wolff, Marc T., 29115A.  
 Luft, Neale M., 29149A.  
 Delgado, Arsenio L., 29042A.  
 Shaud, John A., 29215A.  
 White, Frank D., 29261A.  
 Marr, Lawrence O., 29156A.  
 Masterson, Jerry P., 29157A.  
 Lynch, Thomas C., 29152A.  
 Burgk, Norman A., 29014A.  
 Rensvold, Rand E., 29199A.  
 Arnold, Steven W. N., 28992A.  
 Burd, Frank A., Jr., 29013A.  
 Grassberger, Robert E., 29085A.  
 Butler, Dennis L., 29016A.  
 Conway, John E., 29028A.  
 Kendall, Lisle G., Jr., 29131A.  
 Greene, Robert M., 29087A.  
 Schaumburg, G. Richard, 29209A.  
 Block, Emil N., Jr., 29002A.  
 Palmer, David L., 29181A.  
 Stein, Robert K., Jr., 29229A.  
 Dent, Frederick R., 3d, 29046A.  
 Jakus, Paul A., 29119A.  
 Debus, David L., 29040A.  
 Myers, Barton, 3d, 29173A.  
 Bruno, Nicholas J., 29009A.  
 White, George T., 29262A.  
 Sutherland, John S., 29236A.  
 Sanders, Joe E., 29205A.  
 Chartrand, David P., 29021A.  
 Kauffman, Richard H., 29128A.  
 Kautz, James G., 29129A.  
 Schwartz, Thomas, 29212A.  
 Williams, Oscar E., Jr., 29265A.  
 Weisner, Thomas L., 29254A.  
 DeVoll, Nathaniel O., 29048A.  
 Hansen, Charles J., Jr., 29101A.  
 Thelin, Alan L., 29239A.  
 Wetzel, William T., 29259A.  
 Piatt, Raleigh E., Jr., 29188A.  
 Lansing, Samuel M., 29140A.  
 Kotellos, Harry, 29134A.  
 Murphy, Donald P., 29170A.  
 Dye, Albert J., 29056A.  
 Lorey, Richard W., 29147A.  
 Verfurth, Jan E., 29247A.  
 Cody, Thomas J., Jr., 29024A.  
 Gardella, Stephen G., Jr., 29075A.  
 Widner, Ronald L., 29264A.  
 Murray, Carl H., Jr., 29171A.  
 Hetland, Joel S., 29109A.  
 Campis, Joel R., 29017A.  
 Forbrick, John W., 29071A.
- Cook, James A., 29029A.  
 Reagan, George, 29196A.  
 Sheehan, Donald E., 29216A.  
 Meader, Stanley H., 29165A.  
 Mackey, James B., 29153A.  
 Groner, Sheldon L., 29090A.  
 Hadley, Franklin R., 29095A.  
 Mitri, Charles L., Jr., 29169A.  
 Soltesz, Stephen A., 29225A.  
 Higgins, John H., 3d, 29110A.  
 Vallentyne, Edward, 29243A.  
 Prossner, Leslie T., 29193A.  
 Linden, James A., 29145A.  
 McMahon, James S., 29163A.  
 Hagenmeyer, Willard H., Jr., 29096A.  
 Hubert, Lawrence J., 29114A.  
 Clonts, Darold W., 29023A.  
 Gossens, Gerry F., 29084A.  
 Harbold, Norris B., Jr., 29104A.  
 Coker, Charles F., 29025A.  
 Peterson, George W., Jr., 29187A.  
 Bowen, Stuart W., 29004A.  
 Ferriter, Peirce G., 29065A.  
 Ernst, Donald L., 29060A.  
 Brown, Robert J., Jr., 29008A.  
 Renshaw, Alan B., 29198A.  
 Ankenbrandt, Gerald D., 28989A.  
 Cusick, Paul B., 29035A.  
 Pitzer, George E., 29191A.  
 Gibson, Jerry L., 29880A.  
 Anderson, Darrell L., 28988A.  
 Satterfield, Donald W., 29206A.  
 Warner, Glenn A., 29250A.  
 Skatvold, Jerald H., 29221A.  
 Crum, William P., 29032A.  
 Crase, Roland B., 29030A.  
 Francis, Bob L., 29072A.  
 Lang, Kenneth E., 29139A.  
 Westerhausen, J. Walden, 29257A.  
 Brown, Robert E., 29007A.  
 Greisen, Paul H., 29088A.  
 Swanenburg, Richard, 29237A.  
 Shewchuk, Richard G., 29219A.  
 Carey, William C., 29019A.  
 Herz, Robert T., 29108A.  
 Medley, Porter N., Jr., 29166A.  
 Stewart, William H., 29231A.  
 Hugdahl, Donald L., 29116A.  
 Bowman, Alfred C., Jr., 29005A.  
 Weltman, Bernard I., 29255A.  
 Blocher, Robert M., 29001A.  
 Hansen, Walter, 29103A.  
 Dougherty, Paul G., 29052A.  
