Congress and of our system of representative democracy. I consider this to be a very excellent and worthwhile program which might be carried out with profit in any school system.

The fourth annual model congress was sponsored this year by the Robert Morris Council for Social Studies and was held in the Oakfield-Alabama Central School, Oakfield, N. Y. A number of bills were submitted by the student delegates and referred to proper committees. Six were acted upon by the congress.

Two bills were passed. They were:

Bill No. 5, submitted by Loretta LaRussa, of Notre Dame High School, Batavia; a bill to improve the social status of migrant workers by requiring the Federal Government to license and regulate agencies engaged in the contract of migrant workers; to regulate the method of interstate transportation of migrant workers; and to extend the benefit of social security and the protection of the Labor Management Relations Act to the migrant workers if they are citizens of the United States.

Bill No. 6, submitted by Douglas Fiero of LeRoy High School, LeRoy; a bill to amend the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947 to include the following statement: It shall henceforth be unlawful for any labor union, or other organization of workers to force workers either by threat of violence or strike or agreement with the employer to join or pay dues to that union. Be it also recognized that a worker who does not join a union is in no way deprived of rights of equality of opportunity by his action.

This amendment shall be carried out and enforced by the National Labor Relations Board.

Three bills were defeated: They were:

Bill No. 1, introduced by Ted Schultz of Oakfield-Alabama Central School; a bill to abolish the personal income taxes by imposing a national sales tax of 10 cents on a dollar on all products bought by people in the United States, with the exception of domestic foods, medicines, home fuel, necessary clothing, automobiles used for work, and home lights for reading and homework; a motion was made to accept this as an amendment to the Constitution instead of a bill.

Bill No. 2, introduced by Chester Gabriel of Elba Central School, Elba; a resolution declaring that it is the sense of the Model Congress that the Government of the United States officially recognize the Government of the Peoples' Republic of China, and furthermore look with favor upon the admission of the Peoples' Republic of China into the United Nations but not as a permanent member of the Security Council.

Bill No. 4, submitted by Douglas David and Clarke Aspinall of Pavilion Central School, Pavilion; a bill to repeal the National Fire Arms Act.

One bill was tabled:

Bill No. 3, submitted by Paul Dickinson of Batavia High School, Batavia; a bill to discontinue the operation of the Post Office Department by the Federal Government, but instead to permit private businessmen to operate the Post Office under the supervision of the Federal Government.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 1958

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

Our Father, God, from the vain deceits of the uncertain world in which we live, for this hallowed moment we turn to the white candor of eternal verities. In a clamorous and convulsive day, when the very air of the world sighs and sobs with tremulous anxiety and anguish, we would climb the altar stairs of a faith that will not shrink though pressed by every foe. We would bow in Thy presence in the calm confidence that Thou dost hold the whole world in Thy hand, and all worlds in the clasp of a love that never fails. Our assurance and comfort lie not in our feeble hold of Thee, but in Thy mighty grasp of us.

Keeping ourselves in that love that will not let us go, may we march with conquering tread in the gathering armies of friendship whose armor is the shield of Thy truth, and whose sword is the might of Thy love, against which all the spears of hate cannot ultimately prevail. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's Name, Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 19, 1958, was dispensed with.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 19, 1958, the following reports of committees were submitted on May 20, 1958:

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

H. R. 9291. An act to define parts of certain types of footwear (Rept. No. 1616).

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

S. J. Res. 171. Joint resolution to amend section 217 of the National Housing Act (Rept. No. 1615).

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.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7930) to correct certain inequities with respect to automatic step-increase anniversary dates and longevity step-increases of postal field service employees.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3402. An act to provide for a display pasture for the bison herd on the Montana National Bison Range in the State of Montana, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6198. An act to exclude certain lands from the Sequoia National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6239. An act to amend sections 1461 and 1462 of title 18 of the United States Code;

H. R. 6274. An act to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall accept title to Grant's Tomb in New York, N. Y., and maintain it as the General Grant National Memorial;

H. R. 7241. An act to amend section 6 of the act of March 3, 1921 (41 Stat. 1355), entitled "An act providing for the allotment of lands within the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes.";

H. R. 7306. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide that notice of an action with respect to real property pending before a United States district court must be recorded in certain instances in order to provide constructive notice of such action;

H. R. 7738. An act for the relief of the State of New York;

H. R. 8419. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code relating to actions for infringements of copyrights by the United States;

H. R. 8980. An act to authorize an exchange of lands at Hot Springs National Park, Ark., and for other purposes;

H. R. 9370. An act to permit illustrations and films of United States and foreign obligations and securities under certain circumstances, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9627. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Alaska to the City of Ketchikan, Alaska;

H. R. 9817. An act relating to venue in tax refund suits by corporations;

H. R. 10349. An act to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain properties within Death Valley National Monument, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 11382. An act to authorize the conversion or exchange, under certain conditions, of term insurance issued under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11577. An act to increase from $5 to $10 per month for each $1,000 national service life insurance in force the amount of total disability income benefits which may be purchased by insureds, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12126. An act to provide further protection against the introduction and dissemination of livestock diseases, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12293. An act to establish the Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12356. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes," approved August 30, 1954;

H. R. 12377. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to borrow funds for capital improvement programs and to amend provisions of law relating to Federal Government participation in meeting costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City;

H. R. 12540. An act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes; and

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

H. J. Res. 479. Joint resolution to designate the 1st day of May of each year as Loyalty Day.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

S. 728. An act to authorize the acquisition of certain property in square 724 in the District of Columbia for the purpose of extension of the site of the additional office building for the United States Senate or for the purpose of addition to the United States Capitol Grounds;

S. 847. An act to amend the act of June 5, 1944, relating to the construction, operation, and maintenance of Hungry Horse Dam, Mont.

S. 2557. An act to amend the act granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation of certain compacts by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and South Dakota in order to extend the time for such negotiation;

S. 2813. An act to provide for certain credits to the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association and the Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District in consideration of the transfer to the Government of property in Phoenix, Ariz.;

S. 3087. An act to provide for the establishment of Fort Clatsop National Memorial in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes;

S. 3371. An act to amend the act of August 25, 1916, to increase the period for which concessionaire leases may be granted under that act from 20 years to 30 years;

H. R. 6940. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse owners of lands acquired for developments under his jurisdiction for their moving expenses, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7930. An act to correct certain inequities with respect to automatic step-increase anniversary dates and longevity step-increases of postal field service employees;

H. R. 8547. An act to authorize the disposal of certain uncompleted vessels; and

H. R. 11519. An act to authorize the use of naval vessels to determine the effect of newly developed weapons upon such vessels.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

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

H. R. 3402. An act to provide for a display pasture for the bison herd on the Montana National Bison Range in the State of Montana, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6198. An act to exclude certain lands from the Sequoia National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6274. An act to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall accept title to Grant's Tomb in New York, N. Y., and maintain it as the General Grant National Memorial;

H. R. 7241. An act to amend section 6 of the act of March 3, 1921 (41 Stat. 1355), entitled "An act providing for the allotment of lands within the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes.";

H. R. 8980. An act to authorize an exchange of lands at Hot Springs National Park, Ark., and for other purposes;

H. R. 9627. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Alaska to the city of Ketchikan, Alaska; and

H. R. 10349. An act to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain properties within Death Valley National Monument, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6239. An act to amend sections 1461 and 1462 of title 18 of the United States Code;

H. R. 7306. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide that notice of an action with respect to real property pending before a United States district court must be recorded in certain instances in order to provide constructive notice of such action;

H. R. 7738. An act for the relief of the State of New York;

H. R. 8419. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code relating to actions for infringements of copyrights by the United States;

H. R. 9370. An act to permit illustrations and films of United States and foreign obligations and securities under certain circumstances, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9817. An act relating to venue in tax refund suits by corporations;

H. R. 12293. An act to establish the Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 479. Joint resolution to designate the 1st day of May of each year as Loyalty Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11382. An act to authorize the conversion or exchange, under certain conditions, of term insurance issued under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 11577. An act to increase from $5 to $10 per month for each $1,000 national service life insurance in force the amount of total disability income benefits which may be purchased by insureds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 12126. An act to provide further protection against the introduction and dissemination of livestock diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 12356. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes", approved August 30, 1954; and

H. R. 12377. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to borrow funds for capital improvement programs and to amend provisions of law relating to Federal Government participation in meeting costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 12540. An act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

The Judiciary Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary; the Committee on the District of Columbia; the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia; and the Labor Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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 in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. 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, to consider the nomination on the calendar.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Doris Opal Garner, to be postmaster at Van Horn, Tex., which nominating message was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Herbert B. Warburton, of Delaware, to be General Counsel of the Post Office Department; and

Two hundred thirteen postmasters.

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Andrew McCaughrin Hood, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nomination on the calendar will be stated.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ira A. Dixon, of Indiana, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for a term of 4 years expiring June 30, 1952.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of the confirmation of this nomination.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

LLOYD W. JONES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I was distressed to learn from my friend, the distinguished chairman of the Republican Policy Committee [Mr. BRIDGES], of the sudden passing of the director of the Senate Republican Policy Committee, Mr. Lloyd W. Jones. I wish to extend my condolences to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

As staff director of the Senate Republican Policy Committee, Lloyd Jones made a distinct contribution to the work of the minority. He was energetic, but quiet. His activities were devoted to the service of his party, to the service of the United States Senate, and to the service of the Nation he loved so well.

Mr. President, our sympathies are with his family. We hope and pray that time will soon bring them healing solace.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, all of us on this side of the aisle and, I know, all Senators on the other side of the aisle, as stated by the distinguished majority leader, heard with profound regret of the passing of the director of our policy committee staff, Lloyd Jones.

Lloyd Jones has given long and faithful service to the Senate Republican Policy Committee. Some years ago it was my privilege to serve as chairman of the policy committee; and during that period of time, I worked very closely with Lloyd Jones, as I have done since, as minority leader. He gave faithful service to the committee. He was a very able and conscientious employee and director of the staff, which performs such valuable and useful service to the Members on this side of the aisle.

All of us join in extending to his family our most profound sympathy and regret. He leaves a place which will be most difficult to fill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to join the two distinguished leaders in paying my tribute to Lloyd W. Jones, staff director and secretary of the Senate Republican Policy Committee.

Lloyd Jones, as all the Republican Senators can attest, not only was one of the hardest workers with whom all of us were associated, but in his quiet, efficient manner he fulfilled all his responsibilities and duties, many and varied as they were.

Despite his comparative youth—he was but 48 years of age—Lloyd Jones had a brilliant and responsible background. He came with the policy committee in 1947. He served under four chairmen—the late Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio; Senator William F. Knowland, of California, now Republican floor leader; former Senator Homer Ferguson, of Michigan; and myself.

Mr. Jones was appointed by Senator Taft, in 1951, to be acting secretary and staff director of the committee. Since 1953, he has been secretary and staff director under appointments from Senator KNOWLAND, Senator Ferguson, and myself.

Prior to joining the policy committee staff, Lloyd Jones was engaged in newspaper editorial and public-relations work for more than 15 years. He was a reporter and editor for the Omaha (Nebr.) Bee-News, the Evansville (Ind.) Courier, the Alliance (Neb.) Times-Herald, the San Francisco Examiner, and the Denver Post. He was also Associated Press editor in Omaha. His Government experience included editorial and writing positions with the Agricultural News Service, the National Housing Agency, and the War Food Administration. He was also at one time a copywriter with the Ross Roy Advertising Agency, in Detroit.

A native of Nebraska, Mr. Jones attended the public schools of Omaha and the Municipal University in that city.

I know that all Senators, as well as all others who throughout the years have been associated with Lloyd Jones in the course of his work, join with me in extending our profound sympathies to his wife, Dorothy; his daughter, Lloydell; and his mother, Mrs. Mary Jones, of Long Beach, Calif.; as well as to the other members of his family.

His passing is a great loss to the Republicans in the Senate, a loss which all of us feel deeply.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the passing of Lloyd Jones poses the age-old question of why a fine, Christian person in the very prime of life—he was only 48 years of age—should be so untimely stricken and taken on that long, eternal journey.

I learned to know Lloyd Jones when I first came to the Senate. I doubt whether I have ever encountered a person who was at once so effective and self-effacing and unselfish as Lloyd Jones. There was effectiveness in his restraint, in his self-effacement, and in the friendly attitude he manifested toward every Member of the Senate and toward all others identified with the Senate.

I learned to develop a great affection for Lloyd Jones.

His passing will leave a distinct void in this body and among all those who serve it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I desire to join my colleagues and other in paying tribute to Lloyd W. Jones, who passed away yesterday.

As a member of the Senate Republican Policy Committee, I have been associated with him for the past few years, and I have admired his excellent work. As my colleagues have stated, we could not have had a more able executive to help us fulfill our responsibilities.

All of us feel a deep sense of sorrow and loss at his passing.

I desire to extend to his wife and to the other members of his family my deep sympathies at this sad time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as chairman of the Republican Conference, I wish to add my word of condolence and sympathy to the family of Lloyd Jones, and to pay tribute to him as a conscientious, hard-working, helpful, and patient collaborator in the work of the Republican Policy Committee and the Republican Conference.

Lloyd Jones led a fine organization, which has been helpful to all of us who are on this side of the aisle. I knew him in the past 2 years as a personal friend, who has been in my office many times, and who has been helpful in his advice. I was glad to receive his suggestions for the work of the policy group.

Lloyd Jones' sudden death saddens us all. In the days to come I certainly shall miss him very much, not only as a friend, but as an adviser and a helper in formulating policies for myself and for our side of the aisle.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I wish to identify myself with the encomiums paid by my colleagues to Lloyd Jones. The statements are a tribute to the personality of the late director of the Republican Policy Committee.

If there ever was a gentleman of whom it could be said, "This is a gentleman and a scholar," it was Lloyd Jones. He was moderate, he was scholarly, he dealt in factual material, and he considered his post to be not one for developing propaganda, but for doing research, to which he devoted his diligence, attention, and an abundance of talent. I knew Lloyd Jones personally as a friend, and at one time knew him rather well.

I wish to join my colleagues in extending my sympathies to his family and in the recognition of the fact that his passing has left a great vacuum in the important service he was rendering.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing my deepest sympathy to the family of Lloyd Jones. There is not much one can say after the words which have already been spoken; but it so happens I not only considered myself a friend of Lloyd Jones, but was also a reasonably close neighbor. I shall miss him greatly.

I wish to say, moreover, that certainly those on our side of the aisle, and all persons who were interested in the factual work he carried on, will feel the loss of Lloyd Jones greatly in the days ahead, for he certainly was a sterling citizen and a wonderful person to all those who had an opportunity to be associated with him.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I was deeply shocked by the news of the death of Lloyd Jones. I join the majority leader, the minority leader, and my other colleagues in expressing my sincere regret at his early and untimely death, and my sincere sympathy to his family.

Lloyd Jones was a very friendly, a very quiet, and a very unassuming man, but he was a very true friend and a very effective associate and worker on the Republican Policy Committee. He will be sorely missed.

The tributes we are paying to him today come from the very depths of our hearts. I sincerely hope his family will appreciate how much we shall miss Lloyd Jones.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues in extending my condolences to the family of Lloyd Jones. As a new Member of the Senate, I found Lloyd Jones most courteous, tactful, and accommodating. I shall personally feel a real sense of loss at his passing. We have the solace, and so does his family, of the knowledge that he lived a good life and made many friends, some of whom are now expressing their sympathy.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I, too, wish to pay tribute to the services rendered by Mr. Lloyd Jones to the United States Senate as staff director of the Republican Policy Committee. Mr. Jones had been of great assistance and service to me.

I extend my condolences to his family in this hour of their bereavement. Mr. Lloyd Jones was a very young man. He had given too much of himself, and that must have contributed to his early death.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I rise to speak in behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and myself. We are confident we speak for all our colleagues when we say that the Senate is deeply saddened to learn of the untimely death of Lloyd W. Jones. We who have worked directly with Mr. Jones knew him to be a patient, extremely courteous, and willing worker in his duties as secretary and staff director of the Republican policy committee.

Mr. Jones' early experience in newspaper and public-relations work was gained in the State which it is our privilege to represent in the Senate. He began his public career in 1930 in Omaha and worked his way up to become a research associate on the staff of the Republican policy committee in 1947. Mr. Jones was appointed by the late Senator Taft in 1951 as acting secretary and staff director of the committee. Since 1953 he has been secretary and staff director under appointments from Senators Knowland, Ferguson, and Bridges.

In this, his family's most trying hour, we are proud to pay tribute to one of Nebraska's native sons. We extend our heartfelt sympathies to his family, and we assure his mother, his lovely wife, and his daughter that they can be justly proud, as we are, of his services to the Senate, to his community, and to his associates. Most of all, they can be proud that throughout his career he was without guile, pretension, or rancor in his associations with his fellow men. These are the marks of sterling character; these are the marks of a gentleman.

We shall miss Lloyd, and we sincerely hope that memories of his many fine qualities will help to ease the sorrow of those close to him.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce that following the morning hour there will be a call of the calendar. Prior to the call of the calendar, the Senator from Washington has a unanimous consent request to make concerning some noncontroversial legislation, the unfinished business. Then there will be a calendar call. It will be followed by a quorum call to notify all Members. I anticipate the Senate will consider the conference report on the postal pay-rate bill about 3 o'clock.

I should like the attaches of the Senate on both sides of the aisle to notify members of the committee who may have an interest in this bill or any other Senator who may desire to be present.

My colleagues on the minority side have another meeting which will keep them occupied until about that time. I should like all Members to be present when the conference report is called up.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it might be well, so Senators may have notice, to state that it is possible there may be a yea and nay vote on the conference report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, that is agreeable to me. I had not intended to ask for a yea and nay vote on the conference report. I rather think it will be generally supported. I had not anticipated a record vote. It may be, if a majority of Senators desire, or a substantial number of them desire, a yea and nay vote, we shall have to notify any Senator who had not expected it and give him an opportunity to be present.

SENATE PARTICIPATION IN THE CEREMONIES FOR THE UNKNOWNS OF WORLD WAR II AND KOREA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On behalf of the Vice President, the Chair wishes to make the following announcement:

In response to a communication to the Vice President from the Secretary of the Army the Chair, for the Vice President, hereby appoints the entire membership of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate to serve as a committee representing the United States Senate in connection with the interment ceremonies for the Unknowns of World War II and Korea, to take place both at the Capitol and at Arlington Cemetery on Friday, May 30, 1958.

Further the Chair, for the Vice President, hereby appoints the entire membership of the Senate to serve in attendance in the rotunda of the Capitol at a service during the placing of the two caskets in the rotunda at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, May 28, and the entire membership of the Senate, exclusive of the Armed Services Committee, is appointed to be in attendance during the removal of the caskets from the rotunda at 1 p. m. on May 30.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Joseph C. Duke, Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, giving a brief summary of the Senate participation in the ceremonies for the Unknowns of World War II and Korea.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., May 21, 1958.

DEAR SENATOR: Having been designated by Senators JOHNSON and KNOWLAND as the Senate officer to serve as coordinator with the military forces in connection with carrying out arrangements for the services for the Unknowns of World War II and Korea to take place at the Capitol, I send you the following and hope it will be helpful to you.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH C. DUKE,
Sergeant at Arms.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF SENATE PARTICIPATION IN THE CEREMONIES FOR THE UNKNOWNS OF WORLD WAR II AND KOREA AND CAPITOL PLAZA PARKING PROHIBITIONS

1. OFFICIAL APPOINTMENTS

The Vice President has appointed the 15 members of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate to represent the Senate on Friday, May 30, at a service in front of the main steps to the Capitol, in the procession conducting the bodies from the Capitol to the Arlington Amphitheater, and at the actual interment at the tombs.

The Vice President also appointed the entire membership of the Senate to serve in attendance in the rotunda of the Capitol at a service at 10 a. m., on Wednesday, May 28, during the placing of the two caskets in the rotunda.

The Vice President also appointed the entire membership of the Senate, other than the Armed Services Committee, to serve in attendance in the rotunda and on the east portico of the main Capitol steps during the removal of the caskets from the rotunda on May 30 at 1 p. m.

The above appointments were made in response to a communication from the Secretary of the Army.

2. CEREMONIES ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 28, 10 A. M.—ENTIRE SENATE

The Senate is expected to convene at 9:30 a. m. and all those present will be escorted as a body to the north side of the rotunda where they will stand during a 15- to 20-minute service when the caskets are placed upon the catafalques in the rotunda. This service will be concluded by the presentation, on behalf of Congress, of 2 floral tributes, 1 by the Vice President and 1 by the Speaker.

3. SERVICES ON FRIDAY, MAY 30, AT THE CAPITOL

(*a*) *Armed Services Committee members*

All members of the Armed Services Committee will assemble in the Senate reception room at 12:30 p. m. They will be escorted through the rotunda to a position assigned them by the Army near the foot of the main Capitol steps, to arrive at this position at 12:45. There will be a 15-minute ceremony beginning at 1 p. m. on the main steps as the caskets are removed from the rotunda. At the conclusion of the ceremony the Armed Services Committee members will be assigned to vehicles standing in front of the steps which will be a part of the procession escorting the bodies from the Capitol to the amphitheater.

At the amphitheater the Armed Services Committee members will be seated in a box during the 40-minute service. After this service they will be escorted to the tombs to observe the actual interment.

The Army has not made provision for wives of the members of the Armed Services Committee to accompany them either at the Capitol ceremony or in the procession en route to Arlington. The Army requests wives of those committee members wishing to attend the amphitheater ceremony to go there separately on their own using one of the seat tickets and the vehicle pass for parking in the cemetery which the Army offered to furnish each Senator some time ago.

(*b*) *All Senators except Armed Services Committee—May 30*

All Senators, other than the members of the Armed Services Committee, may assemble informally in the Senate Chamber at 12:30 p. m. on May 30. They will be escorted from the Chamber through the rotunda and to the portico of the main steps on the east front of the Capitol Building from where they may observe the 15-minute ceremony to take place on the steps as the caskets are removed from the rotunda. Senators attending this Capitol ceremony may then proceed individually on their

own to the Arlington Amphitheater and join their wives in, or accompany them to, the amphitheater if they have accepted the two tickets and vehicle pass for parking in the cemetery offered them by the Army some time ago.

4. SERVICES ON FRIDAY, MAY 30, AT ARLINGTON

The principal interment ceremony will be held in the amphitheater at Arlington at 3 p. m. on Friday, May 30, lasting approximately 40 minutes. The actual interment will be at the tombs just outside of the amphitheater with a ceremony of approximately 15 minutes. All of the amphitheater arrangements and ticket distribution are under the control of the Army. The Army states in its bulletins that Senators and others specially invited, with vehicle passes to the cemetery, will need to enter the cemetery gates not later than 2:30 in order that they may be seated before the President arrives shortly before 3. The Army also advises that no one will be admitted through the main cemetery gate at the west end of Memorial Bridge after 2:30 because the procession will start through the gate at that time.

Some time ago the Secretary of the Army invited each Senator to apply for two tickets and a vehicle pass for the amphitheater ceremony.

5. CAPITOL PLAZA PARKING RESTRICTIONS

Cables such as for inauguration will be erected around the Capitol Plaza. On Wednesday, May 28, no parking will be permitted in the Capitol Plaza until 11 a. m. after the 2 caskets are placed in the rotunda. After 11 a. m. on the 28th parking will be normal except in a few instances such as where a stand is provided for photographers.

On May 29 parking on the Capitol Plaza will be virtually normal.

On Friday, May 30, no parking will be permitted on the Capitol Plaza until after 2 p. m.

During the parking restriction period on both May 28 and 30 vehicles may enter the Capitol Plaza at Delaware and Constitution Avenue to discharge passengers under the Senate Wing Arch.

6. ADMISSION TO THE ROTUNDA BY THE PUBLIC

The public will form in line on the Capitol Plaza on the east front of the Capitol. The line will be admitted through the east front door of the rotunda from approximately 11 a. m. to 9 p. m. on Wednesday, May 28; from 8 a. m. to 9 p. m. on Thursday, May 29; and from 8 a. m. until 12 noon on May 30. The public will pass through the rotunda to the west door, down one flight of steps, and out of the building through the middle west front door. Except for the 2 brief ceremonies referred to above in items 2 and 3, there will be no admission to the rotunda other than in the public line forming on the east front. The public will be requested not to take pictures in the rotunda. From time to time while the public line is passing through the rotunda during the 3 days, representatives of various organizations will be permitted to present floral tributes in the rotunda but these activities will not cause a break in the moving of the public line.

Persons who are infirm may enter the Capitol at the Law Library door on the ground level just to the north of the main Capitol steps and be taken to the rotunda level on an elevator and escorted in the north rotunda door separate from the regular public line. Representatives of organizations who have arranged with the Army to make floral presentations will use this same method of ingress and egress.

7. ATTACHMENTS

Copy of a 74-page pamphlet prepared and distributed by the Army of which I received only enough to supply each Senator with one.

Copy of the schedule of routes to Arlington, prepared by the Army.

Preferred dress for all services: Ordinary business suits.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PROPOSED DONATION BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF FIREBOAT TO CITY OF SANTA CRUZ, CALIF.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Material), reporting, pursuant to law, that the Navy Department proposes to donate a 40-foot fireboat to the city of Santa Cruz, Calif., for use as a fireboat to protect its municipally owned pier; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting pursuant to law, a report on export control, for the first quarter of 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON THE ADVANCE IN AIR SAFETY

A letter from the Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D. C., signed by the Chairman and members of the Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental report of the advance in Air Safety, dated May 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

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

RECOMMENDATIONS OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, recommendations adopted by the International Labor Conference at Geneva, June 21 and 22, 1955 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The memorial of Benjamin Golding, of Brooklyn, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of any legislation to curb the powers of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Syrol S. Santos, of Santa Ana, Calif., relating to the treatment of juveniles in the courts of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF TWO HARBORS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I recently received a resolution from the city council of the city of Two Harbors, Minn., concerning the diversion of water from Lake Superior.

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 Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas officials of State and local governments, port authorities and shipping companies have protested the diversion of water in the Great Lakes: Be it

Resolved, That the city council of the city of Two Harbors go on record in opposition to H. R. 2 (water diversion bill) as the Lake Superior level has dropped considerably in the past years which we have noticed at our Municipal Water and Light Plant where the water level has dropped 8 inches or more.

Whereas any further such drop in water level will necessitate the deepening of our well at our water and light plant at a considerable expense to our municipality.

Resolved further, That copies of this resolution be sent to United States Senators EDWARD THYE and HUBERT HUMPHREY, Congressman BLATNIK and Senator ROBERT KERR, chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors.

Adopted this 5th day of May, A. D. 1958.

FRANK EIDE,
President, City Council.

Attest:

RAYMOND W. GUSTAFSON,
City Clerk.

Approved by the mayor this 6th day of May, A. D. 1958.

[SEAL] DAVID BATTAGLIA,
Mayor.

NATIONAL ARBOR DAY—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the board of supervisors of Greene County, N. Y., to establish a National Arbor Day.

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

MAY 9, 1958.

Whereas this board of supervisors has received a communication from the New York State Committee for a National Arbor Day to be observed on the last Friday in April in each year; and

Whereas said committee has asked this board of supervisors to pass a resolution supporting its objective and to send a certified copy of said resolution to our legislators, both State and national; be it

Resolved, That the board of supervisors of Greene County does hereby support the New York State Committee for National Arbor Day and recommends to its legislators the establishment of a unified national observance day to be known as National Arbor Day and to be celebrated on the last Friday in April in each year; and it is further

Resolved, That the clerk of this board be, and she hereby is, directed to forthwith send a certified copy of this resolution to President Dwight D. Eisenhower and Gov. Averell Harriman and to our legislators, both State and national.

Seconded by Supervisor Albright.

Ayes 14; noes 0: absent 0.

RESOLUTION OF DEPARTMENT OF NEW YORK RESERVE OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I offer for printing in the RECORD a resolution of the Department of New York of the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, which was adopted at its convention at Syracuse, N. Y. The resolution calls for the immediate imple-

mentation of plans and the speedy construction of a joint Army Reserve-Air Force Reserve Armory at Hancock Field, Syracuse, N. Y.

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

Whereas the Congress has appropriated funds for a Reserve Armory to be constructed at Syracuse, N. Y., and the site selected was Hancock Field; and

Whereas greater efficiency and economy will be effected by a joint Army Reserve-Air Force Reserve Armory and urgent and immediate needs will be filled: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Department of New York of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States in convention assembled, That this department shall urge through the national headquarters of the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States the immediate implementation of plans and the speedy construction of a joint Army Reserve-Air Force Reserve Armory at Hancock Field, Syracuse, N. Y.; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be furnished to the honorable United States Senators from the State of New York and to the Honorable R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, Member of Congress from the 35th District.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

H. R. 10015. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1959, the suspension of duties on metal scrap, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1618).

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

H. R. 6006. An act to amend certain provisions of the Antidumping Act, 1921, to provide for greater certainty, speed, and efficiency in the enforcement thereof, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1619).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution to establish a joint committee to investigate the goldmining industry (Rept. No. 1617).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

H. R. 7870. An act to amend the act of July 1, 1955, to authorize an additional $10 million for the completion of the Inter-American Highway (Rept. No. 1620).

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. HENNINGS), from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 921. A bill to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records (Rept. No. 1621).

By Mr. FREAR, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

H. R. 12356. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes," approved August 30, 1954 (Rept. No. 1622); and

H. R. 12377. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to borrow funds for capital improvement programs and to amend provisions of law relating to Federal Government participation in meeting costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City (Rept. No. 1623).

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

H. R. 8439. An act to cancel certain bonds posted pursuant to the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, or the Immigration and Nationality Act (Rept. No. 1624).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. THYE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 3864. A bill to enable producers to provide a supply of turkeys adequate to meet the needs of consumers, to maintain orderly marketing conditions, and to promote and expand the consumption of turkeys and turkey products; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. POTTER (for himself and Mr. HOBLITZELL):

S. 3865. A bill relative to the distribution of automobiles in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3866. A bill for the relief of Edwin P. Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 3867. A bill to provide grants to the States to assist them in informing and educating children in schools with respect to the harmful effects of tobacco, alcohol, and other potentially deleterious consumables; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3868. A bill for the relief of Mercedes Ruiz Sanroma Vimda de Notario; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 3869. A bill to extend the availability of certain appropriations for emergency conservation measures to June 30, 1960; to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3870. A bill for the relief of Dr. Kedar N. Bhasker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 3871. A bill to encourage the construction of multifamily rental housing to provide living accommodations for essential civilian personnel employed in connection with an installation of the armed services; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (by request):

S. 3872. A bill to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation cost for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the continental United States and Alaska and for other purposes; and

S. 3873. A bill to amend section 201 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the interchange of inspection services between executive agencies, and the furnishing of such services by one executive agency to another, without reimbursement or transfer of funds; 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. EASTLAND (by request):

S. 3874. A bill to amend section 4083, title 18, United States Code, relating to penitentiary imprisonment;

S. 3875. A bill to amend section 2412 (b), title 28, United States Code, with respect to the taxation of costs;

S. 3876. A bill to provide for the relocation of the National Training School for Boys, and for other purposes;

S. 3877. A bill to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code;

S. 3878. A bill to amend section 152, title 18, United States Code, with respect to the concealment of assets in contemplation of bankruptcy; and

S. 3879. A bill to amend sections 1 and 3 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. GORE, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. CLARK, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. CHURCH):

S. 3880. A bill to create an independent Federal Aviation Agency, to provide for the safe and efficient use of the airspace by both civil and military operations, and to provide for the regulation and promotion of civil aviation in such manner as to best foster its development and safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

CENTENNIAL OF SHATTUCK SCHOOL, FARIBAULT, MINN.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution honoring and commending Shattuck School, Faribault, Minn., on the occasion of its 100th anniversary.

Shattuck, the oldest boys' school of the Episcopal Church west of the Allegheny Mountains and one of the oldest church military schools in the United States, has a long record of achievement. Her graduates have gone out into the world of science, the arts, the military, the professions, government, and private business to bring honor to the school on the hill in beautiful southern Minnesota.

Shattuck School is closely linked with the early days of Minnesota history. It is appropriate that both Minnesota and Shattuck should be observing their centennial in this year of 1958.

Shattuck School introduced organized football to the Northwest in 1878. The first organized regatta in the State of Minnesota was held at Shattuck School. Shattuck graduates have made their mark from Suez to Saigon. Our present United States Ambassador to Vietnam, Elbridge Durbrow, is a Shattuck graduate. In the early days of World War II—behind the battered stone of Corregidor and Bataan—it was another graduate, Colonel Sutherland, who helped engineer the legendary escape of his commander to Australia. His commander was Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

The list of distinguished Shattuck men is a long one. It is interesting to note that 1 out of every 73 graduates of Shattuck School is listed in Who's Who in America. This is a fine testimonial to the standards set for its students down through the years.

But perhaps Shattuck is best characterized by the men who teach—the masters who, by their example and devotion, have inspired generations of young men.

Shattuck School will go on to another illustrious 100 years with the same devotion to duty that has characterized it in the past. Minnesota—and our Nation—can well be proud of the school on the hill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 89) commending Shattuck School, of Faribault, Minn., upon its centennial, submitted by Mr. THYE, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Whereas Shattuck School opened in Faribault, Minn., on June 3, 1858, and is the oldest nonproprietary school in the region and the oldest boys' school of the Episcopal Church west of the Allegheny Mountains; and

Whereas in 1870, the students of Shattuck held the first organized regatta in the State of Minnesota and in 1878 Shattuck introduced organized football to the Northwest; and

Whereas Shattuck graduates have made distinguished records in the State and the Nation and throughout the world as artists, actors, authors, businessmen, clergymen, diplomats, educators, editors, industrialists, and leaders in all branches of the Armed Forces, and 1 out of every 73 graduates is listed in Who's Who in America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Shattuck School be commended upon their centennial.

ESTABLISHMENT OF INTERNATIONAL FOOD AND RAW MATERIALS RESERVE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on July 18, 1956, I submitted a resolution (S. Res. 316) favoring the establishment of an International Food and Raw Materials Reserve. I submit an identical resolution, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

I also ask, Mr. President, that the text of the resolution be printed at this point in my remarks.

Mr. President, this resolution is practically identical to the language contained in the mutual security bill enacted by the Senate in 1956. This language was deleted by the House and Senate conferees on the measure.

I am hopeful that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will see fit to include such language again in the mutual security bill which is now under consideration. I intend to devote my own efforts to that object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 307) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President should explore with other nations the establishment of an International Food and Raw Materials Reserve under the auspices of the United Nations and related international organizations for the purpose of acquiring and storing in appropriate countries raw or processed farm products and other raw materials, exclusive of minerals, with a view to their use in—

(1) preventing extreme price fluctuations in the international market in these commodities;

(2) preventing famine and starvation;

(3) helping absorb temporary market surpluses of farm products and other raw materials (exclusive of minerals);

(4) economic and social development programs formulated in cooperation with other appropriate international agencies.

Participation by the United States in such an International Food and Raw Materials Reserve shall be contingent upon statutory authorization or treaty approval, as may be appropriate.

CLEARANCE OF MILITARY FLIGHT OPERATIONS WITH CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate action, a resolution seeking the direction of the Secretary of Defense, by the Senate Committee on Armed Services, to the requirement that all military aircraft file plans for any flight operation, including traffic patterns and flight plans, with appropriate officials of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

We are saddened by the recent spectacle of two crashes between commercial aircraft on scheduled service and military aircraft on training missions. These are terrible misfortunes, and concern for them is shared deeply by our military officials. It is obvious that well-defined patterns for both commercial and military aircraft operations, in peacetime, be thoroughly defined. In times of emergency, these patterns would give way to military priority for use of the airways.

I realize that comprehensive legislation, on this subject, will be fully studied by the Congress. In the meantime, the proposition contained in my resolution can afford a measure of much needed protection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 308) was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Armed Services is authorized to undertake whatever studies may be deemed necessary for formulating legislation to direct the Secretary of Defense to require all station and post commanders of military establishments operating aircraft to clear all flight operations, including flight patterns and flight plans, with appropriate authorities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

NATIONAL TURKEY MARKETING ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and my colleague the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], a bill to enable producers to provide a supply of turkeys adequate to meet the needs of consumers, to maintain orderly marketing conditions, and to promote and expand the consumption of turkeys and turkey products. I ask that it be held at the desk until the end of the day, Friday, May 23, to accept additional sponsors who may be interested.

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

The bill (S. 3864) to enable producers to provide a supply of turkeys adequate to meet the needs of consumers, to maintain orderly marketing conditions, and to promote and expand the consumption of turkeys and turkey products, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the measure is called the National Turkey Marketing Act, but in effect it is essentially an enabling act providing the means for turkey producers themselves to develop and vote on a marketing order designed to give more stability to their industry.

It is a constructive self-help approach, on the part of the turkey producing industry, sponsored by the National Turkey Federation after several years of study and negotiations with various State turkey federations.

Turkey production is a significant agricultural enterprise in Minnesota and many other States of the Union. It makes an important contribution to our economy. Thanks to the promotional work of the industry itself, turkey is no longer just a holiday bird; it is an all-year staple item in America's diet, and a good buy for consumers. But expansion of the industry has also brought problems of temporary surpluses, usually seasonal, that reflect the need for some stabilization devices to protect the producers. The turkey producers are seeking to meet this need on their own to as large an extent as possible. Turkey production involves many hazards and risks, and effective marketing stabilization can help remove some of that uncertainty.

Mr. President, the National Turkey Federation has compiled a series of questions and answers about this legislation to help explain how it would work. I ask unanimous consent that these questions be printed at the conclusion of my remarks, along with a copy of the proposed bill.

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

A bill to enable producers to provide a supply of turkeys adequate to meet the needs of consumers, to maintain orderly marketing conditions, and to promote and expand the consumption of turkeys and turkey products

Be it enacted, etc., That this act shall be known as the National Turkey Marketing Act.

SEC. 2. Breeder hens for the production of hatching eggs and poults, and market turkeys are produced by persons widely scattered throughout the several States, and hatching eggs and market turkeys and turkey products move in large part through the channels of interstate or foreign commerce.

The number of breeder hens maintained, the supply of hatching eggs, and the number of poults hatched directly affect the supplies of, the markets for, and the prices of, turkeys and turkey products in commerce.

Turkeys which do not move to market in commerce directly affect the markets for and the prices of turkeys and turkey products in commerce.

Farmers maintaining flocks of breeder hens for the production of hatching eggs for poults or market turkeys, persons hatching eggs for the production of poults or market turkeys, and growers of market turkeys individually have been unable to determine the number of breeder hens required, or the number of hatching eggs or poults to be produced, to provide a supply of turkeys needed to meet effective demand. As a consequence turkey breeders and turkey hatcherymen and turkey growers are unable to market in an orderly manner or to prevent excessive supplies or shortages occurring in commerce, with the result that prices fluctuate widely, causing severe losses or injury to producers and consumers of turkeys.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 3. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that it is in the public interest to encourage the producers of breeder hens, hatching eggs, poults, and market turkeys, through marketing orders issued pursuant to the provisions of this act, to establish and contribute to the support of (1) programs to provide, in the interests of producers and consumers, such supply and orderly flow of turkeys in commerce through the marketing season as will avoid unreasonable fluctuations in supplies and prices, and as will tend to provide a reasonable and adequate return to efficient producers, and as will tend to establish, as the prices to farmers, parity prices as defined by section 301 (a) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and (2) research (including disease control), promotion, and market-development programs to expand the consumption of, and to assist, improve, or promote the marketing and distribution in commerce of turkeys and turkey products.

MARKETING ORDERS

SEC. 4. (a) To effectuate the declared policy of this act, the Secretary shall, subject to the provisions of this section, issue and from time to time amend, orders applicable to persons engaged in the marketing in commerce of breeder hens, hatching eggs, poults or market turkeys, and to buyers of turkeys for slaughter.

NOTICE AND HEARING

(b) Whenever the Secretary, upon the request of producers of breeder hens, hatching eggs, poults, or market turkeys, has reason to believe that the issuance of an order will tend to effectuate the declared policy of this act, he shall give due notice of and an opportunity for a hearing upon a proposed order. The formulation of the terms of any such order for proposal to the Secretary or the carrying out of any provision of this act shall not be held to be in violation of any of the antitrust laws of the United States and shall be deemed to be lawful.

FINDINGS AND ISSUANCE OF ORDERS

(c) After such notice and opportunity for hearing, the Secretary shall issue an order if he finds, and sets forth in such order, upon the evidence introduced at such hearing (in addition to such other findings as may be specifically required by this section) that the issuance of such order and all of the terms and conditions thereof will tend to effectuate the declared policy of this act.

TERMS

(d) Orders issued pursuant to this section shall contain one or more of the following terms and conditions, and (except as provided in subsection (e)) no other:

(1) Requiring that every person maintaining breeder hens for the production for commerce of hatching eggs, poults, or market turkeys register his name and address, and that each such breeder hen be registered and issued an official band in accordance with the terms of the marketing order.

(2) Providing for the payment by the person registering breeder hens of a market development and stabilization fee for each breeder hen registered and issued an official band in accordance with the terms of the marketing order.

(3) Prohibiting the marketing in commerce of breeder hens, hatching eggs, poults, or market turkeys produced other than by breeder hens registered and issued an official band in accordance with the terms of the marketing order.

(4) Prohibiting the marketing in commerce of breeder hens, hatching eggs, poults, or market turkeys by any person owning, possessing, or controlling any breeder hens which have not been registered and issued an official band in accordance with the terms of the marketing order.

(5) Providing for payments from funds collected pursuant to the marketing order for marketing breeder hens for slaughter in accordance with the terms of the marketing order.

(6) Providing for the payment by the person hatching eggs for the production of poults for commerce, or marketing hatching eggs in commerce for the purpose of hatching, of a market-development and stabilization fee for each hatching egg so hatched or marketed in accordance with the terms of the marketing order.

(7) Providing for the payment by the person marketing poults in commerce or retaining poults for the production of market turkeys for commerce, of a market development and stabilization fee for each poult marketed in commerce or retained for the production of turkeys for market in commerce in accordance with the terms of the marketing order.

(8) Providing for payment from funds collected pursuant to the marketing order for diverting hatching eggs or poults from the channels of commerce.

(9) Providing for the purchase from funds collected pursuant to the marketing order and the sale or other disposition of breeder hens, hatching eggs, or poults not needed for the production of market turkeys.

(10) Providing for the payment by the person marketing market turkeys in commerce of a market development and stabilization fee for each market turkey marketed in commerce in accordance with the terms of the marketing order.

(11) Providing for the withholding from the proceeds of sale of breeder hens, hatching eggs, poults, and market turkeys of any market development and stabilization fees becoming due and owing by reason of the marketing of same, and for the disposition of such fees in accordance with the terms of the marketing order.

(12) Providing for payments to be made from funds collected pursuant to the marketing order to encourage the marketing, sale, export, diversion, or other utilization of market turkeys or turkey products in accordance with the terms of the marketing order.

(13) Providing for the purchase from funds collected pursuant to the marketing order and the sale, donation, export, or other disposition of market turkeys or turkey products to facilitate marketing, promote consumption, or effectuate a better balance between supply and demand of turkeys in accordance with the terms of the marketing order.

(14) Establishing or providing for the establishment of research (including disease control), promotion, and market development programs designed to assist, improve, or promote the marketing, distribution, or consumption of turkeys or turkey products, the expense of such projects to be paid from funds collected pursuant to the marketing order.

(15) Any term or condition incidental to, not inconsistent with, and necessary to effectuate any other terms and conditions of such order.

TERMS COMMON TO ALL ORDERS

(e) Any order issued pursuant to this section shall provide a method for the selection of a marketing board to administer such order. Such order shall also provide for adequate representation on the marketing board of each class of producer (as defined in section 8 (m) of this act) subject to the order and for proper regional representation. The members of the board shall be appointed by the Secretary from nominations made by producers. Upon request of the marketing board the Secretary shall appoint from persons engaged in allied industries advisers to advise the board on any matter on which the board may request advice in connection with the performance of its duties. No action taken by any such board affecting any class of producer as defined in section 8 (m) of this act shall be effective unless such action is approved by a majority of the members of the board representing such class of producer. Each marketing order shall state the maximum market development and stabilization fee which may be assessed against any class of producer. The order shall define the powers and duties of the marketing board which shall include the power:

(1) To administer such order in accordance with its terms and provisions;

(2) To establish committees or subcommittees to carry out assigned duties and functions and to designate persons who may or may not be members of the marketing board to serve upon such committees;

(3) To employ or retain the services of necessary personnel;

(4) To enter into contracts or agreements to secure the services of others (including trade organizations serving the turkey industry) in administering the order and in formulating, developing, and carrying out programs for the removal or diversion of surplus breeder hens, hatching eggs, poults, and market turkeys from the market, for conducting research (including disease control), promotion, and market development projects to expand the consumption of, and markets for turkeys or turkey products, and for carrying out any other activity provided for in a marketing order;

(5) To recommend to the Secretary rules and regulations to effectutate the terms and provisions of such order;

(6) To receive, investigate, and report to the Secretary complaints of violations of such order;

(7) To recommend to the Secretary amendments to or suspension or termination of, such order; and

(8) To collect market development and stabilization fees and to pay from moneys collected such expenses as may be incurred by such marketing board in the performance of its duties as authorized under this act, including compensation, and expenses to members of the board and advisers.

CONSUMER SAFEGUARD

(f) Whenever the average price of turkeys to growers equals or exceeds the parity price and the Secretary determines that the average price for turkeys for the marketing season will equal or exceed the parity price, the Secretary shall suspend the operation of the provisions of any order authorizing the expenditure of funds for purchasing or diverting market turkeys from normal channels of distribution, and no funds shall be expended to reduce the supply of breeder hens, hatching eggs, or poults available for the production of market turkeys whenever the Secretary determines that the average price of market turkeys to producers during the ensuing marketing season will exceed the parity price.

REQUIREMENT OF REFERENDUM AND PRODUCER APPROVAL

(g) The Secretary shall conduct a referendum among producers for the purpose of ascertaining whether the issuance of an order is approved or favored by producers, as required under the applicable provisions of this act. No order issued pursuant to this section shall be effective unless the Secretary determines that the issuance of such order is approved or favored:

(1) By not less than 65 percent by number of the producers of market turkeys voting in such referendum who, during a representative period determined by the Secretary, have been engaged in the production of market turkeys, and who produced not less than 51 percent of the market turkeys during said representative period produced by producers voting in such referendum, or by not less than 51 percent by number of the producers of market turkeys voting in such referendum who, during the representative period determined by the Secretary, have been engaged in the production of market turkeys, and who produced not less than 65 percent of the market turkeys produced by producers voting in such referendum, and

(2) By not less than 51 percent by number of the producers voting in such referendum of each commodity specified in such marketing order who, during a representative period determined by the Secretary, have been engaged in the production of such commodity for market, and who produced not less than 65 percent by volume of such commodity produced by producers voting in such referendum, or by not less than 65 percent by number of the producers of each commodity specified in such marketing order voting in such referendum who, during a representative period determined by the Secretary, have been engaged in the production of such commodity for market and who produced not less than 51 percent by volume of such commodity produced by producers voting in such referendum.

AMENDMENT, SUSPENSION, AND TERMINATION OF ORDERS

(h) (1) The Secretary shall, whenever he finds that any marketing order issued under this section, or any provision thereof, obstructs, or does not tend to effectuate the declared policy of this act, terminate, or suspend the operation of such order, or such provision thereof.

(2) Upon the request of the marketing board the Secretary shall conduct a referendum to determine whether producers favor the amendment, suspension, or termination of a marketing order. The Secretary shall suspend or terminate the provisions of a marketing order relating to any commodity specified therein whenever he determines that the suspension or termination of such order is approved or favored by a majority of the producers of market turkeys voting in such referendum or of the producers of such commodity voting in such referendum who, during a representative period determined by the Secretary, have been engaged in the production of such turkeys or of such commodity, as the case may be: *Provided*, That such majority have, during such representative period, produced more than 50 percent of the volume of such turkeys or of such commodity, as the case may be, produced by the producers voting in such referendum.

(3) The termination or suspension of any order or amendment thereto or provision thereof, shall not be considered an order within the meaning of subsection (j) of this section.

(4) The provisions of this act applicable to marketing orders shall be applicable to amendments to orders.

ELIGIBILITY TO VOTE IN REFERENDUM

(i) At least 15 days prior to conducting any referendum under this act, the Secretary shall issue a public notice fixing a time and a place in each county where producers who, during a representative period determined by the Secretary, have been engaged in the production of market turkeys or of a commodity specified in a proposed marketing order, may register their names, addresses, and such other pertinent information as the Secretary may require. The Secretary may exclude any person who fails to so register or who is otherwise ineligible to vote from participating in the referendum.

PETITION AND REVIEW

(j) (1) Any person subject to any order may file a written petition with the Secretary, stating that any such order or any provision of any such order or any obligation imposed in connection therewith is not in accordance with law and praying for a modification thereof or to be exempted therefrom. He shall thereupon be given an opportunity for a hearing upon such petition, in accordance with regulations made by the Secretary. After such hearing, the Secretary shall make a ruling upon the prayer of such petition which shall be final, if in accordance with law.

(2) The district courts of the United States in any district in which such person is an inhabitant, or has his principal place of business, are hereby vested with jurisdiction in equity to review such ruling, provided a complaint for that purpose is filed within 20 days from the date of the entry of such ruling. Service of process in such proceedings may be had upon the Secretary by delivering to him a copy of the complaint. If the court determines that such ruling is not in accordance with law, it shall remand such proceedings to the Secretary with directions either (1) to make such ruling as the court shall determine to be in accordance with law, or (2) to take such further proceedings as, in its opinion, the law requires. The pendency of proceedings instituted pursuant to this subsection (j) shall not impede, hinder or delay the United States or the Secretary from obtaining relief pursuant to section 5 (b) of this act.

LIMITATION OF LIABILITY

(k) In exercising powers granted pursuant to this section the members of any marketing board and any agents or employees of any such board shall not be held liable individually in any way whatsoever for errors in judgment, mistakes, or other acts, either of commission or omission, except for their own acts of dishonesty or crime. No such person shall be held responsible for any act or omission of any other such persons.

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 5. (a) Any fee assessed pursuant to any marketing order issued hereunder shall be due and payable to the marketing board by the person liable therefor under the terms of the order. In the event of failure by any person so assessed to pay any such fee in accordance with the terms of the marketing order, the Secretary, upon request of the marketing board, may cause a suit to be instituted against such person in a court of competent jurisdiction for the collection thereof. Any funds so recovered shall be paid to the marketing board for carrying out the terms of the marketing order.

(b) Any person who willfully violates any provision of any marketing order duly issued by the Secretary hereunder or who fails or refuses to pay any fee duly required of him thereunder shall be liable civilly in an action brought in the name of the United States for an amount not exceeding $1,000 for each separate violation or failure or refusal to pay.

(c) The several district courts of the United States are vested with jurisdiction specifically to enforce, and to prevent and restrain any person from violating any order or regulation made or issued pursuant to this act.

(d) Upon request of the Secretary it shall be the duty of the several district attorneys of the United States in their respective districts, under the direction of the Attorney General, to institute proceedings to enforce the remedies and to collect the fees and civil penalties provided for in this section.

BOOKS AND RECORDS: DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION

SEC. 6. (a) All persons subject to a marketing order issued by the Secretary hereunder shall maintain books and records adequate to reflect their operations subject to the order and shall furnish to the Secretary, as may be called for from time to time by the Secretary reports covering such operations. For the purpose of ascertaining the correctness of any such reports or for the purpose of obtaining the necessary information in the event of failure to furnish the information requested, the Secretary is authorized to examine any such books and records relating to such operations.

(b) Any such information so obtained by the Secretary, his agents, or the marketing board concerned, shall be kept strictly confidential and only such information so furnished or acquired as the Secretary deems relevant shall be disclosed, and then only in a suit or administrative hearing brought at the direction, or upon the request, of the Secretary of Agriculture, or to which he or any officer of the United States is a party, and involving the marketing order with reference to which the information so to be disclosed was furnished or acquired. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prohibit (1) the issuance of general statements based upon the reports of a number of persons subject to an order, which statements do not identify the information furnished by any person, or (2) the publication by direction of the Secretary of the name of any person violating any order, together with a statement of the particular provisions of the marketing order violated by such person. Any such officer or employee violating the provisions of this section shall upon conviction be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or to both, and shall be removed from office.

REGULATIONS

SEC. 7. The Secretary shall promulgate such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 8. For the purposes of this act—

(a) The term "commerce" means interstate or foreign commerce and that commerce which affects, burdens, or obstructs interstate or foreign commerce in breeder hens, hatching eggs, poults, or market turkeys, or which affects, burdens or obstructs the supply or prices of such commodities in interstate or foreign commerce.

(b) The term "interstate or foreign commerce" means commerce between any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, and any place outside thereof; or between points within the same State or the District of Columbia, but through any place outside thereof; or within the District of Columbia.

(c) The term "marketing" means the offer for sale, sale, or transfer of ownership by any means of breeder hens, hatching eggs, poults, or market turkeys, or the delivery to another person of breeder hens for the production of hatching eggs, hatching eggs for hatching, poults for the production of breeder hens or market turkeys, or market turkeys for slaughter.

(d) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(e) The term "person" means any individual, partnership, corporation, association, or any other business unit.

(f) The term "turkey" means a live turkey of any species over 6 weeks old.

(g) The term "market turkey" means a live turkey over 6 weeks old produced or marketed for the production of turkey products.

(h) The term "breeder hen" means a live turkey hen kept for the production of eggs for hatching, or a live turkey hen 10 months old or older or any classification thereof as defined in the marketing order.

(i) The term "poult" means a young live turkey not over 6 weeks old.

(j) The term "hatching egg" means any egg produced by a breeder hen.

(k) The term "turkey products" means turkey which has been slaughtered for human food, any edible part of turkey, or any human food product consisting of any edible part of turkey separately or in combination with other ingredients.

(l) The term "marketing season" means a period of not more than 12 consecutive months established pursuant to a marketing order.

(m) The term "producer" means:

(1) In the case of breeder hens and hatching eggs, any person who owns more than 10 breeder hens for the production of hatching eggs for the production of poults or turkeys.

(2) In the case of poults, any person who produces or acquires more than 500 hatching eggs for the production of poults for the production of turkeys.

(3) In the case of market turkeys, any person who produces more than 250 turkeys for market.

(n) The term "person engaged in allied industries" means any person who is engaged in the manufacture or distribution of feed for poults or turkeys, the slaughtering or processing of turkeys for market, or the distribution of turkey products.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 9. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 10. This act shall take effect upon enactment.

The questions and answers presented by Mr. HUMPHREY are as follows:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ABOUT THE PROPOSED FEDERAL ENABLING ACT FOR THE TURKEY INDUSTRY

(The National Turkey Federation, after several years of careful study of the problems of the turkey industry, developed a proposed bill for a Federal enabling act for the turkey industry. The following questions and answers have been prepared to bring out the major facts about the bill and to avoid misunderstandings and misconceptions:)

Question. What is the proposed enabling act?

Answer. It is a proposed bill, which if introduced in and passed by both Houses of Congress and signed by the President, would be enacting a law that would enable turkey people to develop and vote on a marketing order designed to give stability to their industry.

Question. Why does the turkey industry need an enabling act?

Answer. It is an attempt to give direction to a farflung, loosely organized industry wherein producers are unable to act for their best interests in a businesslike and organized manner. Basically, the proposed act sets up an opportunity to develop a board of directors, give it the right to collect money equitable from producers and expend it to improve the turkey business.

Question. Would this enabling act as such put any restrictions on the turkey industry or put any programs into action?

Answer. No. The enabling act would place no restrictions on the turkey industry and, in itself, would put nothing into action. The enabling act would merely provide the machinery whereby turkey people would have an organized and Government-approved means of voting on programs they (turkey people) might want to put into action. The enabling act simply provides the means whereby turkey people could initiate marketing orders which would, after hearing and approval by the Secretary if voted upon favorably by a sufficient majority, put the program into action.

Question. Under the provisions of the enabling act, could the turkey industry vote upon a marketing order to provide for turkey price fixing?

Answer. No price fixing would be possible.

Question. Under the provisions of the enabling act, would it be possible for the members of the turkey industry to vote for turkey production controls with quota allotments governing the number of turkeys that could be raised by each grower?

Answer. No. Production control of this type is not possible under the provisions of the proposed enabling act.

Question. Why was the proposed enabling act written without provisions for production controls by means of allotments for individual growers?

Answer. A large majority of the members of the board of directors of the National Turkey Federation was opposed to including provisions for this type of production controls in the proposed enabling act sponsored by the NTF.

Question. Why do so many members of the board of directors of NTF oppose production controls by allotments to individual growers?

Answer. There are a number of reasons. Most of these directors indicate they are opposed to controls by allotments because they wish to retain freedom of enterprise in the turkey business. It is felt that a quota system would be so complicated and costly that successful administration would be very unlikely.

Question. Would the enabling act provide for controls by allotments of the number of breeders, eggs, or poults that could be produced by individual members of the turkey industry?

Answer. No controls by allotments would be possible under the provisions of the enabling act proposed by the NTF.

Question. Since the enabling act would not provide for production controls by allotments to producers, how could the program bring about stabilization in the turkey industry?

Answer. It is the objective of the industry leaders who proposed this program to provide for a method of raising funds, on an equitable basis from all turkey people, to be used in various ways to bring about as much stabilization as possible. Just what methods would be used for stabilization would depend on the terms of the marketing order voted on by producers and on the judgment of the governing body of elected turkey producers who would be responsible for administering the program. For example, if the number of breeder turkeys, or hatching eggs, or poults, or market turkeys appeared in excess of the market needs, purchases might be made to bring the supply more nearly in line.

Since the purchase of breeder hens in the early part of the season would appear to be the most effective means, this possible method of stabilization has been most widely discussed. It is emphasized, however, this is only one possible method of stabilization that has been discussed and there are many others. Another widely discussed possibility is that in seasons of unfavorable prices, provisions could be made for purchase and pooling of market turkeys to be held for marketing when prices might become more favorable.

Question. If the enabling act should be passed and marketing orders voted into action that eventually would make it possible for the governing body to arrange for the purchase of turkeys, what disposal would be made of such turkeys purchased?

Answer. There would be any number of possibilities. They could be held for a favorable time and put back on the market, canned for disposal when and if a favorable situation developed, sold into some channels whereby they would not be in the usual channels of the turkey market, exported to foreign markets, given or sold to the Government for use in the Federal school-lunch program or other programs, etc.

Question. What methods of fund raising are embodied in the enabling act which might be put into action by a marketing order?

Answer. Provisions are for raising funds from any 1 of 3 or possibly 4 sources. It is proposed that a given amount might be collected per breeder turkey, per hatching egg, per poult, or per market turkey, any 1 or all 4.

Question. Would the United States Government have any control over the type of marketing orders developed and their administration?

Answer. Yes. The Secretary of Agriculture would have what might be called veto power. All Government programs of this general type contain clauses providing such power whenever a proposal is not in the public interest. The Secretary could veto a proposed marketing order or the plan for administering it.

Question. Would the Government take an active part in administering marketing orders that are acceptable to the Secretary of Agriculture?

Answer. Many details of administration would have to be worked out according to the provisions of both the original enabling act and marketing orders that might be put into effect. However, it is the general plan that administration would largely be in the hands of a grower-elected board and that the Government would have only veto power and power to take action in the case of violations of the provisions of the enabling act and subsequent marketing orders.

Question. Could the board of directors of the National Turkey Federation be made the governing board for this program?

Answer. No. It is probable, however, that many NTF leaders might be nominated for this governing board by turkey people in the area where they reside.

Question. Could the National Turkey Federation and its affiliated State turkey organizations be designated as the administrative body for certain phases of the program?

Answer. It is anticipated this might be the case. However, this would be determined by the provisions of the marketing orders.

Question. How would the governing body be selected?

Answer. In its present form, the enabling act contemplates that producers would vote on the persons they wished to nominate to serve on this board. The Secretary of Agriculture would select the board from these nominations.

Question. Would allied industries such as feed manufacturers and distributors, turkey slaughterers and processors, and distributors of turkey products be represented on this governing body?

Answer. The provisions of the enabling act are, in effect, that only turkey producers have an active vote in making decisions. The act also provides that allied industry

representatives may serve on the board in an advisory capacity.

Question. If the enabling act is passed, how would the marketing order be initiated?

Answer. A representative group of leading turkey producers, probably under the leadership of the NTF would prepare a proposal for a marketing order and submit it for the consideration of the Secretary of Agriculture. If the Secretary considers the proposed marketing order to be within the provisions of the enabling act and it is in harmony with the policy of being in the best interests of the public he would schedule hearings on the proposal. If everything proves satisfactory, he will arrange to submit the marketing order for a referendum of turkey producers.

Question. How and where would this referendum be conducted?

Answer. This, of course, would be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. It is contemplated that this voting would be done at county level, in the same general manner as voting on other farm programs.

Question. Who would be eligible to vote on the referendum?

Answer. It would depend somewhat on the terms of the marketing order upon which the voting is to be done. Producers of 50 or more breeder turkeys, 500 or more hatching eggs, 250 or more market turkeys are specified by the enabling act as being eligible to vote.

Question. Who would be responsible for administering the funds provided by this program?

Answer. The appointed governing board of turkey producers as previously described.

Question. Could this governing board delegate the responsibility for administration of some of the funds to another agency—the National Turkey Federation for example?

Answer. The enabling act as presently drafted would permit the board to enter into agreements with trade organizations serving the turkey industry to carry out activities provided for in a marketing order.

Question. Does the enabling act have teeth in it to enforce compliance?

Answer. Yes. The enabling act provides for enforcement. Penalty for each separate violation may not exceed $1,000. Action to prosecute violation would be in civil court, not criminal.

Question. Does the enabling act give an individual producer any right to question any marketing order to which he may be subject?

Answer. Yes. The enabling act provides that any person subject to to an order is entitled to request a hearing to determine whether the order is in accordance with law.

Question. Is it planned that all funds raised by the program would be used for purchase of breeder turkeys, eggs, poults, or market turkeys as a means of stabilization of production or will some of the funds raised by the program would be used for consumption?

Answer. Promotion of greater turkey consumption is one of the objectives of the program. Just how much would be done along this line would be determined by the governing board and the Secretary of Agriculture. Turkey industry leaders believe that a program to increase consumption of turkey is very important from the standpoint of bringing about greater stabilization. However, it is a recognized fact that, with modern methods, production may be increased at certain times to such an extent the crop is greater than the market readily can absorb, with resulting unprofitable prices to producers. It is the hope of the leaders who sponsored the enabling act that a greater degree of stabilization could result through a very carefully instituted program of taking off surpluses of breeder hens, eggs, poults, or market turkeys.

Question. Is the objective of the program to make turkey production profitable for everyone in the business?

Answer. No. The majority of the leaders of the industry who planned the program would like to keep free enterprise in the turkey industry, yet have a means of bringing about a degree of stability that would prevent fluctuations of overproduction with unprofitable prices for everyone. It is not intended as a program to keep marginal producers in business in competition with more efficient producers.

Question. Have any definite plans been made for the amount of money that would be collected, under this program, per breeder turkey, egg, poult, or market turkey?

Answer. No. This would be specified in the marketing order. At least a minimum to maximum range of amounts would be specified in the order. The amount that would be collected per unit could be very little yet a large total amount realized. For example, only 2 cents per market turkey, based on 1957 production, would bring in more than $1½ million; 5 cents per market turkey in 1957, around $4 million; 50 cents per breeder hen in 1957, around $2 million.

Question. Is there a possibility these fees could be set high enough that this, in itself, might be a limiting factor in turkey production?

Answer. While, in theory, this might be possible, in actual practice it would be very improbable, if not impossible. It must be kept in mind that, before any program could be put into effect, it must pass some tough hurdles. Before a marketing order could be submitted to producers for a referendum, it would require the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture. Next, it would be submitted to turkey producers for a vote.

It would appear that producers would vote against any unreasonable proposal. The fees might serve as a deterrent or a discouraging factor but never as a control factor.

Question. Is it anticipated funds collected in the program might be accumulated over 2 or 3 reasonably good years in order to build a large enough amount to be effective in an off year?

Answer. Since this would be determined by the marketing order, and the judgment of the governing board and the Secretary of Agriculture, our answer is purely speculation. It would appear logical to follow this plan of allowing an accumulation of funds in order to be most effective when needed.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. THYE. My distinguished colleague from Minnesota and I were communicated with by the National Turkey Growers Association. I believe the two of us gave assurance to the association that we would study their proposal, and I believe that both of us, at different conferences with that association, agreed to introduce such a bill.

It is rather unusual, Mr. President, but both Senators from Minnesota are standing here with the same papers in hand. I know that is true, because of the color of the papers. The distinguished Senator on the other side of the aisle and I are both standing with pink papers, and apparently both of us have copies of the bill prepared by the National Turkey Growers Association. Both of us met the gentlemen in the corridor of the Capitol, in front of the elevator, and both of us assured the National Turkey Growers Association we would introduce such a bill. Both were standing to be recognized and my colleague from Minnesota was recognized first, so we are now in the unusual position of sparring to be the first to introduce the turkey marketing bill.

I say to my colleague, since he was recognized first, I wish to join as a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am delighted to have my colleague from Minnesota join with me.

Mr. THYE. The bill contains the recommendations of the National Turkey Growers Association. We hope that as a result of unified action on the part of myself and of my colleague from Minnesota the expressed hope and wish of the National Turkey Growers Association can be fulfilled and that the bill will be enacted into legislative authorization this year, so that the turkey growers will have a plan which will permit them to proceed under a self-help method to regulate and to seek to control the production of turkeys, thereby resulting in a more stable market.

I am happy to join with my colleague as a cosponsor of the measure.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am delighted to have my colleague join with me. I know this action will mean success for the measure.

Mr. THYE subsequently said: Mr. President, a few minutes ago I made a few remarks relative to the bill introduced by my colleague [Mr. HUMPHREY] proposing a nationwide turkey industry self-help plan. I had discussed the question with several of my colleagues after the National Turkey Producers Association had met with me and I had also conferred with members of my own State turkey producers organization.

For that reason I had prepared a statement, which I had intended to incorporate in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at the time of the introduction of the bill. However, my colleague introduced a similar bill, to which I have already alluded. For that reason I have asked that I may join as a cosponsor of the bill introduced by him.

I therefore call to the attention of the Senate that such a bill has been introduced, because several Senators from States which produce a great number of turkeys had expressed a desire to join as cosponsors of such a bill. I wish to call to their attention the fact that such a bill has now been introduced.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks, which I had intended to have inserted in the RECORD with my introductory remarks, be made a part of the RECORD at the conclusion of the introductory statement made by my colleague [Mr. HUMPHREY] and by me at the time the bill was introduced earlier today.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THYE

Together with others of my colleagues having a vital interest in the welfare of the Nation's turkey industry, I have joined in the introduction of a bill which would provide for a self-help program for the turkey industry. This proposal is in the nature of an enabling act which would allow the turkey growers of the Nation to set up a stabilization program for their industry. It would provide enabling legislation allowing the turkey people to develop and vote marketing

orders designed to give stability to their industry, through payment of grower-approved assessments to be expended to improve the marketing status of the turkey business.

This proposal has the endorsement of the National Turkey Federation, and in fact, is substantially the program of the turkey industry itself. The turkey people of our Nation have recognized the need for stabilizing the supply and demand situation in their industry which is emphasized by the fact that during the past 6 years the average price farmers have received for turkeys has fluctuated between a high of 37.1 cents per pound and a low of 22.6 cents per pound. I have prepared a tabulation of average prices received by farmers for turkeys during the years 1952 through April 1958.

(See table I.)

The production and marketing of turkeys has been taking on a continually increasing importance in our agricultural economy, and the stabilization of the turkey price situation would contribute greatly toward answering some of the many economic problems with which our Nation's farmers are confronted. It is amazing to note that since 1930 the production of turkeys in this country has increased from some 17 million birds to approximately 84 million birds produced in 1957. That, Mr. President, represents almost a five-fold increase in the last quarter century, and I might add that the increase year by year has been quite constant.

In the meantime, the turkey industry has recognized the problems which attend this increase in production and has conducted in the past years a very commendable eat more turkey campaign. The results of their promotion campaign have been remarkable, illustrated by the fact of an increase in per capita turkey consumption from 1.5 pounds in 1930 to 6 pounds per person in 1957. The industry is to be commended for the fine showing which has been made in this respect. There are appended tables showing the increase in turkey production and per capita consumption for the years 1930 through 1957.

(See table II.)

Now, what is the situation confronting the turkey producers today? Referring again to the table of average turkey prices to which I commented previously, we find there has been a rather constant decline in prices received by farmers for the turkeys they have marketed during the past 5 or 6 years. Except for the month of March this year, the average turkey prices reported by the Department of Agriculture have been consistently lower, month by month, this year than they were last year. The supply situation reported by the Department shows the amount of turkeys in storage as being greater this year than last year and considerably higher than the past 5-year average. In February of 1957, there were approximately 149,586,000 tons of turkeys in storage, and for the same month this year the amounted reported stood at 154,141,000 tons. These figures are considerably in excess of the 113,921,000 5-year average. The existence of this carryover in storage has a depressing effect on the market price, and although the number of turkey poults started this year for slaughter has been reduced by about 16 percent from early 1957, the Agricultural Marketing Service estimate is that final percentage cut from 1957 is not likely to be as sharp in the remainder of the season as it has been so far. It would seem, therefore, that we have not achieved a state of balance in the turkey market supply and demand situation which would result in a situation of stabilized prices.

At various times during past years, the Department of Agriculture has entered the turkey market and bought storage turkeys with section 32 funds for distribution to the school-lunch program and to relief programs. In fact, I investigated this possibility early in this session of the Congress because I was aware of the need for high-protein foods in the school-lunch program and turkey prices had dropped to new lows. At my request the Department studied the possibilities of initiating such a purchasing program and reported that it was not deemed advisable. Section 32 purchases of turkeys in past years have totaled approximately 74 million pounds and have had the effect of removing price-depressing surpluses from the market. A tabulation is appended showing section 32 purchases during certain months in past years.

(See table III.)

TABLE I.—*Average prices received by farmers for turkeys, by months, 1952–57*

Month	Turkeys (cents per pound)						
	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958
January	37.1	33.6	33.2	27.4	31.0	27.6	22.6
February	36.1	33.3	33.9	29.5	31.4	27.3	24.7
March	34.5	33.6	33.6	30.4	32.1	26.0	27.1
April	34.5	33.3	33.3	29.7	30.9	26.8	26.5
May	32.0	32.5	31.0	28.9	30.8	24.9	-----
June	32.3	31.7	31.3	29.4	29.8	23.4	-----
July	31.9	32.3	28.6	29.6	28.6	22.1	-----
August	32.6	32.7	27.8	29.5	28.7	22.6	-----
September	33.2	32.4	27.6	31.0	27.0	22.9	-----
October	32.9	33.3	27.0	31.2	25.8	22.3	-----
November	33.7	33.9	28.5	29.8	26.0	23.6	-----
December	34.6	34.5	29.6	30.5	27.7	24.8	-----
Weighted yearly average	33.6	33.6	28.8	30.2	27.2	-----	-----

TABLE II.—*Turkey production and per capita consumption for selected years, 1930–40 and 1945–57*

Year	Turkeys raised (millions)	Per capita consumption (pounds)
1930	17	1.5
1935	21	1.7
1940	34	2.9
1945	43	3.5
1946	40	3.7
1947	34	3.6
1948	32	3.1
1949	41	3.3
1950	44	4.1
1951	53	4.4
1952	62	4.7
1953	60	4.8
1954	68	5.3
1955	66	5.0
1956	77	5.1
1957	84	6.0

TABLE III.—*USDA sec. 32 purchases of turkeys and United States average prices received by farmers for turkeys during the periods of purchase with comparisons for the previous and following years, 1952–57*

Month and year or purchase	Volume purchased (thousand pounds RTC)	United States average prices received by farmers for turkeys (cents per pound)		
		During purchases	Previous year	Following year
September 1952	3,178	33.2	36.3	32.4
October 1952	10,082	32.9	35.8	33.3
November 1952	30,860	33.7	37.8	33.9
December 1952	2,479	34.6	39.6	34.5
January 1953	1,581	33.6	37.1	33.2
September 1956	360	26.7	31.0	22.9
October 1956	16,128	25.9	31.2	22.3
November 1956	10,626	25.9	29.8	23.6

I might point out here that the turkey industry has not always advocated Government purchasing programs. During hearings which were held before our Senate Agriculture Committee in December of 1954, it was pointed out that the preference of the industry was that they solve their own problems to the extent that it could be done by the individual producers. I remember Under Secretary Morse complimenting the industry at that time for its constructive attitude.

I suggest that the support given to this self-help program by the National Turkey Federation—and at this point I must include the Minnesota Turkey Growers Association—is further indication of the highly commendable constructive attitude that the turkey people are continuing to take with regard to their market problems. In supporting this program they are not asking for price supports or production quotas nor are they asking for a costly program to be administered at great cost to the taxpayer—they are simply asking for enabling legislation according which they may assume the obligation of attempting to stabilize their own industry.

In conclusion I wish to express the sincere hope that this program will be given speedy and careful consideration by our Senate Agriculture Committee during the course of hearings on general farm legislation which have been scheduled to begin next week, and that upon the recommendations of our committee, my colleagues in the Senate will see fit to support this request of our turkey producers.

DISTRIBUTION OF AUTOMOBILES IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relative to the distribution of automobiles in interstate commerce.

In serving the automobile-owning public, the enfranchised automobile dealer is required by his agreement with the manufacturer to maintain adequate facilities to perform the vital services necessary to the preparation of an automobile for sale, and to maintain it in usable and safe operating condition. This bill is designed to clear up the confusion in the law applicable to systems of compensation contemplated between automobile manufacturers and their dealers. It would also permit the manufacturer to make it economically possible for the dealer to perform this essential service in the public interest.

It is mandatory for dealers to maintain adequate stock of parts and factory-trained mechanics, and to purchase elaborate testing equipment required by the intricate modern automobile for maintenance purposes.

The law today is such that, while there are no specific legal prohibitions against the business arrangements contemplated under this bill, in the minds of some the basic philosophy of certain laws could be in conflict with such provisions. This bill, if enacted, would eliminate completely any doubts as to the legality of such arrangements.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be permitted to lie on the table for 5 days to enable other Senators, who may wish to do so, to join as cosponsors.

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

The bill (S. 3865) relative to the distribution of automobiles in interstate commerce, introduced by Mr. POTTER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR STATE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS TO TEACH SCHOOLCHILDREN ABOUT DANGERS TO HEALTH FROM CIGARETTES AND ALCOHOL

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent to proceed for not more than 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize Federal grants-in-aid to the States, for assistance in programs they may wish to follow to inform and educate children with respect to the harmful effects of tobacco and alcohol. This would be done through a program in the schools. The Federal funds would be available on a matching basis. It would be left to the individual States whether or not they take advantage of such grants.

As some of my colleagues know, I have been disturbed for some years over the constant torrent of skillful advertising which seeks to persuade young people to embark upon the cigarette and liquor habit. This advertising saturates many publications, billboards, and other mediums of communication. So far as tobacco is concerned, it dominates much of our radio and television programing.

Particularly with regard to cigarettes, this advertising seeks to make the habit attractive specifically to young people. Television films continually feature the use of cigarettes by famous male athletes or by the glamour girls of stage and screen. Most young people seek to imitate these celebrities. Is it any wonder that they take up smoking at an early age, when they frequently are told to associate this habit with the success of some great baseball star or motion-picture queen?

By contrast, the following statement of warning by the Surgeon General of the United States, Dr. Leroy E. Burney, receives comparatively scant distribution:

> Many independent studies thus have confirmed beyond reasonable doubt that there is a high degree of statistical association between lung cancer and heavy and prolonged cigarette smoking * * * While there are naturally differences of opinion in interpreting the data on lung cancer and cigarette smoking, the Public Health Service feels the weight of evidence is increasingly pointing in one direction—that excessive smoking is one of the causative factors in lung cancer.

What does this mean, Mr. President? It means that young Americans are constantly beseeched—by radio, television, signboards and printed advertisements—to commence upon a habit which the United States Public Health Service believes may lead eventually to the most dreadful disease which can befall large numbers of people in our modern state of medical knowledge.

Is this not a shocking situation? Does it not defy logic and rational consideration?

Nor can there be any valid doubt that the use of cigarettes is on the increase—drastically so. For example, at a time of recession and even depression for many of the greatest industries in the land, the American Tobacco Co. recently reported a 22-percent increase in earnings for this year over the first quarter of 1957. Yet the corporations producing automobiles, pots and pans, electrical appliances, and lumber for homes are far below their profits for last year. In other words, Americans are smoking more cigarettes but building fewer homes and buying fewer cars and refrigerators—not to mention our relative expenditures for schools or medical research. Is this a healthy or desirable situation?

Consider these comparable earnings reports for the first quarter of 1958, as related to the same period during 1957, and then note that American Tobacco has apparently fared more successfully from a financial standpoint than any other major corporation in the land:

[In millions]

	1957	1958	Change
			Percent
General Motors	$261.4	$184.6	−29
Standard Oil (N. J.)	237.0	167.0	−30
Socony Mobil	67.7	39.1	−42
United States Steel	115.5	62.4	−46
National Steel	13.5	3.8	−72
Inland Steel	14.6	8.0	−45
American Can	7.5	7.1	−5
Olin Mathieson	10.0	4.5	−55
Westinghouse	14.2	12.9	−9
American Tobacco	10.2	12.4	+22
Procter & Gamble	51.5	56.3	+9
Weyerhaeuser Timber Co	12.5	10.8	−13.7
Crown Zellerbach Corp	9.5	7.4	−22.1

Ironically enough, the prosperous first quarter of 1958 for American tobacco was announced on the same day that the April bulletin of the American Cancer Society disclosed that most scientists closest to the total evidence now agree that cigarette smoking is a highly significant cause in the majority of cases of lung cancer.

Now, Mr. President, what do we of the Congress do about this? Do we sit by idly and complacently—and indifferently—while millions of youthful Americans are induced daily to begin a habit which the American Cancer Society and the Surgeon General regard with such grim foreboding?

We are not going to outlaw cigarettes, despite their peril to health. We are not going to ban the advertising of cigarettes, and, thus far, efforts to bring about policing of that advertising have been glaringly unsuccessful as far as preventing its deliberate appeal at youth is concerned. What, then, are we going to do?

I propose to try to use the schools of the Nation to arm American boys and girls with the facts about tobacco and alcohol, so at least they have the knowledge and the information to resist the blandishments poured at them daily in behalf of the cigarettes and liquor habits. We owe at least that much to the health, tranquility, and happiness of the next generation of Americans.

With respect to the inclusion of alcohol education in my bill, I desire to point out that my State of Oregon for many years has dedicated a portion of its income from liquor sales to education in the field of temperance. Oregon has a State liquor monopoly which was established in 1933. Liquor can be sold only through State-owned retail outlets. In the original authorizing act it was provided that some of these revenues should be dedicated to providing information and education which would encourage temperance.

Today, liquor is advertised practically as widely as cigarettes. When I was active in opposing signboards on our new interstate highways, I learned that many of the leading outdoor advertisers were distilleries. This means that young people are continually urged not only to start smoking cigarettes but also to commence drinking liquor. The billions of dollars invested in advertising are spent by very shrewd individuals with sensitive pocket nerves. They seek to make both smoking and drinking as attractive as possible, not primarily to mature people who either do or do not smoke or drink, but more significantly to the next generation of American consumers, to the people who will be spending the country's wealth and income during the years directly ahead.

That is why I believe our boys and girls of America should be armed with the basic medical, psychological and clinical facts to resist—at least to some degree—these clever appeals. Alcoholism is distressingly widespread in our country, where it undoubtedly has contributed to the breaking up of many homes and families. Furthermore, drunken driving is a sad factor in our 38,000 highway deaths and countless highway injuries every year. Certainly, the Federal Treasury can assist in some degree in aiding any State which wants to provide education in its schools concerning these and other salient facts pertaining both to use of tobacco and alcohol.

Mr. President, the Federal excise taxes alone that are collected on tobacco come to over four billion dollars—$4,647,245,000 in fiscal 1957. These collections actually increased between 1956 and 1957, while many other types of expenditures by the American public were beginning to slide into the present recession. That is one measure of the hold which the habits of smoking and drinking maintain over scores of millions of Americans, irrespective of the ups and downs of their economic fortunes or the financial resources that they may have for other, more constructive purchases for themselves and their families.

It is also a measure of the tax sums which the Federal Government, in all good conscience, has available, from which to help States finance effective programs of education among boys and girls about liquor and cigarettes. As I have described is the case with Oregon's liquor monopoly, can the United States not afford to devote to this good cause a small fraction of the vast revenues it collects from these unhealthy habits?

Mr. President, the bill I propose is so brief and simple that it speaks for itself. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, for the analysis of those who may be interested in this proposal.

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

Be it enacted, etc.—

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SECTION 1. The purpose of this act is to aid the States, through the making of Federal grants on a matching basis, in informing and educating children in the harmful effects of tobacco, alcohol, and other potentially deleterious consumables.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this act—

(a) the term "State" means one of the 48 States, Alaska, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands;

(b) the term "State agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of elementary and secondary schools, or if there is no such agency or officer any statewide educational agency within the State designated by or under State law, or in the absence thereof by the governor, to be the single State educational agency responsible for developing and submitting a State plan under the provisions of this act; and

(c) the term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

STATE APPLICATIONS

SEC. 3. The Commissioner shall approve any application for funds for carrying out the purpose of this act if such application—

(a) designates the State agency for carrying out such purpose;

(b) provides a plan in accordance with the provisions of this act and in such detail as the Commissioner may require, for carrying out such purpose; and

(c) provides that such State agency will make such reports and in such form, and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require.

STATE PLANS

SEC. 4. A State plan for carrying out the purpose of this act shall set forth, in such detail as the Commissioner may by regulations prescribe—

(a) the number of schoolchildren in the State who it is proposed will be benefited by the provisions of this act;

(b) the types of potentially deleterious consumables, in addition to tobacco and alcohol, with respect to which it is proposed that such children will be educated and informed;

(c) the amount of time it is proposed will be devoted to informing and educating such children with respect to such potentially deleterious consumables;

(d) an estimate of the cost which will be incurred by the State in providing such information and education; and

(e) a description of the instruction techniques proposed to be employed in imparting such education and information.

APPROVAL OF STATE PLANS

SEC. 5. (a) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan which (1) fulfills the conditions specified in section 4 and (2) is otherwise effectively designed to carry out the purpose of this act.

(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency, finds that—

(1) the State plan submitted by such agency and approved under subsection (a) of this section has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 4, or no longer is effectively designed to carry out the purpose of this act; or

(2) in the administration of such plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision or carry out such purpose;

the Commissioner shall withhold further payments under the provisions of this act to the State, until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply, or, if compliance is impossible, until the State repays or arranges for the repayment of any Federal money which has been diverted or improperly expended.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 6. The Commissioner shall pay to each State, out of any money appropriated for the purpose of this act and in such amounts at such time or times during each year as he shall determine, one-half of the costs incurred by such State under a plan approved under the provisions of this act.

APPROPRIATION

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to draw attention to the extremely informative and persuasive material on the subject of the relation between the cigarette habit and lung cancer which has been collected in the most recent issue of CA—the Bulletin of Cancer Progress, published by the American Cancer Society, Inc., in March 1958. The cover of this issue shows one of the posters which are being distributed in England as a means of acquainting the English people with the cancer danger from cigarettes. The text of this particular poster reprints the warning of the medical officer of health, as follows:

It is my duty to warn all cigarette smokers that there is now conclusive evidence that they are running a greater risk of contracting cancer than nonsmokers. The risk mounts with the number of cigarettes smoked. Giving up smoking reduces the risk.

Unfortunately, I cannot reasonably insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD all of the informative material in this issue of the Bulletin of Cancer Progress. I ask unanimous consent, however, to include at the end of my remarks the statement of Surg. Gen. Leroy E. Burney, Chief of the United States Public Health Service, on July 12, 1957; an abstract of an article by E. C. Hammond and D. Horn entitled "Lung Cancer Death Rates in Relation to Smoking"; the conclusions of a report of study group on smoking and health: section on lung cancer; and the statement of the British Medical Research Council on this subject.

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

LUNG CANCER AND EXCESSIVE CIGARETTE SMOKING

(Statement by Surg. Gen. Leroy E. Burney, of the Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, July 12, 1957)

The Public Health Service is, of course, concerned with broad factors which substantially affect the health of the American people. The Service also has a responsibility to bring health facts to the attention of the health professions and the public.

In June 1956, units of the Public Health Service joined with 2 private voluntary health organizations to establish a scientific study group to appraise the available data on smoking and health. We have now reviewed the report of this study group and other recent data, including the report of Dr. E. C. Hammond and Dr. Daniel Horn on June 4 to the American Medical Association in New York.

In the light of these studies, it is clear that there is an increasing and consistent body of evidence that excessive cigarette smoking is one of the causative factors in lung cancer.

The study group, appraising 18 independent studies, reported that lung cancer occurs much more frequently among cigarette smokers than among nonsmokers, and there is a direct relationship between the incidence of lung cancer and the amount smoked. This finding was reinforced by the more recent report to the AMA by Drs. Hammond and Horn.

Many independent studies thus have confirmed beyond reasonable doubt that there is a high degree of statistical association between lung cancer and heavy and prolonged cigarette smoking.

Such evidence, of course, is largely epidemiological in nature. It should be noted, however, that many important public health advances in the past have been developed upon the basis of statistical or epidemiological information. The study group also reported that in laboratory studies on animals at least five independent investigators have produced malignancies by tobacco smoke condensates. It also reported that biological changes similar to those which take place in the genesis of cancer have been observed in the lungs of heavy smokers. Thus, some laboratory and biological data provide contributory evidence to support the concept that excessive smoking is one of the causative factors in the increasing incidence of lung cancer.

At the same time, it is clear that heavy and prolonged cigarette smoking is not the only cause of lung cancer. Lung cancer occurs among nonsmokers, and the incidence of lung cancer among various population groups does not always coincide with the amount of cigarette smoking.

The precise nature of the factors in heavy and prolonged cigarette smoking which can cause lung cancer is not known. The Public Health Service supports the recommendation of the study group that more research is needed to identify, isolate and try to eliminate the factors in excessive cigarette smoking which can cause cancer.

The Service also supports the recommendation that more research is needed into the role of air pollution and other factors which may also be causes of lung cancer in man.

To help disseminate the facts, the Public Health Service is sending copies of this statement, the study group report and the report of Drs. Hammond and Horn to State health officers and to the American Medical Association with the request that they consider distributing copies to local health officers, medical societies and other health groups.

While there are naturally differences of opinion in interpreting the data on lung cancer and cigarette smoking, the Public Health Service feels the weight of the evidence is increasingly pointing in one direction: that excessive smoking is one of the causative factors in lung cancer.

LUNG CANCER DEATH RATES IN RELATION TO SMOKING[1]

With the assistance of over 20,000 volunteer workers of the American Cancer Society, information was obtained on the smoking habits of 187,783 white men, aged 50 to 69, who were then followed for 44 months. A

[1] Abstracted from Hammond, E. C., and Horn, D.: Smoking in relation to death rates, J. A. M. A. In press. Read at the 106th annual meeting of the American Medical Association, New York City, June 4, 1957.

high degree of association was found between total death rates and cigarette smoking; a far lower degree of association between total death rates and cigar smoking; and a small degree of association between total death rates and pipe smoking.

There being a considerable relationship between cigarette smoking and total death rates, the next step was to determine which diseases were involved. The available source of information was cause of death as recorded on death certificates supplemented by more detailed medical information where cancer was mentioned.

An analysis of the data showed the following relationships with cigarette smoking: (1) an extremely high association for a few diseases such as cancer of the lung, cancer of the larynx, cancer of the esophagus, and gastric ulcer; (2) a very high association for a few diseases such as pneumonia and influenza, duodenal ulcer, aortic aneurysm, and cancer of the bladder; (3) a high association for a number of diseases such as coronary artery disease, cirrhosis of the liver, and cancer of several sites; (4) a moderate association for cerebral vascular lesions; (5) little or no association between cigarette smoking and a number of diseases including: chronic rheumatic fever, hypertensive heart disease, other hypertensive diseases, nephritis and nephrosis, diabetes, leukemia, cancer of the rectum, cancer of the colon, and cancer of the brain; (6) a lower death rate among men who had given up cigarette smoking for a year or more before being enrolled in the study than among those who were smoking cigarettes regularly at that time.

The findings in relation to lung cancer may be summarized as follows:

Of a total of 11,870 deaths reported, 448 were attributed to lung cancer. These showed a high degree of association with cigarette smoking. Of these 448 deaths, 32 were from adenocarcinoma and 295 cases were microscopically proved with good evidence of being primary bronchogenic carcinoma. For this group of 295 well-established cases the association with smoking habits was even more pronounced than for the total group. * * *

The death rate (well-established cases) goes up sharply with the amount of cigarette smoking for men with histories of regular smoking of cigarettes only. The age-standardized death rate for the men with this diagnosis, smoking 2 or more packs a day, was 217.3 per 100,000 per year. In contrast, the age-standardized death rate from microscopically proved cancer of all sites combined was only 177.4 per 100,000 per year for men who never smoked. The death rate from bronchogenic carcinoma alone among two-pack-a-day cigarette smokers was higher than the total cancer death rate of men who never smoked.

Men currently smoking 1 pack or more of cigarettes a day in 1952 had a death rate from well-established lung cancer of 157.1 per 100,000 per year. Those who previously smoked at this level but had stopped smoking for from 1 to 10 years had a rate of 77.6, and those who had stopped for 10 years or longer had a rate of only 60.5.

The death rate from well-established lung cancer exclusive of adenocarcinoma was found to be higher in cities than in the country. The age-standardized death rate was 34 per 100,000 in rural areas and 56 in cities of over 50,000 population—39 percent lower in the rural areas. Cigarette smoking is more common in cities than in the country. Standardized for smoking habits as well as for age, the rate was 39 in rural areas and 52 in cities of more than 50,000 population—still a 25-percent difference. This difference may be caused by some etiological factor associated with city life, or to better case finding and diagnosis in the cities. However, the lung cancer death rate was low among men who never smoked cigarettes regularly and high among cigarette smokers in large cities, small cities, suburbs, towns, and rural areas. Whatever the urban factor may be, its effect on lung cancer death rates is small compared with the effects of cigarettes.

HEALTH—SECTION ON LUNG CANCER

The study group on smoking and health was organized in June 1956, at the suggestion of the American Cancer Society. The American Heart Association, the National Cancer Institute, and the National Heart Institute, to review the problem of the effects of tobacco smoking on health and to recommend further needed research to the sponsoring organizations.

The study group has held six 2-day conferences, has examined the pertinent literature and more recent unpublished reports, and has consulted with scientists representing specialized areas of research concerned with the subject.

The study group, cognizant of the implications of its conclusions and recommendations, now submits the following joint report. * * *

CONCLUSIONS

The study group concludes that the smoking of tobacco, particularly in the form of cigarettes, is an important health hazard. The implications of this statement are clear in terms of the need for thorough consideration of appropriate control measures on the part of the official and voluntary agencies that are concerned with the health of the people. The lack of specific recommendations in this regard reflects no lack of interest. Rather, it reflects the desire of the study group to limit its recommendations to the area of research needs in accordance with the instructions it received. The study group recommends that further research on smoking and health be vigorously pursued. The recommendations made in the section on lung cancer are for research into means of coping with lung-cancer hazard, which has been established for cigarette smoking. The study group on smoking and health approves dissemination of this report as desired by the sponsoring agencies and hereby terminates its activities.

TOBACCO SMOKING AND CANCER OF THE LUNG

(Statement of the (British) Medical Research Council)

THE INCREASE IN LUNG CANCER

In their annual report for 1948–50 the Council drew attention to the very great increase that had taken place in the death rate from lung cancer over the previous 25 years. Since that time the death rate has continued to rise, and, in 1955 it reached a level more than double that recorded only 10 years earlier (388 deaths per million of the population in 1955 compared with 188 in 1945). Among males the disease is now responsible for approximately 1 in 18 of all deaths. Although the death rate for females is still comparatively low, it also has shown a considerable increase in recent years and the disease is now responsible for 1 in 103 of all female deaths.

Three comments may be made on these figures. In the first place, the trend over the last few years indicates that the incidence has not yet reached its peak. Secondly, the figures are not to be explained as a mere reflection of the introduction and increasing use of improved methods of diagnosis but must be accepted as representing, in the main, a real rise in the incidence of the disease, to an extent which has occurred with no other form of cancer. Thirdly, only a small part of the rise can be attributed to the large numbers of older persons now living in the population; in the last 10 years the lung-cancer death rates among both men and women have risen at all ages from early middle life onward.

POSSIBLE CAUSES OF THE INCREASE

The extent and rapidity of the increase in lung cancer point clearly to some potent environmental influence which has become prevalent in the past half-century and to which different countries, and presumably also men as compared with women, have been unequally exposed. The pattern of incidence of the disease rules out any possibility that the increase can be due, in a substantial degree, to special conditions, such as occupational hazards, affecting only limited groups. It is necessary to seek some factor or factors distributed generally throughout the population, and in considering the possibilities it must be borne in mind that a very long period, 20 years or more, may elapse between exposure to a carcinogenic agent and the production of a tumor. From the nature of the disease attention has focused on two main environmental factors: (1) the smoking of tobacco, and (2) atmospheric pollution—whether from homes, factories, or the internal combustion engine.

SMOKING AS A CAUSE OF LUNG CANCER

Epidemiological surveys: The evidence that heavy and prolonged smoking of tobacco, particularly in the form of cigarettes, is associated with an increased risk of lung cancer is not based on the observation that the substantial increase in the national mortality followed an increase in the national consumption of cigarettes. It is derived from two types of special inquiry. In the first, the patients with lung cancer have been interviewed and their previous histories in relation to smoking and other factors that might be relevant have been compared with those similarly obtained from patients without lung cancer. The results of 19 such inquiries (in this country, the United States of America, Finland, Germany, Holland, Norway, and Switzerland) have been published. They agree in showing more smokers and fewer nonsmokers among the patients with lung cancer, and a steadily rising mortality as the amount of smoking increases. In the second type of inquiry, information has been obtained about the smoking habits of each member of a defined group in the population and the causes of the deaths occurring subsequently in the group have been ascertained. There have been 2 such investigations, 1 in the United States of America covering 190,000 men aged 50 to 69, and the other in this country covering over 40,000 men and women whose names appeared on the Medical Register of 1951. In both, the results have been essentially the same. The investigation in this country, which has now been in progress for more than 5 years, has shown with regard to lung cancer in men:

(1) A higher mortality in smokers than in nonsmokers.

(2) A higher mortality in heavy smokers than in light smokers.

(3) A higher mortality in cigarette smokers than in pipe smokers.

(4) A higher mortality in those who continued to smoke than in those who gave it up.

It follows that the highest mortalities were found among men who were continuing to smoke cigarettes, heavy smokers in this group having a death rate nearly 40 times the rate among nonsmokers. Although no precise calculation can be made of the proportion of lifelong heavy cigarette smokers who will die of lung cancer, the evidence suggests that, at current death rates, it is likely to be of the order of 1 in 8, whereas the corresponding figure for nonsmokers would be of the order of 1 in 300. The observation on the effect of giving up smoking is particularly important, since it indicates that men who cease to smoke, even in their early forties, may

reduce their likelihood of developing the disease by at least one-half.

It should be noted that the excess of deaths from lung cancer among smokers was not compensated for by any corresponding reduction in the number of deaths from cancer of other sites in the body; in other words, there was a total incidence of cancer in the smoking groups in excess of the incidence that would have prevailed in the absence of smoking.

It will be apparent from what has been said that the evidence from the many inquiries in the past 8 years, both in this country and abroad, has been uniformly in one direction and is now very considerable. It has been further strengthened recently by the observation from several sources that the extent of the relationship with smoking differs for different types of lung tumor which can be distinguished only by microscopic examination.

Laboratory evidence: From the physical and chemical point of view there is nothing inherently improbable in a connection between smoking and lung cancer. Tobacco smoke consists largely of microscopic oily droplets held in suspension in air, and these droplets are of a suitable size to be taken into the lungs and retained there. Over a hundred constituents have so far been identified and, among these, five substances have already been found which are known to be capable, in certain circumstances, of causing cancer in animals. Some workers have succeeded in producing tumors in animals by painting concentrated extracts of tobacco tar on the skin. Known carcinogens are present in tobacco smoke in very small amounts however, and there is no certainty that such low concentrations could be harmful to human beings. Nevertheless, the finding of carcinogenic agents in tobacco smoke is an important step forward, in that it provides a rational basis for the hypothesis of causation.

ATMOSPHERIC POLLUTION AS A CAUSE OF LUNG CANCER

It has been known for some years that mortality from lung cancer is greater in urban areas than in the countryside. This fact, together with the identification of carcinogenic substances in coal smoke and in motor-vehicle exhausts, has led to the supposition that exposure to atmospheric pollution may be concerned with the increase in lung cancer. The role of atmospheric pollution is particularly difficult to investigate, however, and the evidence is neither so consistent nor so extensive as that relating to tobacco smoking. On the one hand no excess mortality from lung cancer has been observed in persons who would be especially exposed by the nature of their work to atmospheric pollution—for example, transport workers, garage hands, and policemen. On the other hand, the results of a number of investigations have suggested that a relationship does exist between atmospheric pollution and lung cancer. Perhaps the best evidence for this relationship comes from studies of the small number of deaths from the disease among nonsmokers in different types of residential district; in these studies higher death rates have been observed among nonsmokers in large towns than among those in rural areas. On balance it seems likely that atmospheric pollution plays some part in causing the disease, but a relatively minor one in comparison with cigarette smoking.

ASSESSMENT OF THE EVIDENCE RELATING TO SMOKING AND LUNG CANCER

Knowledge of the causation of lung cancer is still incomplete. Many factors other than tobacco smoking are undoubtedly capable of producing the disease; for example, at least five industrial causes have been recognized. Nevertheless, the evidence for an association between lung cancer and tobacco smoking has been steadily mounting throughout the past 8 years and it is significant that, during the whole of this period, the most critical examination has failed to invalidate the main conclusions drawn from it. It has indeed been suggested that the fundamental cause may be some common factor underlying both the tendency to tobacco smoking and to the development of lung cancer some 25 to 50 years later, but no evidence has been produced in support of this hypothesis.

In scientific work, as in the practical affairs of everyday life, conclusions have often to be founded on the most reasonable and probable explanation of the observed facts and, so far, no adequate explanation for the large increase in the incidence of lung cancer has been advanced save that cigarette smoking is indeed the principal factor in the causation of the disease. The epidemiological evidence is now extensive and very detailed, and it follows a classical pattern upon which many advances in preventive medicine have been made in the past. It is clearly impossible to add to the evidence by means of an experiment in man. The council is, however, supporting a substantial amount of laboratory research which may throw more light on the mechanism by which tobacco smoke and other suspected causative factors exert their effect, and which may thus eventually add to the degree of proof already attained as a result of studies of human populations. It must be emphasized, however, that negative results from work with animals cannot invalidate conclusions drawn from observations on man.

CONCLUSIONS

1. A very great increase has occurred during the past 25 years in the death rate from lung cancer in Great Britain and other countries.

2. A relatively small number of the total cases can be attributed to specific industrial hazards.

3. A proportion of cases, the exact extent of which cannot yet be defined, may be due to atmospheric pollution.

4. Evidence from many investigations in different countries indicates that a major part of the increase is associated with tobacco smoking, particularly in the form of cigarettes. In the opinion of the council, the most reasonable interpretation of this evidence is that the relationship is one of direct cause and effect.

5. The identification of several carcinogenic substances in tobacco smoke provides a rational basis for such a causal relationship.

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

The bill (S. 3867) to provide grants to the States to assist them in informing and educating children in schools with respect to the harmful effects of tobacco, alcohol, and other potentially deleterious consumables, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EXTENSION OF AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS FOR EMERGENCY CONSERVATION MEASURES TO JUNE 30, 1960

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to extend the availability of certain appropriations for emergency conservation measures to June 30, 1960.

Specifically, this bill extends the time limits for utilization of emergency conservation funds under Public Law 85-58 and Public Law 85-170. It will then make available beyond June 30, 1958, funds for disaster areas stricken by recent spring floods. In my own State of New Mexico, some $60,000 of dike damage was suffered along the Gila River in Grant County. This had already been designated a drought disaster area in July 1957. The Secretary of Agriculture has now designated the Gila River as a flood disaster area. Unless the emergency fund date be extended, this area and similar areas over the Nation will be deprived of reconstruction and subsequent and anticipated floods will inflict irreparable damage. I hope my colleagues in the Senate will give this bill their quick and favorable action.

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

The bill (S. 3869) to extend the availability of certain appropriations for emergency conservation measures to June 30, 1960, introduced by Mr. CHAVEZ, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES ACT OF 1946, RELATING TO PAYMENT OF CERTAIN TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION COSTS

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation cost for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the continental United States and Alaska and for other purposes.

This bill was submitted to the Congress by the Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission as a part of the administration's program for 1958.

The bill is being introduced pursuant to a request from the Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission addressed to the President of the Senate on February 24, 1958. I ask that a copy of the letter of transmittal be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 3872) to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation cost for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the continental United States and Alaska and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MCCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. MCCLELLAN is as follows:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., February 24, 1958.

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

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are submitting for the consideration of the Congress proposed legislation that would authorize the payment of travel and moving expenses

for certain new employees of the Federal Government and would also provide for the payment of an applicant's travel costs to a Federal laboratory or installation under certain conditions as a means of encouraging employment. There are enclosed: (1) a draft bill; (2) a section analysis of the proposed bill; and (3) a statement of purpose and justification.

The proposed bill will significantly improve the ability of the Federal Government to attract able scientists and engineers and other personnel in short supply whose skills are essential to the national security effort and to the proper functioning of the executive departments. If enacted, this legislation would place Government laboratories seeking scientists and engineers on a more equal footing with private industry, which for some time has been paying travel and moving expenses for its new employees and travel expenses for applicants to visit plants as an aid in recruitment. It will also assist Federal departments in securing needed personnel in other shortage occupation. Legislation of this kind is vital to the effective continuation of Federal research and development activities and to other important activities of Federal departments and agencies.

A bill similar to the present proposal was introduced in the 84th Congress and was passed with amendments by the House of Representatives. The bill now proposed incorporates the amendments made by the House of Representatives and is identical to that which was passed by that body in the last Congress.

Because of the great urgency of the situation regarding the shortage of scientific and engineering personnel in the Government service, the Civil Service Commission strongly urges the early and sympathetic consideration of this proposed bill by the Congress.

The Bureau of the Budget advises there would be no objection to the submission of this draft bill to Congress.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

HARRIS ELLSWORTH,
Chairman.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO INTERCHANGE OF INSPECTION SERVICES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act to authorize the interchange of inspection services between executive agencies and the furnishing of such services by one executive agency to another without reimbursement or transfer of funds.

This bill is being introduced at the request of the Administrator of General Services. Its objective is to eliminate the requirement for monetary reimbursement for inspection services rendered by one executive agency to another, and to authorize administrative procedures whereby one executive agency may exchange its inspection services with those of other agencies on a reimbursement in kind basis, and, under certain conditions, waive reimbursement for such services furnished to another agency. According to the letter submitted to the Congress by the Administrator of General Services, enactment of the proposed legislation will promote economy and efficiency in the vast procurement work of the Government by dispensing with present extensive billing, cross-billing, and reimbursement procedures attendant upon agencies furnishing their inspection services to other agencies.

I request that the letter addressed to the President of the Senate under date of April 9, 1958, by the Administrator of General Services transmitting a draft of this proposed legislation and explanation thereof, be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 3873) to amend section 201 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the interchange of inspection services between executive agencies, and the furnishing of such services by one executive agency to another, without reimbursement or transfer of funds, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 9, 1958.

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

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed for your consideration a draft of a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the interchange of inspection services between executive agencies, and the furnishing of such services by one executive agency to another, without reimbursement or transfer of funds.

The purpose of this legislative proposal is to eliminate the requirement for monetary reimbursement for inspection services rendered by one executive agency to another, and to authorize administrative procedures whereby one executive agency may exchange its inspection services with those of other agencies on a reimbursement-in-kind basis, and, under certain conditions, waive reimbursement for such services furnished to another agency. Enactment of the proposed bill will promote economy and efficiency in the vast procurement work of the Government by dispensing with the present extensive billing, cross-billing, and reimbursement procedures attendant upon agencies furnishing their inspection services to other agencies.

Where executive agency A, by reason of the large amount of its procurement from a particular supplier's plant, maintains inspectors there or has them readily available from a nearby office of the agency, it is only good business practice for agency B, when it procures from that plant, to utilize the already available inspection services of agency A, rather than to furnish additional inspectors of its own.

Thus, many military inspection activities maintain resident inspectors, and also make inspection service available on an itinerant basis by groups of military material inspectors stationed in the area, in plants where GSA contracts are being placed. This work is performed for GSA and other agencies on a reimbursable or transfer-of-funds basis, with attendant cross-billing involving heavy administrative costs. Conversely, over half of GSA's purchases are for delivery to military activities, and GSA (in some instances by the use of its own inspectors ragularly stationed in plants) performs the inspection for the items delivered to the military. The cross-billing by one agency to another for the inspection services rendered by the former agency leads into a maze of administrative and fiscal accounting costs, the elimination of which is sought by the proposal embodied in the enclosed bill. The overall interests of the Government will best be served by the interchange of inspection services with a minimum of accountability and exchange of funds.

Section 201. (a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 imposes the responsibility on the Administrator of General Services, in respect of executive agencies, and to the extent that he determines that so doing is advantageous to the Government in terms of economy, efficiency, or service, and with due regard to the program activities of the agencies concerned, to prescribe policies and methods of procurement and supply of personal property and nonpersonal services, including, among others, the related function of inspection. However, as regards the furnishing of inspection services by one executive agency to another, without reimbursement or transfer of funds, we encounter section 3678 of the Revised States (31 U. S. C. 628), which reads as follows:

"Except as otherwise provided by law, sums appropriated for the various branches of expenditure in the public service shall be applied solely to the objects for which they are respectively made, and for no others."

The Department of Defense has taken the view that expenditures of appropriated funds are permissible only for those purposes for which the appropriations were made, and that legislative action therefore appears necessary for the exchange of inspection services between GSA and the Department of Defense when reimbursement funds are not provided in the arrangement between them. Under this view, the Department of Defense, for example, having inspectors regularly stationed at a certain manufacturing plant supplying the Department, cannot make their services available to GSA for inspection of supplies which that plant may furnish to GSA unless the Department is reimbursed by GSA for the value of the inspection work done by the Department for GSA. The consequent burden of cross billing and paperwork should, from the point of efficient business procedure, be removed.

The proposed bill, by the addition of a new subsection (d) to section 201 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, would alleviate this situation. Should the measure be enacted, the Administrator of General Services, utilizing his authority under section 201 (a) of the act with respect to inspection, and his authority under section 205 (c) of the act to prescribe regulations necessary to effectuate his functions under the act, would be in a position to provide by regulation that, with the consent of the agencies concerned:

(1) agencies may exchange inspection and testing services in the interest of overall economy on a reimbursement in kind basis, without cross-billing or monetary reimbursement;

(2) when inspection and testing services performed by one agency for another result in time or other expenditure aggregating less than a limited dollar amount (for example, $100) on a single contract or order, no charge need be made for the services; and

(3) agencies may perform inspection and testing services of any value without reimbursement where resident or itinerant services are immediately available in a manufacturing plant or nearby, and where personnel increases are not necessitated by the additional work.

Any such regulations issued by the Administrator would not, of course, affect the authority of agencies to make and receive reimbursement for inspection and testing services in appropriate cases, such as those where the volume of inspecting work is ex-

tensive, or would require the inspecting agency to augment its staff.

The proposal embodied in the enclosed bill finds a precedent in a comparatively recent enactment applicable only to the departments and organizations within the Department of Defense, which we are informed has proven itself in operation to be both businesslike and economical. Section 621 of the National Military Establishment Appropriation Act, 1950 (63 Stat. 987, 1020, now codified in 10 U. S. C. 2571), includes the provision that, if its head approves, a department or organization within the Department of Defense may, upon request, perform work and services for, or furnish supplies to any other of those departments or organizations without reimbursement or transfer of funds. The administrative implementation of this statutory authority (Department of Defense Directive No. 7230.1 of May 19, 1953) recognized that the processing of numerous small dollar value vouchers for reimbursement for interagency transactions results in unnecessary expense and uneconomical use of manpower, and required that (subject to certain exceptions) each military department shall therefore waive collection of reimbursements for interagency and intra-agency transactions where the amount involved is less than $100.

We are informed that surveys conducted by the Army and the Navy some time ago indicated that the cost of originating and processing cross billing on a Standard Form 1080 (Voucher for Transfers between Appropriations and/or Funds) in a single instance ranged from $50 to $100. During the past few years, however, the Department of Defense and its military departments have practically eliminated overlapping and duplication of material inspection in over 30,000 manufacturing plants furnishing materials and equipment to the departments. In these plants a single military inspection activity performs inspection of all materials and equipment procurement for all the Armed Forces. The 14 military inspection activities of the Department of Defense (seven Army, six Navy, and one Air Force) perform inspection interchange for each other on a "reimbursement in kind" basis. There is no requirement that records be maintained to establish an equitable basis for the amount of reimbursement in kind. Thus cross billing, with its attendant high administrative costs, is eliminated.

The extension throughout the Government of uniform, adequate, and businesslike interchange of procurement inspection, testing, and acceptance services, as proposed by the enclosed bill, would encourage more effective utilization of personnel on a Government-wide basis. It would also promote the economy and efficiency sought to be attained by the Congress when it enacted the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949. Although no data are available as to the number of cross billings and transfers of funds that would be eliminated by enactment of the bill, it is obvious that dispensing with extensive paperwork and attendant financial accounting for individually small sums will achieve savings.

For these reasons, GSA recommends early enactment of the proposed bill.

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

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN FLOETE,
Administrator.

WEARING OF DECORATIONS BY CERTAIN FEDERAL RETIRED PERSONNEL—AMENDMENT

Mr. COOPER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3195) to authorize certain retired personnel of the United States Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign countries, which was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1954—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a series of amendments to the bill (S. 3318) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, now under consideration for mark-up by the Committee on Foreign Relations. I should like to have them printed so that they may be considered in committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3318, supra, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. COOPER) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 3318, supra, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

LIMITATION OF APPELLATE JURISDICTION OF SUPREME COURT IN CERTAIN CASES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on May 2, 1958, on behalf of myself, and Senators CLARK, HENNINGS, LANGER, PROXMIRE, NEUBERGER, MORSE, and HUMPHREY, I introduced a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 169) to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. Last Thursday the Committee on the Judiciary reported out Senate bill 2646, introduced by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], which is a bill limiting the Supreme Court's appellate jurisdiction in certain cases; the accompanying report indicates clearly that the intent of this bill is to curb and intimidate the Court.

Therefore, I now propose that the constitutional amendment previously introduced by me and my associates to protect the Supreme Court from just such Court raiding be substituted for the text of S. 2646. It would strike out the language of the bill as reported by the Judiciary Committee, and in its place substitute a constitutional amendment guaranteeing the Supreme Court's appellate jurisdiction in law and fact in constitutional cases. The amendment would add the following sentence to the language of paragraph 2 of Section 2 of Article III of the Constitution:

> In all cases arising under this Constitution the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact.

In short, in these instances, jurisdiction by the Supreme Court would not be subject to legislative exceptions, as it now is, but the Court would by solemn act be confirmed in a constitutional power it has had almost without attack since Marbury against Madison was decided in 1803. Such a constitutional amendment now appear to be vital to assure the continuance of one of the fundamental safeguards of the individual and of minorities inherent in our form of government—the power of the Supreme Court as a final tribunal of decision to declare an act of Congress or a law of a State to be contrary to the United States Constitution, thereby establishing it in fact as well as in words as the supreme law of the land.

Yesterday, the American Bar Association's board of governors, which is the governing body when the House of Delegates is not in session, adopted a resolution overwhelmingly stating that it "opposes the enactment of the so-called Jenner bill, S. 2646, as amended and reported by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, which combines a limitation on the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and a threat to the independence of the Judiciary with substantive changes of far-reaching significance which should be considered independently of each other and only after adequate public hearings at which the organized bar and others interested can be heard." It declared it to be "a threat to the independence of the judiciary."

A special committee report to the board of governors further pointed out:

> The effect of combining these unrelated amendments into a single bill which includes as its first section the withdrawal of appellate jurisdiction of the Court in the area of bar admissions inevitably makes of the committee bill exactly the same character of legislation as proposed by the Jenner bill originally, i. e., an act to penalize the Supreme Court because of the disagreement of Congress with certain of its decisions and, hence, an attack upon the independence of the judiciary.

At this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the full report of the board of governors, together with a copy of the resolution adopted.

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

REPORT TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AS AFFECTED BY NATIONAL SECURITY OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

RECOMMENDATION

The special committee on individual rights as affected by national security recommends that the board of governors adopt the following resolution:

I

"Resolved, That the American Bar Association opposes the enactment of the so-called Jenner bill, S. 2646, as amended and reported by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, which combines a limitation on the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and a threat to the independence of the judiciary with substantive changes of far-reaching significance which should be considered independently of each other and only after adequate public hearings at which the organized bar and others interested can be heard. This action does not constitute approval or disapproval of the substantive changes proposed by sections 3 and 4; be it further

"Resolved, That in expressing its opposition to the enactment of S. 2646 as amended,

the American Bar Association reaffirms its position as expressed in the resolution on this subject adopted by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association at Atlanta, Ga., on February 25, 1958."

REPORT

At the Atlanta meeting of the house of delegates, the house, acting on the recommendation of the board of governors, adopted a resolution opposing enactment of S. 2646, known as the Jenner bill, which had as its purpose the withdrawal of appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States in five areas which have been the subject of recent decisions by the Supreme Court. Since the action of the house of delegates, there have been the following developments in connection with this proposed legislation:

1. While S. 2646 was under consideration by the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator BUTLER, of Maryland, offered proposed amendments of S. 2646 as to each of its provisions except admission to the bar of State courts.

2. On April 30, 1958, the Senate Judiciary Committee announced that, by a vote of 10 to 5 it was reporting favorably S. 2646 as amended by the committee.

As reported by the Judiciary Committee, S. 2646 contains four sections which may be summarized as follows:

(a) Section 1 is identical with the provision of section 1 as introduced by Senator JENNER which would withdraw the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court to review cases involving admission of attorneys to practice in the courts of the States.

(b) Section 2 would have the effect of withdrawing the jurisdiction of all courts to pass upon the pertinency of questions propounded by committees of Congress in Congressional investigations. The decision of the committee as to the pertinency of the question would be final and not subject to review by any court.

(c) Section 3 of the bill would allow the States to enact statutes concerning subversive activities without running afoul of the prohibition which normally results from occupation of a sphere by the United States.

(d) Section 4 of the bill refers to the Yates and Schneiderman cases, involving construction of the Smith Act, by name, and states that the distinction found to exist in those decisions is one never intended by Congress and is undesirable. It would then amend the statute to prevent such a construction of the act in the future.

From the foregoing summary of the provisions of the bill it is apparent that it is still objectionable for the reasons specified in the resolution adopted by the house of delegates at Atlanta, the difference between the original and the amended bill being merely a matter of degree.

It is further apparent that the portion of the amended bill which does not propose to curtail the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court deals with matters of substance and basic questions having no relation to each other except in the respect that the subject matter of each has been involved in a recent controversial decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. The effect of combining these unrelated amendments into a single bill which includes as its first section the withdrawal of appellate jurisdiction of the Court in the area of bar admissions inevitably makes of the committee bill exactly the same character of legislation as proposed by the Jenner bill originally, i. e., an act to penalize the Supreme Court because of the disagreement of Congress with certain of its decisions and, hence, an attack upon the independence of the judiciary.

Legislation in the important and difficult areas affected by the committee's amendment to the Jenner bill merits the most careful and deliberate consideration of the Congress with public hearings thereon by the appropriate committees of Congress. Each of the amended provisions of the bill is one involving difficult questions of individual rights or of the delineation of legislative power as between the States and the Federal Government.

By this report the committee does not take any position upon the merits of the individual amendments now incorporated in S. 2646 which do not affect the appellate jurisdiction of the Court or the independence of the judiciary. Such a position would be appropriate when and if these measures are considered at public hearings upon their merits by committees of the Congress at which adequate opportunity is afforded for the presentation of views thereon.

The committee recommends that the association oppose the present bill as contrary to the action of the house of delegates at Atlanta, and as an attempt to legislate in these important fields on a "shotgun basis" without adequate consideration of each of the proposed measures upon its merits. The committee further recommends that the association oppose the bill as an attack on the independence of the judiciary, destructive of the separation of powers contemplated by the Constitution.

Copies of S. 2646 as amended by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate will be distributed at the time this matter is considered by the Board of Governors.

Respectfully submitted.

ROSS L. MALONE, *Chairman.*
ARTHUR J. FREUND.
WILLIAM J. FUCHS.
CHARLES G. MORGAN.
WHITNEY NORTH SEYMOUR.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I feel it is particularly appropriate that the national organization of the lawyers of the United States should have responded so eloquently to its responsibility to maintain the integrity of the Court's authority as final arbiter of individual rights and to maintain the vital balance of governmental powers which has served us so well in the development of our free Nation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and on his behalf, I submit 19 amendments which are proposed by him to Senate bill 2646; and on behalf of the Senator from Missouri, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be printed and be allowed to lie on the table, so they may be called up when Senate bill 2646 is considered by the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an explanation which the Senator from Missouri has prepared regarding the amendments 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 BY SENATOR HENNINGS

1. The first amendment proposed by me would strike from the bill the section removing the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court to review cases involving admissions to the bar. The reasons for this amendment are fully set forth in the minority report accompanying the bill.

2. In the event that the first amendment is rejected, the second amendment would clarify some ambiguities in the loose wording of section 1. It would make sure that the limitation on the Supreme Court applies only to "any law, rule, or regulation of any State or of any board of bar examiners, or similar body" concerning the regulation of admissions to the bar, and not to any law, rule, or regulation whatsoever that may be made by a State. The latter meaning is possible under a reading of section 1 as it presently stands.