 Gaudé, Henry R., 29077A.  
 Pilcher, Chester A., 29189A.  
 Culberson, Henry F., Jr., 29033A.  
 Schannep, John D., 29208A.  
 Textor, George P., 29238A.  
 Barrett, Robert T., 28995A.  
 Barker, James N., 28993A.  
 Pearson, Robert L., 29184A.  
 Mavrotheris, Nicholas A., 29158A.  
 Creighton, Terry W., 29031A.  
 Barlow, Allen E., 28994A.  
 Benzi, Leonard F., 28997A.  
 Hoffman, Alfred, Jr., 29111A.  
 Decell, George M., 3d, 29041A.  
 Ragland, Joseph E., 29195A.  
 Gauthreaux, Stephen E., Jr., 29078A.  
 Stebleton, Lawrence A., 29227A.  
 McPeck, William C., 29164A.  
 Denham, Walter S., Jr., 29044A.  
 Hampton, John A., A29099A.  
 McClung, William W., 29161A.  
 Heidrich, George C., 29107A.  
 Irwin, Gerald L., 29117A.  
 Arnold, James R., 28991A.  
 Pope, Joe D., 29192A.  
 Lajeunesse, David W., 29136A.  
 Nelson, John F., 29174A.  
 Magagna, John F., 29154A.  
 Sullivan, Philip L., 29235A.  
 McIntyre, John R., Jr., 29162A.  
 Vaselenko, Robert F., 29246A.  
 Haddock, Harold A., 29094A.  
 Dillon, William M., 29049A.  
 Steele, Ben L., 29228A.  
 Elliott, John E., 29058A.  
 Hopewell, Fred M., 29118A.  
 Guest, Richard P., Jr., 29091A.
- Hackeling, Charles C., 29092A.  
 Garges, Daniel T., 29076A.  
 Frankenberg, Raymond, 29073A.  
 Lally, John J., 29039A.  
 Fales, Philippe B., 29062A.  
 Wood, John E., 29269A.  
 Levis, Charles A., 29143A.  
 Romero, Richard S., 29201A.  
 Mercuro, George J., 29167A.  
 Jones, Robert D., 29124A.  
 Hansen, Edmund E., 29102A.  
 Bauduit, Harold S., 28996A.  
 Frith, Norman L. H., 2d, 29074A.  
 Weigold, George W., Jr., 29253A.  
 Whitaker, William E., 29260A.  
 Godstrey, Kenneth H., 29081A.  
 Visage, James R., 29248A.  
 Alfrey, William D., 31910A.  
 Metcalf, Charles D., 48368A.  
 Richmond, Earl H., 29609A.  
 Everman, Russell D., 29700A.  
 Belden, David L., 29701A.  
 Mandell, Harold, 29699A.  
 Dopler, Edward F., Jr., 29749A.  
 Maupin, Robert E., 48384A.  
 Pavik, Alvin L., 48385A.  
 Holmquist, Carl F., 48386A.  
 Tillotson, David, Jr., 48387A.  
 Preyss, Albert E., 48390A.  
 Kerby, Robert L., 48388A.  
 Monczewski, Matthew E., 48392A.  
 Knagenhjelm, Ludvig, W., Jr., 48389A.  
 Pancyk, Raymond K., 48391A.  
 Bockelman, Harold L., 29661A.  
 Moore, Richard P., 29856A.  
 Swanson, Thomas I., 48393A.  
 Austin, Larry M., 29610A.  
 Moore, Joseph D., 29832A.  
 Walters, Alan B., 29834A.  
 Cleveland, Stuart E., 29833A.  
 Davis, Robert F., 29831A.  
 Holley, Tilden S., 48394A.  
 Hillier, Ronald L., 29750A.  
 Hays, Cloyd A., 48395A.  
 Smith, Clarence T., 29821A.  
 Maggard, Harold C., 29820A.  
 Peito, Ernest E., 48399A.  
 Gelger, Robert B., Jr., 48398A.  
 Pulos, Christo D., 48205A.  
 Stinson, Thomas W., 48400A.  
 Avery, Beatrice B., 48397W.  
 Gilman, Daniel T., Jr., 29835A.  
 Seaman, Raymond A., 29836A.  
 Schoonmaker, Richard W., 50070A.  
 Williams, Bob F., 29662A.  
 Eibling, Joseph H., 48403A.  
 Gaetz, Charles J., 48402A.  
 Gardner, Lorin R., 48404A.  
 Ferrine, Robert K., 29663A.  
 Hendrickson, Richard A., 29664A.  
 Paulsen, William C., Jr., 48406A.
- Medical Service Corps*
- McKinney, Vernor L., 49119A.
- Nurse Corps*
- Heath, Lois M., 49736W.
- (NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)
- 
- CONFIRMATIONS**
- Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 19, 1959:
- UNITED NATIONS**
- Thomas C. Mann, of Texas, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Commission on International Commodity Trade of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.
- DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY**
- Francis F. Healy, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 4, 1959.