3. The third amendment would insure that the Supreme Court is still able to construe the meaning of equal protection of the laws, due process of law, and other Federal constitutional provisions, when they are involved in a case concerning admission to the bar.

4. The fourth amendment would insure that section 1 applies only to cases involving admissions to practice law in State courts. The Supreme Court has recently ruled that the right to practice law in State courts is separate and apart from the right to practice law in Federal courts, even though in general the Federal license to practice depends upon the grant of a State license. This amendment would preserve the distinction.

5. The fifth amendment would strike section 2 from the bill. This section would amend the present law regarding the pertinency of a question which, under the contempt statute, may be put to a witness by a committee of Congress. The reasons for this amendment are fully set forth in the minority report accompanying S. 2646.

6. The sixth amendment comes to grips with the problems raised in the recent Watkins case. It would spell out in statutory form the details of the requirements set forth in the Watkins case in prosecutions for contempt of Congress. These requirements are demanded by ordinary fairness and a sensible construction of the present statute. They would simply require that a witness be reasonably informed of the nature of the subject matter under inquiry and the relevance of the questions put to him at the inquiry. It would give the witness a better opportunity to determine at the hearing whether or not the question he is asked bears any real relationship to the authorized scope of the investigation.

7. The seventh amendment would insure that the ambiguous language in section 2 of S. 2646 would not remove from our Federal district courts and courts of appeals, as well as the Supreme Court, their present right to pass upon the issue of pertinency in a contempt of Congress case.

8. The eighth amendment clarifies the procedure for initiating a prosecution for contempt of Congress. At present, the law is uncertain as to whether the membership of the House and Senate, or merely their presiding officers, are empowered to certify the facts of a contempt citation. This amendment would clearly place the power in the hands of the membership.

9. The 9th amendment would preserve section 2 from the fatal constitutional defect of being a legislative decree of fact. If adopted, the ruling of a committee chairman upholding the pertinency of a question put to a witness would be presumed to be correct. However, a witness would not be precluded at a trial for contempt from showing that the question which forms the basis for the indictment is actually not pertinent to the inquiry.

10. The 10th amendment would serve to strike from the bill section 3, relating to Federal preemption of the field in the area of prosecutions for sedition and subversion.

11. The 11th amendment would preserve section 3, in the event of its adoption, from the vice of being retrospective legislation.

12. The 12th amendment would strike from the bill section 4, relating to changes in the Smith Act.

13. The 13th amendment would remove from section 4, the superfluous and dis-

paraging language contained in subsection (a). It has never been a sensible legislative practice for an act of Congress to refer specifically and directly to an opinion of a Supreme Court justice nor to cite a quotation from a court opinion. When quotations are carefully selected so as to cast aspersions upon another branch of Government, they add nothing to the bill.

14. The 14th amendment would insure that the present right of the Supreme Court to pass upon Federal constitutional questions is preserved inviolate. The need for a uniform interpretation of the laws and of the Constitution is as vital today as it was in the days of Chief Justice Marshall. Anything else would be an invitation to anarchy. Only the Supreme Court can insure such uniformity.

15. The 15th amendment would raise the salaries of the Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court to $37,500 and $35,000 respectively. At the present time, there are State judges who are much better paid than those who are entrusted with the responsibility of reviewing their decisions. Such an incongruity should not exist. In this period of inflation and rising prices, everyone is receiving a cost of living increase. Our highest Court should be no exception.

16. The 16th amendment insures that nothing in S. 2646 should be construed to lessen the obligations of the States to comply with the provisions of the United States Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court. The United States is a Federal Republic, but it could not conceivably exist as such unless the basic charter of its existence is loyally supported. This amendment merely states that principle in statutory form.

17. The 17th and 18th amendments are self-explanatory. They express the sense of the Congress that the Supreme Court, and the members of the bar who are responsible for cases that reach the Supreme Court, are performing a vital and necessary work in the preservation of our freedoms.

18. The 19th amendment changes the title of the bill so as not to reflect any unfavorable sentiments or cast any aspersions upon the Supreme Court.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I desire to make it clear that I am not joining in submitting the amendments at this time; but I am submitting them for the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], as a convenience to him.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, TO CORRECT UNINTENDED BENEFITS AND HARDSHIPS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I submit four amendments intended to be proposed by me to H. R. 8381, the technical amendment tax bill, now before the Senate Finance Committee, and I ask that these amendments be printed for use in committee and later for use on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The four amendments are:

First. Repeal of the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which allow for a credit against tax and exclusion from gross income for dividends received by individuals.

Second. An amendment to provide for the collection at the source of the income tax on dividends.

Third. An amendment to reduce the depletion allowance on oil and gas wells from 27½ percent of gross income to 15 percent of gross income for those with gross incomes from oil and gas wells above $5 million, and to 21 percent for those with gross incomes from oil and gas wells from $1 million to $5 million, but providing for the full 27½ percent for those with gross incomes from oil and gas sources below $1 million.

Fourth. An amendment providing for (1) the repeal or reduction of numerous excise taxes totaling approximately $2.5 billion, plus provisions for floor stock refunds for autos and durable goods, and for a retroactive date on autos to March 1, 1958, and (2) a cut in personal income tax from 20 to 15 percent on the first $1000 of taxable income for the period July 1, 1958 to June 30, 1959, the total revenue loss for which would be approximately $3 billion.

Later I shall submit a supplementary amendment providing for a lowering of the corporate profits tax on the first $25,000 of net corporate income.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table showing the details of the excise tax provisions which my amendments would reduce or repeal.

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

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table giving the details of the excise taxes which my amendment would reduce or repeal, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

Excise provisions of proposed Douglas tax cut

Item	Present rate	How collected at present	New proposed rate	Revenue loss as estimated in fiscal year 1959 budget
1. RETAILER'S EXCISES			*Percent*	*Million*
Sec. 4001: Jewelry selling at retail for $25 or less and watches and clocks selling for $100 or less.	10 percent of selling price	Paid by consumer to retailer	0	[1] $100.0
Sec. 4021: Toilet preparations	10 percent	Retailer	0	102.0
Sec. 4031: Luggage, handbags, wallets, etc.	do	do	0	60.0
2. MANUFACTURERS' EXCISES				
Sec. 4061 (a) (2): Passenger automobiles.	10 percent (permanent rate 7 percent).	Paid by manufacturer to Government.	[2] 5	500.0
Sec. 4061 (b): Auto parts and accessories (includes parts for trucks).	8 percent (permanent rate 5 percent).	do	0	113.0
Sec. 4111:				
1. Refrigeration equipment, household type.	5 percent	Paid by manufacturer	0	44.0
2. Air conditioners	10 percent	do	0	
Sec. 4121: Electrical, gas, and oil appliances.	5 percent	do	0	75.0
Sec. 4131: Light bulbs	10 percent	do	0	28.0
Sec. 4141: Radio and TV, phonographs, etc.	do	do	0	179.0
Sec. 4151: Musical instruments	do	do	0	
Sec. 4161: Sporting goods (except fishing equipment).	10 percent	do	0	[1] 10.0
Sec. 4171:				
1. Cameras and films	do	do	0	22.0
2. Projectors, still and motion of household type.	5 percent	do	0	
Sec. 4191: Business machines	10 percent	do	0	93.0
Sec. 4201: Mechanical lighters, pencils, fountain and ball-point pens.	10 percent	do	0	10.0
Sec. 4211: Matches:				
1. Plain	2 cents per 1,000 but not more than 10 percent.	do	0	6.0
2. Fancy	5½ per 1,000	do	0	
3. FACILITIES AND SERVICES				
Sec. 4231 (1-6): Admissions of all kinds, including musicians.	Various. (20 percent musicians.)	Paid by person paying admission; collected from proprietors.	0	100.0
Communications				
Sec. 4251:				
1. Telephone and telegraph leased wires, etc.	10 percent	Imposed on person paying for facility.	5	517.5
2. Local telephone	do	do	0	
3. Wire and equipment service.	8 percent	do	4	
Transportation				
Sec. 4261: Persons	10 percent	Paid by person making purchase. Collected by transportation company.	5	107.5
Sec. 4271 (a):				
1. Transportation of property other than coal.	3 percent	Paid by person making purchase of transportation.	0	476.0
2. Transportation of coal	4 cents per ton	Paid by person making purchase of transportation per ton.	0	
Total revenue loss (exclusive of floor stock refund provisions and retroactive date for automobiles).				2,543.0

[1] Estimated.
[2] A further cut of 2.5 percent should be conditional on manufacturers reducing prices by approximately 6 percent.

Mr. BEALL submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 8381, supra, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

TEMPORARY ADDITIONAL UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. PAYNE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 12065) to provide for temporary additional unemployment compensation, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations be discharged from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 304, declaring it to be the sense of the Senate that the executive department should initiate a program for conversion of Government-held stocks of chromite and manganese ores and concentrates to a condition of maximum immediate usefulness, and that it be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I wish to state, Mr. President, that I have conferred on this matter with the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and he is agreeable to this referral.

Senate Resolution 304 was submitted on May 14 by me, for myself and 18 Senators of both political parties. All of the sponsors are of the opinion that under the particular circumstances this resolution should be considered by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which is now holding hearings on conditions in the minerals industry. I may add, Mr. President, that this request for reference of the resolution to the Interior Committee is made without prejudice to the original reference of the resolution to the Committee on Government Operations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

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

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

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Address delivered by him before American Feed Growers Association, at Chicago, Ill., on May 20, 1958.

By Mr. JENNER:

Statement prepared by him paying tribute to the people of Poland on the anniversary of Poland Constitution Day.

Statement prepared by him paying tribute to the people of Rumania on the anniversary of their independence day.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

Address entitled "Meeting the Challenge," delivered by him before the 20th District Optimist Clubs, Fresno, Calif., May 16, 1958.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

Address by Secretary of Defense McElroy, delivered at the Armed Forces Day dinner at Washington, D. C., on May 16, 1958.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON H. R. 8943, CODIFICATION OF RECENT MILITARY LAW

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Revision and Codification of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, May 27, 1958, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on H. R. 8943, to amend titles 10, 14, and 32, United States Code, to codify recent military law, and to improve the code. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the proposed legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and myself, chairman.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF TVA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this week marks the 25th anniversary of the Tennessee Valley Authority. TVA has a remarkably successful record of efficiency. It has constructed dams and steam plants at less than cost estimates. Its efficient operation has produced a 4-percent return on the Federal Government's investment in its power facilities.

The May issue of Public Power magazine contains an article by Merrill Demerit, chief power engineer of TVA, on the technological and engineering accomplishments of the TVA organization during the past 25 years. This article shows how a public enterprise, made accountable to the Congress through a Board of Directors headquartered in the Tennessee Valley, has used ingenuity, skill, and imagination in operating at maximum efficiency and at maximum economy. I know of no public or private agency which has surpassed TVA in its constant efforts to improve efficiency, to take the lead in technological developments, and to combine men and materials in a skilled manner to achieve utmost results.

TVA has in many respects been a pacesetter in the electric industry, and it has shared its technological knowledge with all interested parties, both in the power phase and in the chemical and other parts of its multiple-purpose program.

The important lesson which private-power companies have learned from TVA's example is that low electric rates and mass-production techniques make possible low-cost power supply. In addition, however, TVA has constantly made available to private-power companies, manufacturers, and other interested parties the technological discoveries that TVA's skilled engineers have made. This is as Congress intended; that TVA serve as a pilot plant through which the Nation could learn and benefit. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

ENGINEERING GAINS MARK TVA'S PROGRESS—TECHNOLOGICAL ACHIEVEMENTS HIGHLIGHT WATER CONTROL AND POWER PROGRAMS

(By Merrill Demerit, Chief Power Engineer, Tennessee Valley Authority)

In all the world, no river has been brought under control to the extent of the Tennessee. In all the United States, no power system generates and transmits as much electricity as that of TVA. The engineering involved in these achievements—in the building of 20 great dams, eight giant steam plants, and a large economical transmission system—is of notable consequence.

TVA's engineers have plugged leaks in dams. They have experimented with the use of television to examine foundations under water. They have built what has been called an upside down dam, or a dam on legs, and another kind of dam that never appears above the surface of the water.

They have utilized the latest technological methods and devices and spurred the development of others in building and operating the dams and other facilities making up the TVA power system. They have used and reused old equipment to save money, even transporting many construction buildings and houses by barge from one project to another to save on labor and materials. And they have used the very ashes from their coal-burning steam plants to make an improved concrete which is both stronger and cheaper.

They have coordinated the operation of multipurpose hydroprojects and thermal-electric generating plants to make most efficient and economical use of water for power generation, at the same time serving the primary purposes of navigation and flood control.

One leaky old dam was Hales Bar Dam, built across the Tennessee River below Chattanooga some 50 years ago, long before TVA. Because of underground caverns in the limestone on which the dam was built, large quantities of water passed underneath the dam, greatly impairing its power capability. Bales of cotton are said to have passed beneath the structure.

To stop this wholesale loss of water, TVA engineers devised a unique method of closing up these gaping cavities with concrete placed under water.

Electronics are used to determine the amount of silt accumulating in storage reservoirs. By timing an electric impulse from the surface of the water to the bed of the reservoir and return, accurate checks can be made on the silt deposits. The findings of these periodic surveys make it plain that it will be centuries before silt will have any appreciable effect on the operation of the TVA reservoirs.

When TVA built its largest tributary dam, Fontana Dam in the Great Smoky Mountains, engineers confronted the problem of dissipating the energy of water which would at times flow over its spillway. Fontana Dam is the fourth highest dam in the United States at 480 feet and the highest east of the Rocky Mountains.

To solve the problem, a unique spillway was devised in tests at TVA's Hydraulic Laboratory, Norris, Tenn. Excess water is channeled down through the mountainside in twin subway-sized tubes 34 feet in diameter which end in 2 huge concrete spoons. The water is discharged into one end of the spoon and spewed into the air from the other end to dissipate its tremendous energy.

Almost the reverse of this situation was worked out for the second and final power unit at Hiwassee Dam a few miles south of Fontana near the North Carolina-Georgia border. To make the maximum use of hydropower, TVA engineers installed a reversible pump-turbine. The machine generates power like any other generator when power is needed. By reversing its spin, however, it can be used to pump water back through the dam from the lower reservoir to the upper reservoir.

Sometimes mistaken for perpetual motion, the action of this pump-turbine is, instead, a form of hydraulic arbitrage. It was designed and installed for use as a pump when the demand for power is slack and power from TVA's low-cost plants is available to operate it. Later, the water returned by the pump to the Hiwassee reservoir is reused to generate electricity to replace higher cost power at a time when the demand is high.

The Hiwassee pump-turbine is the largest in the world. As a turbine it has a capability of 59,500 kilowatts. As a pump it can lift water 205 feet at the rate of 29,200 gallons per second.

INTERCONNECTED POWER SYSTEM

TVA's power system, of which the Hiwassee unit is a part, has its equally remarkable aspects. It has interconnections with neighboring private utility systems so that each can help the other. These, in turn, connect with other systems so that TVA is part of an integrated network extending from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico and from Montana to the Atlantic coast. Power is exchanged between TVA and the private systems over connections utilizing equipment which automatically controls the flow of power at predetermined amounts. Signals received from connection points are transmitted to TVA generating plants where generation is automatically adjusted to hold the flows to the amounts agreed upon. The control system also allows TVA automatically to send out or receive power almost immediately when emergencies occur on its neighbors' systems or its own. This helps all the interconnected systems give better electric service.

Power is supplied to the TVA system from 37 major hydro projects (many with considerable storage) and 7 large steam plants. The choice between hydro and steam power to provide the most economical supply presents a complex problem. The water supply of many of TVA's hydro plants depends upon the amount of power generated at upstream dams. Power must not be wasted by permitting a surplus of water in any reservoir, in comparison with the reservoir capacity or the capacity of the turbines to utilize the water that must be released for the several purposes for which the TVA water control system is used. Moreover, the head or effective fall of the water must not be sacrificed by undue drawdown of the reservoirs.

This intricate problem of when to use hydro generation and when to use steam generation is made particularly difficult because the future hydro supply is so unpredictable depending upon the vagaries of weather. TVA engineers have solved the problem of optimum coordinated operation of its generating plants with unique economy guide curves. These curves are used as a guide for making a choice at any time between the use of stored hydro energy or auxiliary steam power. In this way the two kinds of power supply complement each other so that production costs are held at a minimum.

In the near future, further savings in operation will be achieved by use of an electronic computer. Many factors enter into the determination of which generating units to use and which to turn off as loads change from hour to hour. These factors include, for example, the efficiency of the unit, the cost of coal, the value of water in storage, transmission losses, and many others. TVA has more than 11,000 miles of transmission lines and 400 generating units. Head and hand calculation can't make these efficiency determinations in time to be useful, but the electronic computer will be able to do it in a few minutes.

RAPID SWITCHING EQUIPMENT

By equipping both ends of its 161-kilovolt transmission lines with ultra high-speed automatic switches, TVA engineers make four such lines do the work of five. In case of trouble on a line—for example, if lightning strikes it—oil circuit breakers at the terminals will open automatically in a 12th of a second or less. After waiting a fifth of a second the switches will automatically reclose so that the line is back in operation in only one-third of a second after the trouble occurs. This operation is so rapid that the trouble usually goes unnoticed by the power consumers. TVA has applied these principles from the very beginning of its operations. TVA engineers estimate that without this rapid switching one-fourth again as many tranmission lines would be required to give the same quality of service.

An important feature of the equipment which accomplishes the rapid switching of TVA transmission lines is the small power-carrier-type radio broadcasting and receiving stations at the line terminals. When trouble occurs on the system these stations automatically measure and compare the current going into each end of the lines. If the current going into and out of a line is the same, then the trouble does not exist on that line and relays prevent the switches from opening. On a line which is in trouble, current will be going into both ends. When the broadcasting and receiving stations find this to be the case, they permit the relays to open the oil circuit breakers. And all of this takes place in a 12th of a second or less.

TVA engineers take motion pictures of the behavior of currents and voltages when troubles occur on the power system as an aid in reducing the number and duration of service interruptions. The pictures are taken by oscillographs installed in primary substations and generating plants. TVA's oscillographs are connected so that they start operation automatically in about one two-hundredths of a second whenever trouble occurs on a transmission line or in equipment in a generating plant or substation. They take a picture of the magnitude and shape of the current and voltage waves at the time of the trouble. From it the approximate location of the trouble can be determined. This information helps maintenance forces locate and make repairs in the shortest time. Oscillographs also help TVA engineers to improve the design and operation of transmission facilities to assure the optimum in continuity of service.

From almost the beginning in planning its power system, TVA has employed equipment with which it can set up a model of its system and determine which of various combinations of facilities is most efficient and economical. This equipment, known as an AC calculating board or network analyzer, is now one of the largest in this country. With it, TVA can simulate generating and transmission facilities and determine the power flows and transmission losses of various plans for increasing the capacity of the system to meet growing loads. With this information the plan which produces the lowest overall cost can be determined. The time and manpower required for engineers to solve these problems using conventional methods are prohibitive.

TVA's transmission lines placed end to end would reach almost halfway around the world and they have to be inspected regularly. TVA does it with helicopters. Troubles can be located much more quickly, and at costs substantially lower than ground inspection. In addition, damages to insulators and wires can usually be detected more readily from the hovering vehicle.

LARGER CAPACITY STEAM UNITS

Steam plant construction on a large scale has taken place within the TVA system since 1949 and was tremendously accelerated by events resulting from the Korean war. The atomic energy plants served by TVA required an almost constant supply of electric power in huge amounts. TVA designers, working with private manufacturers, stimulated the building of generating units of steadily increasing size and of higher efficiency.

The first-units installed at the Johnsonville, Tenn., steam plant in 1951 has a capability of 125,000 kilowatts. The unit now under construction at Widows Creek in northeastern Alabama, which is scheduled to go into service in 1961, will have a capability of 500,000 kilowatts and will be the largest unit in operation in the United States.

The first Johnsonville unit produced a kilowatt-hour with 13.6 ounces of coal (12,000 B. t. u.). The new Widows Creek unit is expected to do it with 11.9 ounces. This fractional difference in efficiency will mean a difference of about 220,000 fewer tons of coal burned or a cost saving of $1 million each year.

TVA's Kingston (Tenn.) steam plant with nine generating units is the largest in the world with a capability of 1,600,000 kilowatts, the equivalent of 16 Norris Dams. Its furnaces consume a 50-ton carload of coal in 6 minutes. Its condensers use cooling water at the rate of a million gallons a minute, as much as New York City uses.

Running a close second to Kingston is the Shawnee steam plant near Paducah, Ky., with a capability of 1,500,000 kilowatts. Kingston is near the Oak Ridge AEC facilities; Shawnee near the AEC Paducah facilities. Each of these atomic plants uses from TVA over twice as much power as is used in the area of Detroit.

With units of such unprecedented size and efficiency, the TVA power system was the first to bring its system heat rate below 10,000 British thermal units per kilowatt-hour. The average heat rate in fiscal year 1957 was 9,705 British thermal units per kilowatt-hour, and the most efficient units—those at the John Sevier steam plant in upper East Tennessee—reached a low of 9,347 British thermal units per kilowatt-hour. Systemwide, TVA was generating a kilowatt-hour with about 13 ounces of coal, on the average.

With the atomic energy plants having a load factor of 98 percent on their power requirements, the TVA power system has achieved an average load factor believed to be higher than for any other large integrated system in the country; it amounted to approximately 75 percent in 1957.

In contrast with the extraordinary size and constancy of the AEC load, another Government defense plant—the Air Force's wind tunnel experimental center at Tullahoma, Tenn.—requires sudden bursts of power which in a few minutes build up to a load the equivalent of the city of Atlanta, and decline in a similar period.

The Kingston steam plant was the place where TVA engineers built the underwater dam and the so-called "upside-down dam" or "dam on legs"—more accurately, a skimmer wall. Both structures were built to secure cooler water for condensing purposes. The skimmer wall was built near the condenser intakes to hold back the warmer water at the top of the river and allow the cooler water to flow under the wall and on to the condenser pumps. The underwater dam was built at the bottom of the Clinch River to divert the cold density stream in the bottom of the river toward the skimmer

wall, and thence to the condenser intakes, while allowing the warmer top water to flow down the river in normal course.

When huge stockpiles of coal at widely scattered steam plants must be inventoried, TVA's mapping service does it by aerial photographic mapping methods. A photographic plane flies over all of the 8 coal piles in a single day and computations made from the aerial photos determine the coal volume within a 2-percent margin of error, with great saving over the cost of ordinary instrument surveying methods. TVA today is the largest coal buyer in the United States.

Fly ash, a waste product from the burning of coal in TVA steam plants, is being used in concrete mixtures to make a superior product at lower cost. One of the structures in which fly ash concrete is being used is the new lock currently being built in the World War I Wilson Dam at Muscle Shoals, Ala. The 100-foot lift of this lock will make it one of the highest single lift locks in the world.

Among all the engineering tasks involving accomplishments of world renown, some of the most obscure are the most interesting. For example, in upper east Tennessee, where engineers had to relocate a road and build a new bridge across a mountain gorge, they found it more convenient simply to construct the steel deck framing on land; when it was finished, it was rolled out cantilever fashion over the chasm and on to its abutments and piers.

Technological developments and adaptations have played a vital role in the achievements of TVA's first quarter century.

SCIENTIFIC PARTNERSHIP WITH GOVERNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD what I consider to be a very fine article which appeared in the New York Times magazine section last Sunday, May 18, 1958, by Theodore H. White.

The article is based largely on the point of view of scientists on "the partnership they want with Government" and, it will be noted, while scientists agree that something must be done to improve relationships between the Government and scientists they have not agreed upon any specific program. Mr. White does point out that there is support for a Department of Science and Technology among the scientists with whom he talked, and also places stress on the need for the improvement of the legislative processes in the consideration of legislation dealing with science and technology.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of my colleagues to the fact that in the other body and in the Senate hearings are now underway concerning science and technology and the relationship of Government to these fields. Such hearings are being conducted by the Committee on Government Operations.

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

"WHERE DO WE FIT IN?" THE SCIENTISTS ASK—ANSWERING WASHINGTON'S CALL FOR HELP, THEY SEEM BAFFLED AND LOST IN A BUREAUCRATIC LABYRINTH. A WAY OUT, LEADING TO MORE EFFICIENT WORK FOR THE NATION, IS NOT EASY TO FIND

(By Theodore H. White)

It is now 7 months since Sputnik Day, October 4, 1957, when the care and health of American science suddenly became as important a subject of national debate as inflation, desegregation, foreign aid and full employment.

Since then, under a torrent of concerned and worried words, much has been swiftly achieved. Three American satellites wheel in orbit. A thousand American communities are rearranging school curriculums to produce more scientists. The President has added to his staff an official science adviser. Science, finally, has become enshrined, a national cliché—a very important thing.

What more could scientists ask of a Nation which has seemed, for months, to hang on their every word?

Odd as it may seem, they want the answer to a very simple query: "Where do we fit in?" This question, dismaying and harassing them for years, baffles them just as much today, since the sputniks as before. For, though everyone knows that some sort of partnership in national planning and policymaking must exist between scientists and Government, scientists still do not understand the terms of the partnership. Moreover, they believe Government understands even less.

Today we spend a greater percentage of the national income on scientific research and development than we did at the height of World War II. With these funds, the country has built in the last decade an unprecedented Government-controlled or supported apparatus of science. But the Nation has yet to wire this apparatus into the councils of policymaking in any way that effectively helps it shape national decision.

Between scientists and Government there stands today an almost indescribable labyrinth of bureaucracy. And to anyone watching scientists trying to operate in Washington, as this correspondent has done for several weeks, it sometimes seems that a generous but thoughtless Government has set up an obstacle race which scientists must win, not by brilliance, but by groping, bumping, and pushing.

No fewer than 38 executive agencies dealing wholly or partly with a wide range of scientific activities now report, in theory, to the President. In fact, they have only the most perfunctory relationship with the source of final decision, the White House; few or none of their problems ever reach the President at all.

Beyond and about these executive agencies is a penumbra of countless overlapping, conflicting committees of scientific advisers and coordinators; the National Science Foundation listed a hundred-odd major ones in 1956 and made no attempt to name the scores, or even hundreds, of lesser committees. One of America's most eminent scientists, a member of half a dozen such groups, said recently: "Practically all these damn advisory committees are window dressing. No one works. You come into Washington for 1 day to talk and be talked to; you spit out a lot of platitudes with great clarity and go back to your own shop. Big national problems in science are too tough to be judged by advisers in 1 day on the run."

Since the military, controlling between 60 and 80 percent of all Government funds appropriated for science, has become the chief patron and employer of American scientific endeavor, it is toward the Pentagon that the anger and bitterness of most scientists rightly or wrongly, are directed. Advisory panels, subcommittees, and coordinating scientific groups cascade down the tables of organization under the Department of Defense, linked horizontally, vertically, diagonally and three dimensionally. Beneath these, some 90,000 paid scientists and engineers—probably 35 to 40 percent of all American creative scientific manpower—work across the country on projects directly concerned with military hardware.

Whether as eminent advisers or payroll employees, these scientists must try to influence American national policy through the indirect and narrow channels of uniformed bureaucracies which interpret their discoveries to the civilians with the power of final decision. And scientists—who consider their own opinions in this fast changing world as vital to policy as those of military men—feel they must be cautious, almost docile, in threading their ideas through the military. For the military can, out of budgetary necessity, sheer ignorance, or piqué, cut off or divert funds on which the progress of national science and the country's security depend.

The situation is, of course, acutely uncomfortable for the military officers who bear the brunt of the scientists' criticism. Their primary function, they protest, is to protect the Nation, by their plans and with their resources, against the enemy, not only 10 years hence but today. They must balance the scientists' urgencies about the future against the urgencies of immediate or fast approaching peril. Each service must conscript scientists to work on the specific mission for which it is responsible, even though duplication or conflict results. All too often military men must judge between the advice and theories of passionately conflicting scientists. Above all, they must think of science in terms of technology and tools, not as broad adventure into a future which may reshape man and society.

For the scientists, the situation is, at the least, humiliating and frustrating.

"It's never been a shortage of brilliant science that's held us up," says a staff member of the President's Supreme Science Advisory Committee. "The brilliant, the superlative, the merely good ideas have all stewed around without any efficient way of distinguishing among them."

"This country has been trapped," says Dr. Albert Hill, chief of the critically important Joint Chiefs of Staff Weapons Systems Evaluation Group, and a distinguished scientist in his own right, "in this funny impedance race between good science and bad management."

"We have been treated," says Dr. I. I. Rabi, Nobel prizewinner and one of the architects of American defense in the nuclear age, "as alchemists were treated by medieval kings, the way German princelings treated strange wise men showing their wares."

How, in a nation that first released nuclear energy, excels in advanced technology, and has so lavishly supported science, did this confusion come about?

The answers lie in the past 15 years, a period in which the influence of science on national policy has receded almost as fast as the exploration of science has moved forward.

Fundamentally, the story starts with the wartime OSRD, the great Office of Scientific Research and Development, perhaps the most effective mobilization of scientific brains for national survival that any nation ever achieved.

The OSRD was a governing body within science itself, empowered to sit as a high court of judgment on the sometimes conflicting theories of American scientists. It was independent of any other agency. It was linked directly to the White House, with authority to speak up whenever it believed science could contribute to the broad national interest. And it confronted actual wartime needs and problems.

"The OSRD was operational," says a man who worked with it. "If we had been an advisory committee to Army, or Signal Corps, like today, nothing would have been done. We decided what was the most inviting point of breakthrough. The White House approved the funds we budgeted. The engineers built the facilities we needed. We contracted directly with industry and universities to do what we had planned. Then, when we were ready, we'd turn the stuff over to the proper military agency for use."

"We had a hardness to our problem then," says J. Robert Oppenheimer. "We knew the shape of the war in Europe and its strategy; there was unanimous clamor for real weapons with real use."

The end of the war ushered scientists into a new era. The hardness of simple combat strategy and requirements was replaced by the cultural competition and ideological warfare of a peaceful revolutionary world. At the same time, nature's frontiers began to recede at an unimagined pace; science exploded with intellectual energy, requiring for its work such great sums of money that only the national budget could provide them.

At this juncture OSRD was dissolved. Not that an ungrateful nation spurned its scientists. Quite the contrary. A conversion to science had taken place, particularly on the part of the military. Dr. James B. Conant describes it as a "fanatic enthusiasm for research and development * * * not unlike that of oldfashioned religious conversion."

But the role of scientists was grossly changed from the days of the OSRD. Instead of controlling their own explorations, settling their own scientific differences and speaking directly to the White House, they found themselves enlisted in advisory panels, groups and committees responsible to civilian agencies or military services. Their funds, even their careers, became dependent on the men they advised. Their mission was increasingly confined to what a single agency wanted and could afford, rather than the strategy and statecraft of the whole Nation.

"The classic Pentagon directive," says Lloyd Berkner, one of the sages of science-in-defense, "is that research and development programs meet military requirements. Whereas actually, in this day and age, it should be the other way around."

The two most discussed episodes in the story of postwar American science—the rocket foul-up and the Oppenheimer case—both resulted directly from the confusion and breakdown in the partnership of science and Government.

For years, the triple problem involved in rocketry—that of tooling a warhead down to a proper size, fitting it to a sufficiently powerful propulsion system, then equipping the rocket, with a proper guidance mechanism—was debated by many overlapping groups, with no one coming to an overall national decision. Cramped by their own narrow service roles and budgetary limitations, balancing current defense needs against future imponderables, the Armed Forces proceeded in fits and starts.

For example, the Air Force completely halted research on the parent of the present ICBM in 1947, reactivated the program only in 1951, and did not go into high until 1954. Similarly, the Naval Research Laboratory twice completely dissolved the complicated teams of scientists working on the rocket which was the direct precursor of the laggard Vanguard missile. Yet no high court of scientists like the OSRD could carry the whole problem directly to the White House for clean-cut decision.

The Oppenheimer case is cited by many scientists as an example of what could happen if they tried to act as if the OSRD still existed. For the General Advisory Committee of the Atomic Energy Commission, which Oppenheimer led in its postwar period, was the only heir to the tradition of the OSRD. Sitting beyond the control of the service arms, the General Advisory Committee created the superiority in nuclear weapons on which our national strategy still hangs; debated and set the priorities to be given nuclear submarines and airplanes; challenged and broke the Air Force monopoly on the uranium bomb, and sent the mission to tell Eisenhower at SHAPE in Paris that nuclear ground weapons would soon be available for the ground defense of Europe.

It was in the General Advisory Committee that the great argument over the hydrogen bomb began.

Out of the tangle of issues aired in the Oppenheimer hearings—the technology of nuclear science, the national resources then available, the police charges arising from that period's McCarthyism—these facts rise clearly: The nuclear scientists, rightly or wrongly, had been debating the H-bomb in terms of the whole sweep of national policy; they disagreed personally and bitterly among themselves, and these disagreements were amplified yet further by disagreement among other Government organs.

No one can plow through the 992 fine-print pages of testimony at the Oppenheimer hearings without realizing how much more crushing for the scientist was the Air Force testimony—based purely on highest-level policy disagreements—than the security charges on which the final decision against Oppenheimer was technically based. Neither Oppenheimer nor the Air Force had worked in a partnership that clearly defined the scientist's role, protected both partners and gave them clear access to a final arbiter if vital differences arose. When the Air Force finally aired its opposition to Oppenheimer, it had to do so at a public police court. Both scientists and the military were trapped; a vital but legitimate difference of opinion was completely obscured in the maze of procedure.

Says a man who was an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force at the time of the trial: "It was like performing an appendectomy with a crowbar."

Many scientists insist they learned from the Oppenheimer case only this: To stay carefully within the confines of their mission and sponsoring agency and not let their minds range over the totality of the nation's problems.

"Several years ago," says a member of the President's Science Advisory Committee, "we would have argued over the nuclear airplane from hell to breakfast. Now, if the Air Force wants a nuclear airplane, we say, give it to them; it's only money. Why get into a fight?"

The debate over the thermonuclear bomb has long receded into the past; the debate over the sputniks is fading too.

But urgent questions involving science and national policy succeed them. Is it safe to explode a thermonuclear warhead beyond the blanket of our own dense air? Who will decide whether the National Science Foundation, the Atomic Energy Commission or the Department of Defense ponies up the money for the new multibillion-volt accelerator American physicists have insisted for a year they need? Can we beat the Russians to an efficient process for desalting sea water? Or would a crash program for solar energy be better for our diplomacy in Asia and Africa? Can we push both efforts at once? What of the sciences of life and death? Should we intensify research on a high-protein grain for countries where few eat meat? Should we mobilize our scientific brilliance in biology and medicine for impact on this world's strange politics?

Above all: Who is to answer these and similar questions?

In the past 6 months, the chief and only positive step taken to pull order out of chaos has been Eisenhower's appointment of Dr. James R. Killian, president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, as his personal adviser, chairman of the reorganized Presidential Science Advisory Committee and ex officio member of the National Security Council.

A brisk, incisive man with the manner and dispatch of a brilliant surgeon, Killian has performed well since he took up residence in Washington. He has achieved a personal relationship with the President that carries him trotting across the street from the old State Department Building to the White House 2 or 3 times a week. He has brought about the appointment of a supreme science adviser to NATO. He has acquired the authority to intervene, a friend in court, when the many scientists in and around Washington need help with strangling budgets and bureaucracies.

Despite their respect for Killian, the attitude of most scientists toward his appointment is still one of friendly reserve; they are waiting to see exactly what his jurisdiction and authority will be. Instead of being able to bring calm, unhurried judgment to the President, Killian has so far been swamped with emergency business. His permanent staff of 5 or 6 is dreadfully inadequate. The eminent scientists he has been conscripting for emergency guidance and consultation give their time unstintingly, but complain they cannot continue to leave their own responsibilities and race to Washington. Most serious of all, Killian has no funds of his own, no real organization and no authority except the right to intercede directly with the President when affairs reach deadlock or crisis.

Scientists are agreed on the principle, but not the blueprint, of the new partnership they want with Government. A few of those with longest experience in Washington want a full-scale Department of Science and Technology, to bring under one executive head all purely scientific agencies such as the AEC, the National Science Foundation, the National Committee on Aeronautics, the Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, etc., leaving to the traditional Government departments only the essential service functions of science.

Dissenters, believing that a Department of Science smacks of too much discipline and centralization, want an expansion of the present Killian office by giving it greater executive authority, a much larger staff, and independent funds.

However much they disagree on forms and organizational boxes, scientists are unanimous in wanting to be told clearly where they fit in, and to be given independence of action clearly commensurate with the role they must play in the Nation's policymaking.

It seems obvious that the reorganization of the partnership must begin in the two divisions of Government that shape our politics—the executive and Congress.

Only Congressional discussion and investigation can clarify what scientists need in order to work efficiently for the Nation. At present, faced with a conflicting mass of figures from many agencies, Congress has no way of judging what share of the country's resources go to science, and who is spending it. A Congressional demand that all science's requirements be packaged together for one consideration would force the creation of new Congressional committees on science and technology, equal in power and prestige to those on military affairs, foreign affairs, and atomic energy. Only such committees can generate the vital political pressures which make Washington act.

But beyond a corps of champions in Congress, science needs, under whatever name, an independent, operational place in the executive structure. Only from such a base can disputes within science be intelligently settled; only from its shelter can scientists speak freely and safely on broad national problems. Though an adviser on science is as necessary to the President as military and economic aides, he cannot take the place of an organized understructure of scientists within Government who can join in the discussion and debate of broad policy before final decision.

There is as yet no name for a reorganized partnership of science and Government, because there is no name for the new kind of world we live in. But the insistent fact is that a name and an accommodation must be found.

THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am happy to bring to the attention of the Senate an Associated Press dispatch from Miami, which indicates that the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army have abandoned their plans for the dismemberment of the Army National Guard. I should like to read the dispatch into the RECORD and then comment upon it.

Under a Miami dateline, the item appears as follows:

The Army disclosed today that plans for disbanding six National Guard divisions have been abandoned.

The disclosure was made by Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Army Chief of Staff, in an address prepared for delivery to the governors conference here.

The original plan for reduction in the size of the ground National Guard grew out of Federal Government economy measures.

In his prepared speech today, Taylor said many governors have passed along their thoughts on the proposal to Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy and Secretary of the Army Wilber Brucker.

Then Taylor added:

"This morning Secretary Brucker and I are happy to announce that there has been a relaxation of the original guidance upon which our plans thus far have been based. The Army has been authorized to develop a plan looking toward the retention of the present 37 divisions in the reserve forces structure, that is 27 National Guard divisions and 10 USAR divisions, provided that this troop structure is maintained with no increase of cost or personnel beyond currently programed levels."

Mr. President, I think I speak for every Member of the Senate in expressing gratification over that action. If the National Guard and Army Reserve had been reduced in size as originally planned it would have been a very bad blow, at least in my judgment, to the Reserve program which we set up after thoughtful study only a few years ago. The proposed reduction in number of units and the proposed reduction of the overall number, particularly of the National Guard, even if based only upon attrition, would have been a very definite blow to the strength of the organized Reserve and to the morale of the officers and men who have given unselfishly of their time and of their energy in building up what must be our first line of defense, after the Regular Army forces, in the event we should have the disaster of another war.

Mr. President, I want to express my warm congratulations to Mr. Secretary McElroy, Mr. Secretary Brucker and General Taylor upon their reconsideration of the earlier decision. I know it is difficult to reconsider an announced decision on an important matter of this kind, but I think the final decision is in line with the best interests and strongest security of our Nation, and will mean most fair treatment to several hundred thousand men and officers who have become part of our National Guard and Army Reserve in the effort to render their patriotic service to our country. It will make those men available on a continuing basis to better secure our country.

AN EXCISE TAX MORATORIUM

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the time has come to talk turkey about taxes. There is one tax cut which I believe should be made—and quickly. That cut would start the ball rolling toward a recovery from the present slump and would not launch the Government on the dangerous course of slashed revenues and soaring deficits.

I believe we should immediately declare a temporary moratorium on most Federal excise taxes—a complete or partial suspension of such taxes on manufactured goods, and on transportation, for a limited period of time. This moratorium could run until the end of the year or the early months of 1959.

The evidence clearly points to higher prices and buyer resistance as a major cause of the recession. The buyers' strike is most marked in durable goods. Industries which seem to be hardest hit are steel, automobiles, appliances, and other manufactured goods. Prices have risen rapidly. Consumers have balked at them, and we cannot blame them for that.

The Federal Government must bear its share of the blame for high prices, because taxes contribute to them. Taxes are a part of the cost of every item we buy. For example, taxes take 24 cents of every dollar spent for a new automobile. The Federal Government should do its part to lower prices by reducing or eliminating its excise taxes.

The moratorium on excise taxes which I propose would kick off a real, nationwide bargain sale—an immediate spur to buying, production, and employment. In my opinion, it would stimulate manufacturers and businessmen to reduce their prices, leading to substantial, across-the-board price cuts, in almost every line of goods. Incidentally, it would raise a barrier against further inflation.

A sales-tax moratorium would be a notice to buyers that they must act quickly while the taxes are suspended if they wish to take full advantage of the lower prices.

A temporary suspension of excise taxes would not prevent, or prejudice, a later, permanent cut in either excise, income, or corporation taxes. On the other hand, a measure granting a temporary suspension would not be an open invitation for hasty, ill-considered amendments for all kinds of tax cuts at this time. Furthermore, a moratorium on excise taxes would give the economy sufficient momentum to carry it through the period when such taxes might be reimposed, and would not eat up next year's market with this year's sales.

When a smart merchant finds his shelves filling and his sales sagging he conducts a bargain sale. An excise-tax moratorium would be a nationwide bargain sale. It would be a clearance sale, but certainly not a going-out-of-business sale.

AIRPLANE COLLISIONS—NEED OF AIRWAY CONTROLS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Another Midair Crash," published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of today; also an editorial entitled "Anarchy in the Air," published in the Washington Post of today.

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

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of May 21, 1958]

ANOTHER MIDAIR CRASH

Another military plane has rammed a commercial airliner in midair—the second such tragedy in less than a month—and this time 12 persons were killed.

The latest collision involved a Capital Airlines Viscount and a Maryland National Guard jet fighter, and took place near Washington. The previous accident, near Las Vegas, Nev., cost 49 lives.

Yesterday's accident can be attributed directly to the inexcusable failure of Government agencies to stop military training flights in commercial airlanes. The jet is said to have appeared out of a cloud bank and crashed into the side of the Viscount. How many more lives must be lost before the military departments and the Civil Aeronautics Board will awaken from their lethargy and do something besides investigate?

After the Nevada collision the Tribune and many other voices demanded that military training flights be forbidden in commercial routes, just as commercial planes are already forbidden to fly in military airlanes. This was an obvious corrective which should have been taken immediately.

As if to emphasize the need for action, the Civil Aeronautics Authority itself published a study on May 11 stating quite plainly the increasing danger of midair collisions and attributing it to crowded skies near airports and to the fact that in most planes the pilot cannot see a plane approaching from the rear, from above, or from below.

With jet fighters darting about the skies at speeds exceeding that of sound, it is painfully evident that they have no business flying in the paths of commercial airliners. But even so nothing has been done to stop them.

In urging action on April 24, this paper said there was no telling when fate would decree the next such accident. We now have the answer. Are those in authority so obtuse that we must await still another tragic example?

[From the Washington Post of May 21, 1958]

ANARCHY IN THE AIR

There are bound to be hard and searching questions raised in the wake of yesterday's terrible midair collision in the skies over nearby Brunswick, Md. Only a month ago, 49 lives were lost when an Air Force jet rammed into a United Air Lines transport near Las Vegas—and now 12 more persons have been killed in circumstances that seem grimly comparable. The Capital Airlines Viscount was only minutes away from Friendship Airport on its allotted course when a Maryland National Guard jet trainer operating on visual control rules apparently struck the left wing of the passenger plane. This makes the fourth midair collision since January 31, 1957, between military and commercial aircraft. Why?

One reason is the woeful inadequacy of air traffic controls. It would be considered intolerable if near-anarchy prevailed on the automobile highways, yet something approximating this condition prevails in the highways of the air. An estimated 11,000 aircraft of all types are flying in the country's airways at any given moment—yet the Civil Aeronautics Administration has hardly any

control over the military plane routes. The result is that last year there were some 971 near-misses in the air (including 53 in the Washington area)—many involving free-wheeling military aircraft. And next fall, the risks will be increased as jet transports begin flying on commercial routes.

The need is desperate to end the anarchy in the airways and to safeguard the needs of the country's civil air transport system against military encroachment. The Maryland tragedy ought to increase demand for prompt effectuation of the CAA's proposed 5-year program for modernizing air traffic controls—and increase interest in Senator MONRONEY's plan for an overall Federal Aviation Authority which could coordinate civil and military traffic.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I commend both newspapers for these excellent editorials. The time is past due when the Congress should make perfectly clear to the military that they must follow an air policy which will prevent murder in the air because of a failure on the part of the Military Establishment to follow safety regulations which are applied to civilian aircraft.

The Air Force must be brought under the regulations of the Civilian Aeronautics Authority. During the past year I have talked with a considerable number of pilots of commercial airplanes on my flights about the country. The appropriate Senate committee had better bring some pilots before it and listen to what the pilots who are operating commercial aircraft are saying with regard to the violation of commonsense safety regulations by the Air Force in handling military planes.

Of the last 5 collisions in the air, 4 have been with Air Force planes. The appropriate Senate committee owes it to the country to proceed immediately to see to it that a thorough investigation is made of the policies of the Air Force in connection with flying military aircraft, because we have a duty to see to it that the Air Force is brought into line.

What the pilots of commercial planes tell me with regard to the bad judgment being exercised by the Air Force is shocking. Such conduct should be brought to an end. The American people have the right to have a feeling of safety. They have a right to feel that when they get into a commercial airplane, some military aircraft is not going to crash into it, as happened yesterday.

I urge that the appropriate Senate committee proceed with hearings to determine why Air Force planes are continually crashing into commercial planes, resulting in great loss of life.

Mr. PAYNE subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today two of our colleagues called attention to the unfortunate tragedy which occurred yesterday near Brunswick, Md., when an Air National Guard jetplane collided with a Capital Airlines plane.

During the course of his remarks the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] had printed in the RECORD the excellent editorial entitled "Anarchy in the Air", which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of this morning.

Mr. President, my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] spoke with references to a resolution he submitted in connection with the control of airspace, and made remarks concerning the activities of the committee. He expressed hope that the resolution would receive immediate consideration.

It is simply my purpose at this moment to invite attention to the fact that the subcommittee dealing with aviation, under the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which the present acting minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], is the ranking member, and on which I am privileged to serve, has for a considerable period of time been delving into the problem.

The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who is not on the floor at this time, and was not on the floor at the time of the discussion, has been conducting hearings in connection with the problem of control of airspace and the dangers inherent in the jet age which is upon us, involving such lamentable accidents as have recently occurred.

So that no one may be misinformed, let me say there is in process proposed legislation which will definitely be brought to the attention of the subcommittee. It is my hope, as I know it is the hope of the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], that perhaps we will be able to bring about definite, concerted action in the way of complete control, under one coordinated body, of the air over the Nation. There are difficulties in the present situation, since the control of the civilian end of the traffic is with the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and the military arm controls, to the very greatest extent, the activities which take place under military auspices.

Gen. Ted Curtis was called upon to make a special study of this problem last year, and he did a remarkable job. The work has been carried on by the present administration, in an endeavor to provide some definite answers.

It is simply my purpose to say that the appropriate committee of the Congress has not lost sight of the particular problem. The committee is at work on the subject. I am sure the committee will continue its work until it evolves an answer which will at least help to end the tragic accidents which have resulted from the present situation.

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

Mr. PAYNE. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Maine for what he has had to say with regard to the unfortunate event of yesterday, tragic in all its aspects. The situation was aptly pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Maine, who is a member of the subcommittee on which I am privileged to serve, under the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] as chairman.

As was pointed out by the Senator from Maine, a troublesome situation has been presented to us. On a number of occasions suggestions have been made as to what was likely to happen. The need for some type of legislation to prevent just such disasters was pointed out. In connection with what the Senator from Maine has said, I do not believe there is any more important subject to which we can direct our attention before the Senate adjourns this year than the subject to which the Senator from Maine has called attention. I commend him for it.

Mr. PAYNE. I thank my colleague from Kansas for his remarks. As he knows, and as he has so well stated, our committee has been greatly concerned about air-traffic safety controls. It is the duty and responsibility of Congress to see to it that adequate funds are made available—and not in niggardly sums—in order to maintain the best possible air-safety control system which can be devised for the protection of those who use the airways. That has not always been the case in the past. Serious reductions have been made in appropriations, but now we are making some progress. However, we have a long way to go to compensate for the lag which occurred a number of years ago.

SENATE PROCEDURE—BOOK BY CHARLES L. WATKINS, PARLIAMENTARIAN, AND FLOYD M. RIDDICK, ASSISTANT PARLIAMENTARIAN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a book which appeared on the desks of Senators today, entitled "Senate Procedure," by Charles L. Watkins, Parliamentarian, and Floyd M. Riddick, Assistant Parliamentarian.

I desire to express my indebtedness to the two Parliamentarians for the book which they have made available to Senators. While I have not read the book, I have turned its pages. Knowing what I know about the Senate rules, I feel assured that we have here a scholarly work, which will be of great assistance to Senators for decades to come. I extend my congratulations to the two Parliamentarians, and my heartfelt thanks.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] with reference to the new book, entitled "Senate Procedure," which we find on our desks today. The book is written by Charles L. Watkins, Parliamentarian, and Floyd M. Riddick, Assistant Parliamentarian. I have scanned the book. I look forward with a great deal of interest to the privilege of reading it. It presents Senate procedure to us in a way which is readable and understandable. I wish to commend the authors of the book. I believe that the action of the Senate in authorizing its publication was very wise.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to add my word to what has already been said about the Parliamentarians of the Senate.

I have debated with Mr. Watkins many times at the desk. I have not always agreed with him, but I have always respected his judgment and integrity.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to express my personal thanks and appreciation to the Parliamentarian,

Mr. Charles L. Watkins, and to the Assistant Parliamentarian, Mr. Floyd M. Riddick, for the fine services they have rendered the Senate, the fine services they have rendered the cause of democratic government, the fine services they have rendered the cause of orderly procedure, and the fine services they have rendered to the American people. The many, many hours and days and weeks and months and years of cumulative work, the authors have now produced a valuable documentary volume entitled "Senate Procedure" which has been distributed to Senators this morning. A great storehouse of seasoned knowledge and experience has now been made available in the permanent form of a manual of Senate procedure.

In talking with Mr. Watkins, in my brief 12½ months in the Senate, and with his able assistant, Mr. Riddick, I have sought their advice many times on precedents and practices of the Senate. I believe that our able Parliamentarian first went on the Senate payroll in 1904. He has rendered his services to the Senate for more than a half century.

I wish to point to another signal honor and distinction of the senior Parliamentarian.

At the time of the United Nations Conference in 1945, upon the motion of the former chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and a senior delegate of the United States delegation to the United Nations Charter Treaty Conference, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas, the Honorable Tom Connally of Texas, Mr. Watkins was selected to serve as the parliamentarian of the first International Conference of the United Nations where he served with honor and distinction.

Now a part of the accumulated wisdom and knowledge of these gentlemen has been condensed into one volume for our benefit, for the benefit of good government, and for the benefit of the American people. They are due the thanks and praise and appreciation of every Member of the Senate, and I believe every Member feels grateful for and appreciative of the fine work they have done.

THE GREAT DECISIONS PROGRAM FOR THE STATE OF OREGON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, it has been my pleasure to study a series of opinion ballots on important questions relating to our foreign policy. These ballots were issued in connection with the great decisions program now being carried on in my home State of Oregon.

The ballots were tabulated at Oregon State College, and thereafter were summarized in news releases distributed by the Oregon State College news bureau.

Four extremely important phases of our foreign policy were most recently the subjects of opinion ballots and news résumés of the great decisions program in Oregon. They were: Awakening Africa—Threat or Promise?; What United States Economic Policy for Survival?; Should the United States Trade With Red China?; and Whose U. N. Is it?

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the Oregon great decisions ballots and news releases on each of the foregoing topics.

There being no objection, the ballots and news releases were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPINION BALLOT—AFRICA

(Discussing the facts is the first step; arriving at an informed opinion is the next. As you weigh the answers on this ballot, bear in mind the consequences of each policy. Check only those policies you are willing to support—and be sure your anwers do not contradict each other. Remember, your opinion counts—make it an informed opinion.)

1. Should the United States take a stronger stand on self-determination and independence for African territories? (Check any policies you would support or write in your own opinion.)

(a) Actively support the colonial policies of our allies (Belgium, Britain, France, Italy, Portugal): 2 percent.

(b) Avoid open conflict with our allies but use United States influence with them to speed progress toward independence: 54 percent.

(c) Take a strong stand in the U. N. Trusteeship Council actively encouraging more rapid progress toward independence: 32 percent.

(d) Support independence in principle in the U. N. Trusteeship Council, but take into account that some territories are not so well prepared as others for self-government: 61 percent.

(e) Set an example on the self-determination question by speeding self-government in United States Trust Territories (Marshall, Mariana, and Caroline Islands in the Pacific): 25 percent.

(f) Set an example by granting statehood and national voting rights to Alaska and Hawaii: 54 percent.

(g) Keep hands off African colonial issue: 5 percent.

(h) In cooperation with our allies, actively assist in the economic, social, and political development of African territories: 55 percent.

(i) Expand our exchange of persons program with Africa; bring more African political leaders to the United States for education: 70 percent.

(j) Confine our activities to those territories which have strategic or economic importance to the United States: 6 percent.

(k) Other: 9 percent.

2. Should the United States expand its program for economic and technical assistance to Africa? (Check those policies you would support or write in your own opinion.)

(a) Continue our present policy of modest technical assistance, leaving major economic aid (for capital development) to the colonial governments and private enterprise: 22 percent.

(b) Expand our economic aid (for capital development) to independent countries in Africa: 32 percent.

(c) Expand our economic aid to African territories: 22 percent.

(d) Concentrate our aid on those areas which have economic or strategic importance to the United States: 11 percent.

(e) Allocate a larger proportion of total United States aid to Africa: 28 percent.

(f) Step up military programs in Africa, including military aid to friendly countries like Ethiopia and the construction of more strategic airbases: 11 percent.

(g) Decrease United States economic aid to Africa: 12 percent.

(h) Expand our exchange of persons program with Africa; bring more African technicians and administrators to this country for study: 68 percent.

(i) Encourage United States private investment in Africa by negotiating treaties with independent and colonial governments to safeguard United States private capital: 34 percent.

(j) Urge a larger role for the U. N. in the economic development of Africa; channel more United States assistance through the U. N.: 60 percent.

(k) Other: 7 percent.

UNITED STATES EDUCATION AID TO AFRICA DRAWS TOP DECISIONS VOTE

Increased opportunities for African political leaders, administrators, and technicians to study in the United States are favored by more than two-thirds of all Oregonians balloting on the great decisions foreign policy issue, Awakening Africa—Threat or Promise?

Ballots from discussion groups in 32 Oregon counties were tabulated this week at Oregon State College. Voting placed strong reliance upon education and United Nations in developing Africa while guarding against Communist inroads.

On the question of whether the United States should take a stronger stand on self-determination and independence for African territories, balloting showed:

Seventy percent believed the United States should expand its exchange of persons program with Africa, bringing more African political leaders to the United States for education.

Sixty-one percent also favored a policy of supporting independence of African territories in principle in the U. N. trusteeship council, taking into account that some territories are not so well prepared as others for self-government. Only 2 percent thought the United States should actively support the colonial policies of our allies, Belgium, Britain, France, Italy, and Portugal.

Fifty-five percent said America should assist, in cooperation with our allies, in the economic, social, and political development of African territories. An equal number thought we should set an example on the self-determination question by granting statehood and national voting rights to Alaska and Hawaii.

On the question of whether the United States should expand its program for economic and technical assistance to Africa, balloting was as follows:

Sixty-eight percent favored expanding our exchange of persons program with Africa, bringing more African technicians and administrators to this country for study.

Sixty percent also favored a larger role for the U. N. in the economic development of Africa, channeling more United States assistance through the U. N. Only 12 percent thought we should decrease United States economic aid or concentrate our aid on those areas having economic or strategic importance to the United States.

Thirty-four percent would encourage United States private investment in Africa by negotiating treaties with independent and colonial governments to safeguard private capital.

OPINION BALLOT—ECONOMICS

(Discussing the facts is the first step; arriving at an informed opinion is the next. As you weigh the answers on this ballot, bear in mind the consequences of each policy. Check only those policies you are willing to support—and be sure your answers do not contradict each other. Remember, your opinion counts—make it an informed opinion.)

1. Should the United States adopt more liberal policies in world trade? (Check any policies you would support or write in your own opinion.)

(a) Congress should take no steps that will increase the flow of foreign imports into United States markets to compete with United States products: 9 percent.

(b) Congress should support present reciprocal trade arrangements by renewing the Trade Agreements Act: 61 percent.

(c) Congress should liberalize United States trade policies by authorizing the President to make further tariff reductions on a reciprocal basis with other nations: 45 percent.

(d) Congress should permit the President to make further tariff reductions, on a reciprocal basis with other nations, except in peril-point cases where an American producer might be injured by increased competition: 34 percent.

(e) Congress should help strengthen GATT by ratifying United States participation in the Organization for Trade Cooperation (GATT's proposed administrative machinery): 63 percent.

(f) Congress should refuse to renew the Trade Agreements Act (thus taking the United States out of GATT): 2 percent.

(g) Other: 3 percent.

2. Should the United States increase its foreign aid activities? (Check those policies you would support or write in your own opinion.)

(a) Congress should maintain foreign aid at about present levels: 10 percent.

(b) Congress should maintain present aid levels but put greater emphasis on economic aid, less emphasis on military aid: 53 percent.

(c) Congress should maintain present aid levels but put greater emphasis on military assistance: 2 percent.

(d) Congress should increase all types of foreign aid activity: 6 percent.

(e) Congress should increase economic assistance to underdeveloped nations: 52 percent.

(f) Congress should put more emphasis on loans and technical cooperation and less emphasis on outright grants: 80 percent.

(g) Congress should reduce all kinds of foreign aid spending: 5 percent.

(h) Congress should reduce military assistance programs: 16 percent.

(i) Congress should reduce economic assistance programs: 4 percent.

(j) United States should channel more United States aid through the U. N.: 47 percent.

(k) United States should channel less United States aid through the U. N.: 4 percent.

(l) Other: 7 percent.

3. Should the United States make other adjustments in its foreign economic policy? (Check any policies you would support or write in your own opinion.)

(a) United States should encourage United States business to invest more private capital in the underdeveloped nations (providing, for example, special tax benefits and more extensive United States insurance on overseas investments): 42 percent.

(b) United States should not expect United States private business to accept responsibility for economic development abroad: 9 percent.

(c) United States should step up its farm surpluses disposal program in needy areas of the world: 60 percent.

(d) United States should avoid creating problems for other farm surplus nations through our own surplus disposal program: 32 percent.

(e) United States should accept the role of world leadership in an attempt to treat world economic problems on a genuinely cooperative basis with all nations of the world: 59 percent.

(f) United States should accept the role of leadership in the non-Communist world, attempting to meet economic problems on a cooperative basis in these areas of the world only: 22 percent.

(g) United States should take no steps that would cause even temporary dislocations in the American economy: 11 percent.

(h) Other: 7 percent.

LIBERAL WORLD TRADE POLICIES SUPPORTED IN DECISIONS VOTE

Liberal policies in world trade in line with administration-backed legislation now before Congress are favored by most Oregonians balloting on the great decisions discussion topic, "What United States economic policy for survival?"

Ballots were tabulated this week at Oregon State College for the 6th topic in a series of 8 foreign policy issues discussed during the 1958 great-decisions program.

Discussion groups in 32 Oregon counties participated this year in the program sponsored by Oregon State College extension service and general extension division of the State system of higher education, in cooperation with the Foreign Policy Association.

The majority of great-decisions voters supported present reciprocal-trade arrangements. Sixty-one percent voted for renewal of the Trade Agreements Act which became law in 1934 but which is due to expire June 30.

Only 2 percent of Oregon voters thought Congress should refuse renewal of the act. The remaining ballots favored even more liberal trade agreements, authorizing the President to make further tariff reductions on a reciprocal basis with other nations.

Congressional debate on the Trade Agreements Act has cut across party lines with some opponents of the bill arguing that high tariff protection to United States business is needed to bolster sagging employment and production.

On the question of whether the United States should increase its foreign aid activities, Oregonians voted on policy alternatives as follows:

Eighty percent said Congress should put more emphasis on loans and technical cooperation and less emphasis on outright grants. More than half the voters thought the United States should give greater emphasis to economic aid and less to military aid. Only 5 percent of the voters thought Congress should reduce all kinds of foreign-aid spending.

Fifty-two percent favored increased United States economic assistance to underdeveloped nations.

Forty-seven percent thought the United States should channel more aid through the United Nations, while only 4 percent called for less U. N. channeling, and 49 percent expressed no opinion.

On the question of whether the United States should make other adjustments in its foreign economic policy, alternatives were rated as follows:

Sixty percent thought the United States should step up its farm surplus disposal program in needy areas of the world, while 32 percent said we should avoid creating problems for other farm-surplus nations through our disposal program. Other countries, notably Canada and Australia, have complained that the United States disposal program robs them of regular markets.

Fifty-nine percent thought the United States should accept world leadership by cooperating on economic problems with all nations, while 22 percent thought we should accept such leadership only in dealing with non-Communist countries. About one-fifth of the voters expressed no opinion.

OPINION BALLOT—RED CHINA

(Discussing the facts is the first step; arriving at an informed opinion is the next. As you weigh the answers on this ballot, bear in mind the consequences of each policy. Check only those policies you are willing to support—and be sure your answers do not contradict each other. Remember, your opinion counts—make it an informed opinion.)

1. What basic attitude should guide United States policy toward Red China? (Check any statements you agree with or write in your own opinion.)

(a) The Communist regime in China is a passing phase; the United States should act on the assumption that the Communist government will ultimately be overthrown: 7 percent.

(b) Strict communism in China is a passing phase; United States policy should allow for the possibility that Peiping's present methods may give way to a more relaxed or liberal government in the future: 18 percent.

(c) We do not have enough evidence that communism, in any form, is on the way out in China; we should learn to live with the Peiping government: 40 percent.

(d) We do not have enough evidence that communism is on the way out but there is no good reason for us to have anything more to do with them than we have at present: 17 percent.

(e) The Red China government is a major power in the Far East, controlling 25 percent of the world's people; the United States should normalize relations: 41 percent.

(f) We shouldn't go too far too fast in normalizing relations with Peiping; we may have to recognize them someday but we should move slowly and demand a high price: 29 percent.

(g) Russia and China may someday be rivals for leadership of the Communist bloc; we should encourage this by establishing better commercial and political relations with Peiping: 24 percent.

(h) More liberal commercial and political policies toward Peiping would probably have little effect on Russian-Red Chinese relations: 22 percent.

(i) Other: 6 percent.

2. How should the United States deal with Red China's growing importance in the world? (Check all the policies you feel the United States should follow or write in your own.)

(a) Continue to arm and aid our Asian allies to check any military expansion by Red China: 25 percent.

(b) Be willing to provide economic assistance, when needed, to any non-Communist country (such as India) in order to help prevent the spread of communism by political or subversive means: 58 percent.

(c) Put less emphasis on military defenses in Asia and more emphasis on economic defenses—helping non-Communist governments raise the living standards of their peoples: 62 percent.

(d) Refuse aid to any Asian country that refuses to join a western military pact against communism. [Note: this would exclude India, Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia, etc.]: 4 percent.

(e) Refuse aid to any Asian country that deals in strategic materials with Red China. [Note: this is currently United States law but the President has some discretion, as in the case of Ceylon which receives United States aid although it sells rubber to Peiping.]: 11 percent.

(f) Help the Nationalist government on Taiwan to accomplish its stated aim of recapturing the Chinese mainland: 8 percent.

(g) Maintain good relations with Taiwan but do not expect this government to take over mainland China: 52 percent.

(h) Extend full or partial diplomatic recognition to Peiping: 34 percent.

(i) Agree to seating Peiping in the U. N. as the government of China: 16 percent.

(j) Other: 7 percent.

3. Should the United States change its policies on trade with Red China? (Check any statement you agree with or write in your own opinion.)

(a) On allied trade with Red China, continue our present policy—insist on special restrictions that do not apply to trade with other Communist countries: 7 percent.

(b) On allied trade with Red China, go along with our principal allies—apply the same restrictions to Red China that apply to other Communist countries: 35 percent.

(c) On allied trade with Red China, try to maintain special restrictions but recognize that some of our allies (like Japan) need more normal China trade for their own prosperity: 39 percent.

(d) On United States trade with Red China, continue our present policy of total embargo: 10 percent.

(e) On United States trade with Red China, experiment with limited trade: 27 percent.

(f) On United States trade with Red China, put it on the same basis as United States trade with Russia: 31 percent.

(g) Abandon all trade restrictions for all Communist countries, including China; trade embargoes have not prevented the Communist world from approaching self-sufficiency: 13 percent.

(h) Maintain restrictions on trade with all Communist countries; this certainly causes them some economic hardships: 17 percent.

(i) Other: 4 percent.

OREGONIANS DIVIDED ON ISSUE OF UNITED STATES-RED CHINA POLICIES

United States foreign policy for dealing with Red China ran into sharp division of opinion among Oregonians balloting on the great decisions discussion topic, "Should the United States trade with Red China?"

Ballots tabulated this week at Oregon State College indicated growing sentiment for easing foreign policy and trade relations with Red China, but at least 10 percent of the voters turned "thumbs down" on any concessions to the Mao Tse-tung Communist regime.

Forty percent of the voters thought the United States should develop normal policy relations with Red China, recognizing it as a major power in the Far East. About 30 percent of the voters, however, favored moving slowly and demanding a high price before recognizing the Peiping government. Less than 10 percent felt that the Communist regime in China is a passing phase that will ultimately be overthrown.

In the question of how the United States should deal with Red China's growing importance in the world, balloting was as follows:

Sixty-two percent thought the United States should put less emphasis on military defenses in Asia and more on economic defenses—helping nonCommunist governments raise living standards. However, 25 percent said the United States should continue to arm and aid our Asian allies to check any military expansion by Red China.

While 52 percent favored maintaining good relations with Taiwan (island base for President Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Chinese Government-in-exile) only 8 percent thought we should help the Nationalist government to accomplish its stated aim of recapturing the Chinese mainland.

Thirty-four percent thought this country should extend full or partial diplomatic recognition to the Communist Peiping government.

Balloting on United States trade policies with Red China was as follows:

Forty percent said the United States and allies should try to maintain special trade restrictions against Red China while liberalizing the position for such allies as Japan that need more normal China trade for their own prosperity.

Present United States trade policy places a ban on strategic goods to all territories controlled by the Chinese Government. The China embargo list contains 200 more prohibited items than does the trade embargo with the Soviet Union and satellites.

Thirty-five percent of the voters would ease the embargo, going along with our principal allies to apply the same restrictions to Red China that apply to other Communist countries and include the most important strategic items.

Ten percent thought the United States should continue its present policy of total embargo with Red China. However, nearly 15 percent said the United States should abandon all trade restrictions for all Communist countries on the basis that embargoes have not prevented the Communist world from approaching self-sufficiency.

OPINION BALLOT—UNITED NATIONS

(Discussing the fact is the first step; arriving at an informed opinion is the next. As you weigh the answers on this ballot, bear in mind the consequences of each policy. Check only those policies you are willing to support, and be sure your answers do not contradict each other. Remember, your opinion counts; make it an informed opinion.)

1. Should the United States work for important changes in the U. N. now? (Check any changes you believe the United States should support or write in your own suggestions.)

(a) Give more weight to votes of the great powers in the General Assembly: 10 percent.

(b) Abolish the veto for the five permanent members of the Security Council: 27 percent.

(c) Place restrictions on the authority of the Secretary General: 4 percent.

(d) Give the Secretary General more power to act independently: 20 percent.

(e) Give the U. N. more authority to enforce its decisions: 45 percent.

(f) Attempt no important changes in the U. N. now; the charter reflects the political realities of the world situation: 33 percent.

(g) Other: 9 percent.

2. Should the United States support the establishment of a permanent U. N. police force? (Check those proposals you believe the United States should support or write in your own recommendations. Note that some questions are paired as "either-or" alternatives.)

(a) Establish a large, well-equipped, permanent U. N. military force: 23 percent; or

(b) Establish a token police force which will represent the prestige of the U. N. (on the UNEF pattern): 38 percent.

(c) Maintain a permanent force at a U. N. base, ready to go into action on short notice anywhere in the world: 30 percent; or

(d) Maintain on a permanent basis a U. N. military staff only; have pledged forces available in member countries for mobilization in an emergency: 42 percent.

(e) Use complete units from existing armed forces of member states (as for UNEF): 33 percent; or

(f) Recruit soldiers for the future on an individual volunteer basis: 17 percent.

(g) Equip the permanent force with tactical nuclear weapons: 24 percent.

(h) Prohibit the permanent, great power members of the Security Council from furnishing units for the force: 17 percent.

(i) Recognize that a U. N. police force can have no military power and little moral power if a large nation chooses to ignore it, therefore, make no effort to set up a permanent force at present: 11 percent.

(j) Other: 6 percent.

3. Should the United States continue to pay the largest share of the U. N.'s budget? (Check the attitudes which you think should guide future United States policy or write in your own opinion.)

(a) Our current share (30 percent) is not too much of a drain on a country which produces 40 percent of all the world's goods and services: 43 percent.

(b) If we are going to pay so large a share of the U. N.'s bills, we should have a bigger say in what the U. N. does: 7 percent.

(c) It makes no sense for the underdeveloped nations to pay a larger share of the U. N.'s costs because these are the countries that have most need for economic and technical assistance under the U. N.'s budget: 37 percent.

(d) We may have to carry more of the burden for the present, but we should urge other nations to contribute more as they can afford it: 71 percent.

(e) Our contribution to the U. N. should be no larger than the contribution of any other great power member: 16 percent.

(f) Communist countries should contribute a larger share of the budget: 27 percent.

(g) Other: 5 percent.

4. Should the United States continue to make extensive use of the U. N. as an important instrument of United States foreign policy? (Check the directions you think United States policy should follow in the future or write in your own opinion.)

(a) Continue working through the U. N. as we are now doing: 42 percent.

(b) Try to handle all major international disputes through the U. N. only: 32 percent.

(c) Recognize that the U. N. has little value in settling major disputes between the great powers, make more use of direct negotiation and diplomacy: 9 percent.

(d) Recognize that the U. N. has limited usefulness in any political dispute (even between small powers), rely less on U. N. political machinery: 5 percent.

(e) Recognize both the usefulness and the limitations of the U. N., be willing to work through the U. N., use direct negotiation, secret diplomacy, "summit conferences," and all other foreign-policy channels in the proper place, at the proper time; be flexible: 62 percent.

(f) Give less support to the U. N.'s economic, social, and other nonpolitical activities: 3 percent.

(g) Give greater support to the U. N.'s nonpolitical activities: 52 percent.

(h) Other: 6 percent.

OREGONIANS GIVE UNITED NATIONS STRONG SUPPORT

Strong support for United Nations—financial, military, and delegation of more authority—was favored by Oregonians balloting on the final 1958 Great Decisions issue, "Whose U. N. Is It?"

Ballots were tabulated this week at Oregon State College, closing the 8-weeks' program carried on in 32 Oregon counties to increase understanding of key foreign policy issues the United States faces this year.

In balloting on whether the United States should work for important changes in the U. N. Oregonians rated policy alternatives in the following order:

Forty-five percent thought the U. N. should be given more authority to enforce its decisions.

Thirty-three percent said the United States should attempt no important changes in the U. N. now, feeling that the U. N. Charter reflects the political realities of the world situation. Under the Charter, any major issue in the Security Council is subject to veto by great power members—United States, Britain, China, France, Russia.

Oregonians were about evenly split on the veto issue, however, with 27 percent voting for abolishment of the veto and the 5 permanent members of the Security Council.

Twenty percent said the Secretary General should have more power to act independently. In both the Suez and Hungarian crises, the U. N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold, performed a key role. Responsibilities included placement of U. N. troops in the Near East and negotiations

for investigation and relief in the Hungary crisis.

Should the United States support establishment of a permanent U. N. police force? Oregonians favored present proposals in the following order:

Forty-two percent said a U. N. military staff, only, should be maintained on a permanent basis, with pledged forces available in member countries for emergency mobilization. By contrast, 30 percent favored maintaining a permanent force at a U. N. base, ready to go into action on short notice anywhere in the world. Only 11 percent thought no effort should be made to set up a permanent force. Some observers contend that a U. N. police force can have no military power if a large nation chooses to ignore it.

Thirty-eight percent favored token police force to represent the prestige of the U. N. while 23 percent voted for a large, well-equipped, permanent U. N. military force. Thirty-three percent thought the U. N. should use complete units from existing armed forces of member states, while 17 percent favored recruitment of soldiers for the force on an individual volunteer basis.

On the question of whether the United States should continue to pay the largest share of the U. N.'s budget, balloting was as follows:

Seventy-one percent said the United States may have to carry more of the burden for the present while urging other nations to contribute more, as they can afford it. The United States now pays 30 percent of the regular U. N. budget; Russia pays about 17 percent.

Forty-three percent of the voters maintained that the United States current share of the budget is not too much of a drain on a country which produces 40 percent of the world's goods and services. In the same vein, 37 percent said underdeveloped countries should not be expected to pay a larger share of the budget, since these are the countries that have most need for economic and technical assistance.

Twenty-seven percent thought Communist countries should contribute a larger share.

Should the United States continue to make extensive use of the U. N. as an important instrument of United States foreign policy? Opinions rated as follows:

Sixty-two percent said we should be willing to work through the U. N. where practical while recognizing that other foreign policy channels may be more useful in some cases. Only 32 percent thought we should try to handle all major international disputes through the U. N. only.

Fifty-two percent favored giving greater support to U. N.'s nonpolitical activities.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, no comments on this subject would be complete without mention of the fact that this fine and stimulating program owes a great deal to the efforts of State Chairman for Great Decisions, Mrs. Mabel C. Mack. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been kept informed of this outstanding local program by Mrs. Mack. We of Oregon are indeed fortunate in having such a program under the able leadership of a State chairman who has demonstrated fine leadership and ability.

As the senior Senator from Oregon, I commend her. I know that I speak for my junior colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER] in this respect. Mrs. Mack is deserving of commendation for the very fine job she has done in helping to inform the people of Oregon with regard to the various aspects of the American foreign policy program.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT EISENHOWER TO ECONOMIC CONFERENCE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the text of a very informative and constructive address delivered last night in New York City by President Eisenhower before the economic-mobilization conference of the American Management Association.

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

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 21, 1958]

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS TO ECONOMIC CONFERENCE

I find my position here tonight a refreshing and somewhat novel one.

For some months now, we in the Government have spent a large part of our waking hours acting on proposals by private citizens on what the Government could do about the business downturn.

Now this group of private business leaders have invited some of us from Government to suggest to businessmen what they could be doing about the downturn.

Needless to say, this is a welcome turning of the tables.

I begin by reminding ourselves of one simple, inescapable fact:

America is not going to stand still. America is going to grow—and grow and grow.

SAYS REPORTS INDICATE SLOWDOWN IN DECLINE

The question that faces us today is not whether America is going to continue to grow and make progress, but how quickly our economy is going to resume its full and healthy advance.

My answer tonight is this: Reports from the country strongly indicate that the economic decline of recent months is slowing down. Not all our economic troubles are over by any means. But there is a change in the making. That it will prove to be a change for the better, I have no doubt.

What America must do now is to gather all its forces for a new offensive to promote an early upturn and renewed economic growth that is vigorous and sound. No single person and no single group, however wise and well informed, can name the day or the week when that upturn will begin. But there is reason to believe that much of the adjustment which a free economy experiences from time to time has already occurred.

From this point on, the conscious determination of the American people—together with resultant actions—can make the difference in lifting the economy to higher and higher levels.

It is at this point that the wisdom, the venturesomeness, the resourcefulness of our business leadership are put to the test.

We have about caught our breath.

There is nothing wrong with our oxygen supply.

Now, what do we do to get climbing again?

EMPHASIS ON PRIVATE ACTION IS APPROVED

The emphasis of this conference is on private action, and rightly so. But we all know that the job of recovery is a joint effort in which business leaders, labor leaders, farm leaders, professional leaders, consumers, together with government, must play a part.

I could not in good conscience come here tonight and call on you as businessmen to do your full part unless I felt confident that the Government was fully alert to its own responsibility.

Government, while it cannot guarantee prosperity, has a continuing responsibility in times like these to use its powers to help counteract recession. It has a duty to alleviate human hardship and protect our human resources, to help promote an upturn in production and employment, and to help build a solid foundation for long-term growth.

All this it should seek to do in a way that strengthens the vitality of our private-enterprise system, and that includes safeguarding the integrity of our currency.

Carrying out this responsibility, your Government has acted over a period of many months in many ways to counter the recession and foster recovery. Let me cite the main items in this record of action.

First, the independent Federal Reserve System has increased the availability of credit and has helped reduce its cost to borrowers.

Second, a series of actions starting last August has been taken to promote private housing construction and to step up activity in such fields as urban renewal and college housing.

Third, measures have been taken toward accelerating approved public construction in many categories, such as post office modernization, water resource projects, hospitals and highways. The accent has been on the speeding up of going or authorized work on needed facilities. I am determined not to get bogged down in a slow-starting, emergency public works program, which would provide a minimum of jobs now and a maximum of budgetary headaches in the years ahead.

RECKLESS EXPENDITURE HELD SELF-DEFEATING

One truth we should always hold before our eyes: Reckless expenditure in the name of economic stimulation is both wrong and self-defeating.

Fourth, steps have been taken to accelerate markedly procurement for needed defense and civilian requirements.

Fifth, recommendations have been made to Congress to deal with special problems. An example is my proposal of March 25 to provide temporary unemployment insurance benefits to individuals who have exhausted their regular benefits.

This proposal goes directly to the heart of the problem of relieving human hardship arising from the recession. There can be arguments about the details, but there is no arguing about the personal anxiety and hardship that this proposal will alleviate. We need its prompt enactment by the Congress.

There is another area of policy that has aroused intense interest, both in and out of government. That is taxation.

Everyone in this country is, I know, concerned about taxation. We would like to achieve improvements in the tax structure. We would like to assume maximum equity in the tax burden. We would like to achieve further simplification. We would like a tax structure which least interferes with sound economic growth.

The timing of such changes always poses problems. During periods of high business activity and high employment there is concern with inflationary effects. In a time like the present, with its rising Government expenditures, we are particularly sensitive to tax burdens, but there is likewise great concern with the future impact of increasing future deficits.

DECISIONS PROMISED IN FIELD OF TAXATION

After consultation with Congressional leaders, certain decisions will shortly be taken in the field of taxation. They will be made in the light of the latest information regarding the economic situation and with a full evaluation of the probable short- and long-range consequences. This matter of taxation is so important to the American people that by no means should it be the subject of political competition.

While we are talking of Government activity, we cannot forget defense reorganization, mutual aid and world trade.

Through our security establishment, we help produce the confidence essential to prosperity at home. Through our mutual-aid program we help other Free World nations develop their strength in order to maintain their defense establishments against Communist threats, in order to bring the economic improvement that spells hope for their people. And through expanding world trade we increase jobs at home and economic strength here and abroad. In these three vital areas we need decisive Congressional action.

Now I want to turn to the field of private business action.

I have been gratified by the underlying purpose and accomplishments of this conference. Business leaders have been reporting precisely what they and their industries are doing in creating new products and designs, reducing costs, modernizing plants and facilities, and merchandising more effectively.

All this will create new and better job opportunities. These reports show that American businessmen are engaged more and more in the best kind of creative competition—investing their resources, their ambitions, their imaginations and themselves to build stronger positions for their companies. Thus they will help build a stronger America and a stronger Free World.

They do this because they are deeply convinced of this plain truth about American life.

Achievement and progress cannot be created for our people; they can only be created by our people.

Americans would have it no other way. Our future is in our own hands. Our prospects are limited only by our vision and by our exertions.

Our economy has always moved ahead to set new records after every period of pause or recession in our history.

It will do so again.

CAN NEVER PEPTALK WAY TO PROSPERITY

One salient fact should be clear. We can never peptalk our way to prosperity. No one here is proposing that we try. We are simply suggesting that businesses do what is clearly in their own interest.

We are suggesting further, that it be done in the time-honored American way of self-reliance and self-starting initiative. Our economy has grown strong because our people have made jobs for each other and have not relied on the Government to try to do it for them.

What is our economy anyway?

Emphatically our economy is not the Federal Reserve System, or the Treasury, or the Congress, or the White House.

This Nation of 43 million families, 174 million people—what we all think and what we do—that is our economy.

Our economy is the result of millions of decisions we all make every day about producing, earning, saving, investing, and spending. Both our individual prosperity, and our Nation's prosperity, rest directly on the decisions all of us are making now.

This conference has been concerned with guides for such decisions by business. Let us look at a few.

The first is this: The best hope of continued progress and growth is for business to keep offering the American consumer something better. This means to create better values.

Creating better values, in turn, calls for vigor and imagination in forging ahead with new and improved product developments, and in product and market research.

In a free economy, people do not always buy just because they have money. Theirs is the sovereign right of choice. One of the hopeful developments of recent years is that new knowledge is rapidly being accumulated about the aspirations and wants and motivations of our people.

Many businesses are extending their research activities further into these fields in order better to find out what people want, and how products can better be adapted to their customers' needs. Thus businesses can serve us all better. These vital activities should be intensified.

ONE GREAT CHALLENGE MET SUPERBLY WELL

One great challenge that our economy has always faced, and met superbly well, is this: To produce the most good, as well as the most goods, for the benefit of the people.

The second guide to business action has to do with inventories.

We have reports of some manufacturers and distributors who are going along on a hand-to-mouth inventory basis.

One businessman told me recently that this kind of timidity had been bad business for him. He was convinced that it had caused him to lose sales. Another told me that his company's policy, back in 1949, of letting inventories fall below normal requirements left it unable to keep up with its competitors when the upswing came.

The guide in this inventory question seems a commonsense one: Buy to normal requirements. Is that good business?

Closely related is a third problem, that of investment in plant and equipment.

Now, no one is going to urge a business with ample capacity to add more facilities just because it might be good for the economy as a whole.

On the other hand, very few of the 4.3 million individual businesses in this country feel that they do not need some modernization or improvement. First, they expect to create better values for better business today: Likewise, they want to get ready to win their full share of the unprecedented markets that certainly lie ahead. Many of these companies are doing these things now, for the simple reason that now is a good time to get them done.

What time could be better than the present for making these outlays? Money and materials are more readily available today, and in many cases on better terms, than they have been for some time—or than they may be for some time.

GOVERNMENT FOLLOWS SIMPLE RULE, HE SAYS

As I have indicated, the Government is following this simple rule: For purchases and investments which must be made anyway, acting now makes sense for the Government, and it gives the economy a lift when it's most helpful. I suggest that there are numerous opportunities for private business profitably to adapt the same principle to its operations.

My fourth comment is on prices.

No feature of America's economic life has been more at the heart of our rapidly rising and widely shared levels of living than the daring of this Nation's businesses in pricing for volume and taking their chances on profits.

It is no accident that this policy has characterized our most profitable industries. If we are to maintain the vigor and vitality of our free economy this drive for the widest possible markets must continue. A price policy designed to bring increasing volume should be nothing short of an article of faith for every businessman.

My fifth observation is this: The economic recovery and growth we bring about must take the form, not of higher costs and prices, but of more production and more jobs.

Let's be realistic. If as earners we obtain such large increases in our incomes each year that the costs of production move always upward, then as customers we will find only higher price tags in the stores.

The American people believe in good wages, both in private and public employment. Good wages reward effort and build markets. But the American people are going to be looking over the shoulders of those sitting at every bargaining table to see whether the wage settlement and subsequent price decisions are consistent with a stable dollar, or whether they mean another dismal sequence of ever-rising costs and prices.

CONSUMER WAGE-PRICE STAKE IS EMPHASIZED

Inequities in the wage structure must, of course, be adjusted. But consumers are not going to be satisfied with less and less value per dollar of price, which is the inevitable result of less and less production per dollar of cost.

If businessmen and labor union leaders forget these truths, the consumer will remind them in ways that are clear and painful. And in the process the whole economy will suffer. These are not theoretical considerations. They have a direct bearing on specific industries today.

Perhaps this is a good time to ask ourselves whether some dangerous rigidities of thought and policy have not been settling in on us in recent years.

There used to be a periodical feature entitled, "We nominate for oblivion."

Let me suggest a few ideas that I would like to nominate for oblivion:

The idea that the consumer is not price-conscious any more.

The notion that without paying the piper in higher prices, we can as a nation overpay ourselves for what we produce.

The idea that management can be lax about costs without pricing its product, not only out of foreign markets, but out of the American market as well.

The idea that large annual wage increases can be regarded as a matter of course.

The delusion that more rigid farm controls and larger surpluses to dispose of at taxpayer expense can lead to a prosperous farm economy.

The notion that we can export without importing.

The doctrine that a competitive-enterprise economy can be free of all loss, failure, and disappointment, and that Government can take all the bumps out of the road of business.

ILLUSIONS DECLARED THREATS TO RECOVERY

All these and similar illusions are threats to that resiliency which enables private enterprise to adjust itself to new conditions. More than that, they are threats to recovery and to our capacity to achieve a vigorous and orderly economic growth. I once more nominate the whole kit and kaboodle of them for oblivion.

Three years ago last October, I discussed the state of the economy in an address at the Forrestal memorial dinner in Washington. As you will recall, that was also a period of some uncertainty. Crosscurrents were evident. Unemployment had risen. Output was below that of the previous year. Dire predictions filled the air.

On that occasion, I urged that we take the long view, venturing the opinion that ours could be a $500 billion economy within a decade if we were wise in our policies. I meant to be conservative in my estimate. It is clear now that I was.

We see all around us evidence that Americans share this confidence in our economy's long-run expansion. It rests upon solid facts like these:

Our population is burgeoning at a rate of 3 million Americans a year. That is equivalent to adding a Kentucky to the Union every 12 months.

Even in this recession year, business is spending more than $30 billion to maintain productive equipment, expand capacity, and provide for the creation of new products. In

the last 5 years these outlays have reached the staggering sum of more than $150 billion.

State and local governments are spending nearly $10 billion each year for new schools, better streets, and the other facilities that our people want and need.

Nowhere is this faith in the future better exemplified than in the $7 billion which will be spent by industry on research and development this year—outlays that have been growing at the rate of 10 percent a year. The wonders of recent years—nuclear energy, miracle drugs, synthetics, electronics—will be dwarfed by new wonders to come.

THREE MILLION GETTING READY FOR TOMORROW

Today 3 million of our young people are in colleges and universities, preparing themselves for the opportunities of tomorrow.

We are now moving forward swiftly on the vast highway program which I proposed a few years ago. It will provide a 41,000-mile nationwide system of new and improved highways for the rapidly enlarging volume of traffic generated by our expanding economy.

After 50 years of indecision, the great St. Lawrence seaway project is moving toward completion. In the field of aviation, plans are well advanced to receive the jet age. Abroad, prospects of new markets are opening to our trade.

In short, the future is bursting with vitality and promise: it is welcomed by rising aspirations of our people; our advancing productivity to meet those expectations; the vast areas of new enjoyment, utility, and adventure opened up by scientific advances; the growth of schools, hospitals, research centers; the rapid strides in wide sharing of personal income, education, and security.

The question, then, is going to be—not one of surmounting our problems—but one of rising to our opportunities.

But remember: These are fast-moving times. The fainthearted and the doubters who hang back today are apt tomorrow to be trampled in the rush of progress. It has been the tough-minded optimists whom history has proved right in America. It is still true in our time.

The economy of the American people has served this Nation faithfully and well. It stands as living evidence of the toil of this generation and those who have gone before. It has yielded the material counterpart to the dignity that is every American's birthright.

It has afforded not only material comfort, but the resources to provide a challenging life of the mind and of the spirit. It has provided the strength to make our homes secure against those who would attack us and destroy our way of life. It has given us the means to work unceasingly for a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world.

All this we can keep and strengthen by our faith and by our exertions. May we so conduct ourselves today that, when we look back upon this time, we can say: We met the test.

INTERSTATE SHIPMENT OF ALCOHOLIC-BEVERAGE ADVERTISING

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, recently the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce concluded hearings on the Langer bill, S. 582, prohibiting the interstate shipment of alcoholic-beverage advertising. A large number of Minnesota citizens have expressed their interest in the passage of this proposed legislation.

Last year I addressed a letter to the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], requesting constructive action on the bills before his committee dealing with the alcohol problem. It was gratifying when he announced hearings on S. 582 in April. The committee is now considering what further action should be taken, in view of the information presented to the committee.

In order that the committee and other Senators may know of the interest of many Minnesotans in this proposed legislation, I ask unanimous consent to have my letter to the chairman and representative letters and petitions printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I received approximately 360 individual letters and 2,700 signatures on petitions from persons all across the State, indicating statewide interest.

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

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 23, 1958.*

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: I have received considerable correspondence from my constituents expressing an interest in legislative proposals which would affect interstate advertising and traffic of intoxicating beverages.

It is my understanding that no action has been scheduled on S. 4 or S. 593 prohibiting the serving of liquor on airplanes in flight in interstate commerce, and that no action has been scheduled on S. 582 which would prohibit the interstate advertising of intoxicating beverages.

Any constructive action that your committee may take on these proposals would be much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senator.

FREEDOM FREE EVANGELICAL CHURCH,
Little Falls, Minn., April 30, 1958.

The Honorable SENATOR EDWARD THYE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In last week's Minneapolis Morning Tribune, I read of a proposed bill which is being considered to regulate interstate liquor advertising. In view of the seriousness of the liquor problem in our Nation today, the most wholehearted support of every honest-minded citizen and Congressman should be given to this piece of legislation.

That such regulation of liquor advertising is sorely needed, is vividly indicated by the sinister methods which the liquor interests use in magazines, newspapers, billboards, etc. For the spiritual and physical welfare of our young people, in particular, should such action be taken in this regard. The close relationship of liquor and delinquency among our teen-agers should impress everyone that something must be done. To control advertising of this terrible evil would at least keep it from being so attractive to the younger generation.

I urgently request your sincere support of this needed legislation and trust that many of your colleagues in Congress will join in enacting this bill.

"Wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging: and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise." Proverbs 20:1.

Sincerely yours,

OLIVER K. VICK, *Pastor.*

EVANGELICAL UNITED
BRETHREN CHURCH,
Worthington, Minn., April 23, 1958.

Senator EDWARD THYE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: I trust you will find it possible to vote for the pending Langer bill (S. 582) when it comes to the Senate floor. This bill would prohibit advertising of beer, wine, and liquor of all kinds in interstate commerce.

Your vote in favor of this bill will be deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

W. H. WIENER.

EYOTA, MINN., *April 24, 1958.*

The Honorable EDWARD J. THYE,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: I am writing you as to my opinion on the Langer bill (S. 582). I feel that you should vote yes for the Langer bill. The advertising of intoxicating liquor tends to give the American people the idea that it is respectable and refined to use. Juvenile delinquency, traffic accidents, drunkenness, murder, and broken homes are many times the result of liquor. I believe the yes vote you cast for the Langer bill will help preserve the sanctity of the Christian home in America.

My address is Wayne Riser, Eyota, Minn. Thank you for taking time to read this letter.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE RISER.

STAPLES, MINN., *May 14, 1958.*

Senator EDWARD J. THYE,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am asking you to vote for the bill S. 582. When $400 million is spent each year for liquor advertising I think we should do something about it.

Also bill S. 4—please do what you can to enact this bill into law.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. P. M. ATWOOD.

MOORHEAD, MINN., *April 23, 1958.*

The Honorable SENATOR EDWARD THYE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: We believe in a great America; and in order for the United States to become truly great, the worst enemy of mankind, the liquor traffic, must be controlled and eventually eliminated as far as possible. The object of this letter is to inform you of our stand against liquor in every form.

Two bills S. 582 and S. 4 are musts in our sight. These bills are essential to help protect our people from the liquor industry and hold down juvenile delinquency in the United States.

Kindly vote for the above bills and any others that will protect our good people from the abuses of the liquor traffic.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. S. M. WADLEIGH.

ST. OLAF HOSPITAL,
Austin, Minn., April 29, 1958.

Senator EDWARD THYE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: It is my wish that you will eagerly work to support the following bills:

S. 582—the prohibiting of the advertising of liquor.

Also, S. 4—the prohibiting of the sale of liquor on commercial and military planes.

Thanking you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. B. F. WATKINS.

P. S.—Mrs. Watkins is a patient in the hospital because she was knocked down by a car, and has asked help to have this letter written.

BELLINGHAM, MINN., *April 15, 1958.*

Senator EDWARD J. THYE,
Washington, D. C.

The Honorable Mr. THYE: I understand that there is to be a hearing on the Langer bill (S. 582) on the 22d of this month. I am writing to urge you to vote for a law

that will prohibit beer and liquor ads on radio and television.

We are having quite a number of meetings in our locality on the juvenile delinquency problem, and law enforcement officers, as well as nearly every one, are convinced that the liquor and beer ads on radio and television, are the largest contributors to this delinquency. Therefore, we urgently request your wholehearted support of any law that will forbid such ads.

Sincerely,

Reverend and Mrs. C. W. MOORE.

WILLMAR, MINN., *April 21, 1958.*

Senator EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: A bill which would prohibit the interstate shipment of alcoholic-beverage advertising introduced by Senator LANGER (S. 582) is pending. I know you are interested in how your constituency feels about this legislation and it is for that reason that I write.

The public is constantly being presented with the properness of drinking and never in advertising with the harm and degradation caused by this evil. I am aware that much revenue is obtained from this advertising and yet the worth of a human body is immeasurable, not to mention the worth of his soul; surely these cannot be compared. Drinking is shown to be so respectable and harmless and often is implied to be the norm. Certainly when some of this advertising is analyzed, it is downright ridiculous. Last year, before Christmas, an ad was run in a leading magazine showing a bourbon bottle tied with a red ribbon and captioned, "The Season's Best." Tell me, Senator, is this the best the season has to offer? Last year an unprecedented amount was spent for liquor advertising before the holiday season. Why should we be subjected to this form of propaganda and twisting of the meaning of Christmas? Whether we submit to it or not, it certainly is an insult to our intelligence as a Nation—or maybe not. Is this Christian United States? Maybe that should be un-Christian.

You know much better than I that we are living in an age which calls for clear minds (and heads)—can we justify the perpetration of this evil which has absolutely no social, moral, or economic value and in the end, damns the soul and warps the body?

I feel very strongly about this and see here an opportunity to stem the tide of liquor which has made us the drinkingest Nation on the globe. What an honor.

I am a high-school teacher and a father. Can we do justice to our coming generation by subjecting their formative minds to the glorification of this evil?

I am urging your vote for this bill, and, in any event, would appreciate knowing of your decision in this matter. You are the only representative receiving a copy of this letter.

Respectfully,

RAYMOND HILLSTROM.

Whereas the glamorous beer and other liquor advertisements increase drinking, especially among youth and mothers and creates a favorable and tolerant public sentiment toward the traffic and for the use and sale of alcoholic beverages; and

Whereas drinking is the sole cause of alcoholism and the chief cause of automobile tragedies, broken homes, juvenile delinquency and other crimes, immorality, wrecked lives, poverty, suffering, insanity, suicides, political corruption and many other deplorable and perplexing problems; and

Whereas the advertising of other things considered injurious to public health and morals is prohibited by law and reenforced by public opinion:

We, the members of the First English Lutheran ladies aid of Sacred Heart, Minn., at their meeting April 3, 1958, do kindly request that you as our representative support such legislation as will prohibit the transportation of beverage alcohol advertising in interstate commerce and to ban its broadcasting over radio and television and thereby reduce the inducements and temptations to become liquor minded.

MRS. LESTER SKOGBERG,
(And four others).

EVELETH SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL,
Eveleth, Minn., April 28, 1958.

The Honorable EDWARD J. THYE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: We are students in the Eveleth Senior High School. We urge you to support and bend every effort you can in working for the passage of S. 582 and S. 4. Passage of both these bills would be of inestimable value to young people and adults, as well.

Browning says in Rabbi Ben Ezra: "Let age approve of youth." If age is to approve of youth, the leaders and the adults must set good examples and further legislation which will help to raise the morals and standards of all citizens. We feel that passage of S. 582 and S. 4 will be of great benefit to all. Please do your utmost to work for their passage. And do cast your vote for each one.

Yours respectfully,

M. W. VAN PUTTEN,
(And 67 others).

Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We urge you to use your influence to promote action on S. 4, the Thurmond bill, and use it to get the bill out of committee. We are deeply concerned about the serving of alcoholic beverages on commercial and military planes.

We also ask that you promote early action on S. 582, the Langer bill, prohibiting transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and over the air.

Minnesota voters, and American plane riders, who have long been asking for these bills to be passed in Congress, now urgently request that they be enacted into a law early this year.

Respectfully,

JEANETTE C. GREEN,
(And 16 others).

WARREN, MINN., *April 25, 1958.*

Senator EDWARD J. THYE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the following undersigned voters of Warren, Minn., wish to urge your full support of the Langer bill (S. 582) to curtail liquor advertising. We consider most of such advertising dishonest, misleading, and detrimental to the morals of our youth.

We would also like to have something done about all billboard advertising along our highways. It spoils the scenery and encourages accidents.

Very respectfully yours,

MRS. A. B. BROWN,
(And 12 others).

Petitions received signed by:

Mrs. Paul Bjornstad, Duluth, Minn., and 615 others.

Anna Gordon, W. C. T. U., Duluth, Minn., and 486 others.

Mrs. W. D. Oakley, Buffalo, Minn., and 37 others.

Reva Cromlish, St. Paul, Minn., and 11 others.

Mr. Oscar Ledin, Buffalo, Minn., and 42 others.

Phyllis Rensink, Dawson, Minn., and 18 others.

Bethel Mork, Dawson, Minn., and 21 others.

Mrs. William Pool, Farmington, Minn., and 14 others.

Mrs. Clarence Fondell, Dawson, Minn., and 47 others.

Mrs. Martin Bergeland, Dawson, Minn., and 18 others.

Mrs. J. R. Regelstad, Wannaska, Minn., and 13 others.

Mr. Ed Tegman, Barnum, Minn., and 17 others.

Mrs. Frances Gustafson, Route 2, Mahtowa, Minn., and 25 others.

Ruth Finifrock, Barnum, Minn., and 24 others.

Mr. H. W. Hughes, Moose Lake, Minn., and 23 others.

Mrs. Florence Shutter, Burtrum, Minn., and 51 others.

Mrs. Olaf Brenhaug, Roseau, Minn., and 42 others.

Vemer G. Anderson, Roseau, Minn., and 27 others.

Peter Thieson, Warroad, Minn., and 35 others.

Bertha M. Hegland, Roseau, Minn., and 44 others.

Mrs. R. E. Denny, Roseau, Minn., and 57 others.

Mrs. Francis G. Drown, Roseau, Minn., and 20 others.

Mrs. Kenneth Stae, Roseau, Minn., and 21 others.

Mr. Emil P. Peterson, Barnum, Minn., and 26 others.

Mrs. Rieff, Moose Lake, Minn., and 20 others.

Mrs. Ed. Hayland, Moose Lake, Minn., and 26 others.

Mrs. Robert Carroll, Finlayson, Minn., and 14 others.

Mrs. Torne Baehre, Moose Lake, Minn., and 26 others.

John B. Nelson, Sturgeon Lake, Minn., and 33 others.

G. O. Tolnson, Cloquet, Minn., and 15 others.

Ruth Anne Cavallin, Two Harbors, Minn., and 38 others.

P. L. Cavallin, Two Harbors, Minn., and 6 others.

Herb Walberg, Jr., Two Harbors, Minn., and 25 others.

Evelyn Lutz, Two Harbors, Minn., and 51 others.

Mrs. W. E. Hertel, Blue Earth, Minn., and 21 others.

Mrs. Donald Patterson, Canton, Minn., and 9 others.

Violet M. Geary, Pipestone, Minn., and 27 others.

Mrs. Fred McKay, Grand Rapids, Minn., and 22 others.

Mr. N. E. Schwartz, Lake City, Minn., and 5 others.

Mrs. Sophie Rasmussen, Milaca, Minn., and 23 others.

Gerald H. Sauer, Oak Park, Minn., and 22 others.

Mrs. Vernon Hedin, Wright, Minn., and 31 others.

Mr. Herbert D. McDonald, pastor, the First Baptist Church, Milaca, Minn., and 94 others.

Mrs. Floyd Glen, Cambridge, Minn., and 18 others.

Mrs. Violet M. Kelley, Milaca, Minn., and 40 others.

Mr. Nels Sikerness, Oak Park, Minn., and 19 others.

D. W. Fuller, Danube, Minn., and 21 others.

Ella M. Lewis, Northfield, Minn., and 13 others.

Mrs. Arthur Benson, Oak Park, Minn., and 32 others.

Raymond C. Ellstrom, Duluth, Minn., and 15 others.

Mrs. William Dahmes, Redwood Falls, Minn., and 28 others.

Mrs. B. G. Hustad, Redwood Falls, Minn., and 18 others.

Mrs. Alice Drackley, Tracy, Minn., and 17 others.

Mrs. Anna Frank, Redwood Falls, Minn., and 30 others.

Mrs. Fritz Olson, Two Harbors, Minn., and 6 others.

Mr. and Mrs. Albert W. H. Anderson, Two Harbors, Minn., and 17 others.

Ruth K. Eklund, Duluth, Minn., and 21 others.

Oscar W. Eklund, Duluth, Minn., and 14 others.

Paul A. Lindgren, Duluth, Minn., and 26 others.

Evelyn Wingness, Duluth, Minn., and 26 others.

Oscar C. Johnson, Duluth, Minn., and 25 others.

Mrs. Elyn V. Sime, Duluth, Minn., and 15 others.

Orville S. Petersen, Saginaw, Minn., and 56 others.

Myrtle Franholt, Moose Lake, Minn., and 22 others.

Harold W. Kamppi, Moose Lake, Minn., and 25 others.

Mrs. Henry Horsen, Barnum, Minn., and 26 others.

Mrs. Hattie J. Smith, Barnum, Minn., and 26 others.

Mrs. Iver Iversen, St. Paul, Minn., and 14 others.

Mary Stachoski, Foley, Minn., and 89 others.

Herman Jenson, Santiago, Minn., and 22 others.

Mrs. Esther Schulz, Minneapolis, Minn., and 30 others.

Rev. V. A. Jensen, Princeton, Minn., and 32 others.

Miss Anna Bjoin, Crookston, Minn., and 16 others.

Mrs. Floyd Margadant, Minneapolis, Minn., and 9 others.

Miss Jane E. Sasse, and 18 others.

Mrs. Glen K. Elliot and 43 others.

EFFECT OF OIL IMPORTS AND COAL EXPORTS ON WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. HOBLITZELL. Mr. President, the coal industry of my State has a double interest in seeing the reciprocal trade program operated on a fair basis. Not only is that industry interested in preventing excessive imports of residual, oil, which create unemployment, but it has a very great interest in coal exports.

More than one-third of the coal mined in West Virginia is exported to Canada, Mexico, Europe, and other areas of the world. In 1957 some 60 million tons were so exported.

According to the official Blue Book of West Virginia, my State produces 90 percent of all coal exported overseas, as well as one-half of all coal shipped to Canada.

Naturally, I worry about the prosperity of West Virginia when I see that coal exports are down approximately 30 percent in the first quarter of this year as compared with last year. Exports declined about 4.4 million tons during this period.

One must examine the European economic situation, as well as the trade factors as they exist, to discover why United States exports to Europe are sloping sharply downward.

The first outstanding fact is that apparently the economies of Western Europe generally are booming, and do not reflect the downturn in the United States.

Second, while recently our Western European allies in the United Nations Economic Commission of Europe ostensibly have rejected Russian trade overtures which look toward the increased use of Polish and Russian coals and natural gas, it is reported that individual countries among our Western allies are buying and bartering for both Russian and Polish coal. Our allies, seemingly, are buying coal from Iron Curtain sources in contravention to trade agreements and to the spirit of the reciprocal trade program. They are choosing to be customers of the Communist fuel source rather than trading with the United States, the only other large coal supplier in the world.

I think that the Departments of State and Commerce and the International Cooperation Administration should explain this apparently anomalous situation. Accordingly, today I have addressed a letter to these three agencies of Government on behalf of the coal miners and mineowners of West Virginia. I am asking them to correct me if my facts are wrong, and, if they are not, to try to persuade our allies to cease discriminating against American coal.

Polish and Russian coal sales, naturally, are subsidized by those Governments. I am told that all the countries of Europe have been buying bituminous coals from Poland.

The Bureau of Mines export data for the first quarter of 1958 show the shrinkage of exports to various European nations. I should like to know to what extent these losses of markets to the United States coal industry represent purchases of Russian and Polish coal, and to what extent these losses have been caused by the internal trade restrictions of those countries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table prepared by the Bureau of Mines, showing United States bituminous coal exports to Europe, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

United States bituminous coal exports to Europe, 1st quarter

	1958	1957
Austria [1]	253,010	312,227
Belgium and Luxembourg	535,283	517,115
Denmark	145,933	94,272
Finland	69,900	115,580
France [1]	1,295,352	2,249,435
Germany (West) [1]	2,580,817	3,183,491
Greece	37,240	26,254
Hungary		10,710
Iceland		1,243
Ireland (Eire)	71,119	
Italy	1,698,826	2,210,329
Netherlands [2]	1,492,304	1,643,773
Norway	64,820	55,411
Poland	28,167	
Portugal	69,378	65,793
Spain	54,332	98,597
Sweden	103,380	256,459
Switzerland [1]	101,434	20,107
Trieste	93,429	155,019
United Kingdom [1]		681,474
Yugoslavia	43,397	188,599
Total	8,738,121	11,885,888

[1] Excludes transshipments through the port of Rotterdam. (See footnote 2.)

[2] Approximately 44 percent of the tonnage exported from the United States in 1957 was transshipped to other European destinations—Austria, France, West Germany, Switzerland and the United Kingdom.

RESIGNATION OF MAXWELL M. RABB

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, last Friday, May 16, saw the conclusion of more than 5 years of service by Maxwell M. Rabb as the first aide appointed to be Secretary to the President's Cabinet. Max Rabb recently was described in the pages of the New York Journal American as an exceptional public servant. These are indeed the finest words of tribute which could be bestowed upon any one individual who has devoted himself to the cause of government. They express devotion, conscientious service, and accomplishment. Max Rabb rates high praise for all of them.

Born in Boston 48 years ago, Mr. Rabb is a graduate of Harvard Law School, in the class of 1935, and since that year has been a member of both the Massachusetts and the Federal bars. During the war he was a naval lieutenant, attached to the amphibious forces. Following the conclusion of hostilities, after a period of service as legal consultant to Defense Secretary Forrestal, he returned to private law practice in Massachusetts. An early Eisenhower stalwart, Max Rabb in 1951 and 1952 was executive secretary to Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., of Massachusetts, and was in the forefront of the effort to call General Eisenhower to political responsibility, and then to nominate and elect him President of the United States.

Mr. President, traditionally the members of the President's Cabinet in addition to being Department heads in their own right, have served the Chief Executive as advisers and as a sounding board on matters of national policy. The office of Secretary to the Cabinet was created during the first year of the present administration, to improve the coordination of work at the Cabinet and sub-Cabinet levels, to lessen the increasing burdens placed upon the President, and to maintain among Cabinet officials an appreciation of points of view beyond the confines of their own departments. Max Rabb pioneered that job, and has discharged his responsibilities in such splendid fashion that he has won the approbation of his own party, the opposition party, the public, and the press.

In furtherance of his duties as Cabinet Secretary, Mr. Rabb has prepared meeting agenda, position papers on the issues at hand, briefed officials at the sub-Cabinet level, and has followed through on implementation of Cabinet decisions. In general, he has been the silent partner in making the Government machinery, at the Cabinet level, run smoothly—no mean task.

Max Rabb has also been a most active partner, with a passion for anonymity, in achieving advances in the field of civil rights. Among the major steps forward, in the field of civil rights, in which he had a significant role have been:

Removing the blight of racial segregation from our National Capital City;

Establishment of the President's Committee on Government Contracts, under the chairmanship of our distinguished Vice President.

Establishment of the President's Committee on Government Employment

Policy, which seeks to prevent and eliminate racial discrimination in the Federal Government service;

Elimination of segregation in naval shipyards at Charleston, S. C., and Norfolk, Va.;

Integration of our Armed Forces; and

Ending of segregation in 47 veterans' hospitals.

Max Rabb has also played a very considerable part in developing proposed legislation and administration policies bearing on immigration and refugee problems, including the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; admittance of Hungarian freedom fighters following the 1956 Budapest uprising; and Public Law 316, which was enacted last year.

Mr. Rabb now leaves Washington to return to the private practice of law. He will be missed in Washington, now that he has left active duty here. But I welcome him as a new and distinguished constituent and resident of the Empire State. Indeed, Max Rabb has been an exceptional public servant. None of us could wish for more.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the editorial which was published in the New York Journal American of May 11, 1958.

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

MAXWELL MILTON RABB: IKE'S "ODD JOB MAN" A TRAIL BLAZER

(By Ed Edstrom)

An exceptional public servant is leaving an exceptional job next Friday. He is Maxwell Milton Rabb, the first Secretary to the President's Cabinet in United States history.

Rabb has played an anonymous role but he has left a historical imprint on the workings of the Cabinet. And, as President Eisenhower's "odd job man," he has a number of accomplishments in the field of civil rights.

Shortly after President Eisenhower took office he created the post of Secretary to the Cabinet and gave it to Rabb. President after President has held Cabinet meetings for which there were no overall preparation. Cabinet officers usually don't care about any problems except their own.

Rabb changed all this and made a real contribution to American political science. He got up an agenda before each meeting to eliminate trivia. He circulated position papers, giving the pros and cons of each issue, to each Cabinet officer.

After each meeting, Rabb met with top-flight deputies from each department and told them what the score was to make certain Cabinet decisions were carried out. Status reports also keep Cabinet officers on their toes.

"It made each member part and parcel of every Cabinet decision," Rabb said. "The Cabinet works as a team instead of as individual department heads. And they use their experience as former Senators, governors, educators, or businessmen to make these team findings."

Even former New Deal adviser Tommy "The Cork" Corcoran complimented Rabb on streamlining this "personal wrestling match with chaos."

Rabb made no civil war out of civil rights. He carried out the administration wish to desegregate the Nation's Capital not by court fights or loud statements. To desegregate the movie houses, for example, he worked quietly with movie-industry leaders.

His affability and energy were put to heavy strains in long after-hour sessions with Congressmen but he ended segregation in the military. It was the same in the passage of the very controversial Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

Rabb's resignation drew personal tribute on the Senate floor from Democratic Senators as diverse as MANSFIELD, NEUBERGER, and SYMINGTON as well as Republicans. Signatures on farewell letters read like "Who's Who" of Washington.

Rabb was born in Boston on September 28, 1910, and was graduated from Harvard Law School. Before World War II, he was secretary to Senator Lodge and later Senator Weeks, now Commerce Secretary. In the war he was a Navy lieutenant. Afterwards, he was legal consultant to Secretary Forrestal. He was one of the original leaders in the "Ike for President" movement.

He is married and has four children.

Rabb is joining the New York law firm of Stroock & Stroock & Levan. But Washington probably will see Rabb again because the President's acceptance of his resignation said he will "put to good use" Rabb's offer to help when needed.

SPOKANE VALLEY PROJECT, WASHINGTON AND IDAHO

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of Calendar No. 1547, Senate bill 2215, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Spokane Valley project, in Washington and Idaho, under Federal reclamation laws.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2215) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Spokane Valley project, Washington and Idaho, under Federal reclamation laws, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, line 3, after the word "the", to insert "physical plan set forth in the", and after line 8, to strike out:

SEC. 2. Contracts to repay that portion of the cost of the Spokane Valley project which is allocated to irrigation and assigned to be repaid by irrigation water users (exclusive of such portion of said cost as may be derived from temporary water supply contracts or from other sources) shall be entered into pursuant to subsection (d), section 9, of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) and may provide that the general repayment obligation shall be spread in annual installments, which may be varied as to any required annual payment in the light of economic factors affecting the ability of the contracting organization to pay and of water supply and water requirement conditions, but in number and amounts satisfactory to the Secretary, over a period of not more than 75 years, which period shall be inclusive of any permissible development period, for any project contract unit or for any irrigation block, if the project contract unit be divided into two or more irrigation blocks.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 2. Contracts to repay that portion of the cost of the Spokane Valley project which is allocated to irrigation and assigned to be repaid by irrigation-water users (exclusive of such portion of said cost as may be derived from temporary water-supply contracts or from other sources) shall be entered into pursuant to subsection (d), section 9, of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), and may provide that the general repayment obligation, which in no event shall be less than $3,700,000, shall be spread in annual installments, which may be varied as to any required annual payment in the light of economic factors affecting the ability of the contracting organization to pay and of water-supply and water-requirement conditions but in number and amounts, satisfactory to the Secretary over a period of not more than 50 years, which period shall be exclusive of any permissible development period for any project unit or for any irrigation block if the project contract unit be divided into two or more irrigation blocks. Costs allocated to irrigation in excess of the amount specified to be repaid by the irrigation-water users shall be returned to the reclamation fund, during a period of time which shall not exceed the period of repayment by the irrigation water users by more than 10 years, from net revenues derived by the Secretary of the Interior from the disposition of power marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of providing a supplemental and substituted irrigation water supply for the Spokane Valley project in Washington and Idaho and the rehabilitation of existing water service facilities, the Secretary of the Interior, acting pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388 and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) so far as the same are not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, is authorized to construct, reconstruct, rehabilitate, operate, and maintain the facilities of the Spokane Valley project, Washington and Idaho, substantially in accord with the physical plan set forth in the report of the Regional Director, Bureau of Reclamation, dated August 1956, as proposed and recommended by the Commissioner of Reclamation dated March 4. 1957, and approved by the Secretary of the Interior on March 15, 1957.

SEC. 2. Contracts to repay that portion of the cost of the Spokane Valley project which is allocated to irrigation and assigned to be repaid by irrigation-water users (exclusive of such portion of said cost as may be derived from temporary water-supply contracts or from other sources) shall be entered into pursuant to subsection (d), section 9, of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), and may provide that the general repayment obligation, which in no event shall be less than $3,700,000, shall be spread in annual installments, which may be varied as to any required annual payment in the light of economic factors affecting the ability of the contracting organization to pay and of water-supply and water-requirement conditions but in number and amounts, satisfactory to the Secretary over a period of not more than 50 years, which period shall be exclusive of any permissible development period for any project unit or for any irrigation block if the project contract unit be divided into two or more irrigation blocks. Costs allocated to irrigation in excess of the amount specified to be repaid by the irrigation-water users shall be returned to the reclamation fund, during a period of time which shall not exceed the period of repayment by the irrigation water users by more than ten years, from net revenues derived by the Secretary of the Interior from the disposition of power marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the proposed Spokane Valley irrigation project will serve some 10,290 acres located

east of Spokane, Wash., including some 197 acres in Idaho.

The development plan calls for replacing existing diversion works and a canal distribution system which were constructed by private enterprise in the early 1900's. The existing works have deteriorated to the point where they no longer provide the service needed for the irrigated agriculture of the area. The existing works could fail at any time, and thus could threaten the entire economy of the area.

The plan of development recommended by the Bureau of Reclamation would replace the existing works which divert water from the Spokane River with a system for pumping ground water from a number of wells and delivering it, under pressure, through a closed-pipe distribution system.

The estimated total cost of the project is $5,016,000.

The bill before the Senate provides that about 26 percent of the cost will be repaid from surplus power revenues of the Bonneville Power Administration. There is ample precedent for this provision. At least 14 irrigation projects receive assistance from power revenues, varying from 6 percent to 90 percent of the total irrigation costs.

In addition to these precedents, however, assistance for the Spokane Valley project enjoys a justification which was not involved in the other projects. At the present time, the irrigation districts in the proposed project have a water right under which they withdraw up to 66,584 acre-feet of water a year from the Spokane River. Under the new project, this diversion from the river will be replaced by pumping from ground water. Thus, stream flow in the Spokane River will be enhanced because the irrigation districts will not be exercising their right to that quantity of water.

The Washington Water Power Co., which operates power-generating facilities on the Spokane River, has recognized the increased generation which will be brought about at its plants because of this increased streamflow. The company has agreed to discount the districts' annual power bill for pumping purposes under the new project to the extent of $30,000, or one-half of the power bill, whichever is less, as compensation for the benefits received by the company. It should be recognized that the Spokane River flows into Roosevelt Lake, behind Grand Coulee Dam, the principal storage facility on the Columbia River; and the added streamflow will enhance power generation at all downstream facilities on the Columbia River. The value of these benefits to the Federal Government has not been exactly computed, but it is expected that it will approximate the amount of assistance proposed in the bill.

With assistance from power revenues, the water users will be able to repay within 50 years the 74 percent balance of the cost.

The Spokane area has been hard hit by unemployment—approximately 12 percent of the labor force being idle. By guaranteeing the continued existence of the irrigated agriculture of the area, we shall be adding significant strength to the entire economy of the area.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill

The bill (S. 2215) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONDITIONS IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, events during recent days have demonstrated that all is not well in the countries to the south of us. I know that each and every Member of the Senate is distressed and disturbed at the treatment accorded the Vice President of the United States and his lady during their visit to Latin America, and that we are thankful that both are safe in the United States, and that no physical harm came to them.

Now that emotions engendered by the treatment accorded the Vice President and Mrs. Nixon have calmed, it is in order for us to take stock, to analyze some of the underlying motives which during recent weeks have caused such violent demonstrations in Latin America, and soberly and thoughtfully to seek ways and means of repairing the damage done to the traditional bonds which have linked North America, Central America, and South America.

I am convinced that the rioting and violence which were displayed in Peru, Venezuela, and Colombia do not reflect the feeling of the majority of the people of those countries. However, they are indications that the concept of hemispheric solidarity, which has been maintained for nearly a century, is beginning to wither, and threatens to degenerate further.

Actually, Mr. President, the circumstances which have brought about this situation are not peculiar to that area of the world. They are found in almost all other underdeveloped countries, but, as experience is beginning to demonstrate, have been patently ignored by those in charge of formulating our foreign policy.

It has been said that the riots in South America and Central America reflect the so-called lack of consideration given our good neighbors to the south of us when Uncle Sam each year passes out his foreign-aid bounty. This is an oversimplification, in my opinion.

Basically, the difficulties confronting us there flow from one overriding fact—the fact that a broad gap, a veritable chasm, exists between the economic classes in Latin American countries.

The little aid we have extended has brought the masses no visible improvement in their way of life.

During the fall of 1952, I visited each and every one of the twenty-odd Latin American Republics. I returned impressed by many of the things I saw: the vast deposits of natural resources, the rising sense of individual pride among the people of those countries, and the desire of some enlightened leaders to provide their people a better way of life. At the same time, I pointed out to the Senate, in a report I filed soon after my return, that a number of of factors which were operating would, unless countered, cause us endless trouble in the years ahead.

In countries where a chosen few live in wealth and splendor, I found misery and poverty. Agitators were at work then, as they have obviously been engaged since that time, sowing the seeds of jingoism and preaching a doctrine which at one time flowered in our own country, and which the historians now call manifest destiny.

Playing upon the desire of any man to provide a better standard of living for himself and his family, these agitators have now turned indigenous conditions in Latin America to their own selfish ends. That they have been able to do so with even a small degree of success attests to the continued validity of one hard, cold fact. That fact is this:

Unless ways and means can be found to enable the masses of the Latin American people to participate in the growing wealth of their countries, we will continue to reap a harvest of hatred in Latin America.

I feel strongly, Mr. President, that the recent developments in Latin America will bring a hue and a cry from some quarters that large-scale economic assistance should be extended to that part of the world, and that the solution to the ills which plague United States-Latin American relationships lies in merely writing Latin America a larger foreign-aid check.

I hope and pray that this sort of advice will go unheeded.

American foreign-aid dollars are not going to solve Latin America's problems, any more than they have solved the problems of France, Lebanon, and many other countries.

It is true that Latin America cries out for development—that Latin America needs capital, and technical assistance. But Latin America is well able to help herself obtain these things, if she desires to do so. If she does not desire to do so, large-scale American grants-in-aid are not going to be of any assistance.

What Latin America needs is capital—private investment which will develop her many untouched resources.

The truth of the matter is that right now Latin America is the recipient of large-scale private investment from this country.

The book value of United States investments in the nations to the south of us has grown from $3 billion in 1946 to approximately $8 billion at the end of 1957.

The amount devoted to such purposes has been increasing at a tremendous rate during recent years, as evidenced by the fact that United States investment in 1957 alone amounted to more than $1 billion.

On the other hand, cumulative United States Government foreign grants and credits to Latin American countries—through programs other than military—amounted to $1,106,952,000 from 1945 through 1956—the last date for which a complete breakdown is available.

This figure compares with the $57.7 billion which the United States has spent during the same period for aid programs all over the world. In other words, aid to Latin America amounted to about 2 percent of all the assistance extended since the end of World War II.

In 1952 I suggested, and I again urge today, that the Latin American nations undertake to set their own houses in order. This is, and must remain, a task for them, and them alone. The United States, no matter how well meant its efforts may be, cannot and must not attempt to impose its own ideas or concepts upon these countries. We cannot tell them how to conduct their own affairs without invading their sovereignty.

This does not mean, however, that our country should continue to support governments that rely for their existence on military control, and which do not reflect the will of the people, expressed at fair and free elections.

As I have already indicated, Latin America abounds in natural resources, including bauxite, iron, copper, nitrates, tin, lumber, rubber, and a wealth of other materials, which we need, and which Latin America needs to sell in order to prosper.

Mr. President, as I have said many times before, if the industrial wheels of the United States are to continue humming; if we are to continue our industrial progress, we will be forced to look to the nations south of us for the raw materials we so need. South and Central America is truly a rich area—rich in all the undeveloped materials which are the raw food for an industrial civilization.

If these natural resources can be developed in such a way as to benefit the masses of the people, in order to provide them with a better way of life, then the good neighbor policy will not only be maintained, but strengthened, and it will flourish.

In essence, Mr. President, Latin America today finds itself in substantially the same position as our own country was 75 or a hundred years ago—rich in natural resources, but poor in development capital and technical know-how.

Senators will recall from their history books that our own development began with capital borrowed from European countries, and with know-how imported from across the seas. As a matter of fact, it was only a few years ago that domestic industries paid off the last of the many financial obligations incurred during their infancies.

It is my considered judgment that Latin American nations can prosper as we have prospered, without subjecting themselves to foreign domination or control in any degree, if they will but embark upon a similar program of self-development.

In this connection, it must be emphasized that development does not mean exploitation by foreign business, or foreign capital.

Fortunately, the Sinclair fiasco in Mexico a generation ago marked the high water mark of American exploitation of Latin American natural resources. Generally speaking, American businesses operating in Latin America today return to the countries in which they do business a substantial share of the profits so derived.

In 1953, following an extended inspection of Latin America, I recommended that no United States concern be permitted to do business in Latin America unless it agreed to share a portion of its profits with the government of the country in which it operated, by way of adequate taxation.

I still believe that such an approach is sound.

However, in addition to this, there must be assurance that this money will go to assist the people who need help. It should be used to build schools, hospitals, and to otherwise improve the way of life of the people—as has been done in certain areas of Venezuela. For example, around Lake Maricaibo—which I visited in 1952—where oil development is taking place, and near the iron ore deposits on the Orinoco River—which I also visited in 1952—modern cities, complete with schools, hospitals, sound housing, electricity, sewerage, and other up-to-date conveniences have been built.

These cities benefit the workers, but they also benefit the companies by providing a congenial atmosphere in which to work, as well as contented workers.

What is more, the wealthy people of these Latin American nations who are reaping vast profits from their participation in United States investments must also be required to contribute a fair share of those profits toward bettering the way of life of the masses.

The best way such participation could be assured would be through the imposition of reasonable and realistic income and other taxes by the host country on its own citizens—taxes which would preclude the possibility of further exploitation of the masses of the people by the wealthy classes.

Unfortunately, as foreign exploitation has declined, it has not been accompanied with a commensurate decline in exploitation from within.

Needless to say, if the masses are still being exploited, it makes no difference to them who is at fault. All the masses know is that while the wealthy grow richer their lot is not being improved. Frequently, foreigners are blamed for bleeding a country white, even though the fault lies not with outside business or outside capital, but with selfish interests within.

This was graphically demonstrated a few nights ago when an American newscaster reported that at least one member of the mob which rioted in Caracas said he merely wanted to protest American oil companies taking Venezuelan oil without paying for it. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, all the oil companies which are now operating in Venezuela pay more than half of their income to the local government and, in addition construct roads, schools, hospitals, and other facilities for the benefit of the working classes.

United States oil firms operating in Venezuela have generally conducted their enterprises in a fair and reasonable manner. A large share of their profits remain within the country. Evidently, by the time this money has passed through the hands of the rich and the politicians, very little is left to trickle down to the masses by way of better wages, good schools, adequate housing, and other necessities of life. Wherever large American enterprises operate in Latin America better schools, good hospitals and more roads are to be found. I hope that policy will continue and will expand.

In Latin America today, as during the time of my visit in 1952, there are found two classes of people—the very rich, and the very poor. In too many cases, the rich unmercifully exploit the poor, and drain the fruits of internal development into their own coffers. There is no effort made, nor is there any requirement imposed, to plough a fair share of their earnings into programs designed to better the way of life of the masses.

American technical assistance has, to some extent, reversed this trend. We have helped build schools, hospitals and health centers. We have initiated programs of disease eradication, midwifery, and sanitation. While these programs have brought some benefits, small though they may be, others have served merely to further enrich the ruling classes. Teaching a large landowner how to produce a crop more efficiently has not brought any better way of life to those who till his lands. Instead, the landowner has merely been further enriched. The poor and miserable people who do the work are still only one step removed from complete and absolute physical bondage in many of the countries I visited in 1952.

As I have already stated, the United States cannot inject itself into purely local Latin American affairs—we cannot tell these people how to operate their own governments. However, those of us who have long endorsed and sought to foster Latin American-United States friendship can, I hope, offer a word of advice to our good neighbors to the south.

This advice is simple, and yet basic.

As the fruits of economic development flow into Latin American countries, those countries must undertake to see that these fruits are fairly and equitably distributed among the people. There must be an end to domestic exploitation, just as any remaining foreign exploitation must end.

As the share of Latin America's profits from the development of their natural resources increases, a large part must be reinvested in the human resources of the countries affected.

Labor must be adequately compensated.

Education must be fostered and expanded. Political stability will never flourish in an atmosphere of ignorance, nor will contentment be made a reality in the midst of poverty.

Domestic business must be guaranteed a fair return on its investment, with the understanding that fair return is not synonymous with greed.

Public health measures must be broadened and the miracles of modern medicine made available to the sick.

Foreign investment must be welcomed and sought, with the understanding that

here, too, there is no room for greed or self-seeking interests.

With these developments must come opportunities for better housing for the people, the establishment of better labor standards, and better transportation, in the form of roads and highways, in order that the benefits of a rising standard of living may be made available to those citizens who dwell far from the sources of wealth.

If these things were done, Mr. President, we would need not fear the loss of Latin American friendship or understanding. Unless they are done, vast sums of money will not bring us an ounce of Latin American good will.

NEED FOR PROTECTION OF DOMESTIC MINERALS INDUSTRY

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Montana Great Falls Tribune on May 13, 1958, published an editorial quoting some remarks made in Great Falls by Democratic Chairman Paul M. Butler at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner. Mr. Butler's statements are especially appropriate in view of the refusal of the Ways and Means Committee to attach to the Trade Treaties Act amendments which would have given a measure of protection to the domestic minerals industry. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

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

BUTLER SCORED PERTINENT HIT ON IKE'S NEGLECT OF MINERS

It goes without saying that attacks on the opposition by a national party chairman, either Democrat or Republican, are not expected to be completely free from partisan motivation. But Democratic Chairman Paul M. Butler found a worthy target for criticism in his address to the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner here Saturday night.

The record strongly supports his charge that a large part of Montana's unemployment and underemployment can be traced to the fact that the Eisenhower administration "has deliberately deflated raw material producers."

Few would dispute that agricultural and mineral production dominate Montana's economy. Nor can it be successfully refuted that the Eisenhower administration has constantly and consistently put a great variety of other considerations above such concern as he may have for the difficulties in the market place of our Montana producers of raw commodities. That lack of concern is reflected most severely by unemployment in the mining industry.

Currently the farm situation has brightened but our mineral producers are still in distress.

After prolonged temporizing, the administration has recommended a subsidy "relief" program for which few if any copper, lead, or zinc producers have any enthusiasm.

The President and his advisors have steadfastly opposed use of either the distress clause of the existing tariff law or enactment by Congress of a new tariff provision to deal with the foreign raiding of our domestic metals market. The reasons lie in the field of foreign political and trade relations. These obviously are given priority over consideration for the distress of the western mining industry.

Traditionally the Republicans are the protective tariff proponents but it has been left to the Democrats in Congress to lead the fight for tariff relief to miners.

Senators MANSFIELD and MURRAY, and in the House METCALF and ANDERSON, have been active in that fight. Mr. Eisenhower and his cabinet advisors have supplied repeated obstruction.

LONG-RANGE MINERALS PROGRAM

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, for several years the Department of the Interior has been promising the domestic mining industry a long-range minerals program. Last year the Secretary of the Interior sent to the Congress two bills purporting to deal with this subject. One was a tariff measure for lead and zinc. The other was drafted in two parts; title I providing for continuation of the Defense Minerals Exploration Administration, and title II providing for totally inadequate short-term incentive payments for beryl, chromite, and columbite-tantalite. Now Secretary Seaton has proposed a subsidy plan for copper, lead, zinc, fluorspar, and tungsten—a plan which is neither long range nor adequate pricewise. The mine operators in Utah have characterized the Seaton plan as "hare-brained." The reaction in other sections of the country is about as violent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a column from the Salt Lake Tribune of April 29, 1958, entitled "Up and Down the Street," by Robert W. Bernick.

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

UTAH MINE FIRMS' CHIEFS SCATHE SEATON SUBSIDY

(By Robert W. Bernick)

"Hare-brained." "Ill-conceived." "A cup of poison." "A starvation diet."

These were the terms the Utah mining industry employed Monday in describing Interior Secretary Fred Seaton's program for aid to the lead, zinc, copper, tungsten, and fluorspar industries.

Their attack was aimed primarily at provisions regarding lead, zinc, and copper, however.

Clark L. Wilson, vice president of the New Park Mining Co., said that "in the first place the Interior Department itself fails to recognize their own peril points announced last year" for the lead and zinc industry.

He said Seaton told Congress in 1957 that lead ought to be selling in the domestic market for 17 cents a pound and zinc at 14½ cents a pound. That was before the big price break last June.

"Now he tells Congress that the proper price of lead is 14¾ cents a pound and zinc 12¾ cents a pound."

"Secondly, Seaton still doesn't understand that the American mining industry doesn't want to live off of subsidies and handouts from the Federal Government. We want a permanent industry.

"The only way to establish a permanent, taxpaying lead-zinc industry in the United States is with import quotas" (as recommended by the Republican members of the United States Tariff Commission), Mr. Wilson said.

OBVIOUSLY DICTATED BY STATE DEPARTMENT

"The Seaton program was obviously dictated by the State Department of the United States. My first reaction to the announcement is that Mr. Eisenhower, by endorsing this plan, already has indicated he will veto the recommendations for tariffs and import quotas by the Republican members of his own Tariff Commission."

"All the Seaton program will do is condemn us to another series of stop-gap actions accompanied by a starvation diet. No one in the industry is going to buy this," Mr. Wilson said.

Another major lead-zinc company official in the area, who asked that his name not be used, said the program was "hare-brained and haywire. Is this what the Department has spent all that money on?" he asked.

Charles D. Michaelson, general manager of the western mining divisions of Kennecott Copper Corp., said he felt that plan at best was "ill-conceived."

"I cannot imagine what they are trying to accomplish," He pointed out that if a given mine were now closed down because it could not sell at the present price of major base metals, "all it would have to do would be offer, say, lead metal at 5 cents a pound. As I understand it, the Government would then pay him the difference between 14¾ cents a pound and his sale price of 5 cents a pound.

"All this would do in the long run would be to further depress prices. The bigger the spread, the greater the cash contribution from the United States Government."

Mr. Michaelson said he could not "imagine the United States taxpayer making such contributions to Kennecott Copper, Anaconda Co. or Phelps Dodge Corp.," the big three copper producers in the United States of America.

"Giving Kennecott Copper Corp. 2½ cents a pound for every pound of copper they sell to a fabricator at 25 cents a pound isn't going to increase employment at our mines," Mr. Michaelson said.

COUP DE GRACE FOR INDEPENDENTS

He said what was needed was a spur to the demand for copper.

Cecil Fitch, Jr., Eureka, Utah, president of the Chief Consolidated Mines Co., said that "Seaton proposes quotas for American miners, but he's opposed to quotas for foreign producers.

"We've been fighting for some kind of equity for the last 10 years. The administration with this kind of program is handing us the last cup of poison—the coup de grace for independent mining."

The Utahan said the Chief had shut down when lead was 15 cents a pound and wages for miners at $16.20 a day.

"Now they want us to reopen at 14¾ cents a pound for lead when mine labor is being paid $20 a day. They are offering us less than what we had when we closed down," Mr. Fitch said.

"This Seaton has apparently announced there is no further hope for the American western miner insofar as this Republican administration is concerned," he declared.

Seth K. Droubay, general manager of the United Park City Mines Co., branded the "whole Seaton program a tie-in with the international operations of the big mining companies. This subsidy of Seaton's is not for the independent miner. Most of the benefit will go to the big producers who have most of their production and get most of their profits from their foreign production. People like American Smelting & Refining Co. and St. Joseph Lead Co. would be continued in business on the foreign side by foreign production and then they would have their domestic mines subsidized by the Seaton plan.

Mr. Droubay said United Park City had been losing money for more than a year and that "our labor unions are just hanging fire waiting on a raise that has been due them for 4 years. We cannot even hang on, however, under this State Department-dictated minerals program. The only reason United Park City has been taking these losses is in

the hope that this administration would take us off the hook. This isn't the way to do it."

PROPOSED INCREASE IN OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, less than 1 month ago, on April 24, I introduced S. 3685, which would increase old-age assistance to needy elderly Americans by $5 a month.

I said then and I say now that this bill provides the very minimum amount of increase which the needy old folks are entitled to.

In my remarks to the Senate when I introduced this legislation I stated, "Thousands of old people are starving in America each year, and it is a national disgrace in a country of freedom and wealth. They are starving, not generally for beans and potatoes, but dying of malnutrition because they cannot afford a balanced diet that will sustain life in the late years."

Recently the El Paso Herald-Post, the most independently minded newspaper to be found in any metropolitan Texas city, carried an illuminating article on the plight of our elderly citizens in the city of El Paso. The headline above this article, which glares at the reader as if to ask, Can this be true in rich and prosperous America, states, "Payments to El Paso's Old People Here Range as Low as $5 a Month." That refers to those who are eligible, under the old-age assistance program, for old-age assistance.

This article, written by Cliff Sherrill, of the El Paso Herald Post staff, points up the excellent work which several community and volunteer organizations are attempting to do to aid the old people. But they are understaffed, underfinanced, and the load is so great that these community and volunteer organizations cannot meet the crying need which demands legislative remedy.

Again, I wish to say, as I said when I introduced this bill, relief to the old people of America is long overdue. The aid given them monthly is, in many States, so low as to constitute starvation payments. An example is the payment of $5 a month in El Paso.

The need clearly calls for the enactment of S. 3685. The elderly citizens of America are in desperate need of the extra $5 a month which this legislation would provide. In some instances the extra $5 a month would double the amount allowed.

They need that extra $5 a month to pay for the increasing cost of medicine, food, rent, clothing, and the other necessities of life.

We are enjoined by the decalog to honor thy father and mother. The fathers and mothers of America in their older years are not receiving the assistance which they deserve.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the article by Cliff Sherrill which appeared in the May 16, 1958, issue of the El Paso Herald Post, and I commend it to my colleagues as vital reading for a fuller appreciation of the urgency of this situation.

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

PAYMENTS TO EL PASO'S OLD PEOPLE HERE RANGE AS LOW AS $5 A MONTH—SOCIAL SECURITY RATES AT TOP

(By Cliff Sherrill)

El Paso County's aged and unemployable people who are without resources for support must depend upon 1 of 3 agencies: Federal social security, State old-age assistance, or the City-County Community Relief Association.

The best for these aged dependents is to qualify for Federal social security under the old-age and survivors insurance program, in which the husband or wife or both have insurance provided by themselves and their employers. This provides a degree of comfort, if there is enough in the insured's account.

Next best is the State old-age assistance program, which provides subsistence—of sorts.

BOTTOM OF AID

At the bottom of the assistance avenues is the City-County Community Association, which provides bare existence at best.

There are approximately 5,800 persons, men 65 or over or women 62 or over in El Paso County who are drawing benefits under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program. This totals $3,852,000 a year for the county.

The beneficiaries of this program are retired wage earners or their widows, or dependent men whose wives qualified for social security. It does not include widows under 65 and children who qualify for benefits from the deceased husband and father's insurance. The total for all ages in the county under social security runs now at about $425,000 a month, or $5.1 million a year.

The maximum a retired individual worker can receive under Federal social security is $108.50 a month, or $162.80 for a husband and wife, if the wife does not qualify on her own as a retired worker with her own insurance account. A widow of a qualified beneficiary who has two or more dependent children can receive up to $200 a month. Dependent parents of a deceased person insured under social security also can qualify for benefits.

BARE SUBSISTENCE

Persons who do not qualify for social security but who are United States citizens, 65 years old or over, and are without sustaining resources of their own, can qualify for regular and specific aid under the old age assistance program of the State Department of Public Welfare.

Dependents who are qualified residents but not necessarily legal citizens can receive uncertain, bare subsistence aid from the Community Relief Association.

The State program for aged, needy citizens is barely sufficient to support the recipient. The maximum is $60 a month. This program is conducted by the State of Texas, with the Federal Government contributing.

Those receiving aid from the Community Relief Association, supported in part by the city and in part by the county, get only enough aid for bare subsistence. Even that often has to be supplemented by humanitarian organizations that likewise are hard pressed for funds with which to meet emergency demands. What the individual receives from the association is determined by the emergency and the funds available.

Both the old age assistance office and the Community Relief Association office are located in the old city detective headquarters building at 209 South Campbell street. From ground level, those who enter go downstairs to the community relief office, and upstairs the old age assistance office. There is a third floor where the child welfare office is located.

ONE OF FOUR

Mrs. Hettie Taft is district supervisor of the State Department of Public Welfare, in charge of the old age assistance program. This program is one of four conducted by the public welfare department. The others are assistance to dependent children, assistance to the needy blind (who are United States citizens over 21 years old), and assistance to the totally and permanently disabled (approved by Texas voters and effective last Sept. 1).

Mrs. Taft is employed by the State. The old age assistance program is a State program. When it started, the State and the Federal Government financed the program on a 50–50 basis. But the Federal portion has been increased until it works out about 65 percent Federal and 35 percent State. For instance, suppose a recipient goes on the aid program for $58 a month. Of the first $30, the Federal Government pays $24 and the State pays $6. Then each pays 50 percent of the remaining $28, making a total $38 Federal and $20 State for the combined $58.

To qualify for this assistance, an applicant not only must be 65 or over and a citizen of the United States, but also must have been a resident of Texas 5 of the last 9 years, not necessarily consecutive years, but the last year must have been in Texas, and must show actual need and not an inmate of any institution.

DIVIDED INTO PLANS

Any person meeting those qualifications is admitted to the old age assistance program for such regular monthly payments as are determined by the circumstances.

The program is divided into plans, and the recipient is placed under one of the plans, depending upon whether he or she is single and living alone, or a married couple living together, or an individual living with children, and so on.

The State has an experience table showing what is considered sufficient assistance to meet specified needs. This table lists $32.50 as sufficient to provide food for an aged individual for a month, $2.25 as sufficient for replenishment of clothing, $2 for such incidentals as tobacco money or soap or whatever the individual wants to buy incidentally.

There are figures for every necessity, and those listed above give an idea of how closely the sums are figured.

COMPANION CASE

A qualifying individual living alone and having to pay rent can get a maximum of $60 monthly, but if the individual has any income, that is subtracted from the $60. Even the State's own figures for necessities, when totaled, amount to $78.40 for an individual living alone and having to pay rent. But $60 is the maximum under the State program, and that's that.

A man and wife, officially called a companion case, are figured on a base of $41.40 each, plus $12.50 each for rent, and $2 each for incidentals, a total of $55.90 each monthly.

There were 1,140 persons in El Paso County on the old-age assistance program when the last official figures were compiled and announced last March 1. These 1,140 persons received a total of $52,576 in March. That was an average of just under $46 each.

These old-age assistance recipients live wherever they can get along best on the money they receive. Many live alone in a housekeeping room where they cook and live and sleep in the one room and manage to make ends meet.

A few—22 at the last report—live at Pleasant View Home at 215 West Yandell Drive. Those who live there must be able to wait on themselves, and not require a nursing attendant.

Many are married couples who manage to live on their combined $111.80 monthly—if each gets $55.90 under the State's plan for them.

Old age aid grants in El Paso County range from $5 to $60 monthly.

NEED AID FOR ILL

If an old-age assistance beneficiary happens to be alone in the world and chronically ill—well, there is no El Paso County answer to that problem.

Mrs. Taft said, "One of the greatest needs in El Paso County is that of a place for chronically ill, aged people. El Paso General Hospital is for emergency cases, not for the chronically ill."

As for dependent persons under 65, Texas is 1 of the 7 States in the Nation when there is no provision for their aid. In 41 States, there are provisions for general assistance programs. For instance, suppose a woman alone in the world is stricken by cancer at 42 and is unable to work, she can get financial aid under the general assistance program in States that have these programs.

The Community Relief Association, supported 50-50 by the county and city, gives assistance without regard to age. The majority of the recipients are elderly people. The association is supervised by Mrs. Jane Carrie Cohn and Mrs. Avelina DeGroat. Official authority over the association is vested in a board of governors, 1 of which is a county commissioner and 1 a city alderman.

The city and county this year are contributing $2,500 to the association, or $1,250 each. The only qualification for a needy person to obtain relief is that he or she establish evidence of Texas residence for a year, but this is interpreted liberally—for pressing need is the major qualification.

SOME NEED LITTLE AID

The present caseload of the association is about 140 persons, many of them aged, but some entire families ranging down to tots. Rent, food, and clothing funds are provided on a continuing basis as the case may require—up to the extent of available funds. Private charitable organizations often help the Community Relief Association to care for extreme cases of need for which the association has inadequate funds.

"Sometimes one grocery order will solve the problem for an entire family until the breadwinner can get employment," Mrs. Cohn said. "But in other cases an individual, or perhaps an aged couple, or maybe a whole family will have to be helped along for weeks or months. It all depends on the circumstances.

"Our business is to help needy people, regardless of age. Many of those helped, particularly old people, have been residents of El Paso since childhood but never have become legal citizens of the United States. They are not eligible for old age assistance from the State. They must depend on us if they are without funds and unable to work—or must go to Rio Vista Farm, which is the county home."

Rio Vista Farm is for persons who are destitute and have no relatives or friends to aid them, and no home. Such persons never are required to go to the farm as an alternative to starvation. They can go of their own accord.

There are about 40 aged and destitute persons at the farm now. The farm home has two wards that are not open, although all indications are they are needed. The county commissioners court has failed to make provision for this additional aid to the destitute aged of the county.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, pursuant to the unanimous consent agreement hitherto entered, I ask that the Senate proceed to the call of the Calendar beginning with Order No. 1539.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will automatically proceed to the call of the calendar at this time under the unanimous consent agreement previously entered.

The clerk will state the first bill on the calendar.

E. B. KAISER CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, H. R. 3679, an act for the relief of the E. B. Kaiser Co., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims, notwithstanding any prior determination or dismissal by such court, or any other provision or rule of law to the contrary, to hear de novo, determine, and render judgment upon all claims of the E. B. Kaiser Co., of Chicago, Ill., against the United States for compensation for additional work done in connection with the performance of subcontract numbered 27-42 under contract W559 eng-5949, and such claims shall be considered as if they had arisen subsequent to the enactment of the act entitled "An act to permit review of decisions of the heads of departments, or their representatives or boards, involving questions arising under Government contracts," approved May 11, 1954 (41 U. S. C., secs. 321 and 322): *Provided*, That the enactment of this legislation shall not be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States Government.

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claims may be instituted at any time within 90 days after the date of enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims of the E. B. Kaiser Co., of Chicago, Ill."

UNITED FOUNDATION CORP., OF UNION, N. J.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5355) an act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims of the United Foundation Corp., of Union, N. J., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 2, line 7, after the numerals "322", to insert a colon and *"Provided*, That enactment of this legislation shall not be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States Government."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MARIA GARCIA ALIAGA

The bill (S. 2511) for the relief of Maria Garcia Aliaga was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Garcia Aliaga shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN COLORADO TO WILLIAM M. PROPER

The bill (S. 59) directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property in the State of Colorado to William M. Proper was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to William M. Proper, of Montrose, Colo., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the water ditch situated near the town of Montrose, Colo., known as the reservation (United States) ditch, together with any water rights to the water carried by such ditch which were acquired by the United States under a decree entered by the district court in and for the county of Montrose, Colo., on November 14, 1888 (clause No. 149), such ditch being more particularly described in a plat of such recorded in book 2, ditch plats, Montrose County clerk and recorded, Montrose, Colo.

MRS. HELEN HARVEY

The bill (H. R. 1342) for the relief of Mrs. Helen Harvey was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HONG-TO DEW

The bill (H. R. 2763) for the relief of Hong-to Dew was announced as next in order.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, because the enactment of this bill would constitute a precedent, I ask that there be an explanation of the bill.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, this bill would pay the sum of $2,820.32 to a Chinese national, whose property was vested by the Office of Alien Property under authority of the Trading With the Enemy Act. The claimant was resident on Formosa during World War II

and his property was, therefore, subject to seizure under the terms of the general law. The seizure, however, took place in 1950, 4 years after hostilities had ceased, and was based, so far as the records show, solely on the fact that the claimant had resided in enemy territory during World War II.

The property consisted of 102 shares of Socony-Vacuum Co. stock, which represented the savings of the claimant which he had accumulated during the 36 years that he served as an employee of the Socony-Vacuum Co. The stock has since been sold for the sum of $2,820.32.

The claimant has sought the return of his stock under the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act, but his claim was denied by the Office of Alien Property, the denial being based on a determination that the claimant had not been discriminated against as a member of a political, racial, or religious group.

The claimant has submitted evidence of considerable harassment and inconvience inflicted by the Japanese by reason of his Chinese citizenship and his association with an American company.

The bill is recommended for approval, since there appears to be no justification for the delayed seizure and the continued retention of property of a national of a country allied with the United States during World War II. Furthermore, the current administration proposals for the return of vested properties would not cover the claim of this individual.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it is quite clear, from the explanation given, that unique facts attach to this case. It was my desire to call attention to that, so that if a precedent is created by the passage of the bill, it will be considered a precedent limited to unique facts of this particular nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2763) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF MR. SHIRLEY B. STEBBINS

The bill (H. R. 4445) for the relief of the estate of Mr. Shirley B. Stebbins was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FOUAD GEORGE BARODY

The bill (H. R. 6176) for the relief of Fouad George Baroody was announced as next in order.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the proposed legislation would pay the sum of $500 to Fouad George Baroody as reimbursement for a departure bond which he posted and which was forfeited.

The claimant was granted preexamination in 1955 and was found admissible to the United States as a nonquota immigrant. He subsequently proceeded to Canada and was readmitted for permanent residence. The claimant has set forth in an affidavit that he kept in regular touch with the immigration office at Charleston, S. C., and followed their advice. Although the status of the alien was not adjusted retroactively to the date of his original entry he was granted permanent residence and the committee believes that he acted in good faith and accordingly feels that the amount of the departure bond which he forfeited should be returned to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6176) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. LYMAN C. MURPHEY

The bill (H. R. 6528) for the relief of Mrs. Lyman C. Murphey was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HARRY SLATKIN

The bill (H. R. 6731) for the relief of Harry Slatkin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DWIGHT J. BROHARD

The bill (H. R. 7203) for the relief of Dwight J. Brohard was considered, ordered, to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROY HENDRICKS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 7718) for the relief of Roy Hendricks of Mountain View, Alaska, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HRUSKA. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

EDWARD L. MUNROE

The bill (H. R. 8039) for the relief of Edward L. Munroe was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CAPT. LAURENCE D. TALBOT

The bill (H. R. 8433) for the relief of Capt. Laurence D. Talbot was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIE C. WILLIAMS

The bill (H. R. 8448) for the relief of Willie C. Williams was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALEXANDER GROSSMAN

The bill (H. R. 9012) for the relief of Alexander Grossman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN A. TIERNEY

The bill (H. R. 9109) for the relief of John A. Tierney was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CORNELIA V. LANE

The bill (H. R. 9395) for the relief of Cornelia V. Lane was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SIDNEY A. COVEN

The bill (H. R. 9490) for the relief of Sidney A. Coven was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VALLEYDALE PACKERS, INC.

The bill (H. R. 9514) for the relief of Valleydale Packers, Inc., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FELIX GARCIA

The bill (H. R. 9991) for the relief of Felix Garcia was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES R. MARTIN AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 9992) for the relief of James R. Martin and others was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THOMAS HELMS AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5424) for the relief of Thomas Helms and other employees of the Bureau of Public Roads, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 1, line 11, after the name "Lee R.", to strike out "Kinnman" and insert "Kinnan."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

ARNIE M. SANDERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7733) for the relief of Arnie M. Sanders, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 1, line 11, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF PARCEL OF LAND TO THE CITY OF MACON, GA.

The bill (H. R. 9738) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the

city of Macon, Ga., a parcel of land in said city was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO POST 924 VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

The bill (H. R. 9362) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to Post 924, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF EASEMENT OVER CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE NORFOLK SOUTHERN RAILWAY

The bill (H. R. 8071) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey an easement over certain property to the Norfolk Southern Railway in exchange for other lands and easements was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELEASE OF RESTRICTIONS AND RESERVATIONS IN INSTRUMENT CONVEYING CERTAIN LAND TO THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

The bill (H. R. 7645) to provide for the release of restrictions and reservations contained in instrument conveying certain land by the United States to the State of Wisconsin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REINSTATEMENT OF CERTAIN TERMINATED OIL AND GAS LEASES

The bill (S. 3307) to reinstate certain terminal oil and gas leases was announced as next in order.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the bill involves timely payment, as required by the Department of the Interior, on lands which are being prospected for oil purposes. In a particular case, it appears that the day for payment fell on a Sunday. The following day was Labor Day. Some difficulty ensued as a result, and there was a delay of several days in the payment.

The prospectors and other persons who are interested had already invested $180,000. Because of the equitable circumstances involved, I felt that they were entitled to relief. That is the very essence of the bill.

Mr. HRUSKA. I am impressed with the equities which are recited in the record. But, again, it is this type of bill which, if approved and enacted, would establish a precedent. If a precedent is to be established, it should be limited to peculiar facts of the type with which the bill is concerned. If it is not so limited, one can well imagine that a flood of bills would be introduced requesting similar relief in cases of untimely offers of rental payments. Therefore, this record is being made as a part of the legislative history.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. As the Senator from Illinois knows, in supporting the reporting of the bill, I thought it would be unfortunate if, generally speaking, permission were given to reinstate leases where payments had not been made. Would not the Senator from Illinois agree, for the purpose of the RECORD, that the pending bill in no way either constitutes a precedent or involves permission for the land office to do this sort of thing, but that there would have to be, as there were in this instance, a very unusual set of circumstances, backed by a double holiday, in the future in order to justify such relief as is by the bill afforded?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is quite true. I tried to make it clear to the committee when I testified that the bill should not be considered as a precedent.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Illinois did make that clear to the committee. Therefore, I wanted to be certain that it was made clear in the record being made in the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3307) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the payment of the annual rental, which was due no later than September 3, 1957, but which was made on September 6, 1957, with respect to noncompetitive oil and gas leases Colorado 08830, 08861, and 08832 shall be deemed to have been compliance with the terms and provisions of those leases and of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U. S. C., sec. 181 and the following), and those aforementioned leases which were automatically terminated for the failure to make timely payment of rental are hereby reinstated as of the date of that termination.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS AT OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1191) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange lands at Olympic National Park, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 2, after line 4, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. The provisions of this act shall not be applicable with respect to any privately owned lands lying within the exterior boundaries of the Olympic National Park which are within township 23 north, range 10 west; township 23 north, range 9 west; township 24 north, range 9 west; and township 24 north, range 8 west, West Willamette meridian; and lot 5 of the July Creek lot survey consisting of .15 acres, and lot 12 of the July Creek lot survey consisting of .35 acres.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., that the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to exchange approximately 6,608 99/100 acres of land adjacent to the Queets Corridor and Ocean Strip portions of Olympic National Park, which were originally acquired by the Federal Government for public works purposes, for lands and interest in lands not in Federal ownership within the exterior boundaries of the park: *Provided*, That the lands so exchanged shall be of approximately equal value.

SEC. 2. Lands acquired pursuant to the exchange authority contained herein shall be administered as a part of Olympic National Park in accordance with the laws and regulations applicable to the park.

SEC. 3. The provisions of this act shall not be applicable with respect to any privately owned lands lying within the exterior boundaries of the Olympic National Park which are within township 23 north, range 10 west; township 23 north, range 9 west; township 24 north, range 9 west; and township 24 north, range 8 west, West Willamette meridian; and lot 5 of the July Creek lot survey consisting of 0.15 acre, and lot 12 of the July Creek lot survey consisting of 0.35 acre.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FREE IMPORTATION OF SOUND RECORDINGS AND FILMS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7454) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation by colleges and universities of sound recordings and films to be used by them in certain nonprofit radio and television broadcasts which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after "Par. 1631", to insert "by inserting 'sound recordings, slides, and transparencies,' after 'Music,' "; on page 2, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "sound recordings, exposed or developed picture films, and slides and transparencies" and insert "exposed or developed picture films"; in line 6, after the word "a", where it appears the second time, to strike out "radio or", and in line 15, after the word "act", to insert a comma and "and, in the case of articles imported under subparagraph (b) of paragraph 1631, prior to July 1, 1960."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation under certain conditions of sound recordings, films, and slides and transparencies."

GIUSEPPE FRICANO AND OTHERS

The bill (S. 143) for the relief of Giuseppe Fricano, Maria Scelba Fricano, Stefano Fricano, and Vincenzo (Jimmy) Fricano was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Giuseppe Fricano, his wife, Maria Scelba Fricano, and their two minor sons, Stefano Fricano and Vincenzo (Jimmy) Fricano, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of

permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

BENJAMIN BARRON-ARAGON

The bill (S. 1234) for the relief of Benjamin Barron-Aragon was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Benjamin Barron-Aragon shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

CONCEPCION RAMIRO (ROMELIO) GAMBOA

The bill (S. 2816) for the relief of Concepcion Ramiro (Romelio) Gamboa was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Concepcion Ramiro (Romelio) Gamboa may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

YOSHIKO MATSUHARA AND HER MINOR CHILD, KERRY

The bill (S. 2944) for the relief of Yoshiko Matsuhara and her minor child, Kerry, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Yoshiko Matsuhara, the financée of Sgt. Lawrence W. Alexander, a citizen of the United States, and her minor child, Kerry, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Yoshiko Matsuhara is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Sgt. Lawrence W. Alexander and that they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Yoshiko Matsuhara and her minor child, Kerry, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Yoshiko Matsuhara and her minor child, Kerry, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Yoshiko Matsuhara and her minor child, Kerry, as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees.

KIMIKO ARAKI

The bill (S. 3080) for the relief of Kimiko Araki was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kimiko Araki, the fiancée of Ronald Frederick Astalos, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Kimiko Araki is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Ronald Frederick Astalos and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Kimika Araki, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of section 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Kimiko Araki, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Kimiko Araki as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

FOUAD (FRED) KASSIS

The bill (S. 3136) for the relief of Fouad (Fred) Kassis was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Fouad (Fred) Kassis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

RYFKA BERGMANN

The bill (S. 3172) for the relief of Ryfka Bergmann was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ryfka Bergmann shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

PRISCO DI FLUMERI

The bill (S. 3173) for the relief of Prisco Di Flumeri was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (9) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Prisco Di Flumeri may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act. This act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

TAEKO TAKAMURA ELLIOTT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2965) for the relief of Taeko Takamura Elliott, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Taeko Takamura Elliott shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROMULO A. MANRIQUEZ

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3060) for the relief of Romulo A. Manriquez, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "of", where it appears the first time, to strike out "the date of the enactment of this act" and insert "August 29, 1954,", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Romulo A. Manriquez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of August 29, 1954, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TEOFILO M. PALAGANAS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3176) for the relief of Teofilo M. Palaganas, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first

year that such quota is available.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Teofilo M. Palaganas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MILDRED (MILKA KRIVEC) CHESTER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3269) for the relief of Mildred (Milka Krivec) Chester, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Mildred (Milka Krivec) Chester, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Harry J. Chester, citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That no natural parent of the beneficiary, by virtue of such relationship, shall be accorded any right, status, or privilege under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JANEZ (GARANTINI) BRADEK AND FRANCISKA (GARANTINI) BRADEK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3272) for the relief of Janez (Garantini) Bradek and Franciska (Garantini) Bradek, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, Janez (Garantini) Bradek and Franciska (Garantini) Bradek, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Peter Bradek, citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That no natural parent of the beneficiaries, by virtue of such relationship, shall be accorded any right, status, or privilege under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN DEMETRIOU ASTERON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3358) for the relief of John Demetriou Asteron, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in line 7, after the word "States", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That no natural parent, by virtue of such parentage, shall be accorded any right, status, or privilege under the Immigration and Nationality Act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, John Demetriou Asteron, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Asters, citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That no natural parent, by virtue of such parentage, shall be accorded any right, status, or privilege under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 529) for the relief of certain aliens, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 12, after the word "act", to insert "Ellen Yuin-Shang Chung Au, Mosche Davidovitz, Frieda Davidovitz,", and on page 2, line 3, after the name "Mohajer", to strike out "Eliseva Kaufman (Saltz)."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 552) to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 2, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out:

SEC. 3. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jamie H. Salva and Fred H. Salva shall be deemed to be nonquota immigrants.

And insert:

SEC. 3. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jamie H. Salva and Fred H. Salva shall be held and considered to be the minor alien children of M. Sgt. Calvin V. Salva, a United States citizen.

After line 3, to strike out:

SEC. 4. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Teruko Miesse shall be deemed to be a nonquota immigrant.

And insert:

SEC. 4. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Teruko Miesse, the widow of a United States citizen, shall be deemed to be within the purview of section 101 (a) (27) (A) of that act, and the provisions of section 205 of that act shall not be applicable in this case.

After line 16, to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 5. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Athos Benedos Perin, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Peter Perin, citizens of the United States.

At the beginning of line 22, to change the section number from "5" to "6", and in line 23, after the word "sections", to strike out "1 and 2" and insert "1, 2, and 5."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

NATIVIDADE AGRELLA DOS SANTOS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3129) for the relief of Natividade Agrella Dos Santos, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, in line 5, after the name "Natividade", to strike out "Agrella" and insert "Agrela", and in line 7, after the word "States", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That no natural parent, by virtue of such parentage, shall be accorded any right, status, or privilege under the Immigration and Nationality Act."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Natividade Agrela Dos Santos, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Rose C. Agrella and Frank Agrella, citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That no natural parent, by virtue of such parentage, shall be accorded any right, status, or privilege under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Natividade Agrela Dos Santos."

URBANO I. GUERRERO, JR.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3159) for the relief of Urbano I. Guerrero, Jr., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 4, after the word "act", to strike out "Urbano I. Guerrero, Jr." and insert "Cresencio Urbano Guerrero", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Cresencio Urbano Guerrero, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Cresencio Urbano Guerrero."

SOUHAIL MASSAD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3271) for the relief of Souhail Massad, which had been reported from

the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 4, after the word "act", to strike out "Souhail Massad" and insert "Souhail Wadi Massad", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Souhail Wadi Massad shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-contral officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Souhail Wadi Massad."

ANTONIOS THOMAS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3364) for relief of Antonios Thomas, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, at the beginning of line 4, to insert "and section 205"; and in line 7, after the word "States", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That no natural parent of the beneficiary, by virtue of such relationship, shall be accorded any right, status, or privilege under the Immigration and Nationality Act"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted etc., That, in the administration of section 101 (a) (27) (A) and section 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Antonios Thomas, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Mitchel Thomas, citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That no natural parent of the beneficiary, by virtue of such relationship, shall be accorded any right, status, or privilege under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 586) to extend the time for filing of claims under section 6420 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for refund of taxes on gasoline used on farms between January 1, 1956, and June 30, 1956, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CLARK. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

GREETINGS TO THE CITIZENS OF NEVADA CELEBRATING THE CENTENNIAL OF THE DISCOVERY OF SILVER IN THE UNITED STATES

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 52) extending greetings to the citizens of Nevada concerning the celebration of the centennial of the discovery of silver in the United States was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress extends greetings and felicitations to the citizens of the State of Nevada, and particularly to the Nevada Centennial Committee, upon the occasion of their commemorative celebration of the 100th anniversary of the first significant discovery of silver in the United States. The Congress joins with the people of the United States in expressing appreciation of the great contribution by the citizens of the State of Nevada in preserving the Union.

The preamble was agreed to.

NATIONAL OLYMPIC WEEK

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 586) to authorize the designation of the week beginning on October 13, 1958, as National Olympic Week was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

ELEANOR A. LOEBRICH

The resolution (S. Res. 305) to pay a gratuity to Eleanor A. Loebrich was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Eleanor A. Loebrich, sister of Barbara Bell, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The resolution (S. Res. 300) to increase the amount of funds for the Committee on the Judiciary was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the 85th Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT STUDY ENTITLED "FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC ANALYSIS, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS"

The resolution (S. Res. 302), printing as a Senate document a study entitled "Financial and Economic Analysis, Colorado River Storage Project and Participating Projects," prepared by the Department of the Interior, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That a study entitled "Financial and Economic Analysis, Colorado River Storage Project and Participating Projects, February 1958," prepared by the Department of the Interior, be printed with illustrations as a Senate document, and that 2,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN THE LABOR OR MANAGEMENT FIELD

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 295) increasing the limit of expenditures of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, on page 2, line 2, after the world "of", to strike out "$16,000" and insert "$20,000", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the amount authorized in Senate Resolution 74, agreed to January 30, 1957, Senate Resolution 186, agreed to August 26, 1957, and Senate Resolution 222, agreed to January 29, 1958, 85th Congress (authorizing and directing the committee to conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been, engaged in in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers to the detriment of the interests of public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities), is hereby increased by the additional amount of $20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ENTITLED "CIVIL RIGHTS, 1957" FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 87) to permit additional copies of the hearings entitled "Civil Rights, 1957" for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representaitves concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary 2,000 additional copies of the hearings of its Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights entitled "Civil Rights, 1957," held during the 85th Congress, 1st session.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 232, 84TH CONGRESS

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 17) authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 232, 84th Congress, was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING AS HOUSE DOCUMENT PAMPHLET ENTITLED "OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT—WHAT IT IS?—HOW DOES IT FUNCTION?"

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 228) authorizing the printing as a House document of the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government—What It Is?—How Does It Function?" was considered and agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF ORGANIC ACT OF GUAM

The bill (H. R. 4215) amending sections 22 and 24 of the Organic Act of Guam was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3506) to authorize the transfer of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 8490) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to rice acreage allotments, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Over, as not proper calendar business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2646), to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in certain cases, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CLARK. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ANTI - HOG - CHOLERA SERUM—CHANGE IN MINIMUM INVENTORY DATE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3478) to insure the maintenance of an adequate supply of anti-hog-cholera serum and hog-cholera virus.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this bill changes the date on which manufacturers are required to have the prescribed minimum inventory of serum on hand under anti-hog-cholera serum marketing agreements. At present the prescribed date is May 1. This is too late for many producers, particularly those in the South, whose heavy requirements for serum may begin in March. If, after satisfying these requirements, they must have the minimum inventory on hand on May 1, they may be forced to carry stock over until the next marketing season. The bill, therefore, would prescribe April 1 as the date when the minimum inventory shall be held, except that in the case of any particular manufacturer the Secretary may, upon the manufacturer's application, fix another date between January 1 and May 1.

The bill makes a few other clarifying changes in language, which do not, however, represent any change in substance. Thus, the bill would require each manufacturer to have the prescribed amount in inventory in his own possession rather than simply available but, as pointed out in the Department's letter, the new language reflects the Department's long-established interpretation of the existing law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 58 (b) of the act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 853 (b)), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Terms and conditions requiring each manufacturer to have in inventory in his own possession on April 1 of each year a reserve supply of completed serum equivalent to not less than 40 percent of his previous year's sales of all serum, except that any marketing agreement may provide that upon written application by a manufacturer filed before September 1 of the preceding year, the Secretary may fix another date between January 1 and May 1 on which such manufacturer shall have such inventory if the Secretary finds that such action will tend to effectuate the purposes of this act. The Secretary may impose such terms and conditions upon granting any such application as he finds necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act. Serum used in computing the required reserve supply of any manufacturer shall not again be used in computing the required reserve supply of any other manufacturer."

CONTROL OF NOXIOUS PLANTS ON LAND

The Senate proceeded to consider bill (S. 3861) to provide for the control of noxious plants on land under the control or jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this bill provides for the application of State weed-control plans to Federal lands. It authorizes the State commissioner of agriculture to destroy noxious plants on Federal lands if the agency having jurisdiction of the lands consents thereto, and has not already complied with the requirements of the program. The States would be reimbursed for expenses incurred by them to the extent that Congress sees fit to appropriate funds for that purpose.

Federal agencies already have authority to cooperate with States in weed-control programs and are doing so to a limited extent. The bill would not require agencies to cooperate in any particular programs, but would encourage greater cooperative efforts with the States. State weed-control agencies are very interested in this bill since failure to control weeds on Federal lands may mean that State funds used in weed control would be largely wasted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3861) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Agriculture or other proper agency of any State in which there is in effect a program for the control of noxious plants may enter upon any land in such State under the control or jurisdiction of a department, agency, or independent establishment of the executive branch of the Federal Government, with the permission of and in accordance with the program acceptable to the head of such department, agency, or independent establishment, and destroy by appropriate methods noxious plants growing on such land if—

(1) the same procedure required by the State program with respect to privately owned land has been followed; and

(2) the department, agency, or independent establishment involved has failed to comply with the requirements of such program.

SEC. 2. To the extent that funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this act are available therefor, any State incurring expenses pursuant to the first section of this act shall be reimbursed, upon presentation of an itemized account of such expenses, by the head of the department, agency, or independent establishment of the executive branch of the Federal Government having control or jurisdiction of the land with respect to which such expenses were incurred.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to departments, agencies, or independent establishments of the executive branch of the Federal Government such sums as the Congress may determine to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

RESEARCH RELATING TO FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3076) to amend section 12 of the act of May 29, 1884, relating to research on foot-and-mouth disease.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this bill was requested by the Department of Agriculture, and its purpose is to eliminate unnecessary Government expense. It would permit transportation of foot-and-mouth disease virus to and from the Plum Island laboratory across the mainland under adequate safeguards. At present the virus must often be transported by a circuitous route and removed from the boat before docking in New York Harbor. These precautions are expensive and unnecessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3076) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12 of the act of May 29, 1884, as amended (62 Stat. 198, as amended; 21 U. S. C. 113a), is hereby further amended by inserting after the word "tunnel" in the proviso in the first sentence of the section the following clause: ", and except that the Secretary of Agriculture may transport said virus in the original package across the mainland under adequate safeguards."

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL SEED ACT OF AUGUST 9, 1939

The bill (S. 1939) to amend the Federal Seed Act of August 9, 1939, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the bill makes a number of changes in the Federal Seed Act which have been found necessary and have been recommended by the Department of Agriculture. Labeling requirements somewhat similar to those imposed on domestic seed would be imposed on imported seed. Exceptions for particular kinds of seed would be eliminated. The industry would be relieved of unnecessary burdens. The bill is designed to result in generally improved administration and effectiveness of the act.

I believe the principal purpose of the bill is to bring the importations of seed under the same general restrictions as those which apply to the labeling of domestic seed. The bill was requested by the Department of Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the bill (S. 1939) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 101 (a) (7) (A) of the Federal Seed Act of August 9, 1939 (53 Stat. 1275), as amended (7 U. S. C. 1561 (a) (7) (A)) is amended by deleting from the list of agricultural seeds the phrase "Beta vulgaris L.—Field beet, excluding sugar beet." and substituting therefor the phrase "Beta vulgaris L.—Field beet."

SEC. 2. Section 101 (a) of said act (7 U. S. C. 1561 (a)) is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (24) to read as follows:

"(24) The term 'treated' means given an application of a substance or subjected to a process designed to reduce, control, or repel disease organisms, insects, or other pests which attack seeds or seedlings growing therefrom."

SEC. 3. Section 101 (a) of said act (7 U. S. C. 1561 (a)) is further amended by adding at the end thereof, after new paragraph (24), a new paragraph (25) to read as follows:

"(25) The term 'seed certifying agency' means (A) an agency authorized under the laws of a State, Territory, or possession, to officially certify seed, or (B) an agency of a foreign country determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to adhere to procedure and standards for seed certification comparable to those adhered to generally by seed certifying agencies under (A)."

SEC. 4. Title I of said act (7 U. S. C. 1561) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section 102 to read as follows:

"SEC. 102. Any labeling, advertisement, or other representation subject to this act which represents that any seed is certified or registered seed shall be deemed to be false in this respect unless (a) it has been determined by a seed certifying agency that such seed was produced, processed, and packaged, and conformed to standards of purity as to kind or variety, in compliance with the rules and regulations of such agency pertaining to such seed; and (b) the seed bears an official label issued for such seed by a seed certifying agency stating that the seed is certified or registered."

SEC. 5. Section 201 (a) (8) of said act (7 U. S. C. 1571 (a) (8)) is amended to read as follows:

"(8) For each agricultural seed, in excess of 5 percent of the whole, stated in accordance with paragraph (a) (1) of this section, and each kind or variety or type of agricultural seed shown in the labeling to be present in a proportion of 5 percent or less of the whole, (A) percentage of germination, exclusive of hard seed, (B) percentage of hard seed, if present, and (C) the calendar month and year the test was completed to determine such percentages."

SEC. 6. Section 201 (b) (1) of said act (7 U. S. C. 1571 (b) (1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Name of each kind and variety of seed and if two or more kinds or varieties are present, the percentage of each."

SEC. 7. That part of section 201 (b) (2) of said act (7 U. S. C. 1571 (b) (2)) which precedes clause (i) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) For each variety of vegetable seed which germinates less than the standard last established by the Secretary of Agriculture, as provided under section 403 (c) of this act—"

SEC. 8. Section 201 of said act (7 U. S. C. 1571) is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (i) to read as follows:

"(i) Any agricultural seeds or any mixture thereof or any vegetable seeds or any mixture thereof, for seeding purposes, that have been treated, unless each container thereof bears a label giving the following information and statements in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed under section 402 of this act:

"(1) A word or statement indicating that the seeds have been treated;

"(2) The commonly accepted coined, chemical (generic), or abbreviated chemical name of any substance used in such treatment;

"(3) If the substance used in such treatment in the amount remaining with the seeds is harmful to humans or other vertebrate animals, an appropriate caution statement approved by the Secretary of Agriculture as adequate for the protection of the public, such as 'Do not use for food or feed or oil purposes': *Provided*, That the caution statement for mercurials and similarly toxic substances, as defined in said rules and regulations, shall be a representation of a skull and crossbones and a statement such as 'This seed has been treated with poison,' in red letters on a background of distinctly contrasting color; and

"(4) A description of any process used in such treatment, approved by the Secretary of Agriculture as adequate for the protection of the public."

SEC. 9. Section 202 of said act (7 U. S. C. 1572) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 202. All persons transporting, or delivering for transportation, in interstate commerce, agricultural seeds shall keep for a period of 3 years a complete record of origin, germination, and purity of each lot of such agricultural seeds, and all persons transporting, or delivering for transportation, in interstate commerce, vegetable seeds shall keep for a period of 3 years a complete record of germination and variety of such vegetable seeds. The Secretary of Agriculture, or his duly authorized agents, shall have the right to inspect such records for the purpose of the effective administration of this act."

SEC. 10. (a) That part of section 203 (b) of said act (7 U. S. C. 1573 (b)) which precedes clause (1) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The provisions of section 201 (a), (b), or (i) shall not apply—"

(b) Clause (2) of such section 203 (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) to seed intended for seeding purposes when transported or offered for transportation in interstate commerce—

"(A) if in bulk, in which case, however, the invoice or other records accompanying and pertaining to such seed shall bear the various statements required for the respective seeds under sections 201 (a), (b), and (i); or

"(B) if in containers and in quantities of 20,000 pounds or more: *Provided*, That (i) the omission from each container of the information required under sections 201 (a), (b), and (i) is with the knowledge and consent of the consignee prior to the transportation or delivery for transportation of such seed in interstate commerce, (ii) each container shall have stenciled upon it or bear a label containing a lot designation, and (iii) the invoice or other records accompanying and pertaining to such seed shall bear the various statements required for the respective seeds under section 201 (a), (b), and (i); or

"(C) if consigned to a seed cleaning or processing establishment, to be cleaned or processed for seeding purposes: *Provided*, That (i) this fact is so stated in the invoice or other records accompanying and pertaining to such seed if the seed is in bulk or if the seed is in containers and in quantities of 20,000 pounds or more, (ii) this fact is so stated on attached labels if the seed is in containers and in quantities less than 20,000 pounds, and (iii) any such seed later to be labeled as to origin and/or variety shall be labeled as to origin and/or variety in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed under section 402 of this act."

SEC. 11. Section 204 of said act (7 U. S. C. 1574) is amended to read:

"SEC. 204. The use of a disclaimer, limited warranty, or nonwarranty clause in any invoice, advertising, labeling, or written, printed, or graphic matter, pertaining to any seed shall not constitute a defense, or be used as a defense in any way, in any prosecution or other proceeding brought under the provisions of this act, or the rules and regulations made and promulgated thereunder. Nothing in this section is intended to preclude the use of a disclaimer, limited warranty, or nonwarranty clause as a defense in any proceeding not brought under this act."

SEC. 12. Section 301 (a) of said act (7 U. S. C. 1581 (a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (4) to read as follows:

"(4) any seed containing 10 percent or more of any vegetable seeds unless the invoice pertaining to such seed and any other labeling of such seed bear the name of each kind and variety of vegetable seed present."

SEC. 13. Section 302 (a) of said act (7 U. S. C. 1582 (a)) is amended by inserting the word "owner or" before the word "consignee" wherever the latter appears except in the two provisos therein; and by deleting said provisos and substituting therefor, respectively, the following: "*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury may authorize the delivery of seed or screenings which are being imported or offered for import to the owner or consignee thereof, pending decision as to the admission of such seed or screenings and for staining, cleaning, labeling, or other reconditioning if required to bring such seed or screenings into compliance with the provisions of this act, upon the execution by such owner or consignee of a good and sufficient bond conditioned upon redelivery of the seed or screenings upon demand unless redelivery is waived because the seed is reconditioned to bring it into compliance with this act or is destroyed under Government supervision under this act, and providing for the payment of such liquidated damages in the event of default as may be required pursuant to regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury: *And provided further*, That all expenses incurred by the United States (including travel, per diem or subsistence, and salaries of officers or employees of the United States) in connection with the supervision of staining, cleaning, labeling, other reconditioning, or destruction, of seed or screenings under this title shall be reimbursed to the United States by the owner or consignee of the seed or screenings, and such reimbursements shall be recredited to the appropriation from which the expenses were paid, the amount of such expenses to be determined in accordance with joint regulations under section 402 of this act, and all expenses in connection with the storage, cartage, and labor on the seed or screenings which are refused admission or delivery, shall be paid by the owner or consignee, and in default of such payment shall constitute a lien against future importations made by such owner or consignee."

SEC. 14. Section 302 of said act (7 U. S. C. 1582) is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (d) to read as follows:

"(d) The provisions of this title prohibiting the importation of seed that is adulterated or unfit for seeding purposes shall not apply—

"(1) when seed grown in the United States is returned from a foreign country without having been admitted into the commerce of any foreign country: *Provided*, That there is satisfactory proof as provided for in the joint rules and regulations prescribed under section 402 of this act, that the seed was grown in the United States and was not

admitted into the commerce of a foreign country and was not commingled with other seed, or

"(2) when seed is imported for sowing for experimental or breeding purposes and not for sale: *Provided*, That declarations are filed, and importations are limited in quantity, as provided for in the rules and regulations prescribed under section 402 of this act, to assure that the importations are for experimental or breeding purposes."

SEC. 15. Section 306 of said act (7 U. S. C. 1586) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (c) to read as follows:

"(c) To make any false or misleading representation with respect to any seed subject to this title being imported into the United States or offered for import: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not be deemed violated by any person if the false or misleading representation is the name of a variety indistinguishable in appearance from the seed being imported or offered for import and the records and other pertinent facts reveal that such person relied in good faith upon representations with respect to the name of the indistinguishable variety made by the shipper of the seed."

SEC. 16. This act, and the amendments made hereby, shall take effect upon the date of enactment.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6765) to provide for reports on the acreage planted to cotton, to repeal the prohibition against cotton acreage reports based on farmers' planting intentions, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2447) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to undertake continuing studies of the effects of insecticides, herbicides, and fungicides upon fish and wildlife for the purpose of preventing losses of those invaluable natural resources following spraying and to provide basic data on the various chemical controls so that forests, croplands, and marshes can be sprayed with minimum losses of fish and wildlife, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HRUSKA. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) providing for the construction of a demonstration plant for the production from seawater of water suitable for beneficial consumptive uses, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Over, as not proper calendar business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2629) for the relief of John J. Spriggs was announced as next in order.

Mr. HRUSKA. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

NATIONAL SAFE BOATING WEEK

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 378) to authorize the President to proclaim annually the week which includes July 4 as "National Safe Boating Week," was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble as amended was agreed to, as follows:

To authorize the President to proclaim annually the week which includes July 4 as "National Safe Boating Week."

Whereas our people in increasing numbers are taking part in boating activities on the waters of our Nation, with more than 20 million expected to participate during 1958; and

Whereas safety is essential for the full enjoyment of boating; and

Whereas many lives can be spared and injuries and property damage avoided by safe boating practices; and

Whereas it is proper and fitting that national attention should be focused on the need for safe boating practices: Therefore be it

SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1061) to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments to settle certain claims for damages to, or loss of, property or personal injury or death, not cognizable under any other law, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 2, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out:

"§ 2736. Property loss; personal injury or death; incident to use and operation of Government property and not cognizable under other law.

"(a) Under such regulations as the Secretary of a military department may prescribe; he or any officer designated by him may settle, and pay in an amount not more than $1,000 a claim against the United States, not cognizable under any other provision of law, for damage to, or loss of, property, or for personal injury or death, caused by a civilian officer or employee of that department or a member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, as the case may be, incident to the use or operation of Government property.

"(b) Under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, he or any officer designated by him has the same authority as the Secretary of a military department with respect to a claim for damage to, or loss of, property, or for personal injury or death, caused by a civilian officer or employee of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, incident to the use or operation of Government property.

And insert:

"§ 2736. Property loss; personal injury or death; incident to the use and operation of Government vehicles, or incident to the use of other Government property on a Government installation and not cognizable under law.

"(a) Under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, the Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary of a military department, may settle, and pay in an amount not more than $1,000, a claim against the United States, not cognizable under any other provision of law, for damage to, or loss of, property, or for personal injury or death, caused by a civilian officer or employee of the office of the Secretary of Defense, or a civilian officer or employee of a military department, or a member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, as the case may be, incident to the use and operation of Government vehicles or incident to the use of other Government property on a Government installation. The authority conferred by this subsection to settle such claims may be redelegated to such officer as the Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary of a military department, may designate. Any regulations promulgated pursuant to this authority shall not become effective until the expiration of 60 days after such regulations have been filed with the Committees on the Judiciary of the House and Senate of the United States and the Congress may, within such time, amend, or disapprove such regulations in whole or in part.

"(b) No claim shall be allowed under subsection (a) if the damage to, or loss of, property, or the personal injury or death, was caused wholly or partly by a negligent or wrongful act of the claimant, his agent, or his employee.

On page 4, line 11, after the word "accrues", to strike out the quotation marks and "; and"; after line 11, to insert a new subparagraph, as follows:

"(e) No claim may be paid under subsection (a) unless the amount tendered is accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States.

After line 14, to insert a new subparagraph, as follows:

"(f) No payment made under this section shall give rise to any right of subrogation to any claim for reimbursement in whole or in part under any contract of insurance providing for the making of any payment for or on account of the damage, loss, injury, or death for or on account of which such payment was made under this section, and no payment made hereunder shall absolve any insurer, in whole or in part, of any obligation under any such contract."; and

And, on page 5, after line 2, to strike out:

"§ 2736. Property loss; personal injury or death; incident to use and operation of Government property and not cognizable under other law."

And insert:

"§ 2736. Property loss; personal injury or death; incident to the use and operation of Government vehicles, or incident to the use of other Government property on a Government installation and not cognizable under other law."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MARIA SABATINO

The bill (S. 445) for the relief of Maria Sabatino was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Sabatino shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

CHIU-SANG WU AND HIS WIFE

The bill (S. 683) for the relief of Chiu-Sang Wu and his wife was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a

third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chiu-Sang Wu and his wife, Catherine Naoko Mitsuda Wu shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

LORI BIAGI

The bill (S. 1542) for the relief of Lori Biagi was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lori Biagi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

INCREASE IN PUNISHMENT FOR GIVING FALSE INFORMATION RELATIVE TO DESTRUCTION OF AIRCRAFT AND MOTOR VEHICLES

The bill (S. 1963) to amend section 35 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to increase the punishment for knowingly giving false information concerning destruction of aircraft and motor vehicles was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 35 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by striking out "$1,000" and inserting "$5,000", and by striking out "1 year" and inserting "5 years."

KALLIOPE GIAMNIAS

The bill (S. 2982) for the relief of Kalliope Giamnias was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Kalliope Giamnias shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

GIUSEPPINA FAZIO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3175) for the relief of Giuseppina Fazio, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of sections 203 (a) (3) and 205 of the Immigation and Nationality Act, Guiseppina Fazio shall be held and considered to be the minor child of Mr. and Mrs. Antonio Fazio, lawful resident aliens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RONALD H. DENNISON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3055) for the relief of Ronald H. Dennison, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 2, line 3, after the word "act", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That Ronald H. Denison of Kalamazoo, Mich., is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $1,217.42, representing overpayments of longevity paid to the said Ronald H. Denison while he was an officer in the United States Air Force, such overpayments having been made as the result of administrative error.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Ronald H. Denison, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAUL S. WATANABE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3205) for the relief of Paul S. Watanabe, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 4, after the word "section", to strike out "349 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952" and insert "401 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That Paul S. Watanabe, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 401 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940 may be naturalized by taking, prior to one year after the date of the enactment of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, an oath as prescribed by section 337 of such act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Paul S. Watanabe shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANCISCO SALINAS AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consdier the bill (S. 459) for the relief of Francisco Salinas and others, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the name "Quilantan", to strike out "and his wife Graciela de Jesus Garza Salinas (also known as Graciela de Jesus Garza Quilantan)"; in line 9, after the word "visa", to strike out "fees" and insert "fee"; and at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Francisco Salinas (also known as Daniel Castro Quilantan) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Francisco Salinas (also known as Daniel Castro Quilantan)."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 489) for the relief of Mary K. Ryan was announced as next in order.

Mr. HRUSKA. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ELISABETH LESCH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1593) for the relief of Elisabeth Lesch, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act Elisabeth Lesch, the fiancée of Sfc. William R. Hopper, a citizen of the United States, and her minor children, Gonda, Norbert, and Bobby, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Elisabeth Lesch is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Sfc.

William R. Hopper and that they are found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, except that section 212 (a) (9) of the said act shall be inapplicable in the case of Elisabeth Lesch: *Provided further*, That the exemption provided herein in the case of the said Elisabeth Lesch shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Elisabeth Lesch and her minor children, Gonda, Norbert, and Bobby, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Elisabeth Lesch and her minor children, Gonda, Norbert, and Bobby, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Elisabeth Lesch and her minor children, Gonda, Norbert, and Bobby, as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees.

The amendment was agree to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Elisabeth Lesch and her minor children, Gonda, Norbert, and Bobby."

DR. THOMAS B. MEADE

The bill (H. R. 1466) for the relief of Dr. Thomas B. Meade was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROBATION ACT—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 7261) to amend the Federal Probation Act to make it applicable to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I see the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], is in the Chamber. I should like to inquire whether he would object to having the bill go over until those of us on the District of Columbia Committee, particularly the Judiciary Subcommittee, can have an opportunity to determine whether the law enforcement agencies of the District of Columbia have any particular objection to this change in the probation law. The present District of Columbia Code is somewhat more elaborate than the uniform law. It may be this change is desirable, but I should like to have an opportunity, inasmuch as none of the District Committee members are present, to query the authorities.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is agreeable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania ask that the bill go over?

Mr. CLARK. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

WILLIAM J. McGARRY

The bill (H. R. 9775) for the relief of William J. McGarry was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WESTERN INSTRUMENTS ASSOCIATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1700) for the relief of Western Instruments Associates, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ESTATE OF W. C. YARBROUGH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6932) for the relief of the estate of W. C. Yarbrough, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 2, line 10, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

GILLOUS M. YOUNG

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1492) for the relief of Gillous M. Young, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "States", to strike out "the sum of $3,751.47. Such sum represents" and insert "any sum representing", and on page 2, after line 5, to strike out:

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Gillous M. Young, the sum of $1,375.65. Such sum represents the portion of the retired pay received by the said Gillous M. Young for the period beginning January 8, 1951, and ending February 28, 1953, which he has already refunded to the United States by means of deductions from amounts otherwise due him: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3862) to establish certain provisions with respect to the removal and the terms of office of the members of certain regulatory agencies was announced as next in order.

Mr. CLARK. Over, as not being calendar business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 171) to amend section 217 of the National Housing Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Over, as not properly being calendar business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 9291) to define parts of certain types of footwear was announced as next in order.

Mr. CLARK. Over. The bill was not reported in time for the calendar committee to consider it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

That completes the call of the calendar.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATEMENT BY SOUTH CAROLINA STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE IN SUPPORT OF S. 3773 AND S. 3774

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by the South Carolina State Chamber of Commerce, intended for submission to the Labor Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in support of bills S. 3773 and S. 3774. In this statement, the chamber of commerce has given opinions as to the beneficial effect that will result if these bills are enacted.

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

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE IN SUPPORT OF SENATE BILLS S. 3773 AND S. 3774 INTRODUCED BY SENATOR STROM THURMOND, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. Chairman, the South Carolina State Chamber of Commerce wishes to go on record in behalf of two bills now pending before this committee, S. 3773 and S. 3774. These bills were recently introduced by Senator THURMOND, of South Carolina, and are presently pending before you.

S. 3773 is designed to give employees who have been injured, as a result of unfair labor practices on the part of labor organizations,

the right to sue for damages for such injury. At the present time, the Taft-Hartley Act provides that in certain specified types of unfair labor practices employers may sue labor organizations for damages in Federal courts without the necessity of establishing diversity of citizenship or the amount in controversy. The present bill would amend this particular provision of the Taft-Hartley Act to the extent that all unfair labor practices committed by labor organizations would be subject to suit by employees. This bill would give to employees the additional protection of having a remedy in the nature of damages from unlawful conduct now proscribed by the Taft-Hartley Act as unfair labor practices.

The State chamber endorses this bill because it believes that the present trend on the part of organized labor has been to ignore the individual rights of employees. The recent McClellan committee hearings have given clear indication of the abuses foisted upon individual employees by labor organizations, which today have achieved tremendous economic power and strength. To arm employees with this protection would tend to insure elimination of many abuses which have been uncovered on the part of labor organizations by the McClellan committee. The basic intendment of the present Taft-Hartley Act is not to protect the rights of employers nor labor organizations but to protect the right of the individual employee in his desire to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of his own choosing. Unfortunately, today these rights have been impaired through the medium of mass picketing, violence, threats, intimidations, and coercion by labor organizations in their efforts to compel the individual employee to become and remain a member of the labor organization or to join with it in concerted action even though the employee may not wish to do so. If this bill is passed, the aforementioned conduct would be a suable action by any employee whose rights were so interfered with. We believe that this legislation would tend to curb, if not stop, these unlawful practices and strengthen the soundness of our Federal labor relations picture.

The chamber also endorses S. 3774 because we believe that labor organizations should be put in the same position as employers are today in connection with monopolistic practices. No one doubts today that labor organizations are big business. Within the shadow of the United States Capitol are immense edifices which are witnesses to the strength of the trade union movement; buildings that house hundreds of people not unlike corporate structures established throughout the length and breadth of this land. To put labor organizations back under the Sherman Antitrust Act would do nothing more than to place them, as big business, in the same position as those corporate structures which are now presently subject to this law. Indeed, up until the Hutchinson case, the courts had construed the Clayton Act and the Sherman Antitrust Act as being applicable to monopolistic practices on the part of labor organizations. In the Hutchinson case, through judicial legerdemain, the Clayton Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and the Sherman Antitrust Act were read together and the conclusion reached that Congress had never intended labor organizations to be subject to the Sherman Antitrust Act. This decision was, in our opinion, clearly contrary to the original intent of Congress and should be corrected by spelling out precisely and clearly that Congress this time intends for that act to be made applicable to labor organizations. The net effect of this legislation would do precisely that. No one can doubt that labor organizations today maintain and occupy a monopolistic control over many areas of our economic society. Again, the recent hearings before the McClellan committee clearly support this conclusion. Vicious secondary boycott activities aimed at destroying neutral employers and other types of monopolistic practices would now become unlawful if this bill were to be enacted into law. Not even organized labor, in many of its areas, attempts to justify the evils of such monopolistic practices. Indeed, they are, at the present time, attempting to clean their own houses in order to avoid the censure of the American public which is evidence that they would not be averse to supporting legislation which would, in a measure, protect the overall trade-union movement from this type of conduct. We wholeheartedly recommend that this legislation be enacted into law and thereby give additional protection to the American public from the monopolistic practices which are presently engaged in by labor organizations.

Respectfully submitted.

W. HAROLD BUTT,
President, South Carolina State Chamber of Commerce.

MAY 16, 1958.

REPORTS ON ACREAGE PLANTED TO COTTON

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 1621, H. R. 6765.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6765) to provide for reports on the acreage planted to cotton, to repeal the prohibition against cotton acreage reports based on farmers' planting intentions, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC POLICIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this past week the events on the international front indicated only too clearly the troubles and difficulties which we are facing. As is pointed out in the New York Times, our "worldwide prestige was in jeopardy, if not deteriorating. A reappraisal of our entire foreign policy appears a certainty."

I note, Mr. President, that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has agreed with the observation of the New York Times.

As Members of Congress are now aware, a study is underway with respect particularly to our relationships with Latin America and our neighbors to the south.

A resolution was adopted which authorized at least a preliminary inquiry into the overall scope of American foreign policy, which preliminary survey by staff and selected members of the Committee on Foreign Relations could well lead to an overall reevaluation and study of American foreign policy.

But, as the Times also notes, it is not only in the field of foreign affairs where we are in trouble:

Back on the home front a reappraisal might also be in order. The recession was obviously still very much with us. This was underscored by the latest figures on industrial production. It fell again in April, this time to the lowest level since October, 1954. The Federal Reserve Board index of industrial production is now 18 points below the year ago rate.

Although a decline in the gross national product—the total output of goods and services—had been expected to show up in the first quarter, the extent of the drop came as something of a surprise. The Department of Commerce reported that the annual rate had slipped $10,600,000,000 to $422 billion in March. This compared with $432,600,000,000 in the last quarter of 1957 and $440 billion in the third quarter of last year.

This decline definitely stamps this recession as the most serious since World War II. What's more, the Government's own economists predict a further dip in the current quarter.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article from the May 18 New York Times, by John G. Forrest, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

BAD NEWS FROM ABROAD DEPRESSES MARKET—PRODUCTION DOWN FURTHER

(By John G. Forrest)

It was a troubled stock market most of last week, troubled not only by continuing gloomy economic news but perhaps even more by grim international news.

Happenings in South America, the Middle East, and Algeria depressed the market through Wednesday. On Thursday, however, with some tension dissipated, prices recovered.

But stocks eased in quieter trading on Friday. The New York Times combined average of 50 stocks closed at 278.39, off 5.01 points in the week.

The disturbances abroad, in South America particularly, pointed up the fact that this country's worldwide prestige was in jeopardy, if not deteriorating. The problems are more economic than political. Once again the United States got the chief blame. A reappraisal of our entire foreign policy appears a certainty.

Back on the home front a reappraisal might also be in order. The recession was obviously still very much with us. This was underscored by the latest figures on industrial production. It fell again in April, this time to the lowest level since October 1954. The Federal Reserve Board index of industrial production is now 18 points below the year-ago rate.

TEN BILLION DIP

Although a decline in the gross national product—the total output of goods and services—had been expected to show up in the first quarter, the extent of the drop came as something of a surprise. The Department of Commerce reported that the annual rate had dipped $10,600,000,000 to $422 billion in March. This compared with $432,600,000,000 in the last quarter of 1957 and $440 billion in the third quarter of last year.

This decline definitely stamps this recession as the most serious since World War II. What's more, the Government's own economists predict a further dip in the current quarter.

A bit of consolation might be drawn from the latest report on personal income. This yardstick of purchasing power r e slightly in March and April, according to the Department of Commerce. In April it reached a seasonally adjusted annual rate of $342,800 million. This represented a rise of $600 million in April and $800 million in March. The annual rate of personal income was only 1.3 percent below the peak of last August.

TAX DECISION NEAR

There still is no clear-cut indication of what the Administration will recommend on taxes, but it is going to have to act soon. On June 30 corporate taxes are scheduled to decline and excise taxes expire. Before that time the question of a reduction in personal income taxes may be considered also. The discussion is being heard from Wall Street to Main Street, and there is anything but agreement.

For instance, Henry C. Alexander, chairman of J. P. Morgan & Co., Inc., urged a $5 billion tax cut applying to both individuals and corporations. On the other hand, the Commerce Department's Business Advisory Council voted three to one against a general tax reduction. Perhaps the President may make his own views known on Tuesday, when he speaks at the American Management Association meeting here.

William McChesney Martin, chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, told a Senate Banking subcommittee last week that there were "hopeful signs" that the business downturn was leveling off. He added, however, that there was nothing conclusive as yet.

SMALL CAR?

Automobile sales should be hitting a seasonal peak right now with Memorial Day less than 2 weeks off. They are not. Last week production picked up slightly, but it was still far below the 1957 pace. More and more Wall Street observers are convinced that Detroit, whether it likes it or not, will soon be entering the small-car field. The latest nominees to make the step are Studebaker-Packard and Chrysler.

Steel output fell to a 12-year low last month. There has been some pickup in May. Railroad traffic still is lagging badly behind year-ago levels and industry leaders see no indications of a real upturn before fall. James M. Symes, president of the Pennsylvania, the Nation's No. 1 carrier, said his road may well operate at a loss this year. It lost $15 million in the first quarter. In its 112-year history the carrier has only once—in 1946—failed to operate at a profit.

Housing starts last month rose moderately. Even so, the annual rate is still below that of a year ago and 33 percent below the high in 1954, when activity began to slacken. The April rise was probably due to easier private mortgage money, coupled with relaxed terms on Veterans' Administration and FHA mortgages.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday the President, speaking in New York City before one of the great business organizations—I believe it was the American Management Association—noted that the economy could look forward to a fall bursting with vitality and promise if the American people were bold enough to reach for it. The President gave a very optimistic report, which of course is reassuring to all of us. I hope and pray that every promise and every prophesy he made will be fulfilled over and over again.

However, Mr. President, the recession is obviously still with us.

Another indication of the recession is the latest report of the Federal Reserve Board showing that in the week ended May 10, department store sales were down 4 percent from a year ago. In my own area, for example, sales were down 1 percent in Minneapolis, 8 percent in St. Paul, and down 15 percent in Duluth-Superior.

I ask unanimous consent that the figures on department store sales from the May 18 New York Times be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT STORE SALES TREND

The Federal Reserve Board reports the following percentage comparisons of department store sales by districts with last year's:

	1 week ended—		4 weeks ending May 10	Jan. 1 to May 10
	May 10	May 3		
Boston	−6	−6	−6	−3
New York	−3	[1]−6	−3	0
Philadelphia	−3	−6	0	−3
Cleveland	−5	−10	−8	−5
Richmond	−6	[1]−11	−9	−5
Atlanta	−5	[1]0	−3	−3
Chicago	−6	−14	−8	−6
St. Louis	−9	−15	−9	−6
Minneapolis	−4	−10	−8	−2
Kansas City	0	[1]−5	−3	−1
Dallas	+4	−5	−2	−3
San Francisco	+1	−[1]2	0	−2
Total, United States	−4	−8	−4	−3

[1] Revised.

The United States weekly index, without seasonal adjustment follows (1947–49 equals 100):

1958:	
April 12	110
April 19	125
April 26	136
May 3	132
May 10	138
1957:	
April 13	131
April 20	138
April 27	131
May 4	143
May 11	143
1956:	
April 14	124
April 21	123
April 28	129
May 5	136
May 12	140

Percentage changes in department store sales from last year's volume by cities for the weeks indicated:

	Weeks ended—	
	May 10	May 3
Akron	+14	−7
Atlanta	−16	−3
Augusta, Ga	−9	−6
Baltimore	−5	[1]−16
Birmingham	−9	[1]+1
Boston (C)	−3	−6
Buffalo	−4	−12
Chicago	−4	−8
Cincinnati	−13	−6
Cleveland (C)	−6	−8
Columbus, Ohio	−7	−13
Dallas	+4	−9
Denver	−3	−5
Detroit	−10	−22
Duluth-Superior (C)	−15	−11
Erie	−8	−12
Fort Worth	+4	−10
Houston	0	−4
Indianapolis	−9	−16
Jacksonville	+1	−4
Kansas City (C)	0	−7
Little Rock	−2	−14
Los Angeles area	−1	−4
Los Angeles downtown	−7	−7
Los Angeles west side	0	−7
Louisville	−8	−19
Memphis	−13	−27
Miami	−4	[1]+6
Milwaukee	−2	−14
Minneapolis	−1	−6
Newark	−9	−14
New Orleans	−2	−6
New York (C)	−6	[1]−9
Oakland, Calif	0	−5
Oklahoma City	0	−3
Philadelphia (C)	−3	−4
Pittsburgh	−3	−11
Portland, Oreg	−2	−3
Rochester	−4	[1]+2
Salt Lake City	0	−1
San Antonio	+9	−2
San Diego	−8	−1
San Francisco	+1	0
Seattle	0	−9
Spokane	−2	−5
Springfield, Mass. (C)	−12	+2
St. Joseph	+3	−4
St. Louis	−9	−10
St. Paul	−8	−16
Syracuse	−5	−11
Tulsa	+4	0
Washington	−5	−9
Wichita	−6	−3

[1] Revised.

(C) Cities: Those not marked (C) are metropolitan districts.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is not difficult to explain this decline of 15 percent in department-store sales in the Duluth-Superior area when it is considered what an important role the iron-ore industry plays in that section's economy.

The Department of Labor in its latest report on surplus-labor areas shows that Duluth-Superior has been among the hardest hit areas in the entire country. As of mid-March 13.6 percent of the Duluth-Superior work force were without jobs. Only eight other major labor areas in the United States had a higher jobless percentage figure. And since mid-March, when this survey was reported, the number of jobless in Duluth-Superior has risen by 35 percent measured in terms of the number of insured unemployed.

Consumption of Lake Superior iron ore by iron and steel plants fell in the first quarter of this year by 44 percent from a year ago. Stocks on hand at each dock and furnace yard are up by 71 percent from a year ago. As a result, scores of ore carriers are idle, and thousands of workers without jobs.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the May 18 New York Times reporting on the sharp drop in use of iron ore be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

LAKE IRON ORE USE OFF—CONSUMPTION FELL 9,000,000 TONS BELOW 1957 IN QUARTER

CLEVELAND, May 17.—Consumption of Lake Superior iron ore by iron and steel plants was approximately 9,000,000 tons less in the first quarter of this year than in the corresponding period of 1957, the American Iron Ore Association reports.

Furnaces consumed 11,524,802 tons of the ore in the first 3 months of this year, compared with 20,405,250 tons in the 1957 period.

Ore receipts totaled 344,745 tons in the first quarter of 1958, against 881,327 in the comparable period last year, but stocks on hand at lake docks and furnace yards have been considerably larger this year due to reduced operations of steel plants.

Stocks totaled 33,569,601 tons on April 1, compared with only 19,638,051 tons a year ago. The huge surplus is keeping scores of ore carriers idle.

Ore consumption increased slightly in March, aggregating 3,712,549 tons, against 3,557,595 in February, but the gain is attributed to the longer month rather than to any improvement in orders.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I note again that on Monday last the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] the present Presiding Officer, addressed himself in detail and with great understanding and knowledge to these very pertinent economic facts.

Mr. President, for several weeks we have been receiving assurances from the administration that the recession is bottoming out.

When figures were released showing a drop in the number of jobless from 5.2 million as of mid-March to 5.1 million as of mid-April, the administration attempted to leave an impression in the public's mind that things were looking up. What the administration failed to emphasize was that on a seasonally adjusted basis unemployment actually rose—from 7 percent of the labor force in mid-March to 7.5 percent in mid-April—the highest level of unemployment since pre-World War II. The administration also sought to divert our attention from the significant fact that the April rise in unemployment of 0.5 percent is, with the exception of the months of January and February of this year, the largest increase on a seasonally adjusted basis since this recession began 8 months ago.

The administration points to the recent decline in the number of jobless receiving unemployment insurance benefits, but it does not call attention to the fact that jobless workers are exhausting their unemployment insurance benefits at a rapidly mounting rate.

Again, Mr. President, I am pleased to see the announcement today that the senior Senator from Illinois is preparing an overall unemployment compensation bill which will meet these needs, in lieu of the sorry and inadequate measure which the administration is attempting to pass on to the American people and the Congress as being one which is able to satisfy the requirements of the unemployment situation. I assure the Senator from Illinois that his effort will be received with enthusiasm and wholehearted support by the Senator from Minnesota and, I am sure, by many others. At long last it is beginning to sink into the public mind that something has to be done, other than playing around with mirrors and political games. The people expect the Congress to act. We are fortunate that leadership is being offered and that a sound proposal is being prepared. I congratulate the Senator from Illinois for his very valuable efforts in this area of our economic situation.

Here are the grim figures on unemployment benefit exhaustions: 147,000 in January; 145,000 in February; 189,000 in March; and 230,000 in April. And government experts tell us that such exhaustions by this summer will be topping over 300,000 a month: It is estimated that a total of 2,600,000 workers will exhaust their benefits this year.

Mr. President, unless a measure such as the proposal being advanced by the Senator from Illinois is enacted, we are going to see literally millions of people in this country with no income whatsoever, because I know of no economist who is predicting an upturn in the economy by this fall sufficient to bring about the reemployment of the 5 million plus persons who are currently unemployed. The difference, simply stated, will be that of the 5.1 million presently unemployed a substantial number will not be receiving unemployment-compensation benefits. At least, there is at present some purchasing power for some of the essentials of life. Mr. President, if workers exhaust benefits at the rate of 300,000 a month in the months ahead, we will soon find more than 2 million breadwinners without any income whatsoever. They will become a real drag on the economy, to be sure, but, more significantly, they will become people who have to rely upon public charity for subsistence.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that an article from the May 20 Washington Post reporting on the rising rate of benefit exhaustions be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

IDLE USING UP BENEFITS AT FAST-RISING RATE

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

Jobless workers are using up their unemployment compensation at a rapidly mounting rate.

Moreover, Government experts figure that the total of those exhausting their benefits will continue rising through the spring and reach a peak in June or July.

Thereafter, they look for a gradual decline in exhaustions through the rest of the year. This improvement, the economists point out, assumes that the recession will soon touch bottom and turn into a recovery in the fourth quarter.

The increase in workers running out of benefits is almost enough by itself to explain the recent drops in unemployment among those in the jobless pay system. The official explanation has credited this decline to the usual spring gain in outdoor work.

For the 3 weeks ended May 3, the number drawing benefits shrunk by almost 170,000. But in April, about 230,000 used up all the compensation pay to which they were entitled.

The periods are not, of course, identical. But they indicate that if not a single idle worker had found a job, exhaustions would still have sharply reduced the compensation rolls.

Some workers using up benefits undoubtedly found jobs. The number, however, was probably not very large since long unemployment periods are a feature of the current slump. By April, those idled 15 weeks or more totaled 1,900,000. This group never exceeded 1,100,000 in any of the earlier postwar recessions.

Against this background, the Senate Finance Committee goes into executive session on Wednesday to begin marking up a bill extending unemployment compensation benefits. Chairman HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, said yesterday he hopes to finish by the end of the week and report out a bill like that passed in the House. It would extend the State-set standards by 50 percent, or an average of about 10 weeks.

The Government figured exhaustions would be increasing now because of the sharp winter rise in unemployment. There is an average 20-week lag between the time a worker goes on the jobless rolls and uses up his benefits. But the Labor Department has had to revise upward its earlier calculation on exhaustions because of the difficulty idled workers have had getting new jobs.

In March, Labor Secretary James P. Mitchell said about 2,300,000 workers were expected to run out of benefits this year; last week, he put the number at 2,600,000.

Here's how exhaustions have climbed this year: In January, they were 147,000; in February, 145,500; in March, 189,000, and April, 230,000. By the summer, if the Government calculations hold, they will be topping 300,000 and running a little above 200,000 at the year's end.

The lengthy unemployment spells confronting many laid-off workers mean that many will exhaust a 50-percent extension, too.

Even a substantial fourth-quarter recovery (and the guess is for a modest one) is not expected to bring any dramatic rehiring of the idled.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I compliment the staff reporter, Mr. Nossiter, on this fine article, because it packs into a few brief paragraphs a great deal of economic information which should be understood by the Congress and the people.

We are also being told that the rise in April in retail sales and in personal income are indications that the worst is behind us. But, once again, the administration has failed to give us all the facts. They have failed to point out that we may expect the decline in durable goods production to continue for several months at least.

I submit that any responsible commentator on the economic situation agrees that we can expect the decline in durable goods production to continue for at least the next few months.

I invite attention to an excellent article from the May 19 Journal of Commerce which points out that there is little likelihood of any general business recovery without an upturn in durable goods production and such an upturn is not in sight. It notes that roughly half of total manufacturing production is accounted for in durable goods output. It is in durable goods where the greatest drop has taken place—more than 18 percent since last August and far in excess of the decline in the recession of 1948–49 and 1953–54.

The Journal of Commerce reports that as of March, the latest month for which figures are available, the ratio of durable manufacturers' inventories of finished goods to new orders rose to the highest—or most unfavorable—level in the entire postwar period. In other words, the decline in new orders is far in excess of the decline in inventories.

I believe this is the point which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] emphasized in his speech on the issue of the economy and the necessity for an immediate tax reduction. The decline in durable goods orders is far in excess of the decline in inventories. The inventory new-orders ratio is considered by the Journal of Commerce to be one of the best single leading indicators of business activity in the months ahead.

In considering the seemingly conflicting trends evidenced in the prospect of further declines in durable goods production and the April rise in retail sales and personal income, the Journal of Commerce states:

Both retail sales and personal income are "lagging" business indicators tending to follow by several months the course of industrial production and other "coincident"

indicators and to follow by even a longer period the "leading" indicators.

Under the circumstances it appears that the improvement in retail trade and personal income is unlikely to be more than transitory.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article from the Journal of Commerce be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

FURTHER DIP IN DURABLES LIKELY

(By J. Roger Wallace)

Present indications, based on inventory-new order relationships, are that the decline in durable goods production will continue at least until the early fall.

Durable goods output normally accounts for approximately half of total manufacturing output. Accordingly, there is little likelihood of any sustained general business recovery without an upturn in durables production.

In March, the ratio of durable manufacturers' inventories of finished goods to new orders rose further to the highest—or most unfavorable—level in the entire postwar period. New orders again declined, although at a slower rate than earlier this year, while finished goods inventories held unchanged at near record high levels. Manufacturers' backlogs of unfilled orders continued to shrink.

LONG LEAD TIME

The finished goods inventory-new orders ratio, which we consider one of the best single "leading" business indicators, tends to forecast the course of durable goods production for approximately 6 months ahead.

Since all business booms are primarily durable goods booms and all business recessions are primarily durable goods recessions, reliable indications as to the future course of durables output are essential for analyzing total business probabilities.

Durable goods producers still are carrying topheavy inventories of finished goods, and new orders have continued to decline despite the impact of additional defense business. It is highly unlikely that the contraction in production will be checked until some progress has been made in liquidating finished goods inventories.

DURABLES IMPORTANCE

Unlike soft-goods production, most of which is for consumer goods, the larger part of durable-goods output, approximately two-thirds, is for other than consumer goods.

Construction both residential and nonresidential, capital goods, and military goods account for the major portion of durables output.

The sharp contraction in capital expenditures, which is expected to continue into 1959, has been an important factor in the declines in durables output and may continue to exert a drag for many months to come.

Last year, new plant and equipment expenditures totaled $37 billion as compared with consumer expenditures for durable goods of $35 billion. Federal spending for national security totaled nearly $46 billion, but only a portion of this went for durable goods.

CONFLICTING TRENDS

The prospect of further decline in durable goods production, as indicated by the unfavorable inventory-new orders ratio, is in direct contradiction to the reported April upturns in total retail sales and personal income. These upturns have been hailed in some quarters as marking the bottoming out of the business recession.

Both retail sales and personal income are lagging business indicators tending to follow by several months the course of industrial production and other coincident indicators and to follow by even a longer period the leading indicators.

Under the circumstances it appears that the improvement in retail trade and personal income is unlikely to be more than transitory.

There is distinct evidence that the miserable weather in February and the continuation into March served to depress a number of business series during both of these months, and hence may have been responsible in a sort of left-handed way for the upturns or slower downward pace reported in April.

Accordingly, it well may be that a proper perspective on the course of business since the first of this year will not be possible until the data for May become available some weeks hence.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I have stated so often in recent months, this recession is not going to be licked by whistling in the dark, by pep talks, or by closing our eyes to the cold harsh economic facts of life. The Administration works a serious disservice to the country when it tells us that there is nothing to worry about, and that we should just sit back and remain calm, cool and collected, when the facts indicate only too clearly what an alarming position our economy is in.

Because I did not have the opportunity to remain throughout the presentation by the Senator from Illinois on Monday, let me say that I fully concur in his conclusions and recommendations. What the country needs is not merely a public works program, important as it is; but it needs the kind of balanced, sensitive tax reduction which has been recommended by the Senator from Illinois. It also needs a public works program of broad scope.

It seems to me that Members of the Senate should soon get busy on this problem, in terms of schools, and in terms of hospital construction. We are appropriating money for hospitals, but we need more than is contemplated, when we face up to what has been noted recently—a $10.6 billion decline in gross national product, which is something that should frighten anyone.

I note the presence in the Chamber of the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee [Mr. CHAVEZ]. I compliment the chairman and his committee for what they have done, but I regret to say that we have found very little support at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue for the proposals, the projects, and the hard work which has been accomplished by the Senator from New Mexico and his fine associates on the committee.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am very proud of the committee. It did not act in a partisan manner. There was a practically unanimous report on the public works bill, which provided for construction and employment. I am sorry the President saw fit to veto the bill, but I hope—and I think I can say with confidence—that we shall soon have another public works bill before the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator, not only for his reassurance, but for his activity. There is a difference between giving reassurance and being on the job. The Senator from New Mexico and his committee have been on the job in the work they have undertaken.

I note that the Senator from Illinois, at the conclusion of his address on Monday, said:

> In a recession, tax cuts should, along with unemployment compensation, have first priority.

That is a statement of policy which is clear and unmistakable. The Congress is whistling in the dark, so to speak, while the unemployment compensation benefits are being exhausted, and while the economy is being slowed down. Of course, we need the help, guidance, and support of the executive branch—guidance and support which have been sorely lacking.

Unemployment is at the highest rate since before World War II.

Industrial production is down by 13 percent since August.

The gross national product is down at an annual rate of $18 billion since the third quarter of 1957.

As I have noted in my remarks here today, the ratio of inventories to new orders in the durable goods industries is at the most unfavorable level in the postwar era.

The time for prompt and meaningful action is long past due. The waste of this recession to date can never be retrieved, but we must put out the fires of the recession before it spreads completely out of control.

Let me add, for the benefit of those who are so deeply concerned about our budgetary problems—as all of us should be—that we have literally permitted to be flushed down the drain an economic loss of billions of dollars of gross income because of an economic recession. That is income which can never be reclaimed, any more than topsoil which flows down the rivers and into the sea can be reclaimed. We are permitting this to happen when we have the economic tools at our command to avert this kind of loss, which our economy can ill afford.

I hope we shall follow the advice of those in the Congress who are experienced in economic affairs. I hope we shall heed the voice of the Senator from Illinois and others, and get on with the job. I make these few comments about economy not because I am an economist, but because I am a citizen. I am concerned. The people are concerned. The silence in Congress on this economic issue is resented by the American people. The American people are entitled to know what we propose to do about some of these problems. They are deeply concerned about many things—Latin America, outer space, the Soviet Union, the problems in Algeria, France, and Lebanon, but they are also concerned about their jobs, their income, and their debts.

The Congress of the United States, with the power at hand and the means at its disposal to do something, is not taking action. The executive branch would try to lull us into a sense of false

prosperity and security, saying that all is well.

Mr. President, I now wish to turn to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1953—NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I desire to announce, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations, of which I have the privilege of serving as chairman, that public hearings have been scheduled to begin at 10 a. m. on Thursday, June 5, 1958, on S. 2990, which would amend Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 as it affects the Rural Electrification Administration.

I make this announcement because a number of Senators have indicated interest in this particular endeavor.

As Senators are aware, plan No. 2 of 1953 vested all functions of the Rural Electrification Administration, including the REA Administrator's authority to grant loans, directly in the Secretary of Agriculture, with authority to redelegate these functions to any officer, employee or agency of the Department of Agriculture as he deemed fit. S. 2990, which I introduced on January 13, 1958, after many months' study, transfers back to the Adminstrator of the Rural Electrification Administration the functions which were transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture by the reorganization plan.

As this is a matter of direct concern to the Secretary of Agriculture, and one which involves a change in policy to which no officer of the Department of Agriculture except the Secretary can speak with authority, I am today, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Reorganization, extending to Secretary Benson a most cordial invitation to appear personally before the subcommittee to provide its members with the benefit of his views.

In order to give the Secretary, who I know is a very busy man, time within which to arrange his schedule so that he can meet with members of the subcommittee on this important matter, I have suggested that we should be glad to have him appear toward the close of the hearings, on June 18. If that date is inconvenient, I have asked the Secretary to suggest an alternate date about that time.

I make note of this because my colleagues may recall that last year we were unable to get the Secretary of Agriculture to appear before the subcommittee. He was doing some traveling at the time, and seemed to be absent from Washington on every occasion when the subcommittee sought his presence.

As soon as I hear from the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. President, as to what date is most convenient for him to appear, I shall so notify Members of the Senate, many of whom I know have a great interest in this matter, which I shall now discuss at some greater length.

UNDERMINING THE REA

Mr. President, many of the dedicated men who have pioneered in developing a sound rural electrification program throughout the United States are seriously concerned about growing indications of administration attempts to undermine the REA. Many of us in Congress who have had an opportunity to look into this situation share that deep concern.

Last summer, I had occasion to look into the administration's handling of the REA program. I found that under the leadership of the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, the administration is moving to dominate the REA Administrator and his staff of career employees. I found that Secretary Benson had already made a figurehead out of the REA Administrator. The primary function now of this important office seems to be that of traveling salesman. His job seems to be to go around the country and to give nice, pleasant talks to farm and co-op meetings to assure the people that everything is just fine and that nothing can possibly happen to the REA program. Meanwhile, his superiors back in Washington are hatching new schemes for crippling the REA program.

I want to examine some of these schemes at this time because I believe the Senate should be aware of the dangers the REA program is up against.

To put it bluntly, the Eisenhower-Benson drive aims to emasculate REA—one of the most successful social and economic programs ever initiated by the Federal Government. They work to accomplish their purpose in three major ways:

First is, as I have said, to dominate the actual workings of REA as an efficient Government agency.

Second, is to raise the cost of financing so that REA borrowers will no longer be a serious factor in the utility business in rural areas.

Third is to cut off Federal loans and give private lenders an opportunity to get their hands on the best of the REA business.

Success on any one of these fronts, I am convinced, will end the REA program that we have known up to now and that has been so effective in serving farmers and other rural people.

Let us go into point 1—the kidnaping of the Administrator's authority given him by the Congress.

In the Rural Electrification Act, the Congress set up the REA Administrator as an important official. He was to be appointed by the President with the approval of the United States Senate. He was given the responsibility of acting as Administrator for one of the most important programs that the Congress has established for the betterment of rural America. For 18 years this framework continued to function effectively in bringing light and power to farmers and other rural people.

Then, in 1953, Secretary Benson came to the Congress with a request for power to reorganize the Department of Agriculture, including REA. This power was granted but only after he agreed that he would discuss with us any major change in responsibility or authority.

Mr. President, I digress to note that during my attendance at those hearings on the reorganization plan, one of the most able and constructive Senators in the field of agricultural policy, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], warned us and Congress that the adoption of the reorganization plan would result in weakening REA. He appeared before the subcommittee and so admonished us. I regret that we did not take his advice. The reason we did not take it was because the Secretary of Agriculture had reassured us that if any changes were to be made in the rural electrification policy and programs, those changes would first be announced to Congress and would be discussed with appropriate committees of Congress; and that only then, after Congress had been notified and given an opportunity to study the changes, would any policy adjustments or changes be consummated.

Despite this pledge he went ahead and transferred all the responsibility and power of the REA Administrator into his own hands.

One result of this change which was instituted without the knowledge of the Congress was to take away from the Administrator a very important part of his authority to make loans. Today, the REA Administrator cannot make any new loan until after it has been reviewed in the Secretary's office. He can make no loan over $500,000 to an existing borrower until he has cleared it with Assistant Secretary Scott in the Secretary's office.

"Clear it with Scott" is now an important step in the REA loan procedure. This is the loan procedure that was once concerned only with matters of economic and engineering feasibility of loans to provide electric service for rural America.

We repeatedly asked the Secretary of Agriculture last autumn to come before our Reorganization Subcommittee of the Senate Government Operations Committee. But he refused to come and explain to us what he had done to the REA program.

Today we can see that Mr. Benson's action in taking over REA was no haphazard byproduct of the 1953 reorganization. Instead it is part of a deliberate plan to restrict and to destroy once and for all this thorn in the side of the power trust.

It is my firm intention to call the Secretary of Agriculture to account for his misuse of reorganization authority to go beyond the intent of Congress, at the hearings I announced earlier in my remarks on legislation proposing to curb that authority. I hope this time the Secretary will make himself available, rather than head off on some new trip to escape questioning by committees of the Congress.

Now permit me to turn to other steps in this master plan of weakening REA. There is the move to raise the cost of financing for all REA borrowers. It is interesting to note that the timing of this proposal coincides with the downgrading of the REA Administrator. Both came to light last summer.

The interest increase measure is simple. The President's Budget Bureau sent to the Congress legislation that would merely double or triple the REA interest rate.

In his letter of transmittal, Percival Brundage said that raising the interest rate will encourage substantiation of private financing. Nothing is said about advancing rural electrification or rural telephones.

This interest rate increase proposal was followed the first of this year by the third measure—this one calling for a shift of the REA loan business from REA to the private money lenders.

Once again, behind misleading words and attractive phrases, there is hidden a proposal to change REA in such a way as to wipe out the right rural people have been exercising to serve themselves with electricity at costs they could afford.

The following is a brief analysis of these administration anti-REA bills. This analysis was made by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association which represents nearly all of the REA borrowers:

The administration has asked Congress to pass two anti-REA bills which would put Hoover Commission recommendations into effect. The Capehart-Hiestand bill would triple financing costs for all rural electrics. The administrations' new Wall Street proposal would provide for Wall Street private financing.

Mr. President, this is the report, not of the junior Senator from Minnesota, but of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association:

Here are some important features you should know about:

1. The proposal sets up an alleged revolving fund. But this revolving fund is not a fund, and it cannot revolve. Congress would still have to authorize money, as now, to keep this deceptive fund alive.

2. A so-called loan-insurance scheme is set up, but you would still have to find money you need; your lender would get the insurance.

3. The Secretary of Agriculture could subordinate your present mortgage in order to give your Wall Street lender a higher lien.

4. The Secretary could sell your mortgage to your enemies.

5. No leniency is provided—if you fall behind you would be foreclosed.

6. No refinancing is provided—once you're on the hook, you're stuck, even if refinancing might reduce your interest costs.

7. Partial advances are out—you would pay full interest on your full loan right from the start.

8. No procedure is set up for deciding who is to get 2-percent money, if any, or 6-percent money.

9. The REA Administrator is, in effect, abolished—he isn't even mentioned in what would be the new parts of the law.

10. The Secretary of Agriculture is the specified official, but by controling financing and rates, the Secretary of the Treasury could still dominate all REA policies.

In a nutshell, this proposal insures nothing but bankruptcy for you. It revolves nothing but your system.

I repeat: This is a report of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

The House of Representatives Agriculture Subcommittee on Appropriations also expresses an opinion about the administration's anti-REA proposals. In the committee's report of March 28, there is the following passage:

It is to be noted that, under the terms of this proposed legislation, the operating costs of the REA cooperatives would be increased through a substantial increase in interest rates. Further, the legislation would increase the Government's liability to the private lenders and would make it possible for the first lien, which the Government now has on the approximately $3.6 billion in assets of the REA cooperatives, to be surrendered to purchasers of the debentures or bonds issued by the REA. This could lead to the taking over of this great program by foreclosure by the purchasers of the bonds or debentures and could result in the complete loss of these valuable assets to the Federal Government.

The committee wishes to go on record at this point as strongly opposing any such proposed change in the law. It can see no possible benefits to the REA cooperatives, and it can foresee the possibility of enormous losses to the taxpayers if such legislation were adopted.

The committee is unanimous in its opinion that the REA program as it now exists is sound.

That last statement is one that bears repeating:

The committee is unanimous in its opinion that the REA program as it now exists is sound.

In other words, when Congress looked at these measures which the Secretary of Agriculture and the administration are attempting to put forward and have passed, the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations in the other body said that the program as it now exists is sound, and they said so unanimously. The program is indeed sound, as the record of accomplishment readily shows.

The farmers in my State and in other parts of the country are distressed by the proposals being made by the administration. Opposition is not something new but we are not accustomed to opposition to this program from the President, the White House palace guard, and the Cabinet.

I am hearing from many farmers. They are writing letters, like the one I received the other day from Arthur Zschetzsche, president of the Brown County Rural Electrical Association at Sleepy Eye, Minn.

I digress to say that this is one of our good, prosperous, southern Minnesota agricultural counties, which is primarily inhabited by people of German stock, solid citizens, hard-working people, honest, competent, and efficient.

Mr. Zschetzsche writes:

I am enclosing a copy of a letter I just mailed to President Eisenhower. The letter is self-explanatory.

As indeed it is. Here is what he wrote to the President:

As president of the Brown County Rural Electrical Association, I have received from the REA Administrator, David A. Hamil, a letter asking the REA borrowers to increase their spending for many different items to stimulate employment.

We assure you that we will comply if you lift the clouds from the horizon in regard to turning the REA over to the bankers through their raising the interest rates on loans needed to do the job. Because we have agreed to the area coverage program, we were assured the 2 percent interest rate. No power companies would consider building the lines out in the country and give farmers electricity until the rural electrification program was put in effect. The whole country was amazed how this program went to work and put thousands and thousands of people to work cutting trees for poles, hauling poles by the railroads, conductor used and electric equipment needed. Besides all the local wiring, men got jobs on our farms, and it stimulated business for the appliance manufacturing companies.

We are ready to build additional power lines and substations, but we are just wondering whether to go ahead. Assurance that the REA will be left as it is as long as we agree to give area coverage, will strengthen the attitude of our REA directors to push forward.

That is what a president of a rural electric cooperative says. And he is not the only one. Others are joining in the protest. They feel that somehow they have been doublecrossed, that they have been told one thing one day and something else another, that the words they hear say one thing while the actions they see portray something different.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a similar letter from Lynn Wulkan, president of the McLeod Cooperative Power Association in Minnesota, and another from the Minnesota Accountants and Managers Association reporting resolutions upholding the views of the Minnesota Electric Cooperatives.

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

MCLEOD COOPERATIVE POWER ASSOCIATION,
Glencoe, Minn., April 18, 1958.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

THE HONORABLE SENATOR HUMPHREY: The Secretary of Agriculture has recently suggested an amendment to the Rural Electrification law providing generally for the creation of an REA revolving loan fund. We have no other means of identifying the Secretary's proposed amendment except to state that it creates such a revolving fund, and in addition has several provisions objectionable to the members of this cooperative.

The Secretary's proposal was presented to the members of the cooperative at their last annual meeting with the result that the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States Government has proposed an amendment to the Rural Electrification Act as now constituted and which would create a rural electric revolving loan fund which would be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture and which would have the result of taking the administration of the REA projects, funds, and loans out of the hands of the Rural Electric Administrator and of increasing the rate of interest paid by the cooperatives, all to the detriment of the REA cooperatives of the country: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the members of the McLeod Cooperative Power Association in annual meeting assembled, That this association go on record as opposing any legislation having the effect of removing the loan-making authority and administration of REA funds from the Administrator of Rural Electrification Administration to the Secretary of Agriculture or of increasing the interest rates required to be paid by rural electric co-ops."

We urge your support in defeating this proposed legislation.

Yours very truly,

LYNN WULKAN,
President.

FARIBAULT COUNTY COOPERATIVE ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION,
Frost, Minn., April 29, 1958.

Subject: Resolutions, Minnesota Accountants and Managers Association.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

At the annual meeting of the Minnesota Accountants and Managers Association held at the Curtis Hotel on April 11, 1958, two resolutions were presented. These resolutions are in full support of the same resolutions passed at the Minnesota Electric Cooperative meeting in March. The resolutions read as follows:

"1. Whereas proposals have been made to urge the Congress to enact legislation to increase the interest rate on REA loans: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the Minnesota accountants and managers, in joint session assembled, are unalterably opposed to any such increase.

"2. Whereas certain loan procedures within REA have been changed to require the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, or his assistants, before granting certain REA loans: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the Minnesota accountants and managers strongly request that any limitations on the Administrator to make loans determined by him to be feasible be removed."

After deliberation, each of the resolutions were duly offered on motion, seconded, and adopted without dissenting vote.

The president of the Minnesota accountants and managers was then instructed to prepare and mail to each of our honorable Congressmen and Senators copies of the resolutions adopted.

CARL W. SCHNEIDER,
President, Minnesota Accountants and Managers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a similar resolution adopted at the March 15 annual meeting of the East Central Electric Association at Braham, Minn.

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

RESOLUTION 1

Whereas the 2-percent REA interest rate has been attacked as being a subsidized rate; and

Whereas there is no basis that this 2-percent rate is a subsidized rate for over the years the REA has accrued a net income from lending operations of some $48 million; and

Whereas the Congress entered into contract with the rural electric cooperatives in 1944 to lend them money at a fixed 2-percent interest charge if the rural electric cooperatives would provide complete and continuing area coverage to serve all new consumers and provide adequate service to existing consumers which the cooperatives are doing; and

Whereas any increase in the REA interest rate would, for all practical purposes, seriously hinder the rural electric cooperative program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the membership of the East Central Electric Association assembled at their annual meeting this 15th day of March 1958, go on record opposing any action that would increase the REA interest rate; and be it further

Resolved, That the East Central Electric Association oppose any other legislation proposed that would in any way change the current rate structure of interest rates charged to REA borrowers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the administration put up quite a smokescreen recently about stepping up REA activity as an antirecession measure. However, it was a hollow and meaningless bluff.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a press release from the White House announcing the President's request to Secretary Benson, and a subsequent release from the Department of Agriculture asking REA co-ops to step up needed construction.

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

The President today sent the following letter to Albert M. Cole, Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, and Ezra T. Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture, designed to accelerate federally aided construction totaling over $2¼ billion in private, State, local and Federal funds:

MARCH 19, 1958.

The Honorable EZRA TAFT BENSON,
The Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In accordance with the policy announced in my statement of March 8, 1958, of accelerating, where feasible, construction programs under existing appropriations and authorizations, you are directed to take the following steps with respect to the Rural Electrification Administration loan programs:

1. Encourage REA borrowers to accelerate necessary construction of electrification and telephone facilities under already approved loans. I am informed that there is a total of some $740 million of balances available but not yet used under previously approved loans. Since these funds would be used for needed facilities, it may be possible for cooperatives and other borrowers to move forward the time at which orders are placed with manufacturers of materials and equipment under these programs.

2. Encourage additional facilities loans to finance farm and rural home installations for electrical services, and the purchase of electrical appliances and other equipment. Funds are presently available under the REA program which can be used to finance such installations and purchases by consumers. Additional purchases of facilities, where needed for improved farm and family living, would be of special benefit to the economy at this time.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

REA FINANCED ELECTRIC AND TELEPHONE SYSTEMS URGED TO STEP UP NEEDED CONSTRUCTION

Rural electric and telephone systems financed by the Rural Electrification Administration have been asked by the United States Department of Agriculture to step up needed construction and the purchase of necessary materials and equipment.

The request was contained in a letter from REA Administrator David A. Hamil to the agency's 1,572 electric and telephone borrowers. Mr. Hamil referred to the March 19 letter from President Eisenhower to Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson urging that REA borrowers be encouraged to expedite the start of necessary construction.

"The purpose of this request from the President is clear," Mr. Hamil wrote. "It is to stimulate immediate productive employment in a manner that will benefit local communities and the Nation. This objective is in keeping with the aims of the rural electrification and telephone programs."

Stating that "Secretary Benson and I wholeheartedly endorse the President's suggestion," Mr. Hamil asked REA borrowers to review, "at the earliest possible date, your engineering plans, construction schedules and equipment needs to determine the extent to which you feel you can feasibly advance construction starts and placement of orders."

The Administrator suggested consideration of such items as: project construction and system improvements; purchase of office, transportation and work equipment; construction of headquarters, warehouse and other facilities; and right-of-way and maintenance work.

"Any speedup action at this time, in keeping with your needs, will contribute to the economy," Mr. Hamil said.

Rural electric and telephone systems financed by REA operate in rural areas of 46 States and in Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the answer to the President from Clyde Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

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

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
March 21, 1958.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your letter of March 19 to Secretary Benson directing him to encourage REA borrowers to accelerate their efforts in the fight against the growing depression, seems inconsistent to us of the rural electrification program. You have ordered Mr. Benson to do something he cannot do effectively; and you have failed to order him to do something he could do effectively to help alleviate unemployment through an accelerated REA program.

Furthermore, we think your directive about "balances available but not yet used under previously approved loans" is seriously misleading; we hope not for political purposes. As your Budget Bureau experts know, most of the $470 million which you mention is not only committed and under loan contract by REA, but also is currently being invested by the rural electric and rural telephone systems in orderly process of construction. The money is not lying idle. It is not an appropriation, but merely a loan authorization to be drawn down from the Treasury over whatever years are required, project by project.

If you really desire to speed up the rural electric and rural telephone programs so that they may make their maximum contribution to the national economy, here's what we think you should direct Mr. Benson to do:

(1) Lift the stop orders that are now holding up construction of generation and transmission systems, such as the $10-million one in Arkansas. The electric co-ops there are ready to go; all they need is a go-ahead from REA. These stop orders are holding up the use of part of the $740-million which you mention.

(2) Speed up the processing of loan applications now being kept on ice, such as Indiana's Hoosier application which has been in REA for many months. This single loan would inject $42 million into the national economy quickly besides helping thousands of Indiana rural people solve a pressing power supply problem.

(3) Assure all electric and telephone borrowers that your administration will ditch your budget message pronouncement calling for a restrictive REA loan program. Your effort to tighten REA credit is serving only

to restrict all plans for construction. If you and Mr. Benson will assure REA borrowers their source of credit will not be cut off, they will move ahead aggressively as they have in years past.

(4) Assure the electric cooperatives that your administration will abandon your no-new-starts policy with regard to new Federal multipurpose river development programs—including wholesale power development—and proceed with construction on a full-steam-ahead basis. Nothing will accelerate the rural electrification program more in all its aspects than assurance of adequate wholesale power at low cost.

(5) Give telephone cooperatives an opportunity to provide area coverage service in rural America. As you know, this will require promotion by REA in getting these service-oriented, nonprofit groups organized and into business. The current practice of emphasizing loans to non-consumer-controlled businesses to the exclusion of cooperatives is not getting telephone service into the back-roads country. Nearly half the farmers still don't have telephones.

We are in accord with the second part of your directive to Mr. Benson to "encourage additional facilities loans to finance farm and rural home installations for electric services and purchase of electrical appliance and other equipment," but you must realize that this effort can be fully effective only if the rest of the program is accelerated as we have indicated above.

Rural America is doubling its use of electricity about every 5 years, and only with the limitations removed can we hope to sustain this rate or exceed it.

Mr. President, everything I have expressed in this letter is consistent with the declared policies of the rural electric systems—more than 90 percent of which are members of this their National Rural Electric Cooperative Association—and it is consistent with my understanding of the policies of the National Telephone Cooperative Association, representing the telephone cooperatives.

If, as I hope, you are sincere in your expressed desire to obtain the substantial help in fighting the recession that rural people can provide through the REA program, I can assure you we welcome such sincerity—and that we will work with you. I respectfully request an opportunity to discuss these matters with you.

With personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

CLYDE T. ELLIS,
General Manager.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, officials of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association have endeavored to discuss these issues regarding REA's future with the President—and have been refused the opportunity.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an article entitled "Ike Refuses Meeting," published in the May issue of Rural Electrification, the monthly magazine of the national association.

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

IKE REFUSES MEETING

NRECA General Manager Clyde T. Ellis asked last month for an audience with President Eisenhower to discuss with the NRECA Board of Directors crucial REA matters. This was the second such request by Ellis in less than a month.

In a letter to Presidential Assistant Jack Anderson, Ellis asked that NRECA Board members and he be allowed to meet with the President to discuss the present needs, problems, and status of the rural electrification program. Ellis said that many rural electrics are in crucial times because of the constantly deteriorating farm situation and the drastic migration away from the farm.

The rural electric systems have lines constructed to serve some 335,000 rural homes that at the present time stand vacant, Ellis pointed out. This idle capacity represents about $100 million that the remaining REA consumers have to pay back to the Treasury along with the rest of the funds borrowed to build new rural lines and maintain the ones that are in use.

"I am sure this must be of concern to the President as part of the recession picture, if for no other reason," Ellis wrote. "Our rural-electric systems also want to help fight off a recession," the letter continued.

Ellis told the President that as farmers and officials serving local rural electric co-ops, the rural electric leaders know that the President's directive to Secretary Benson to urge REA borrowers to speed up expenditure of loan funds is simply bad advice from every standpoint.

At the same time, the letter said, rural electric leaders are aware of the fact that the President, in his budget request, asked for less than half the amount of funds needed by rural electric borrowers during the next fiscal year.

NRECA would also like to know why Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson maintains stop orders on $74.5 million in loans approved for 55 co-ops. Ellis said he could not understand why the President on the one hand apparently is pushing the rural electric systems while holding them back on the other.

Ellis' March 21 letter was answered by Benson. Benson wrote that REA Administrator David Hamil would extend assistance to rural electrics to carry out the President's directive encouraging rural electric cooperatives to accelerate construction activities.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, what was the proposition that brought about the creation of REA?

REA was established by the Congress to perform a function that private enterprise had not been able or willing to do—to electrify rural America. This has to mean more than hanging a meter on the country home; it means keeping the wires hot. What would electrification amount to if citizens could not get the power they wanted when they needed it?

History records the fact that the Congressional decision to establish the REA was not made on the basis of the best way to make money. Profitmaking is not the business of Congress. If profit had been the primary objective, Congress would have turned down the farmers seeking electric light, just as the power companies had done for so long. Serving the byways of rural America with power is not a profitmaking proposition in terms that appeal to investors. This, it seems to me, is a highly important point, that the program was created to light up rural America, and not to make money.

Congress recognized from the start that the territory to be served was marginal, but decided that the national welfare would be improved if this territory could be served by low-cost electric light and power on an area coverage basis. Area coverage up to that time had been applied only inside city limits. Service for all on an equal footing was unheard of out in the country, and still is unknown in many areas where rural electric systems do not operate.

This was the responsibility the rural electric systems undertook: to serve rural America on an area coverage basis. When they accepted this responsibility, the rural electric leaders perhaps were as unaware of the magnitude of their job ahead as were all who have since been astounded by the tremendous growth in the use of electricity in rural areas. Growth is typical of the entire utility industry, of course, but in the rural areas the use of electricity is record-breaking, doubling every 5 years.

The REA borrowers have gone ahead heavying-up their systems to meet these growing responsibilities because of their agreement with the Government. They provide the service; the Government lends them the capital on terms that make the electrification of rural areas possible.

Congress felt that rural electrification was in the national interest in 1936. It is just as sound today; in fact, much sounder, because of the valuable experience we have had. If REA were abolished and the rural electric systems were sent to Wall Street for their capital needs, a large number of the rural electric systems would go out of business, and the consumers would go back into the dark ages. Not all, to be sure, because some rural electric systems do operate in territories so good that power companies have long regretted they did not enter them first. But many rural systems would go broke if they had to depend on Wall Street for their capital, and the result would be a national catastrophe of major proportions.

There are several reasons why the rural electrics cannot survive on Wall Street rations, but basically it is a case of the inadequate security which stems from the marginal territory. For example, the amount of equity REA borrowers have accumulated to date is an indication of the problem which confronts them. At present, 66 percent of the rural electric systems have less than 20 percent equity, and 91 percent have less than 40 percent equity. Over the Nation as a whole, the average equity per system is only about 13.5 percent. This is hardly enough to insure adequate capital investments at low cost. Power companies on the average have an equity of several times that amount.

On the basis of these facts, it is evident that if we are to have rural electrification we need a continuation of the type of Government program which has been provided through REA.

The facts of the REA interest rate have been consistently distorted by opponents of the program. Over the 22 years, REA loans actually have accrued a net profit for Uncle Sam, even though this was not the intent of Congress. The Administrator reported to Congress that this margin totals $48 million.

REA's interest rate to borrowers has traditionally been substantially higher than the average cost of money to the Federal Government. The hard-money policy initiated in 1953 changed this situation. But this was a deliberate political policy decision and not the workings of the investment market. Now, however, this temporary policy appears to have run its course, as the average cost of money to the Federal Government is settling down to the previous

levels. Currently each successive Treasury issue is going for less interest than the one before.

It is to be noted that, generally speaking, the groups proposing an interest-rate increase for REA have always opposed the program in the past. Now they are suggesting interest rates that not merely will equal the cost of money to the Government, but will saddle the rural electric systems with 2 or 3 times that rate. Obviously, there is more to their intentions than elimination of the so-called subsidy.

To the extent that the Government pays for the processing and the servicing of the REA loans, there is subsidy in the program; but this is very small, compared to the $24 billion in tax-amortization benefits given the power companies and other subsidies dealt out to publishers, shipbuilders, watchmakers, oil and gas producers, and others. Moreover, it was a deliberate decision of the Congress to provide this type of assistance to the rural areas, just as it was deliberately decided to provide assistance to the other groups mentioned.

The rural electric systems have a most enviable repayment record.

I submit that no other lending agency of the Federal Government can claim as good a repayment record; and this repayment record was made despite the fact that many of the loans were made at a time when the economic conditions were very bad and when the number of customers in the particular areas was limited. Overall, the program is one of the most successful social and economic programs ever initiated by the Federal Government.

In two decades this program has succeeded in bringing rural America out of darkness. Not only has the farmer benefited from REA, but his improved standard of living brought about by REA has been the foundation of increased prosperity for the entire business community of the Nation. The electrified farm is a consumer farm. It uses not only electricity but also electrical appliances, steel, petroleum, and rubber products, as well as the many consumer items the prosperous farm family buys.

Thus the Nation is receiving tremendous dividends, social and economic, on a modest investment. Why change it so that it will not work as well—or perhaps not work at all?

Mr. President, this situation was reviewed most effectively in an article by Bob Awbrey, manager of Marlboro Electric Cooperative, of Bennettsville, S. C., in the May issue of Rural Electrification. The article is entitled "Interest Rates and Our Future;" and it is summarized in an editorial by Clyde Ellis, published in the same issue of that magazine under the title "Let's Have the Showdown—Now." I ask that both these articles be printed in the RECORD, following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I hope my colleagues will be interested in the hearings; and if they have any complaints from the REA's or if they have any suggestions, I hope they will see fit to forward them to the Reorganization Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations.

EXHIBIT A

INTEREST RATES AND OUR FUTURE

(By Bob Awbrey, manager, Marlboro Electric Cooperative, Bennettsville, S. C.)

Over the past few years several pieces of legislation have been introduced in the Congress, and other legislation proposed which, if passed, would seriously affect the continued successful functioning of the rural electrification cooperatives and program.

It is of more than passing interest to note that each successive piece of anti-REA legislation introduced or proposed has been of a more serious nature and more devastating in its proposals, provisions and results.

The most recent of this proposed legislation, and the most serious in effect if its provisions were enacted into law, is the administration's proposed legislation to raise REA interest rates through a so-called revolving fund and insured loan program. It has been conservatively estimated that if this proposal were now in effect, it would raise REA interest rates to some 6 percent.

In attempting to counteract these anti-REA proposals the rural electric cooperatives have presented some very formidable and cogent arguments and facts, including the following:

Rural electric cooperatives have an excellent repayment record.

The Federal Government has made and not lost money on their loans to REA borrowers.

The United States has loaned large sums of money to foreign nations at less than the 2 percent charged REA borrowers and sometimes with no interest charged—no repayment of principal and on more favorable terms.

The private commercial power companies are receiving outright subsidies under Section 167 and 168 of the Internal Revenue Code which will amount to some $24 billion.

Most American business has at one time or another been subsidized, whereas this is not true of the rural electric cooperatives.

We must take into account the social aspects of the rural electrification program.

The contrived "hard money" policy is of a temporal nature and is rapidly disappearing.

The rural electric cooperative distribution and generation and transmission systems serve as a competitive yardstick.

When the REA interest rate was fixed by the Congress in 1944 at 2 percent, the Congress entered into a moral covenant with the rural electric cooperatives and rural people whereby the cooperatives agreed to provide the added burden of complete area coverage if the Congress would maintain a 2 percent interest rate. The rural electrics have lived and are continuing to live up to their part of the covenant, and the Congress has a moral obligation to live up to its part.

These and many other good arguments have been presented to the public and the Congress in answer to and refutation of the various proposals which would raise our interest rates.

Also, several States—Illinois and North Carolina specifically—have made excellent and detailed studies showing in general what the effect would have been on their systems had an increase in interest rates been in existence in the past.

But the real question to be answered, and one which to my knowledge to date has not been answered, is what will happen to the rural electric systems in the future if REA interest rates are increased?

It is not a difficult task for any rural electric system to accurately estimate what the effect of a rise in interest rate would mean to their individual system. In managing any rural electric cooperative, it is axiomatic that estimates of future needs and future planning must be made. These projections, if complete, definitive and accurate, provide the basic information needed to arrive at an actual and factual answer to the question: "What effect will an increase in interest rates have on the efficient and continued functioning of a rural electric cooperative?" (Of course, we have to assume that future loan funds will be available to any system regardless of the source of funds or the interest rate.)

To estimate the effect of a raise in REA interest rates the following information is needed:

1. The existing principal debt outstanding.
2. New loan requirements.
3. The estimated future principal balance outstanding.
4. The present and future interest payments on existing loans.
5. Future interest rate requirements at various levels of interest rates.
6. Estimated operating margins before interest deductions, and
7. Estimated net operating margins or deficits.

Table 1 shows, from 1958 through 1965, what the estimated principal balances on long-term debt will be for the Marlboro Electric Cooperative. Table 2 is an estimate of our anticipated new loan requirements for the years 1958 through 1964. As is shown, for the next 6 years our system will be borrowing some $1.2 million in order to continue to provide complete area coverage and continued full service to our member consumers.

With this basic data it is possible to estimate our future interest charges at various rates.

Detailed in table 3, column 1, is our interest rate charges at 2 percent for the years 1958 through 1965 on existing long-term debt. Column 2 of table 3 provides data on future interest payments on additional requirements assuming the existing 2 percent interest rate. And column 4 is an estimate of our interest rate charges on future requirements based on 6 percent interest cost. By adding columns 1 and 4 we can arrive at our total interest rate charges on existing long-term debt at 2 percent and future debt at 6 percent (column 5). By combining these two columns we arrive at a total interest cost for the years 1958 through 1965 of $351,500 as compared to $266,300, if our interest rate continues at 2 percent—an increases of some 30 percent.

The remaining estimate that needs to be made in order to complete an analysis on what the effect of an increase in REA interest rates will be, is an estimate of operating margins. Table 4, column 1, shows the estimates of operating margins for the Marlboro Electric Cooperative system for the years 1958 through 1965. Now, by deducting interest costs for these years on existing debt at 2 percent (column 2) and interest cost at 6 percent on future loan requirements (column 4) we can arrive at our estimated net operating margins for future years (column 5).

As shown in table 4 and chart 1 [chart not printed], based on an interest cost on existing long-term debt of 2 percent and a 6 percent interest cost on future debt, the Marlboro Electric Cooperative would be operating at a deficit, in the red, beginning in the year 1962 and in all subsequent years.

Of course this analysis is based on an assumed gross operating revenue and operating margins. It appears quite valid and obvious to argue that if rates were raised sufficiently to provide funds to continue to operate in the black, rates would have to be increased to such an extent that the cooperative would soon fall prey to power company infiltration and sellout.

The above analysis, in my opinion, is vitally needed by every electric system if we are to present a logical and complete argument in opposition to any attempt to raise REA interest rates. Only by such an analysis can we maintain that a raise in REA interest rates will preclude our continued attempts to provide complete area coverage.

Only such an analysis, taken in conjunction with the above other arguments, can prove that if REA interest rates were raised we could no longer continue to function as a competitive yardstick.

Only by presenting a well-rounded, complete, factual, and logical argument and analysis can the rural electric cooperatives make clear to the Congress and the public and convince them that any legislation aimed at increasing REA interest rates is aimed at eliminating the REA program.

We cannot convince the Congress and the public that a 2-percent interest rate should be maintained, or the rural electrification program should be maintained, merely because it should be maintained.

In my opinion, only by presenting a well-rounded and logical analysis as has been attempted in this article can we hope to convince the voters of this Nation, both rural and urban, that the REA program is not subsidized; that it is operating efficiently and effectively and providing an economic and social function not only for rural America, but by its very existence providing a vital economic and social function for urban America.

TABLE 1.—*South Carolina 27 Marlboro—Marlboro Electric Cooperative, Bennettsville, S. C.—Principal balances on long-term debt years 1958 through 1965*

Year	Beginning of year	End of year	Average balance
1958	$1,531,330	$1,761,123	$1,646,227
1959	1,761,123	1,660,147	1,710,635
1960	1,660,147	1,587,118	1,623,633
1961	1,587,118	1,538,125	1,562,621
1962	1,538,125	1,671,750	1,604,937
1963	1,671,750	1,571,343	1,621,547
1964	1,571,343	1,898,273	1,734,808
1965	1,898,273	1,724,322	1,811,798

The above balances included the following anticipated new loan requirements.

TABLE 2

Year	Construction loans	Sec. 5 loans	Total
1958	$146,000	$75,000	$221,000
1960	----------	50,000	50,000
1961	----------	75,000	75,000
1962	100,000	150,000	250,000
1964	250,000	200,000	450,000
Total	496,000	550,000	1,046,000

TABLE 3.—*South Carolina 27 Marlboro—Marlboro Electric Cooperative, Bennettsville, S. C.—Interest computations at various rates, years 1958 through 1965*

Years	Interest on present allocation at 2 percent (1)	Interest on future requirements at 2 percent (2)	Total cols. 1 and 2 (3)	Interest on future requirements at 6 percent (4)	Totals cols. 1 and 4 (5)
1958	$32,175	$750	$32,925	$2,250	$34,424
1959	32,713	1,500	34,213	4,500	37,213
1960	30,670	1,803	32,473	5,409	36,079
1961	28,582	2,670	31,252	8,011	36,593
1962	26,685	5,413	32,099	16,240	42,926
1963	25,337	7,094	32,431	21,282	46,619
1964	24,307	10,389	34,696	31,168	55,475
1965	23,248	12,988	36,236	38,965	62,213
Total	223,717	42,607	266,325	127,825	351,541

TABLE 4.—*South Carolina 27 Marlboro—Marlboro Electric Cooperative, Bennettsville, S. C.—Effect upon margins of changes in interest rates, years 1958 through 1965*

Year	Operating margins before interest deductions (1)	Deduct interest at 2 percent (2)	Estimated net operating margins cols. 1 and 2 (3)	Deduct interest at 2 percent and 6 percent (4)	Estimated net operating margins cols. 1 and 4 (5)
1958	$47,925	$32,925	$15,000	$34,425	$13,500
1959	46,213	34,213	12,000	37,213	9,000
1960	44,473	32,473	12,000	36,079	8,394
1961	41,252	31,252	10,000	36,593	4,660
1962	41,099	32,099	9,000	42,926	−1,827
1963	41,431	32,431	9,000	46,619	−5,188
1964	41,696	34,696	7,000	55,475	−13,779
1965	41,236	36,236	5,000	62,213	−20,977
Total	345,325	266,325	79,000	351,543	6,217

NOTE.—Figures in col. 3 were furnished by manager as estimates for illustration.
Minus signs denote deficits.

LET'S HAVE THE SHOWDOWN—NOW

(By Clyde T. Ellis)

War has been declared upon us. We have the strength to lick the enemy. Yet we sit and wait. But wait for what—for the enemy to grow stronger?

The President and the Secretary of Agriculture have sent two bills to Congress designed to triple our interest rates and to force us to Wall Street for our loans. They are urging Congress to pass both bills.

They are doing more than that. They are trying to persuade Congress to withhold loan funds from us until we agree to their proposals. They are still refusing to ask Congress for more than $150 million in electric loan funds for next fiscal year, although admitting the need is $325 million. (NRECA's survey shows a need of $359 million.)

In other words, Ike and Ezra are refusing to support a law they swore to administer in good faith. Their aim evidently is to put pressure on the rural people and on Congress to change the law to suit them. This is pretty harsh treatment—hardly compatible, it seems to me, with best traditions of democracy.

Meanwhile the propagandists are having a field day. On television, radio, through the newspapers and the slick magazines, the Madison Avenue boys are pouring it out. Their ads and articles and editorials are everywhere. Subsidy they yell about our 2-percent interest rate. Kill REA they demand.

They cleverly never mention, of course, the billions in interest-free loans to the profit-power companies through the accelerated depreciation programs. Nor do they mention the $200 million area coverage subsidy which members of the rural-electric systems are required to pay for taking service to a third of a million farmers whose homes now stand idle, and to help provide service to perhaps a million more who don't pay their own way.

But where is all the pressure for this legislation coming from? From Wall Street. From the very groups that control the privately owned power monopoly.

Now, they know as well as we do that they can't pass their bills at this time. Even spokesmen in the administration admit it—yet they go right on advocating what the bills provide.

But why the big push now by our opponents? Could there just be a diabolical scheme afoot to shake the big utilities down for a billion dollars (they would love it) to try to control the next Congress? Utility monopolies have the freest influence money there is, since they simply add it to their cost-plus operations. Nothing like the proper climate of opinion and plenty of campaign cash.

While I don't believe our opponents can grab off enough ratepayers' dollars to control the Congress of the United States, I do think it wise that we have the showdown now.

Let's get hearings on the administration's proposals. Let's deliver the coup de grace to both the Capehart-Hiestand and the phony revolving fund and insured loans bills in this election year session of Congress.

Let's also push for hearings on the Humphrey-Price bill (S. 2990 and H. R. 11762). This bill should be passed. It would restore to the Administrator the authority taken from him by Secretary Benson under the reorganization plan of 1953. There is no sense in an Administrator appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate not having the authority to pass on loans without a review by someone not appoined by the President and not confirmed by the Senate in the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CHAVEZ TO THE AMERICAN G. I. FORUM AT CHICAGO

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the American G. I. Forum, as the letters "G. I." would indicate, is a military organization, which originated in Texas. It is composed in the main of American-born men of Latin American origin who have worn the military uniform of the United States. It was organized by Col. Hector Garcia, of Corpus Christi, Tex., and now it has G. I. units in 18 States of the Nation.

On May 17 I addressed the G. I. Forum at Chicago, Ill., at the Congress Hotel. The message I delivered on that occasion was based on Latin America, and I discussed what, in my opinion, were the reasons for the Latin American attitude toward the United States.

In view of the incidents which occurred in connection with Vice President Nixon's recent trip, I deem it fit and proper to repeat on the floor of the Senate the remarks I made on that occasion at Chicago.

My remarks at that time were as follows:

I have taken an interest in the GI Forum since its inception. Your national leaders have been known to me personally throughout these years. I have grown to like and respect them and, of course, the purposes of your organization have had my wholehearted approval and endorsement all this time. Why not? My public life, since my early youth, is based on these principles. Respect and obligation to God, love of country and devotion to fellow man are the foundations on which our country was established and has grown great. These are your tenents and mine. So long as we never lose sight of these objectives, we shall not falter.

Consequently, you know that it is a pleasure for me to address an audience of the GI Forum. I am glad to see you get started in Chicago. You have much work cut out for you, but the field is ripe. The tremendous influx of minority groups, especially from Latin countries, poses a problem of readjustment which you can help solve. Fortunately you will not encounter in Chicago the difficulties found in other communities. Here your elected officials, civic organizations, as well as your citizens as a whole, have for years been mindful of the social and economic problems created by different racial groups, and their understanding and willingness to aid in ameliorating these difficulties has a long history. I mentioned these matters because I want to lead up to the subject of this evening's discussion.

You have, as American veterans, labored to obtain equality of opportunity without special privilege by focusing public attention on discrimination in education, housing, work, business and politics locally. History affords you the same opportunity to again serve your country in the international field. What organization in this country is better equipped to sell our political and cultural philosophy to the world? Freedom and opportunity are ours by inheritence but to give them meaning and expression they must be constantly cultivated and this means work. To preserve the institutions which insure these God-given rights, our country must be secure.

The G. I. Forum can help make America secure by helping to foster and cement ties of friendship with our friends, relatives and neighbors to our south.

If our governmental agencies and theirs can't get together and resolve differences, then why not start at the grass roots here in the United States and at the grass roots in Latin America.

We are all aware of Vice President NIXON's unfortunate experiences in South America. A mission of friendship was received by indignities and abuse. I am sure you feel indignant, as I do, at the discourteous, insultive and reprehensible attacks visited upon the persons of two Americans, RICHARD NIXON and his wife, Pat, and upon the office of Vice President of the United States. Words cannot describe the dastardliness of these deeds, but it will do no good to attribute these attacks to the Communists and let it go at that. Nor will it do to lose our heads in anger and blame all the South Americans for the evil deeds of a few. We must keep our heads, analyze the reasons for these actions and, if possible, see what knowledge we can glean from this in order to avoid similar mistakes in the future.

In the first place, placards and demonstrations on the part of students of universities and colleges throughout the world, including Latin America, have been a part of the educational curriculum throughout the years. In the midst of abysmal poverty and ignorance, students take for granted that they are the intellectually select members of their community. Lacking maturity of judgment, they tend to anarchistic methods, such as strikes and violence, to change, right now, conditions which are not to their liking. Mixing large groups of such students with a smaller, older, trained, but ruthlessly determined core of unrest, you create the basis for what happened to Vice President NIXON. When you add an anti-American catalyst which has been in existence for over a century, violence is inevitable.

On the surface, Vice President NIXON's trip seemed timely and in order, but the State Department either overlooked or probably discounted the mounting anti-American feeling in all of South America. They forgot that there is some reason for distrust and even hatred of the United States. But for a short time under Roosevelt, the attitude of the United States toward her poor relations in South America has been anything but salutory. When South America revolted against Spain, England helped them in their struggle for freedom. We helped them with editorials, but our goods went to their enemy. Throughout their history, they were always menaced by the colossus of the north. The acts of economic reprisals employed by the oil companies and related financial and industrial houses, aided and abetted by the State Department, that went on for years after the expropriation of the oil fields, is very fresh in the memories of our closest Latin neighbor, Mexico. The "Big Stick," "the Mighty Dollar," and "Yankee Imperialism" are not political slogans of the middle ages. They are indelibly imprinted in the political consciences of all Latin Americans. They are alive today.

No one liked the threat to Vice President NIXON's life, but the hasty and ill-conceived deployment of paratroopers and Marines to the Caribbean area, in order to protect the Vice President and his wife, is a poor sample of good neighborliness and a stark reminder to the Latin Americans that they live under our threat.

The Commander in Chief gave the order to move the troops. Did he do this with the advice of the State Department, or against the advice? Was he prepared to wage war against a weak and helpless neighbor? The hoodlums who spat on the Nixons and stoned them—are they different from the teen-age rumblers who mobbed and killed the Korean student in a ruthless and cowardly attack in Philadelphia?

What were we prepared to do? It served no good purpose; it has done nothing more than create ill will, give comfort to the rowdies who attacked the Nixons, and it furnishes grist for the propaganda mill of the Communists.

The Nixon mission failed in one sense. For the moment it failed to create good will. But in the long run, if it helps us to readjust our attitude toward Latin America, the Nixon trip will have served a good purpose and will long be remembered by a grateful country. Out of this, I hope, will grow a mature appraisal of our relations with Latin America. I hope we will realize that we can no longer be indifferent to their needs and that though we have been at fault in some instances, they are mutually involved with us by history, geography and modern events in a common fate. We can't foretell our future nor determine our fate, but we can influence it by actions which we have time and opportunity to take today.

The United States is by no means exclusively responsible for Latin America's social, economic and political woes. They need capital and at the same time create artificial barriers of duties and currency restrictions that block the flow of investment capital to their countries. They need new business and industry and prevent foreign investment by uneconomic labor laws and needless expropriation of property.

The point is that we must both realize our mistakes and do something about correcting them before it is too late. There is more at stake than ruffled tempers and hard feelings. The fate of Latin America whether it likes it or not, is irrevocably linked with ours. We can't afford under any circumstances for Russo-imperialistic communism to take over Latin America. We are absolutely dependent upon them. Their markets, raw materials, manpower, their political influences in world opinion and international organizations, such as the U. N., etc., are absolutely indispensable. We can't just write them off. Unfortunately, that is what we have been doing since World War II. We have forgotten their willingness to aid us with troops in World War II and in Korea; we have forgotten the vast quantities of raw materials on which war industries fed. We forgot that these materials must inevitably be needed should we get into another conflict. Perhaps we were too occupied in the United States adjusting our lives to a peacetime economy to bother with Latin America. Korea, the cold war, and finally the sputniks woke us up to our danger. Unfortunately our attentions have been focused on all the world, except the Americas. We are in danger at home. We've got to realize that.

The State Department is much to blame for what happened to Vice President NIXON. So are all the intelligence agencies of our Government. They knew of the threats the minute the trip was announced. Why weren't steps taken to protect the lives of two great Americans and to prevent or avoid insults to our country?

It is fortunate for the United States that the Vice President and his wife conducted themselves the way they did. They came away with dignity and with their honor and that of our country unsullied. RICHARD NIXON and Pat deserve the applause and appreciation of every American.

As a Democrat, I would say that RICHARD NIXON could be a great American President. I continue reading my remarks to the G. I. Forum:

And, if you ask me, he has won himself a host of friends and admirers, not only in the United States, but also in Latin America.

He was poorly advised by the State Department. The State Department should have known what was coming and our envoys should have communicated this information to the respective Governments. Once alerting them, we could have insisted on proper security as is customary. As usual, our people took too much for granted and did nothing. But what could be expected.

The State Department has always looked with jaundiced eyes toward Latin America. The Ambassadors we send there are either political hacks (and in fairness this has been true under Democrats and Republicans alike) or inexperienced or second-rate career men. Rarely in the times I have visited there, and I know that it was the same long before this, did I encounter an Ambassador who spoke Spanish. For that matter, it was hard to find members of the Embassy staff who spoke Spanish—if they did, they spoke it poorly. In most cases they did not speak Spanish at all, weren't trying to learn. They cared nothing for the people, the language, or the customs of the country in which they were stationed. How can one ever understand another people if you can't speak their language, much less make friends with them.

The masses in Latin America are awakening just as are the masses in Africa, the Middle East, Asia, and Indonesia. When there was lack of communication, they were not cognizant of social, political, and economic disparities, and it did not bother them. Today with radio, television, and newspapers, these masses are not satisfied with poverty, illiteracy, political oppression, and misery. They can't help but be envious of us. They resent the asinine superiority of our representatives from the business, diplomatic, and tourist world. They want to be good neighbors, but they view this as a two-way street, not as something to be hastily organized in times of war and promptly dropped when they are not needed. They insist on lasting mutual respect and equality. They fail to see why we aid former foes, or aid friends who may be enemies or neutral tomorrow, and ignore Latin America. The responsibility for adjusting our whole attitude toward Latin America devolves on the American people. The hatreds and bitterness engendered by un-American, un-Christian, and nonbrotherly racial measures adopted by individuals, private groups, and communities, and governments of some of our States, help

to fertilize the seeds of hatred which we all know exist in the Latin American mind.

Since my first days in the Houseof Representatives and since going to the Senate, I have insisted that an industrially advanced and an economically sound Mexico would contribute more to the security of the United States than Canada can with all its industrial might. Yet we continue to ignore this great potential. If Latin America were one-fourth as progressive and advanced as Canada, our fears of attack would be greatly reduced. The resources in raw materials and manpower are, in the foreseeable future, inexhaustible. We have the capital; we have the resources; and we have the talent to organize these resources.

To do this a complete change in attitude must take place. We must determine that the job be done and then, through public opinion, force our Government officials to action. Latin America wants to advance in all lines of human progress. They will help us, for it requires their cooperation and willingness as well. If we respect them and treat them as partners and as equals, we will be met more than half way.

We must do this if we are to survive. It is one chink in our armor which must be repaired. If we act at once, the Nixon incident in South America will have served a good end.

I sincerely believe that the G. I. Forum with its goals of education, Americanism and respect for the dignity of man and equality of opportunity, are admirably fitted to carry this message to all of the Americas. By aiding in this cause you can again serve your country and help guard the security of freedom in the world of the future.

Mr. President, I have one more point to make, and I shall be through. There is another thing which the liberty-loving, freedom-loving South American and Latin American does not like about this country. We sermonize all over the world about how we want to protect those who fight for freedom, yet this is a country which gives asylum to all dictators ever chased out of Latin America.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum; and I should like to announce to the attachés of the Senate they should get in touch with all Senators to tell them to be present, because it is going to be a live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ervin	Kuchel
Anderson	Frear	Langer
Barrett	Fulbright	Lausche
Beall	Goldwater	Magnuson
Bennett	Gore	Malone
Bible	Green	Mansfield
Bricker	Hayden	Martin, Iowa
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Martin, Pa.
Bush	Hill	McClellan
Capehart	Hoblitzell	McNamara
Carlson	Holland	Monroney
Carroll	Hruska	Morse
Case, S. Dak.	Humphrey	Morton
Chavez	Ives	Mundt
Church	Jackson	Murray
Clark	Javits	Neuberger
Cooper	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Cotton	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Curtis	Johnston, S. C.	Payne
Dirksen	Jordan	Potter
Douglas	Kefauver	Proxmire
Dworshak	Kennedy	Purtell
Eastland	Kerr	Revercomb
Ellender	Knowland	Robertson
Russell	Sparkman	Watkins
Saltonstall	Stennis	Wiley
Schoeppel	Symington	Yarborough
Smathers	Talmadge	Young
Smith, Maine	Thurmond	
Smith, N. J.	Thye	

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is absent because of illness.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

POSTAL RATES AND POSTAL PAY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5836) to readjust postal rates and to establish a congressional policy for the determination of postal rates, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of May 22.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina obtained the floor.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator have any idea how long he will discuss the conference report, and about how long it will be before a vote on it can be scheduled?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I would say that I shall consume about 12 or 15 minutes. I cannot tell, however, how long the questioning will proceed. I do not believe it will be very long.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I assume there is considerable unanimity prevailing in regard to the decision the conferees have reached, although I am not able to speak with authority on the matter. I personally support the conference report. However, I do wish to be sure that all Senators are notified so that they will have an opportunity to vote on the question, because we have spent months—yes, even years—in attempting to enact very desirable legislation, both in the rate field and in the pay field. It would be unfortunate to have a division of sentiment at the last moment and take any chances of the report not being adopted. I do not believe that is likely to occur; but I see no other purpose to be served by having a yea-and-nay vote, unless it is to make a record. For that reason I wish every Senator to have the opportunity to be present. Therefore, I believe that Senators should be on notice that we expect to vote sometime before 4:30 p. m. on the conference report, if that is at least possible. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I agree, so far as I am personally concerned. Of course, I do not know how much questioning there will be. I shall be very brief.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the conference agreement on House bill 5836, the postal rate and pay bill, was reached only after weeks of deliberation.

I am very happy to report that the conference agreement has been approved by every one of the eight conferees. Furthermore, the statement of the managers on the part of the House, that will be filed in the House when the bill is brought up on that side, was read and approved before the conference agreement was signed. I mention this for two reasons. First, on such a complex and controversial matter, it is unusual that every problem be resolved in such a satisfactory manner. Second, it is also unusual for everyone to completely agree on the bill as well as the report on the bill.

This happy result is a source of great satisfaction to me and I am confident it will be viewed both in the Senate and in the House as complete assurance, if any be needed, that both the bill and the report are as complete, as accurate, and as factual as is humanly possible.

I should like to emphasize one further point of an overall character. Except for yielding to the House on first-class rates, the bill as agreed to is almost completely the version as passed here in the Senate some weeks ago. Yet not a single decision was made lightly. None was made quickly. Not one concession was made or gained easily by either side. At times the outlook for agreement seemed dim. It was only because of the dedication to the task by each conferee on both sides that a satisfactory overall agreement was finally reached.

Neither side nor any one conferee won a smashing victory or suffered a crushing defeat. The agreement in many respects is a compromise between honest, strong, and sincere convictions of a widely divergent nature. Nonetheless, the conference agreement on an overall basis is better perhaps than either the House or Senate versions of the bill standing alone.

In my opinion, the agreement will stand as a lasting tribute to our democratic process under which differences

between the House and Senate are resolved in free conference, with the national interest as the only real issue in the hearts of the conferees.

Mr. President, I propose to take only a few minutes to summarize briefly the highlights of the bill as agreed to in conference. I shall then be happy to answer any questions.

Title I establishes a postal policy designed to provide a lasting basis for the maintenance of a sound and equitable rate structure.

One of the basic precepts of the policy is that the total loss on mail carried free or at reduced rates as provided by statute shall be considered a public service to be paid for from the general fund of the Treasury and not charged to other classes of the mail. It is well that the public know what services are of a public service nature and exactly what they cost.

Title I of the bill is deemed by many to be the most progressive piece of postal legislation agreed to in many years. In this connection, I am happy to announce that the Senate was successful in gaining acceptance of its position virtually intact.

The major exception to the Senate policy statement was the elimination of rural free delivery from the list of public service items. The determination not to include rural free delivery as a public service item was based on a clear agreement that it be passed over as an unresolved issue, without prejudice to further legislative consideration at a later date. This decision was reached in order not to further delay final agreement on the bill.

The agreement in this connection emphasized that the action taken is not to be construed as authorizing or requiring the elimination of any rural route, nor is it intended to preclude the making of appropriations for the operation of rural free delivery routes on a public service basis.

Title II relates to postal rates which in summary are changed as follows:

Letters of the first class are increased from 3 cents to 4 cents.

Post and postal cards are increased from 2 cents to 3 cents.

Domestic airmail letters are increased from 6 cents to 7 cents.

Domestic airmail cards are increased from 4 cents to 5 cents.

The pound rates on publications of the second-class are exactly as set forth in the table in the bill passed by the Senate. The table provided for 3 annual increments of approximately 10 percent each on the reading portion of such publications and similarly 3 annual increments of approximately 20 percent each on the advertising portion of such publications.

The minimum charge per piece on publications of the second-class is increased from one-eighth of one cent by one-eighth of a cent annually until it reaches one-half cent. However, publications of certain nonprofit organizations and publications designed for classroom use continue to be exempt from any increase.

The rate on controlled circulation publications is increased from the present rate of 10 cents for those not over 8 ounces and 11 cents for those over 8 ounces to a uniform rate of 12 cents per pound regardless of the weight.

The piece rate on indivdual mailings of the third class is raised from 2 cents to 3 cents on the first 2 ounces and from 1 cent to 1½ cents for each additional ounce.

The piece rate on bulk mailings of circulars, and so forth, of the third class is raised from the present rate of 1½ cents to an eventual rate of 2½ cents in 2 equal increments of ½ cent each.

There was real concern among the conferees over the effect which third-class bulk rate increases might have on small businesses of the Nation. For this reason the conference agreement authorizes and directs the Department of Commerce and the Small Business Administration to make separate studies of the matter after the first increase and prior to the second increase so the Congress can take remedial action should it be deemed necessary.

The minimum charge per piece for bulk matter of the third class mailed by certain nonprofit organizations is 50 percent of the regular minimum rate.

The pound rate on bulk mailings of circulars, and so forth, of the third-class is increased from 14 cents to 16 cents.

The annual fee for third-class mailing permits is raised from $10 to $20.

The pound rate on mailings of the fourth-class is raised from 8 cents on the first pound and 4 cents for each additional pound to 9 cents on the first pound and to 5 cents on each additional pound.

The conference agreement includes a provision to the effect that nothing in the policy shall be deemed to require a downward adjustment in fourth-class parcel post rates existing on the date of enactment. In other words, it was believed that users of the mail have the right to know exactly what their rates of postage will be for a reasonable future period of time. This knowledge and assurance of the stability of postage rates will be helpful to business both large and small at this time when every possible encouragement is so badly needed.

Title III establishes a postal modernization fund as provided for in the Senate passed bill, but in a modified form.

The bill passed by the Senate earmarked a fixed amount of postal revenues for the fund. The conference agreement merely establishes the fund to enable the Post Office Department to retain funds unused during a fiscal year for use in subsequent fiscal years when Congress appropriates such funds for such purposes.

I come now to the part of the bill relating to the pay increase for postal employees.

Title IV of the bill provides for a permanent pay increase of 7½ percent, plus a temporary adjustment for 3 years of 2½ percent in levels 1 through 6 and 1½ percent in level 7, with a comparable adjustment for rural letter carriers and postmasters of the fourth class. Both the permanent and temporary increases are made effective at the beginning of the first pay period starting on or after January 1, 1958.

Mr. President, the bill that passed the Senate provided an eventual maximum increase in revenues of $730 million annually, $175 million of which would have been temporary for a 3-year period. The conference agreement provides for an eventual increase in revenues of $547 million, according to the Post Office Department estimate which I hold in my hand. I myself believe that the bill will result in revenues of $575 million, according to the information we have received from all sources.

The pay provisions of the Senate-passed bill would have cost $320 million annually.

The pay provisions of the conference agreement will cost $265 million annually, as estimated.

This difference is a reduction of $55 million annually in the cost of the pay increases.

The cost for fiscal year 1958, ending June 30, will be $115 million. The reason the cost for what appears to be a half year, that is, from January to July, is less than half the annual cost, is that the period of January to July includes no Christmas help and covers, in fact, only 12 biweekly pay periods out of a total of 26 pay periods in a full year.

Mr. President, from an operating standpoint, the Post Office Department technicians view this bill as the best piece of postal legislation developed in more than 40 years.

I am not aware of how it may be viewed otherwise by the Post Office Department. As for me, I think it is all in all, a good bill. I think it would be safe to predict that the problems involved in even attempting to work out a revised rate bill would be insurmountable in the foreseeable future.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Did I correctly understand the Senator from South Carolina to say that the pay raises will be retroactive to the first pay period beginning after January 1, 1958?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. I compliment the Senator from South Carolina. I believe that the good results of the bill are due in large measure to the able leadership he gave to the conference.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. President, I have completed my statement. I think the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] wishes to make a statement, but I will answer any questions which may be directed to me at this time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator

from South Carolina on the statement he has made on the conference report. I agree with what he has said about it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement by me in support of the report.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

The postal workers of the United States have waited a long time for an upward adjustment in their wages. They have had only one wage increase since 1951. That increase was totally inadequate. It amounted to 8½ percent.

In the meantime, the cost of living in our great country has increased more than 20 percent. Therefore, I want to align myself with my colleagues in the United States Senate who are supporting the conference report.

In so doing, I want to make the record crystal clear that even this amount is insufficient to accomplish the objectives of the postal workers.

Many of my colleagues on the Senate floor know that not only postal employees are working at extra jobs, but their wives as well find it necessary to seek employment in order to make enough to meet everyday living costs. This bill constitutes a step in the right direction, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the report brought in by the Senate-House conferees.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, if there are no other questions, I yield the floor so the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] may address the Senate.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has made a very fine statement regarding some of the problems which confronted the conference committee and regarding the work done by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and also in general explanation of the conference report.

The pending conference report is the result of much effort on the part of the conferees. In addition, it is the result of years of work on postal rates, by the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

I believe I can state that, as in the case of most conference reports, every item of the report does not meet with the approval of every member of the committee. However, in the final analysis, the report represents the best agreement we were able to reach.

Personally, I am disappointed with several features of the report.

In the first place, I believe Congress lost a great opportunity to write postal-pay legislation which would modernize the postal operations.

As a result of an amendment that I offered and action by the Senate, we could have, within a period of 3 to 5 years, provided a sufficient number of new buildings and modern automatic equipment to make our postal plant the equal of any modern industrial plant in the United States. Here we are, the wealthiest nation in the world; but we are operating with a mediocre and deteriorating postal service.

Since 1938, not one new post office has been built with Government funds. Beginning in 1953, under the authority granted by Congress, the Post Office Department embarked on a program to encourage private industry to build, according to their specifications, new post office buildings which, in turn, are leased on a long-term basis by the Department. This is a fine program; but because of the uncertainties of funds available from year to year for new equipment, it is impossible to coordinate the need for new facilities with the available equipment.

Had the bill which was passed by the Senate been retained by the conferees, thousands of new post offices could have, and would have, been built under a lease-rental program. That was a golden opportunity to render a real service to our people and to the postal operations of the Nation.

Second, I feel that the conference report does a real injustice to thousands of our postal employees, by violating every principle of sound pay policy, in writing pay legislation that does not give proper consideration to those in administrative and supervisory positions in the Department.

Although the 2½-percent pay increase above the 7½-percent across-the-board pay increase may be justified on the basis of need, it does disrupt the principles and differentials embodied in Public Law 68, which was passed by this Congress as a sound salary schedule program measure.

I would not have signed this conference report, and would not today be urging the Senate adopt it, if I did not feel that, despite these inequities, our postal employees are entitled to, and should have, a postal-pay increase, and should have it now.

The RECORD will show that I offered an across-the-board postal-pay increase amendment when the matter was before the Senate, but my amendment did not prevail.

Third, I want the RECORD to show that in this instance I did not favor, and do not now favor, tying postal-pay legislation to postal-rate legislation. While it may be argued that it is an advantage to do so in this instance, I believe that in the future it might be fraught with great danger to further pay increases for our postal workers.

It is my contention that, regardless of the revenues of the Postal Department, our postal employees are entitled to fair and just salaries, based on the service they render.

Not only is it unfair to the postal workers of the Nation, but I think it is unfair to the executive branch of the Government, to have to pass on a bill that is, in the first instance, a revenue or a tax measure coupled with an appropriation bill.

Congress has always handled tax or revenue bills and appropriation bills by means of separate committees and separate actions.

The approval of this conference report will be a great relief to those of us who have labored long and hard with the difficult problem of postal rates and postal pay.

Again, as I stated in the beginning, although I can think of many objections to this conference report, it is, in my opinion, the best that could be worked out under the circumstances.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the conference report will be agreed to by a unanimous vote of the Senate.

Mr. President, in the course of his statement, the distinguished chairman of our committee referred to 2 or 3 items in which I not only concur, but regarding which I wish to make a few comments, for the legislative history.

For instance, the chairman mentioned the fact that title I establishes a postal policy which is designed to provide a lasting basis for the maintenance of a sound and equitable rate structure. This is a policy on which our committee has been working for at least 4 or 5 years. It seems to me that the approval by the conferees of a realistic policy section will be welcomed by all who recognize that the postal service performs many, many services for the American people without any charge, or else for fees which do not meet, or do not begin to meet, the actual costs.

The earmarking, as such, of purely public-service items will enable future Congresses to adjust postal rates and fees more equitably. The study conducted under my chairmanship in the 83d Congress recommended the policy section approved by the conferees. In my opinion it is a long, healthy step forward; and I am pleased that the distinguished chairman of the committee has also sponsored hearings on this very problem. He has consistently maintained this position; and we have finally brought the section to the Senate, for its consideration.

Our distinguished chairman has also discussed the third-class rates, and has stated that they might have an effect on our economy at the present time, when a recession exists, because the third-class mail is business-builder mail.

It seems to me that the conference report, in providing for an impact study with respect to the bulk third-class rate, has much merit. It must be remembered that direct-mail advertising is one of the principal selling tools of tens of thousands of small-business firms. The $20 per thousand rate will go into effect January 1, 1959. If we find that the further increase to $25 per thousand on July 1, 1960, would have an adverse effect, the Congress can take action to avoid hardships. I may say that the 2½-cent minimum piece rate approved by the conferees represents a 150-percent increase over the rate in effect in June 1952. That is a substantial rate increase in anyone's language.

The distinguished chairman of the committee also mentioned another item to which I wish to refer briefly, because in the committee we had considerable discussion of it. I refer to the item on controlled circulation.

In the course of his statement, the chairman of the committee said:

The rate on controlled circulation publications is increased from the present rate of 10 cents for those not over 8 ounces and 11

cents for those over 8 ounces to a uniform rate of 12 cents per pound regardless of the weight.

Mr. President, as one of the Senate's conferees on the bill, I should like to observe that the conferees took no action regarding controlled-circulation publications that was inconsistent with the wishes of the Senate which were so well expressed by the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] during the debate on the bill last February. The pertinent remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma, who was also a conferee, can be found on page 2725 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 25, 1958.

Mr. President, with these few remarks and observations, let me say that I sincerely hope the conference report will receive the unanimous approval of the Senate.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield to me?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. When the distinguished Senator from Kansas was discussing the proposed pay increase, I was somewhat under the impression that he was opposed to the proposed legislation. However, I note that his exception to the proposed pay raise was taken because of the fact that certain classes of the employees will be favored over others.

Is it not a fact that this is the first pay raise for the postal employees since 1955?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct; in 1955, the Congress passed a pay increase bill for the postal employees.

Mr. BARRETT. And since 1955 the cost of living has increased approximately 7.8 percent, has it not?

Mr. CARLSON. The information that I have is that the consumers' price index for the cost of living has increased 7.78 percent since the last postal pay increase bill was enacted in June 1955.

Mr. BARRETT. So this increase of somewhat more than 10 percent, on the average, will just a little bit more than compensate for the increase in the cost of living during the past 3 years, will it not?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes. I have no objection to this pay increase, because I think it was justified at the hearings, where the distinguished Senator from Oregon showed that the persons in these brackets need this salary increase.

What I object to is that we are getting our salary schedules out of line, in so far as the supervisory and administrative employees are concerned.

I believe I should state for the RECORD that the conference report does not provide an increase in the pay of the supervisory employees in the upper brackets.

Increases for management personnel in levels 15 and above are scaled down to 7½ percent. The average increase for nonsupervisors is 10½ percent, but the average increase for supervisory employees is 7½ percent.

Let me state the difficulty which I think Congress is getting into. Congress will pass a bill increasing the pay of classified employees, and I hope Congress will act soon. So far as the Senator from Kansas is concerned, classified employees are going to be paid as liberally as are postal employees. It is my hope that when Congress writes such legislation it will provide for increases across the board. I sincerely hope Congress will do that. When Congress acts, and the bill is signed by the President and becomes law, classified workers in the same Federal Government will be drawing larger salaries for supervisory work than will employees in the Postal Service. That is what I object to more than to the rate of pay provided.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. Can the Senator tell me what the prospects are that the bill will receive the approval of the President?

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Kansas is in no position to give an answer to the Senator from Wyoming. All the Senator from Kansas can do is say he hopes the Senate will approve the conference report unanimously and that the President will sign the bill.

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

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I merely wish to express my deep appreciation to the Senator from South Carolina for the fine work and the ability which he has demonstrated as chairman of the conference. I express my pleasure that the Senate conferees, led by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and the very able and distinguished friend of mine from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], have been able to resolve some 40 or 50 differences with the other body and to bring back to the Senate a much deserved and long overdue pay raise for thousands of patriotic public servants who are dedicated to their work, and who perform it willingly and for long hours, and in inclement weather.

I am proud of the Senate committee that has been able finally to get to the Senate a necessary pay-raise bill and a necessary rate-increase bill. I know of no two men who have worked more unselfishly and more devoted in the public interest than have the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], with whom I served in the House for so long.

I also desire to express my appreciation to the other members of the committee, particularly the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Oregon, for the contributions they have made, as well as to all members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

In view of what the Senator from Kansas has said, and in view of the very able statement made by the Senator from South Carolina, I have no doubt the conference report will get the approval of practically all Members of this body.

I hope the President will see the merits of the measure as we do, and will sign it promptly, so the people who deserve to receive pay increases will get them at the earliest possible date.

Mr CARLSON. The Senator from Kansas appreciates very much the kind words of the majority leader. This was a very difficult job. We have been working on the rate-structure problem for 4 or 5 years. It was not an easy matter to resolve. We have had difficulty with the problem. It is only through the generosity and kindness of our committee that we come to the Senate with a unanimous report. Every member of the committee had different views. We resolved them, and brought the report to the Senate. As I stated earlier, I hope the Senate will approve the conference report.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I believe the conferees have reached what is a just and reasonable agreement regarding the salary scale as it applies to all employees, with the exception of supervisors, or the upper grades. The bill does disrupt the supervisors' pay scale in relation to the scales paid to lower grades. However, if we were the ones who were trying to clothe and feed our families and pay house rent or make downpayments on homes, and we knew we could not reach a higher level, perhaps we, like the mail carriers and clerks, would be very appreciative of the cost-of-living adjustment that has been written into the bill over and above the 7½ percent pay increase.

A 3-year period is provided in the bill. However, if that inequity were not corrected, but were permitted to run for the 3-year period, there would be no incentive for an employee's assuming the responsibilities of a supervisor, rather than remain a senior mail carrier or senior clerk. If one became a supervisor, he would have to become a junior in that class, and he would have to work evenings or have night hours as his shift. No clerk would be willing to assume that type of responsibility for the same level of pay. Therefore, the hope of getting competent men to take the supervisory type jobs in the postal service would possibly be jeopardized.

For that reason, if it would be possible, I would suggest that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service give thought and consideration to correcting the inequity by increasing the pay scale of the supervisory worker. Without such an adjustment, it might be found that at the end of a year, or 2 years, or 3 years, there might be difficulty in having an employee assume the responsibility of a supervisor.

That is the only phase of the conference report about which I had any question. As to the rest of it, I commend the Senator from Kansas, as the senior member on the committee from the Republican side, and I also wish to commend the chairman, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. The Senators have done an excellent job. I know that some very able Members of the Senate, both Republican and Democratic, serve on the committee.

I am confident the President will sign the bill, because, in the main, it is perfectly sound, and the bill adjusts postal rates as they should have been adjusted even earlier than this time.

So I commend the Senators for a job well done. I know the postal employees are deserving of the pay raise. I believe commercial employees have had about a 19-percent, or perhaps a 20-percent, increase in salaries. The bill will adjust

the salaries of postal employees so as to bring the increases somewhere near the increases provided commercial employees in recent years.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Minnesota has again, as he has on many occasions in the past, demonstrated his personal interest in the postal employees of the United States. I do not know of anyone in the Senate who has come to me more often in the last few months, both on the floor and off the floor, urging that we get the type of action taking place today. I am pleased the conferees have brought to the Senate a measure that at least partially meets the Senator's suggestions and hopes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The conference report is satisfactory in every respect other than with regard to the danger in the wage scale for the supervisors and those in the higher grades, since perhaps that is too low. That is the only phase of the conference report about which I am concerned. All other phases show a very just and proper agreement.

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

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to take this occasion to express my appreciation for the excellent work done by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and the ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

This is probably the most difficult bill considered in conference in recent years, since there were some 50 highly controversial and difficult differences as between the House and the Senate. The fact is that the House had passed its rate-increase bill last year, and the Senate passed the rate-increase bill this year. The fact is that the House bill of last year, passed as a separate bill last year, which provided a pay increase for postal workers, had been pocket vetoed last September. Those circumstances made it difficult to put the versions together.

I think the long 3 weeks which have been spent in a tedious and nearly endless conference, oftentimes with difficult decisions being unreachable at the time, have been resolved by the good humor, good patience, and perseverance of the distinguished chairman of the committee and ranking minority member of the committee.

Certainly no one who served on the conference committee received exactly the bill he wanted. I know the distinguished Senator from Kansas was disappointed many times. The distinguished chairman of the committee was disappointed many times. The junior Senator from Oklahoma was disappointed many, many, many times as to some of the things which we had fought hard to keep in the bill when it was considered on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I think primarily there are two principal objectives of the bill. We have attempted to deal fairly and squarely with the men and women who carry the mail in good weather and foul, to help them meet the increased cost of living. We have endeavored to put the emphasis upon those who are the most poorly paid and who have the least chance for promotions within grade in the postal service. That is the keystone of the bill.

I am grateful indeed that the conference committee saw fit to provide for the 7½ percent permanent increase and the 2½ percent temporary increase. I give notice now that the junior Senator from Oklahoma, at least, believes the Congress should, before too many months, make the 2½ percent increase a part of the regular pay scales, and provide more adequate compensation for those who could not be helped because of the situation in the conference, rather than cutting the provision off at grade 5 as we were compelled to do under the rules of the conference.

I think we have treated the Treasury of the United States fairly. I think a revenue increase of more than a half billion dollars is long past due. All of the items related to post office operation, from salaries to transportation, and even to the mucilage which goes on the backs of the stamps, have increased in cost by significant amounts. It is high time that the rates should be revised in the interest of sound business operation of this branch of the Government.

I did not get all I wanted insofar as the rate structure was concerned. Many things which I thought were important were cut out. I think, however, I believe that by and large it is true we have resolved the matter properly. The 4-cent postage stamp issue was resolved in favor of the House position, and it will meet with the satisfaction of most of the public who use the mails to the greatest extent.

Some of the adjustments which perhaps needed to be made as between the bills passed by the two Houses were restricted by the rules of the conference, which made it absolutely impossible to reach a compromise below or beyond the limits prescribed by the bills as they came from the two Houses.

I wish to thank both the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member of the committee for their patience, and for the long hours they worked, and the diligent work they did to perfect the measure, which I think will be hailed as an outstanding piece of legislation by the Congress.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I could not permit this opportunity to go by without expressing my appreciation to the junior Senator from Oklahoma for his part in the conference. I think I can state without violating any confidences that there were times when the chairman of the committee and I had about given up. It was the persistence and, I believe, the trading ability of the junior Senator from Oklahoma which made it possible to work out some compromises with the House conferees. I have to admit that after 3 weeks of these sessions—and we had many of them—at times the situation looked hopeless, but the junior Senator from Oklahoma never gave up, and we bring the conference report to the Senate. I know the conference report is largely due to the efforts of the junior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. NEUBERGER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the chairman of the committee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wish to say that in the conference at all times the ranking Republican member of the committee, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], worked diligently. If it had not been for the able assistance of the Senator from Kansas, we probably never could have secured a final and complete agreement.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] was also present at all times, giving us the benefit of his great experience of the past with the various matters concerning the civil-service workers and postal rates. If we had not had the benefit of the service of the Senator from Oklahoma on the conference committee, I doubt we could have persuaded the members of the committee to get together on several items on which we did agree.

I was blessed by having one Senator on my right and one Senator on my left who worked diligently every minute we were in conference.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate very much the fine statement of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. NEUBERGER rose.

Mr. CARLSON. I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who did such a fine piece of work in the preliminary stages of the legislation by holding hearings as to postal pay and several other matters relating to our civil-service workers. I know there are many features of the bill about which the Senator from Oregon may not be happy, but I assure him we did the best we could.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Kansas is characteristically kind, as usual. Of course, no one of us has exactly the kind of bill he wants, because that is symbolic of the legislative process, where the views and opinions of many have to be adjusted.

As Chairman of the Federal Pay Subcommittee, I merely wish to state that I believe the conference committee has brought forth a bill which is fair and just in most essentials. That does not mean that it is universally fair, but I believe that in its major aspects it is an excellent bill.

I am particularly conscious of the way in which the pay of postal employees has lagged behind the cost of living. As the Senator from Kansas has pointed out, we held extensive and voluminous hearings on this issue. We discovered that many men and women employed by the Post Office Department have not been receiving sufficient pay to maintain their

families on what we traditionally refer to as the American standard of living. Therefore, I think it is particularly sound that the pay increases have been made retroactive to the first of the year. While the delay in bringing forth the conference report on the bill may have caused some aggravation and disturbance, the people concerned and their families will not suffer because of such delay.

In addition, I wish to refer to what the Senator from Oklahoma pointed out so cogently. I agree with him that the so-called temporary increases should eventually be made permanent, because I think every Senator recognizes that the increases in the cost of living are permanent; and that, if anything, they will be subject to expansion rather than diminution, although we might wish that such costs could come down.

With respect to the supervisory employees, I agree with what has been said regarding unfairness to them. However, if I am not mistaken—and I should like to have the eminent chairman of the committee corroborate or dispute my statement in this connection—my Subcommittee on Federal Pay and the Full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which he heads, have already approved a bill known as Senate bill 3400. If I am not mistaken, that bill provides additional pay increases for supervisory employees.

Therefore, I think we are not a long way off, legislatively speaking, from bringing about justice to the supervisory employees. I know that the necessity of doing so was stressed by the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], as members of our committee, as well as by the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who, we all regret, is ill today. We all wish for his speedy recovery.

Senate bill 3400 is before the committee. I believe that the full committee has ordered it to be favorably reported, and that we can take early steps to provide an upward adjustment in the pay of the supervisory employees. Is not that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In conclusion, I should like to ask one question of both the distinguished chairman of the committee and the distinguished ranking Republican member of the committee.

In my State the claim has been voiced that the rate revisions are not sufficiently large for second-class users of the mail and third-class users of the mail. The claim has been voiced that those who send so-called circulars or "junk" mail are not paying a sufficient increase, and that magazines and newspapers are not paying a sufficient increase. I do not happen to agree with that charge, but it has been expressed in my State. Therefore, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee if he happens to agree with that claim.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe that the increases provided in the bill are more than sufficient to cover the full cost involved. When these increases go into effect, there will be three 20-percent increases for advertising matter in second-class mail. That will amount to 60 percent. For ordinary reading matter or editorial matter, there will be three 10-percent increases. The increases had to be staggered, for the simple reason that if we were to put them all into effect at one time, many magazines would be driven out of existence.

Similar increases were made in the rates of third-class mail.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In other words, the chairman of the committee believes that the rate increases provided for are fair and adequate.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe they are. Further, I was pleased to have the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] state for the RECORD that he is in complete agreement.

When many people consider second-class mail, and note the deficit in connection with second-class mail, they think only of magazines and newspapers. They forget that many people are getting a free ride in second-class, and that, by legislation, we give all the little county newspapers free circulation within the county; and, for that matter, all newspapers have free circulation within the county where they are published. As a result, a deficit results, but it should not be charged to those who are paying full or proper rates.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I agree with the distinguished chairman.

I should like to put the same question, very briefly, if I may, to the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. Does he feel that the increases provided for in the conference report for the use of second-class mail rates and third-class mail rates are both adequate and fair?

Mr. CARLSON. The rates in the bill are higher than I desired to have enacted into law. I favored three 10-percent rate increases for second-class. The bill provides three 10-percent rate increases for second-class reading matter, and three 20-percent increases in the case of advertising.

I should like to give the Senator the figures for the fiscal year 1960. In that year the rate increase on second-class mail will amount to $15.4 million. In 1961, $25.4 million; in 1962, $30.4 million; and with respect to third-class, we have increased the rate 150 percent over the rate for 1951, the date of the last postal rate increase.

For the fiscal year 1960, that represents an increase of $90.5 million; for 1961, an increase of $133.7 million; and for 1963, an increase of $133.7 million. That is a substantial increase, and if I had had my way the increases would have been lower.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the able Senator.

In conclusion, I merely wish to emphasize that, as chairman of the subcommittee which handled pay legislation for the postal workers and for the classified employees generally, I believe that, by and large and in the main, this is a fair bill. It does equity and justice not to all postal workers, unfortunately, but to a majority of postal workers. I hope that such deficiencies as remain can be taken care of by the subcommittee and the full committee later. I commend the Senate representatives at the conference.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I know of no Member of the Senate who did more spade work on this piece of legislation than did the junior Senator from Oregon. He did an outstanding job during many weeks of hearings and studies, and presented some very fine material to the full committee and to the Senate.

Mr. President, if no other Senator desires to speak, I wish to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to say to the distinguished chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and the distinguished ranking Republican member of that committee that it has been a privilege to work with them on the committee during the months they worked on the postal-pay bill. We heard discouraging reports during the negotiations with the House conferees. I wish to commend them and the other member of the conference committee, the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], for continuing negotiations week after week until an agreement was reached on the bill.

I doubt if any one of us could have sat down and written a better bill. Personally, I regretted to see my 2-cent post-card amendment go out of the bill. The Senate conferees were able to keep it in the bill until a very late stage. I thank them for making a fight for the 2-cent handwritten post card.

Those of us who have worked long and hard for the pay raise for postal employees are gratified that that amendment has been agreed to. As the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] has pointed out, we do not believe that the bill does exact justice to all the postal employees. However, we do believe that it is a far better bill than many of us thought a month ago would be possible, from our standpoint in the Senate. The conferees are to be commended for the success with which they have been able to retain in the bill so many of the features which the Senate had adopted.

I have heard in the past that the House conferees always outtrade the Senate conferees. I do not believe that has happened in this instance. The Senate conferees came out of conference with a bill which is far more representative of the ideas of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, than did the House conferees, so far as their version was concerned.

I wish to congratulate the Senate conferees on having been defeated on the nickel letter rate and having come out with a bill which provides not for a 5-cent letter rate as between towns, but for a blanket rate of 4 cents. If we are to have an increase in the first-class mail rate, I feel very strongly that it should be a uniform increase, not a 5-cent rate in certain instances and a 4-cent rate in other instances.

I wish to commend the three Senate conferees on the outstanding work they did in the conference, and to express my appreciation to them.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Texas rendered outstanding service in the preparation of the bill. He did it in committee and on the floor of the Senate. We had written into the bill a 2-cent rate on hand-written postal cards. I wish the RECORD to show that the Senate conferees did everything they could to retain it, and only gave it up at the very last.

If there is nothing further to be brought up in connection with the conference report, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hayden	Morton
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Barrett	Hill	Murray
Beall	Hoblitzell	Neuberger
Bennett	Holland	O'Mahoney
Bible	Hruska	Pastore
Bricker	Humphrey	Payne
Bridges	Ives	Potter
Bush	Jackson	Proxmire
Capehart	Javits	Purtell
Carlson	Jenner	Revercomb
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Chavez	Jordan	Saltonstall
Church	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Clark	Kennedy	Smathers
Cooper	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Kuchel	Sparkman
Dirksen	Langer	Stennis
Douglas	Lausche	Symington
Dworshak	Magnuson	Talmadge
Eastland	Malone	Thurmond
Ellender	Mansfield	Thye
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Watkins
Frear	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Fulbright	McClellan	Yarborough
Goldwater	McNamara	Young
Gore	Monroney	
Green	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. 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 Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—88

Aiken	Hayden	Morton
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Barrett	Hill	Murray
Beall	Hoblitzell	Neuberger
Bennett	Holland	O'Mahoney
Bible	Hruska	Pastore
Bricker	Humphrey	Payne
Bridges	Ives	Potter
Bush	Jackson	Proxmire
Capehart	Javits	Purtell
Carlson	Jenner	Revercomb
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Chavez	Jordan	Saltonstall
Church	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Clark	Kennedy	Smathers
Cooper	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Kuchel	Sparkman
Dirksen	Langer	Stennis
Douglas	Lausche	Symington
Dworshak	Magnuson	Talmadge
Eastland	Malone	Thurmond
Ellender	Mansfield	Thye
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Watkins
Frear	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Fulbright	McClellan	Yarborough
Goldwater	McNamara	Young
Gore	Monroney	
Green	Morse	

NOT VOTING—8

Allott	Case, N. J.	Long
Butler	Flanders	Williams
Byrd	Hennings	

So the report was agreed to.

REPORTS ON ACREAGE PLANTED TO COTTON

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6765) to provide for reports on the acreage planted to cotton, to repeal the prohibition against cotton acreage reports based on farmers' planting intentions, and for other purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senate now has under consideration House bill 6765.

I wish to say that during the call of the calendar today, that bill was passed over. I have consulted with the majority leader and the minority leader, and I find that there is no objection to the consideration of the bill at this time. Let me say that the bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The bill will make three changes in the law relating to cotton-acreage reports.

First, it would base the July cotton-acreage report on planted acreage, instead of acreage in cultivation. Planted acreage is used in reporting on other crops, is required in the administration of various laws, and is a more definite figure, more easily reported and better understood.

Second, it would advance the second cotton-acreage report from September 1 to August 1, which is the beginning of the marketing year.

Third, it would permit the Department of Agriculture to report on farmers' intentions to plant cotton, by removing the prohibition enacted in 1924. The Department presently makes such reports on other crops reported on.

The bill was requested by the Department of Agriculture, and would result in improved cotton-acreage reporting.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I am advised by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], that there is no objection to the consideration and passage of House bill 6765 at this time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 6765) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FARM PRICES AND FARM PRODUCTION PROBLEMS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the declining position of the American cotton industry is a matter that has been of deep concern to me since President Eisenhower vetoed S. J. Res. 162, which would have continued existing cotton-acreage allotments and existing price levels on certain basic commodities.

The New York Times Sunday edition of May 11 carried a very enlightening article on this subject, which should be of great interest to everyone concerned with the plight of our Nation's farmers. Written by J. H. Carmichael, and featured in the business section of the Times, the article said: "Big cut in acreage likely in 1959 unless Congress acts this session." In his lead paragraph, Mr. Carmichael stated:

> Unless Congress acts to amend the farm law before the end of this session, the prospects are that cotton growers will face another drastic cut in acreage allotments in 1959.

The article then goes on for several columns to detail the problems confronting the cotton farmer and the textile industry, and it also states that the "act establishing a minimum national cotton allotment for 1957 and 1958 of about 17,500,000 acres will expire this year." Mr. Carmichael then reports:

> An effort already has been made in Congress to freeze price supports and acreage allotments for the 1959 crop, but this was vetoed by President Eisenhower.

I quote from this article because of its comprehensive and complete picture of the situation we are facing.

Mr. President, since conditions on cotton farms and in the cotton industry are getting worse, I believe it is in the national interest, at this time, to review the effort on the part of Congress to provide needed legislative relief for this vital industry, and to examine the administration's negative attitude thereon.

For the record, let it be restated that the Congress passed a joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 162, authorizing an immediate stay of reductions in price supports of certain commodities, and acreage allotments of rice and cotton crops; but that measure was vetoed by President Eisenhower on March 11. The President "Bensonized" the measure.

It is noteworthy that the President, in his veto message, stated that progress in solving farm problems has been made,

in addition to other means, "through stepped-up research to find new uses for farm products."

I should like to comment on this section of the Presidential veto. Back in 1954, a Presidential bipartisan commission was created to develop, through research, increased industrial uses of agricultural products. The commission, duly created, appointed, and staffed, seriously undertook its mission, and, as of June 1957, filed its final report.

Let it be noted that the Commission's work was well done; its inquiry was exhaustive. It covered the field thoroughly. It developed pertinent and promising research leads, particularly those relating to possible new crops. The Commission's findings were such as to warrant the most enthusiastic and wholehearted support in the way of legislative implementation.

Perhaps the best comment I can make here is that there was, and has been, absolutely no "follow through" from the White House on the Commission's report, which was made back in June 1957. Several weeks ago, I submitted a bill of my own, together with a statement, to stimulate a program as outlined by the Commission. I did this in the absence of any follow-up action by the administration.

I believe this brief recounting of the development since the Commission filed its report last June is adequate commentary on what the crop raiser and agriculture generally can expect in the way of resarch from the White House. Apparently all the follow-through has been left at the Burning Tree Golf Course.

As pointed out in the Senate Agriculture Committee report supporting passage of the joint resolution which the President vetoed, the measure would have prevented another half billion dollars slash in farm income, which will occur in 1958. If the reduced price-support rates announced by the Secretary of Agriculture become effective.

In its report the committee frankly stated that Senate Joint Resolution 166 was a hold-the-line measure, and contended its enactment was necessary because the urgency of the economic situation makes it imperative that the drop in farm income be halted—not only for the benefit of the hard-pressed farmers, but also for the welfare of the economy as a whole. Long-range legislation is under consideration; but because of the diversity of views among the committee membership, farm leaders, and the administration, progress has been slow.

In the meantime, however, farm income needs to be protected; and that is what Senate Joint Resolution 162 purported to do. Recent history reveals that recessions and depressions usually start with declining farm incomes. Poor times on the farm spill over into the towns and the cities, and result in a large casualty list among small business. The committee aptly pointed out that 40 percent of the Nation's total labor force is engaged in producing, processing, and distributing farm products.

One of the telling points raised by the committee report is the following:

> If the proposed new slash in farm income, of a half billion dollars, is permitted to take place, on the basis of past experience most of this loss in farm income will be retained by middlemen. Consumers will benefit little if at all.

Mr. President, a prosperous and healthy agricultural industry is essential to a great power. It is a warning sign when large numbers of people have to forsake the farms, as Americans have been doing in recent years. Agriculture is one of the prime supports of a strong national economy.

I am convinced that in his veto of this joint resolution, the President leaned on weak reeds of false reasoning. The evidence was to the contrary, and was in support of the Congress' position that it was unwise and unsound to permit damaging cuts in price supports and acreage allotments to go into effect at this time.

Therefore, I am convinced that the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 162 to temporarily halt any reduction in support prices and acreage allotments were eminently sound; that such "hold-the-line action" is sorely needed; and that cotton and other crops need to be safeguarded in this period of recession. I intend to do all in my power to bring about its enactment. The Presidential veto, in my opinion, was ill-advised, unwarranted, works a hardship on agriculture, is detrimental to the whole national economy, and robs the Agricultural Committees of the Congress of the breathing space and the necessary time to perfect permanent legislation.

This veto should be overridden, and the sooner the better. In this effort, I earnestly solicit the support and invite the collaboration of all true friends of agriculture on both sides of the aisle in this body.

So, Mr. President, I urge all Members of the Senate to vote to override the President's veto of Senate Joint Resolution 162.

RICE ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 1615, House bill 8490, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to rice acreage allotments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8490) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to rice acreage allotments, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments, on page 1, line 11, after the word "follows", to strike out "The planting of rice in 1957 or any subsequent year on a farm for which no rice acreage allotment was established shall not make the farm eligible for an allotment as an old farm or the producers on the farm eligible for allotments as old producers under this section: *Provided, however,* That by reason of such planting the farm or the producers, as the case may be, shall not be considered as ineligible for a new farm allotment or new producer allotment, as the case may be, under the preceding sentence of this subsection." and insert, "In determining the eligibility of any producer or farm for an allotment as an old producer or farm under the first sentence of this subsection or as a new producer or farm under the second sentence of this subsection, such producer or farm shall not be considered to have produced rice on any acreage which under subsection (c) (2) is either not to be taken into account in establishing acreage allotments or is not to be credited to such producer." The amendment made by this section shall be applicable to the planting of rice in 1958 and subsequent years.

On page 2, after line 19, to insert:

> SEC. 2. (a) Section 353 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended—
>
> (1) by inserting in the first proviso contained therein, before the words "the State acreage allotment", the following: "part or all of";
>
> (2) by inserting at the end of such first proviso a colon and the following: "*Provided further,* That if the Secretary determines that part of the State acreage allotment shall be apportioned on the basis of past production of rice by the producer on the farm and part on the basis of the past production of rice on the farm, he shall divide the State into two administrative areas, to be designated 'producer administrative area' and 'farm administrative area', respectively, which areas shall be separated by a natural barrier which would prevent each area from being readily accessible to rice producers in one area for producing rice in the other area, and each such area shall be composed of whole counties"; and
>
> (3) by adding at the end of such subsection (b) (as it would be amended by the first section of this act) the following: "For purposes of this section in States which have been divided into administrative areas pursuant to this subsection the term 'State acreage allotment' shall be deemed to mean that part of the State acreage allotment apportioned to each administrative area and the word 'State' shall be deemed to mean 'administrative area', wherever applicable."
>
> (b) Section 353 (c) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting immediately following the colon, the following: "*Provided,* That if the State is divided into administrative areas pursuant to subsection (b) of this section the allotment for each administrative area shall be determined by apportioning the State acreage allotment among counties as provided in this subsection and totaling the allotments for the counties in such area:".
>
> (c) This section shall become effective for the 1958 and subsequent crops of rice: *Provided,* That if any State is divided into administrative areas for 1958 pursuant to section 353 (b) of the act, as amended, acreage allotments heretofore established for farms in such areas shall be redetermined to the extent required as a result of such division: *Provided further,* That the allotment heretofore established for any farm shall not be reduced as a result of such redetermination. The additional acreage, if any, required to provide such minimum allotments

shall be in addition to the 1958 National and State acreage allotments.

On page 4, at the beginning of line 17, to change the section number from "2" to "3", and on page 5, at the beginning of line 15, to change the section number from "3" to "4".

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I am advised by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], that there is no objection to the consideration and passage of the bill at this time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a short explanation of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SHORT EXPLANATION OF H. R. 8490

This bill makes several technical corrections and amendments in the rice acreage allotment law designed to improve the administration of the program.

At present there are three types of producers who are regarded as old producers for allotment purposes, even though they have no production history in the State in which the allotment is to be made.

First, there is the producer who has produced rice in another State. Congress made it very clear in 1955 that production history in any State would count only toward an allotment in that State and not toward an allotment in any other State. However, at present a producer with history in any State is regarded as an old producer in all States.

Second, there is the producer who has produced rice without an acreage allotment. Again, the law now specifies that the acreage so planted shall not be counted in computing future allotments. However, even though such acreage does not count toward an allotment, it is counted in determining the producer's status as an old producer.

Third, there is the producer who has no production history himself, but who has produced rice jointly with another who, under the law, was entitled to the history resulting from such production. Thus, in a producer allotment State a landlord might share in the crop produced by a tenant on an allotment based on the tenant's previous rice production. The law now provides that in such a situation the tenant receives all of the production history. However, the landlord is now regarded as an old producer, even though he has no history.

In all three of these cases the bill provides that the producer having no production history would not be regarded as an old producer. This represents a technical correction rather than any substantial change, since past acreage is the prime factor upon which old producer allotments are made. The principal effect of the change is that it may result in slightly lessened eligibility for an allotment for these producers under the Secretary's regulations.

At present, rice acreage allotments are made in some States on the basis of the producer's previous rice acreage history, while in other States allotments are made on the basis of the farm's previous production history. The Secretary has authority to use whichever method is best adapted to the particular customs and situation in the State. He does not, however, have authority to use both of these bases within a single State, even though one basis may be clearly the best for the particular situation in one part of the State, while the other may be superior in the other part of the State. The bill would correct this by permitting the Secretary to divide a State into two areas and make allotments on a producer basis in one area and on a farm basis in the other area.

At present, provision is made in the case of cotton, peanuts, tobacco, and wheat for producers whose farms are acquired by agencies having the right of eminent domain whereby such producers are given allotments on other farms owned by them. There is no such provision for corn or rice, so that rice is the only commodity subject to marketing quotas for which such provision has not been made. Section 3 of the bill makes such provision for rice.

The marketing penalty on rice is now 50 percent of parity. The bill would increase it to 65 percent and provide for the termination of previous quotas whenever current quotas are terminated, making it clear, however, that the penalty would not be forgiven on any rice sold prior to such termination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments. Without objection, the committee amendments will be considered en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the bill has been recommended by the Department of Agriculture. All of the language contained in the bill has been submitted by the Department.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand that the Senator from Louisiana is submitting for the RECORD a statement on the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, I have obtained consent to have an explanation of the bill printed in the RECORD.

If the Senator from New York desires to have me read the explanation at this time, I shall do so. However, as I have pointed out, I have obtained unanimous consent to have the explanation printed in the RECORD.

Mr. JAVITS. Very well.

Mr. ELLENDER. The bill received the unanimous vote of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 8490) was read the third time, and passed.

DEFINITION OF PARTS OF CERTAIN TYPES OF FOOTWEAR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 1646, H. R. 9291, and I should like to announce in advance that we do not expect to take action on that bill today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YARBOROUGH in the chair). The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9291) to define parts of certain types of footwear.

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 Finance with an amendment.

RECORD OF THIS CONGRESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, few sessions of Congress of record in recent years have acted with more vigor, more directness, and more success than has this session in meeting major national problems.

Although the end of the session is still several months away—I hope not quite that long, but it may well be—the record of the Congress is already being recognized and applauded as a record of accomplishment. I am sure that when the final score is entered, this will be known as one of the 20th century's 2 or 3 most important and most constructive sessions.

Credit is due many who have participated so diligently, foregoing partisanship and obstruction, to do what was needed for the Nation. In this body, certainly particular credit is due the man who has so wisely and so tirelessly labored to hold the Senate on a purposeful course of constructive action. The distinguished leader of the majority, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], has set a standard of responsible leadership which the Nation will not soon forget.

In the May 15, 1958, issue of the Reporter magazine, Carroll Kilpatrick has written an objective, timely appraisal of both the record of this Congress in dealing with the recession and of the constructive role of the leadership offered by Senator JOHNSON. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD this article entitled "Congress, Politics, and the Recession."

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

CONGRESS, POLITICS, AND THE RECESSION

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

In the absence of powerful and effective Executive leadership, political initiative is nearly always asserted in some form, good or bad, by Congress. But perhaps not since the post-Civil War Reconstruction Congress, during which the Republican radicals sought to destroy President Andrew Johnson, has power been so firmly centered on Capitol Hill as it is right now.

The Democratic machine under the direction of Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON and Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN has functioned with great smoothness. There has been less stripping of gears than in any Congress in two decades or more, and not since 1933 has Congress got through so much work in so short a time.

But there is a vast difference between 1958 and 1933. In that deep depression year, a topheavy Democratic Congress acted with dispatch on a host of bills that had been sent to it from the White House. The 1958 Congress has acted on its own responsibility and with an unusual sense of direction under the firm discipline of the two Texans, JOHNSON and RAYBURN.

When the Easter recess approaches, political correspondents in Washington usually prepare long articles on how little Congress has accomplished in its first 3 months. The opening months are generally spent on committee work, in preparing bills for the floor, and in jockeying for position. But when Congress went home this Easter it had already run up a considerable record of accomplishment. Instead of the desultory floor sessions to be expected in the first months, Congress this year met regularly and worked long hours. Under JOHNSON's prodding, the Senate often convened early and sat late, occasionally remaining in session until midnight.

"Urgency," said Senator JOHNSON on February 23, "is not a dirty word."

At the end of its first 3 months, the 2d session of the 85th Congress had taken 6 major antirecession steps. It had:

Approved the Johnson resolution urging the administration to accelerate civil public works to the greatest practicable extent.

Approved the Johnson resolution urging that military construction projects already planned and approved be accelerated to the greatest practicable extent.

Approved the Sparkman housing bill designed to stimulate the construction industry.

Approved the Gore bill to accelerate the Federal highway programs, which would create some 520,000 additional jobs.

Approved the omnibus rivers and harbors bill, which its sponsors said would create a potential of nearly 400,000 jobs.

Approved a farm bill designed to freeze farm price supports and acreage allotments for 1 year at the 1957 levels.

At this point, the administration suddenly became fearful that Congress was moving too fast. The White House sent word to the Capitol that Republicans must slow down the precipitate spending program initiated by the Democrats. Meade Alcorn, chairman of the Republican National Committee, denounced the frenzied spending plan thrown together in Congress—apparently forgetting that there had been substantial bipartisan support for all six measures.

Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California, and Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, the Republican leaders, issued a statement stressing the administration's sensible, well-planned ways to check the recession.

The Democrats could not have been more pleased by these reactions. The Republicans themselves seemed intent upon sharpening the lines in the picture their opponents were drawing of a timid, slow-moving administration. When Congress returned after the Easter recess, JOHNSON ordered that work should begin immediately on the three remaining features of the Democratic antirecession program:

The Fulbright bill to authorize Federal loans to communities for public-works projects.

The Monroney bill to expand the airport program.

The Anderson bill to authorize a new and far-reaching reclamation program.

TO SIGN OR NOT TO SIGN

When the bills passed before Easter reached his desk, President Eisenhower signed the housing and highway bills, though not without misgivings because of the large amounts of Federal money involved. But he vetoed both the farm bill, which ran directly contrary to his recommendations for more flexibility in fixing price supports, and the omnibus rivers and harbors bill.

Though it may be argued that Mr. Eisenhower was acting in the public interest in both vetoes, it is extremely doubtful that he was acting in the best interests of the Republican Party as far as next fall's elections are concerned. His farm-bill veto will be used by the Democrats to continue their attack on Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson and his farm policies. The rivers and harbors veto will be used by Democratic candidates in districts that would have been affected to attack Republican water and resources policies.

To keep these issues alive, the Senate has resorted to a most unusual strategem. It authorized the appropriate committees to hold hearings on the two veto messages. There is practically no chance that Congress will override either veto. But how better to harass the President and his supporters? There was strong Republican support for the farm bill; the GOP Senate caucus voted 17–14 to request the President to sign it. There was equally strong Republican support for the rivers and harbors bill; Senator KNOWLAND even made a trip to the White House to plead for the President's approval. Be that as it may, Republicans will have to put up some kind of defense in the public hearings.

On another front, the Senate Finance Committee has been piling up evidence designed to show that the Republican tight-money policy helped bring on the recession. JOHNSON himself has attacked the administration for allowing the weight of burdensome money costs to slow down the forward march of the Nation's economy.

What does this Democratic plan of battle add up to? Although as political strategy it seems nothing short of brilliant, some doubt must remain as to whether it can provide an effective attack on this recession. Most of the works projects are unquestionably desirable. But their timing may be bad. They will have little effect this year, when, in the opinion of most economists, the recession will be at its worst. The projects will begin to take effect only in 1959 and 1960, when the natural forces of recovery may make inflation—not deflation—the primary problem. If President Eisenhower had fought for his school-construction program last year, when it had a chance of passing, it would just now be taking hold with beneficial effects on the economy.

Looking back, it is obvious that in asking for a tax cut earlier this year, Vice President NIXON displayed a keen awareness of his party's true political interest—and perhaps of the Nation's true economic interest. A tax reduction early this year might have helped slow down the recession at the time of its most rapid advance to date. It almost certainly would have put Republican candidates in a considerably stronger position to face the impending electoral campaigns.

THE LIMITS OF RESPONSIBILITY

The Employment Act of 1946, which established the Council of Economic Advisers, charged the United States Government with promoting maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. The act placed the primary responsibility on the executive branch, which has far better means than Congress of obtaining information on the state of the economy and of providing guidance for the development of fiscal and monetary policies.

Congress has many committees dividing up the work and is subject to manifold pressures. It is not the most competent agency to provide the unity of leadership needed to cope successfully and energetically with either inflation or recession.

Even if the program Congress has enacted under the leadership of LYNDON JOHNSON succeeds to some extent in softening or shortening the current recession, it is clear that the legislative branch can provide only stopgap temporary leadership in economic matters. In the long run, effective economic leadership must come from the executive branch. Senator JOHNSON is well aware of this. As he has remarked on a number of occasions, "I've read the Constitution."

FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to create an independent Federal Aviation Agency, to provide for the safe and efficient use of the airspace by both civil and military operations, and to provide for the regulation and promotion of civil aviation in such manner as to best foster its development and safety.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table for 24 hours, for the purpose of adding additional sponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table as requested.

The bill (S. 3880) to create an independent Federal Aviation Agency, to provide for the safe and efficient use of the airspace by both civil and military operations, and to provide for the regulation and promotion of civil aviation in such manner as to best foster its development and safety, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, at this time the bill is sponsored, in addition to myself, by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], by Senators BIBLE, SMATHERS, and PAYNE, all three of whom are members of the Subcommittee on Aviation, and is further sponsored by Senators KUCHEL, CHAVEZ, GORE, YARBOROUGH, BARRETT, MANSFIELD, CLARK, SALTONSTALL, MCNAMARA, CARROLL, JACKSON, HUMPHREY, STENNIS, and THURMOND.

For the second time in less than a month the Nation has been shocked by a collision between a military jet aircraft and a commercial airliner. I am reliably informed that at the very time the crash was occurring, only a few miles to the north of Washington two near misses occurred within the vicinity of the Washington Airport. Those near misses occurred within 1 hour of the fatal crash.

Each week there are dozens and dozens of near misses, which could result in great tragedy to the lives of hundreds of people.

They occur because of a nearly chaotic condition in the allocation of and the use of our airspace. They are multiplying as a result of the increasing use of high-speed jet aircraft, which fly faster than the speed of sound and which close with other aircraft at speeds so great that it is almost impossible for the human eye to see the approaching aircraft.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I commend the Senator from Oklahoma for the leadership he has shown in the field of air legislation, and merely wish to ask him if I can be listed as a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to have the Senator from Oregon become a cosponsor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Oregon be placed on the bill as one of the sponsors.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, as the air becomes more and more congested with jet aircraft flying at faster than the speed of sound and with the advent of jet airliners, which will carry up to 160 passengers, and fly at speeds of five to six hundred miles an hour, the need for immediate consideration of a common control of our airspace is apparent.

When we consider a 1,200-mile-an-hour fighter plane closing with a jet transport airplane flying at a speed of 600 miles an hour, that is a closing speed of 1,800 miles an hour. It is impossible for the eye to see or the human faculties to react quickly enough to avoid collisions that could occur at those speeds.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague, who is one of the cosponsors of the bill.

Mr. GORE. Has not the pilot of the military aircraft which was involved in the tragic accident of yesterday been quoted as saying he did not see the other plane and was not aware of the impending collision?

Mr. MONRONEY. The junior Senator from Tennessee is absolutely correct. This is one of the first instances in which the pilot of a jet airplane involved in a collision has survived the crash so as to describe the speed at which the planes came together. Certainly, there may be more such crashes unless we do something about eliminating the present divided control of airspace.

It is just as illogical to have the military exert almost complete freedom in the half of the airspace it uses, while the civilian airspace is rigidly controlled by CAA flight procedure, as it would be to have one department of Government controlling the red lights and another department controlling the green lights of the same traffic system. It does little good to be moving air traffic on green lights if the access of airspace is violated by the crisscrossing of high-speed military jet aircraft which are not so regulated as to be required to stay away from the heavily traveled main airlanes which constitute our great civilian air network system.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. With the large number of near misses reported, would not the law of averages indicate that, without some action, the country must expect in the ensuing months several more such catastrophes as that which just occurred?

Mr. MONRONEY. It is inevitable that we shall be reading of such crashes in greater numbers unless something is done, and done quickly, to give one agency of Government the right to control all the air space, to put all air traffic under a single control system, and to provide that airways that are traveled by hundreds and thousands of persons each month shall not be subject to the every-increasing hazards of unregulated military training flights, such as occured in the Nevada crash and in the air collision of the National Guard jet plane with the Capital airliner only yesterday.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, there has been introduced today by the able junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and some of us who have been glad to join with him, an indispensable measure for not alone the jet age of aircraft, which we are now entering, but also the protection of life and property in America now.

Certainly the able Senator from Oklahoma merits the congratulations of Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle, and, beyond that, of the American people, for now giving us the legislative vehicle by which proper controls can be nailed down by the Congress of the United States in this important field.

I am happy to join with the Senator from Oklahoma in sponsorship of the measure. I wonder if the Senator would permit me to make a short comment on the subject?

Mr. MONRONEY. I should appreciate the Senator's doing so.

May I say to the Members of the Senate that many months ago, after one of the tragic air crashes in California, and later after the tragedy in Nevada, the distinguished junior Senator from California began to cooperate with me and with the staff of the subcommittee dealing with aviation as we began to put together a bill such as the one we present today with the sponsorship of 20 or more Senators. I have greatly appreciated the Senator's keen and intense interest in aviation safety. Certainly the State of California has been a leader in aviation, and is to be complimented for the fine service which its junior Senator has performed, and the interest he has shown in the vital field of air safety. I thank the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his comments.

Mr. President, with the indulgence of the Senator from Oklahoma, I wish to say that, as all of us know, there has been a continuation of mass tragedies in the air these last many months. A number of these tragedies have occurred over populous areas in California. Some have been collisions between military aircraft. Others have been collisions between military aircraft and aircraft under civilian control, either commercial or otherwise.

The problem, as the Senator from Oklahoma outlined it before his subcommittee many months ago, is whether order can be achieved administratively, or whether the legislative process has to be invoked.

The administrative agencies charged with the responsibilities in this field endeavored, by tightening up regulations, to eliminate, so far as law or regulation can eliminate, a recurrence of the type of disaster to which the Senator has alluded. Apparently, however, that action has not gone far enough.

There is no rhyme or reason in the control, as between aircraft which are under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense and all of the rest, so far as that is concerned, being divided. The bill introduced by the Senator from Oklahoma provides for a completely integrated, independent agency which would have the responsibility and which would have control.

If my friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, will permit me, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a short letter from the Navy Department to me, enclosing a summary of findings with respect to the midair collision which took place over the populous Los Angeles area only a few months ago, when a MATS aircraft and a naval aircraft collided, causing both death and destruction to property. In making that request, I will say to the Senator it was rather encouraging to find, for the first time, a responsible official in the Defense Department who indicated that there should be regulations which would prevent "overflying" in populous areas, and that immediate and positive steps should be taken to bring about greater separation of aircraft, particularly in congested traffic areas.

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

There being no objection, the letter and summary report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D. C., May 13, 1958.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: In your letter of February 3, 1958, you requested results of the Navy's investigation of the mid-air collision between an Air Force C-118A and a Navy P2V aircraft over Norwalk, Calif., on February 1, 1958. Accordingly, I am enclosing a summary of the investigation for your official use.

I trust the information is that which you desire. If any further data in this case is required, I shall be most happy to obtain it for you.

Sincerely yours,
GARRISON NORTON,
Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Air).

SUMMARY: MIDAIR COLLISION OF UNITED STATES AIR FORCE C-118A AND UNITED STATES NAVY P2V OVER NORWALK, CALIF., ON FEBRUARY 1, 1958

THE ACCIDENT

1. A C-118A aircraft, serial No. 53-3277, assigned to the 1611th Maintenance Group, McGuire Air Force Base, Trenton, N. J., and P2V-5F, Bureau No. 127723, assigned to the Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, Long Beach, Calif., collided in flight over Norwalk, Calif., at approximately 1913[1] on February 1, 1958. The major portion of the C-118 crashed in flames on the parking lot and adjoining

[1] Times herein are Pacific standard unless otherwise indicated.

yard behind the Los Angeles County sheriff's office at the corner of Firestone and Pioneer Boulevards in Norwalk. The aft portion of the C-118 fuselage and empennage landed on the roof of a service station across Pioneer from the sheriff's office. The P2V crash-landed in a large clay pit approximately two nautical miles north-northeast of the C-118 wreckage. Debris from both aircraft fell in the general area of Norwalk, causing the death of one civilian woman. All 41 persons aboard the C-118 perished. Six of the eight-man crew of the P2V were killed. The radioman of the P2V received minor injuries, and the plane captain was critically injured. Both aircraft were destroyed. Extensive private and public property damage occurred as a result of this accident. The mission of the C-118 flight was crew training and transport of military passengers from Long Beach Municipal Airport, Calif., to McGuire Air Force Base, N. J. The mission of the P2V flight was to provide local area familiarization, instrument flight training, and crew training during an authorized weekend drill period.

HISTORY OF FLIGHT

2. P2V-5F, Bureau No. 127723, took off on runway 22L, NAS Los Alamitos, at approximately 1908, February 1, 1958. The aircraft was on an authorized local VFR flight plan. All crew members were assigned to Naval Reserve Aviation Patrol Squadron 773 in a drill pay status.

3. Witnesses stated that the jet engines were utilized during take off and subsequent left climbing turn. Wing tip and tail lights were observed to be on and flashing by persons at NAS Los Alamitos and in the Norwalk area. Computation of the most probable flight path of the P2V indicates that the aircraft continued the left turn after takeoff for approximately 270 degrees. It then reversed turn gradually to a northerly heading, leveling off between 2,500 and 3,000 feet altitude.[2]

4. C-118A, serial No. 53-3277A, took off on runway 30, Long Beach Municipal Airport, at approximately 1908, February 1, 1958. This aircraft was on an instrument flight plan, and had been cleared to McGuire Air Force Base. The clearance specified that the flight climb in VFR conditions to 17,000 feet and maintain 17,000 feet. All crew members were assigned to the 58th Air Transport Squadron, based at McGuire Air Force Base, Trenton, N. J.

5. Shortly after takeoff, the C-118 pilot requested and received clearance to make a right turn out of the traffic pattern. About 1 mile from the airport, at an estimated altitude of 500 feet, the aircraft was observed to enter a climbing right turn to an easterly heading and proceed in the general direction of the Ontario OMNI Radio Range which is on airway Victor 21. Witnesses at Long Beach Airport, and those in the Norwalk area stated that the aircraft's anti-collision light and normal running lights were flashing.

6. Flight path computations for both aircraft were made, based on witness observations, aircraft performance characteristics, standard operating procedures, and relative motion evidenced in the wreckage. These computations indicate that just prior to collision the C-118 was heading approximately 079° M, climbing at 500 feet per minute, with a true airspeed of 162 knots. The P2V apparently was cruising at 172 knots true airspeed on a heading of about 008° M. At approximately 1913, slightly southwest of the intersection of Firestone and Imperial, at an altitude between 2,500 and 3,000 feet, the aircraft collided.

7. Following the collision the G-118, minus the aft portion of the fuselage, spiralled to the ground in flames. The P2V flew on for another minute or so. Word was passed to the P2V crew to bail out, and the pilot apparently headed the aircraft toward the only dark area he could see. Before anyone could bail out, however, the aircraft glided over Fire Station No. 17, at 9702 South Norwalk Boulevard, on a northwesterly heading and crash landed in the northwest corner of a large clay pit across the road.

8. Examination of debris from the P2V-5F which fell in the Norwalk area revealed that—

(a) The plexiglas from the bow observer station was shattered and some pieces were heavily scratched and smeared with white paint similar to that used on the upper fuselage of the C-118.

(b) Lower left side fuselage skin from the bow to the aft end of the nose wheel was fragmented and heavily smeared with white paint from the C-118.

(c) A piece of the Radar installation was found imbedded in the starboard wing tip of the C-118. This piece is normally located along the port side of the radar well deck.

(d) A portion of the radar well deck and supporting structure was found in the C-118 after galley.

(e) The starboard jet engine nacelle had fragments of the C-118 interior cabin lining caught in punctures of the nacelle skin.

9. Most of the P2V wreckage was located in a large clay pit across the road from the Pacific Clay Products Co., 9500 South Norwalk Boulevard, Los Nietos, Calif. This pit is estimated to be 250 yards square, oriented along the cardinal directions, and is about 60 to 70 feet in average depth. The bottom is irregular, contains several mounds of soil; roads, ditches, and piles of solid fill. Examination of the P2V main wreckage and ground impact area revealed that—

(a) The aircraft heading at the time of ground impact was approximately 310°M. It struck the ground in a nose high, left wing down (10-20°) attitude, wheels and flaps up, apparently in controlled flight.

(b) The port propeller remained attached to the engine. One blade was broken out of the hub, but was found in the immediate vicinity. Three blades of the propeller were missing portions of their tips. The fourth blade was intact.

(c) The starboard engine broke out of the nacelle, and the propeller was torn from the engine. Outer portions of all four propeller blades were missing.

(d) The location of impact damage to the blade shank gears of both propellers indicated that they were in the low pitch range at the time of ground impact.

(e) All P2V flight control surfaces were located in the clay pit. The damage to these surfaces was attributable to ground impact.

(f) Three large pieces of C-118 vertical stabilizer, comprising approximately its upper half, and various small fragments of C-118 rudder fabric were found in the clay pit.

10. Examination of the C-118 wreckage and a study of its distribution revealed that:

(a) Approximately 8 feet of the starboard wing outer panel had been shattered by contact with the radome-bomb-bay area of the P2V.

(b) Two definite propeller cuts were found in the leading edge of the right wing just outboard of the No. 4 engine nacelle.

(c) Less definite evidence of propeller cuts was noted in the right wing tip area, upper portion of the No. 4 engine nacelle. Other propeller cuts were found in the lavatory area of the aft fuselage.

(d) The aft section of the fuselage, with horizontal stabilizers and elevators attached, separated from the forward portion of the aircraft along an irregular line in the aft lavatory area. The tail section landed on a filling-station roof approximately 100 yards west of the main C-118 ground impact area.

(e) The main portion of the C-118 which crashed on the garage and parking lot behind the sheriff's office in Norwalk was almost completely consumed by fire. The engines and most of the starboard wing were about the only recognizable parts of any significance that remained.

(f) Field examination of the four engines of the C-118 revealed no evidence of any malfunction prior to the collision. The lack of malfunction is also confirmed by witness statements.

(g) All four propeller governors were examined and bench checked. This inspection revealed that the governors had been set for 2,400-2,450 r. p. m., which is the normal climb r. p. m. for the C-118.

11. The following pictures depict a properly scaled plan view of the collision and further correlate all the points of contact between the two aircraft as evidenced by wreckage examination.

12. In attempting to answer the basic question of why these two aircraft collided, consideration was given to the time and action required for either pilot to avoid collision, assuming no errors in decision or interpretation. The first requirement is, of course, detection. The pilot must either see or be told about the other aircraft. Next, he must have sufficient time to recognize and evaluate the collision situation. The time required for this step may vary considerably. For example, it may be difficult to determine whether the other craft is opening or closing in range, or which way a turning aircraft is moving, particularly at night. The pilot must next make a decision regarding what evasive action is appropriate, and then take that action. Finally, sufficient time must remain for the aircraft to respond to the pilot's actions. In the case of aircraft the size of the C-118 and P2V, the altitude may be changed fairly rapidly, but several seconds are required before the flight direction is changed enough to miss another airplane.

13. Of the above factors, detection probably involves the longest period of time because of human visual limitations. To compensate for these limitations the pilot must resort to area scanning, which is an art in itself, and which requires different techniques depending on whether day or night vision is employed. How many times has an individual looked at an area and seen nothing, only to look back again and see something obvious? Contrast is another factor which influences detection. Recognizing the flashing lights of an aircraft against a large, multicolored background of both steady and flashing lights, similar to that afforded by the metropolitan Los Angeles area, is difficult. It is also difficult to see a dim light, such as an aircraft navigation light, when looking toward a much brighter light source, such as the moon.

14. The most probable flight paths of these two aircraft were plotted based on all known facts or logical assumptions as described in paragraph 6. This plot indicates that the aircraft were on collision courses for approximately 60 to 90 seconds prior to collision. Furthermore, it is doubtful that either pilot could have seen the other aircraft prior to their establishing collision courses because of altitude distance separation, background lighting, and/or aircraft blind spots. During the brief period that the pilots possibly could have seen the other aircraft, the C-118 was bearing 52 degrees to port from the P2V and was below the horizon with the brilliantly lighted downtown Los Angeles area in the background. The P2V was bearing 57 degrees to starboard from the C-118, and was between a bright moon and the horizon.

15. Photographs of the pilot's field of vision from the cockpit of a P2V-5F were made using the special equipment and facilities at the Civil Aeronautics Administration

[2] Altitudes herein are mean sea level, distances are nautical miles.

Technical Development Center, Indianapolis, Ind.

A person in the pilot's seat should have been able to see the C-118, however it would have been outside the focal field of vision if the primary scan were centered on the instrument panel. Similar photographs of a DC-7 cockpit, which is essentially the same as that of a C-118, indicate that the C-118 copilot should have been able to see the P2V. Again the conflicting aircraft was outside the focal field of vision provided the scan pattern was centered on the instrument panel.

16. Lookout doctrine and training are prescribed and conducted on the squadron level for crew members of VP-773. Two of the P2V crew, 1 qualified crewman and 1 trainee, were to serve as lookouts on this particular flight. None of the P2V lookout stations, waist or bow, are occupied during landing or takeoff because they are not suitable ditching stations. However, they are usually manned as soon as practical after takeoff. Since the bow was severely damaged during the midair collision and the crewman whose assigned duties included those of bow lookout fell from the P2V at that time, it can be assumed that the P2V lookouts were stationed or were being stationed at the time of the collision.

17. Pertinent regulations concerning right of way and other responsibilities of pilots, CAR, part 60, OPNAV INST 3710.7A and AFR 60-16 clearly state that in a crossing situation the pilot of an aircraft that has the other on its right must take positive action in time to avoid collision. The other aircraft normally would be expected to maintain heading and speed; however, this does not relieve the pilot from the responsibility of taking such action as will best avert collision. These regulations are considered to be adequate. The question of right-of-way is an academic one in this case however, since neither pilot apparently saw the other aircraft.

18. The concept that pilots must provide their own air traffic separation while operating in visual flight conditions exists as a matter of necessity. In view of the present volume of air traffic and the increasing numbers of high performance aircraft in use, it is considered that immediate, positive steps are necessary to assist pilots in maintaining VFR separation, particularly in areas of congested air traffic. It is realized that this problem is not a new one and that appropriate agencies have been and are continuing to study the air traffic control problems. Until technological advances are made to provide the pilot with positive control or proximity warning devices, it may be well to survey the air space of the United States and establish appropriate high density air traffic zones in which additional requirements or rules apply to VFR traffic. Los Angeles and environs are considered to be in a high density air traffic area.

19. Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, and Long Beach Municipal Airport are located approximately five and seven-tenths miles apart. Since this accident both control towers keep each other advised as to the duty runway, direction of traffic, and notify one another of any abnormal traffic. It appears that a similar procedure should be established and maintained between towers of all airfields which are proximate to the extent that their control zones conflict.

20. As a result of this accident the local flying area, course rules, and VFR weather minimums of NAS Los Alamitos have been changed. The entire densely populated area of Los Angeles and environs has been eliminated from the local flying area. Approach and departure corridors over sparsely populated areas have been established to seaward. At least 5 miles visibility and a ceiling of 7,000 feet are now required for jet aircraft and 2,000 feet and 3 miles are required for propeller-driven aircraft to obtain a VFR clearance out of Los Alamitos.

21. Weather in the Los Angeles area at the time of this accident was high, thin, scattered cirroform clouds at 20,000 feet, visibility unrestricted, temperature 63, dew point 38, wind north-northeast 4. Three-fourths of the moon was shining. Weather is not considered to be a factor in this accident; however, the bright moon may have been a contributing factor.

22. According to survivors, the pilot of the P2V ordered the crew to bail out immediately after the midair collision. Lack of lights, and obstructions created by the collision damage apparently precluded this. Positions of the crew in the wreckage indicated that all of them except the pilot and bow lookout were in the process of abandoning ship when the aircraft struck the ground.

FINDINGS

23. On the basis of all available evidence it is concluded that:

(a) The crews of the P2V and C-118 were currently qualified in their respective aircraft and for the type of operation involved.

(b) The flights were duly authorized and proper clearance had been issued.

(c) Both pilots were complying with their respective flight clearances.

(d) There was no evidence found to indicate that malfunction or failure of the aircraft or their components was a factor in the accident.

(e) The present system for control of air traffic operating under VFR flight rules in congested air space is not adequate.

(f) Lighting conditions, cockpit visibility, and flight paths were such that the pilots of both aircraft had limited opportunity to see each other.

(g) Congestion, intensity, and type of local ground lighting in the metropolitan Los Angeles area forms a background against which it is difficult to distinguish airborne lights from ground lights.

(h) The civilian who was fatally injured was struck by falling wreckage.

PROBABLE CAUSE

24. Based, on all available evidence it is determined that the probable cause of this accident was the failure of the pilots of both aircraft to observe each other in sufficient time to avoid mid-air collision. This is not considered a failure in the sense of negligence or poor technique, but a failure created by human limitations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

25. It is recommended that—

(a) All Commanding Officers of Naval Air Stations review their local flying areas to eliminate over-flying densely populated areas as much as possible.

(b) All Commanding Officers of Naval Air Stations establish appropriate procedures for the coordination of traffic within their control zones with that of nearby, and conflicting airports.

(c) The Chief of Naval Operations request that the Civil Aeronautics Administration designate Los Angeles and environs as a high density air traffic zone and establish restrictions therefor similar to those for the Washington D. C., high density air traffic zone.

(d) The Chief of Naval Operations requests the Civil Aeronautics Administration to survey air traffic at other metropolitan areas of the United States to determine which should be designated as high density air traffic zones, and conduct a thorough analysis and reevaluation of air traffic controls in order to provide coordinated and modernized radar service and traffic information to all aircraft operating in these areas under either VFR or IFR clearances. This service should be designed to aid pilots in avoiding collisions but should not relieve the pilot of any responsibilities or requirements governing VFR flights as established by pertinent military or civil air regulations.

(e) That all naval aircraft be equipped with at least one anticollision rotating beacon, and further that all large transport or patrol aircraft be equipped with two anticollision lights positioned in such a manner that at least one will be visible from any angle.

(f) The Navy conduct cockpit visibility surveys for all multipiloted naval aircraft, and the results be published in the Pilot's Handbook as a mandatory requirement for aircrew indoctrination.

Mr. KUCHEL. This represents progress, but no real progress will be made toward protecting the American people—those who live on the ground over which the aircraft fly or those who utilize air transportation today—until the legislation proposed by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma becomes the law of this land.

I can only repeat, as I conclude, that I consider it a privilege to associate myself with my friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, in the sponsoring of legislation which is in the public interest and which needs to be speedily enacted into law.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from California for his contribution and for his continuing interest. I agree completely with the Senator.

So long as we have the present diversification, with the Civil Aeronautics Administration controlling only half of the traffic which flies in the air, and with the other half practically free from effective regulation; and so long as we have responsibility for technological advances in electronics, which might prevent crashes such as that between two Navy planes over the city of Los Angeles, spread out through the agencies of the Department of Defense and all the coordinating boards and other committees we shall be unable to solve the problem. The science is available. The knowledge required is available. No one, however, can throw it into gear, because authority is spread all over Washington and all over the Pentagon.

The responsibility for the control of airspace is impliedly given to the Civil Aeronautics Board, yet that Board, being busy with economic regulations, only a few months ago got around to delegating authority for the control of the airspace to the CAA.

We could go on to cite page, chapter, and verse with respect to the fact that what is everybody's business becomes nobody's business.

The airspace has become more dangerous and more crowded. The airspeeds have gone beyond the speed of sound. They are now going past the speed of sight, so far as navigation is concerned. Yet no effective effort is made to coordinate or to bring under unified control the direction of such a vital part of our transportation system.

Today more people travel by air than travel on the railroads. No railroad would think of trying to operate even a single line across the country without an electric block system to prevent accidents. If the eastbound trains were controlled on the block system and the westbound trains were not there would be lots of wrecks.

The same thing is true with regard to the regulation of civilian traffic by the CAA, with the other half of the traffic practically unregulated. We have to bring about, as a necessary first step, a concentration of authority and responsibility, if we are going to move forward with the speed necessary. It is later than we think. The crisis is here. For years we have dilly-dallied, with a Bureau of the Budget and a hostile Commerce Department which cut the money for the electronic devices down to almost nothing, when they were needed 4 or 5 years ago. Only in the past year or so have we begun to spend money to modernize and to put in the equipment needed to give the safety which can be built into our airways. But even electronics devices are of no value if half of the air traffic does not have to abide by the rules.

I will say to the Senator that this is not a quickly "jumped up" bill, brought about as a result of the crash in Maryland yesterday. For 3 years we who serve on the subcommittee dealing with aviation have been talking about the matter, and attempting to develop the necessary support. We have had hearings every year as to the advisability of a single civilian aviation agency to control air space. The matter has been studied by many experts at Presidential commission level. Each group has come up with almost the same answer.

I think the time for action is now. We must complete action at the present session of the Congress, or we shall issue an invitation to further disaster before the next session of Congress assembles.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I think it is important for the American people to understand that the bill introduced today by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma and other Senators is in no sense a sudden attempt to meet a longstanding problem. I have known of the Senator's interest in this field both from the standpoint of his committee service, and from the standpoint of his position as a United States Senator. I know the care and the many long months that have gone into the preparaiton of this particular piece of legislation. So I think it should be made crystal clear to all who are interested that the bill is introduced today merely because it is now in form to be considered and acted upon favorably by the Congress.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished colleague.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I have read the salient features of the bill which has been introduced by the junior Senator from Oklahoma. I find that it reflects the high quality of public service which characterizes the work of the Senator from Oklahoma. I commend him on the bill. It is certainly timely and important, and I want him to know that I would deem it a privilege to be included as a cosponsor.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should be happy to have the distinguished junior Senator from Idaho join as a cosponsor.

I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Idaho be listed as one of the original cosponsors of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, for the second time in less than a month, the Nation has been shocked by a collision between a military jet aircraft and a commercial airliner. A few weeks ago, following the tragic accident near Las Vegas, I called the attention of the Senate to this most serious problem facing American aviation today. At that time, May 1, I said:

> We have reached the point in this air age when dual control in our airspace is inviting disaster, both for the military aircraft and civilian aircraft of our Nation.

Many drafts have been prepared in years past, as we studied the question in the Aviation Subcommittee, but the proposal lacked support. After the disaster at Las Vegas, we again sought to redraft up-to-date legislation. The staff of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and particularly Mr. Robert Murphy, has consulted many individuals in positions of leadership in aviation organizations, representing almost every segment of aviation, in an effort to put together this bill, which we think will give us the framework on which we can begin to solve today's problems regarding air navigation.

This group has been working night and day since the Nevada crash. They worked almost all night last night to complete typing of the bill, and to prepare a print showing the changes in existing law which were proposed. They endeavored to draft a piece of legislation which would create a workable single Federal Aviation Agency to enable the Government to deal with these problems, and particularly to provide the essential coordination of military and civilian utilization of the same air space. While we have been moving with full dispatch, because it has become crystal clear that the present dangerous situation requires immediate corrective legislation.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the lead editorial in the Washington Post of today, entitled "Anarchy in the Air," and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the Washington Post of May 21, 1958]

ANARCHY IN THE AIR

There are bound to be hard and searching questions raised in the wake of yesterday's terrible mid-air collision in the skies over nearby Brunswick, Md. Only a month ago, 49 lives were lost when an Air Force jet rammed into a United Air Lines transport near Las Vegas—and now 12 more persons have been killed in circumstances that seem grimly comparable. The Capital Airlines Viscount was only minutes away from Friendship Airport on its allotted course when a Maryland National Guard jet trainer operating on visual control rules apparently struck the left wing of the passenger plane. This makes the fourth mid-air collision since January 31, 1957, between military and commercial aircraft. Why?

One reason is the woeful inadequacy of air traffic controls. It would be considered intolerable if near-anarchy prevailed on the automobile highways, yet something approximating this condition prevails in the highways of the air. An estimated 11,000 aircraft of all types are flying in the country's airways at any given moment—yet the Civil Aeronautics Administration has hardly any control over the military plane routes. The result is that last year there were some 971 near-misses in the air (including 53 in the Washington area)—many involving free-wheeling military aircraft. And next fall, the risks will be increased as jet transports being flying on commercial routes.

The need is desperate to end the anarchy in the airways and to safeguard the needs of the country's civil air transport system against military encroachment. The Maryland tragedy ought to increase demand for prompt effectuation of the CAA's proposed 5-year program for modernizing air traffic controls—and increase interest in Senator MONRONEY's plan for an overall Federal Aviation Authority which could coordinate civil and military traffic.

Mr. MONRONEY. Also, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "He Didn't See It," published in the Washington Daily News of today.

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

HE DIDN'T SEE IT

Another airliner bashed out of the skies by a military jet—12 dead. Only last month a similar mishap in Nevada killed 49.

And it doesn't soften these tragedies to know, as the Civil Aeronautics Board reported recently: "Every day 200,000 or more persons fly safely through the airspace over the United States."

The safety record, percentagewise, of air travel is phenomenal.

But the jet age is just beginning. Safety controls admittedly are not keeping up. For last year, the CAB has reports of 971 "near misses"—ample warning of what may come.

Visibility is not enough. The Maryland crash yesterday happened in near-perfect weather—ceiling 7,500 feet, visibility 7 miles. The jet pilot, who miraculously escaped, said he didn't see the Capital Airlines Viscount. The Viscount pilot had even less chance.

Add this fact: The pilot of a 300-mile-an-hour craft who saw a similar plane 2 miles away, approaching head on, would have 12 seconds to get out of the way. Jets go much faster.

That indicates the problem. But there is more to it. Military planes, which account for a large share of the traffic, are not under the same controls as commercial and private craft. There is no coordination.

Gen. Pete Quesada, President Eisenhower's special assistant on this problem, estimates it will take 3 years to install automation for complete control of aircraft. That's not soon enough.

And what about the blind cockpits of which so many pilots complain? Surely it shouldn't take 3 years to correct that situation.

The jet pilot who survived yesterday's crash didn't see the passenger liner—in clear weather, visibility 7 miles.

Mr. MONRONEY. Also, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled, "Mid-Air Madness," published today in the Washington Evening Star.

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

MID-AIR MADNESS

Following so closely upon the disclosure that 971 near misses were reported by aircraft last year—53 of them over Washington, Maryland, and Virginia—the latest air-collision tragedy near Jefferson, Md., accentuates the need for better traffic control for the Nation's airways. The inexcusable crash which cost 12 lives yesterday occurred, ironically, as Federal authorities were proposing to Congress a billion-dollar program for jet-age modernization of the airways. The Maryland accident and near-miss tabulation provide convincing evidence of the urgent need for immediate action on this program.

There was a time when traffic control was considered necessary chiefly in the vicinity of large airports. But as commercial and military air flights have increased and the speed and passenger-carrying characteristics of aircraft have multiplied, dangerous congestion has developed not only near the big cities but on the principal air routes across the continent. Control of commercial flights has been strengthened substantially by the Civil Aeronautics Administration in recent years, but military aviation largely has been free to go where it pleases, when it pleases. And the number of near misses and of actual collisions between civil and military planes has risen ominously. Yesterday's collision between a turbo-prop Viscount airliner and a National Guard jet trainer came only a few weeks after the Las Vegas airliner-military jet catastrophe that took 49 lives. In both cases the jets apparently flew into the civilian planes, although the latter were on their prescribed courses.

In reporting to Congress the 1957 near-miss total, the Civil Aeronautics Board stressed that many other close calls may have occurred. Pilots, the CAB said, have an inherent antipathy to filling out reports. But the reported total was shocking enough in its implications of potential danger to warrant prompt and effective action to bring the airways under better control—for military as well as civilian aircraft. Many lives are at stake.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the basic problem which must be dealt with is that the joint use of air space by civilian and military aircraft is a problem which requires a centralized control, if the problem is to be properly solved.

At this point there appears to be general agreement among all those who have studied the problem that a necessary first step is centralization of airspace and air-traffic control into a single independent Federal aviation agency. No one suggests that this step will be the final answer. However, without it, the achievement of a solution will be more difficult, more complicated, and further delayed. I believe it will be impossible to find the answer unless we centralize authority and responsibility for air-traffic control.

The answers must be found to both procedural problems and equipment problems involved in air traffic control in order to assure safe and efficient utilization of our air space by all those who use it.

Congress has recognized this problem through a series of positive actions on its part. It has fully supported the greatly increased budget requests of the Civil Aeronautics Administration for funds to implement its 5-year plan for improving the airways through the establishment of additional air navigation facilities. In addition, it has approved the establishing of an Airways Modernization Board to accelerate and coordinate research and development of improved air traffic control equipment and methods.

On December 31, 1955, William B. Harding submitted his report to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, recommending that a study of aviation facilities requirements be made in order to make more efficient use of national airspace, integrate civil and military expenditures for aviation facilities and to determine what kind of government organization is required to control use of the airspace.

Subsequently, the President appointed Edward P. Curtis, an official of the Eastman Kodak Co. and a distinguished aviation authority in his own right, who had served ably during World War II period, as Special Assistant for Aviation Facilities Planning and directed him to make such a study which was completed on May 10, 1957, and submitted to the President.

The report contained recommendations for meeting the Nation's requirements for aviation facilities and formulated an organizational and administrative budgetary program to implement this plan.

The Curtis report came to the following conclusions:

First. Airways operations and control must be modernized through a comprehensive and continuous research and development program.

Second. The program must be implemented with a Government organization geared to meet the modern-day requirements of both civil and military aviation.

Third. Such a Government organization should include the following:

(a) The creation of an Airways Modernization Board to immediately implement the research and development aspects of the problem. This was accomplished by Public Law 85-133, which became effective on August 14, 1957.

(b) The appointment of a special assistant to the President on aviation matters until a permanent organization can be created. This was accomplished on June 14, 1957, by the appointment of Elwood P. Quesada, a distinguished general of the Air Force, who has been studying the problem and helping to develop the facilities necessary for the modernization of our airways.

(c) The establishment of an independent Federal aviation agency into which are consolidated all of the essential management functions necessary to support the common needs of the military and civil aviation of the United States.

The type of aviation agency which is needed has been measured against the yardstick of the Curtis report, the Harding report, the experience of General Quesada, and the studies by the Aviation Subcommittee extending back over a period of more than 3 years.

I feel that the bill which I have just introduced, along with the distinguished cosponsors who have joined me, meets every test of the Curtis report, and every test of the studies which have been made in this direction. I believe we must get busy and hold hearings on the bill, in order to find out what mistakes, if any, or what loose points, if any, there are in the bill, or what changes are necessary in the original draft.

Certainly it will be the desire of the Aviation Subcommittee, which will begin questioning military and civilian aviation authorities tomorrow at a hearing before the subcommittee, to complete committee action as soon as possible, in order to enable Congress to complete legislative action this year. Next year will be too late.

At the time Congress was considering the Airways Modernization Board bill, there was considerable sentiment for immediate establishment of an independent Federal aviation agency in accordance with the recommendations contained in the Curtis report. Because of the complexity of the required administration and planning, however, the President was requested to submit his recommendation by January 15, 1959. The tragedy of recent events now makes it imperative that prompt action be taken at this session of Congress to establish a single aviation agency. This was a recommendation—the most important one—of the Curtis report.

I am today introducing a bill which will generally accomplish the basic recommendations for a single Federal aviation agency and the centralization of authority and control of airspace and air navigation traffic control into that agency, as recommended in the Curtis report.

This is not a hastily drafted bill.

Much time and effort has gone into its preparation. The opinions of several Government agencies and various segments of aviation have been considered. The bill recognizes the essential requirements of national defense, but at the same time, it gives consideration to the operation, growth, and development of all the various elements of civil aviation.

Basically, the bill will provide the governmental machinery required along with improved equipment, additional personnel, and better operating procedures, which are necessary to meet the greater volumes of traffic and higher speeds of aircraft of today and the immediate future.

The following is a summary of the principal provisions of the bill which I have introduced today:

First, it creates a Federal aviation agency as an independent agency of Government, directly responsible to the President and Congress. It will be headed by a single civilian administrator, who shall have had prior aviation experience.

Second, it gives the Administrator authority to regulate the use of airspace over the United States, with respect to both civilian and military aircraft, and to set up and operate a uniform system of air-traffic control.

Third, it provides for the appointment by the Secretary of Defense of a special military adviser to the Administrator, to

advise the Administrator on special problems of military aviation.

Fourth, it transfers to the new agency the responsibilities now assigned to the Civil Authority Administration and the Airways Modernization Board.

Fifth, it transfers to the new agency the responsibility of the Civil Aeronautics Board for making and enforcing air-safety rules, but provides for an appeal to the Board from orders of the Administrator in certain cases.

Sixth, it leaves with the Civil Aeronautics Board its present responsibility for economic regulation of civil aviation and its accident-investigation duties.

Seventh, it authorizes the Civil Aeronautics Board to request the President to appoint public members to special boards of inquiry to investigate major air accidents.

Mr. President, I should like to explain the latter two provisions, because some question has been raised as to why we did not recreate the Air Safety Board. We felt that the Civil Aeronautics Board, acting as a quasi-judicial agency, should have the right to continue its authority in accident investigations.

In the first place, they are more familiar with the problems of aviation than was the old Air Safety Board; and on routine aviation accidents, which occur due to faulty equipment, and things of that kind, they request the Civil Aeronautics Administration, with their specialists in engines and airframes—detectives of air accidents, one might say—to conduct the accident investigations in their behalf.

It would not be proper to give to the proposed Federal Aviation Agency the responsibility for accident investigations, because some of these accidents may be the result of failure of navigational devices, or air traffic control, or control-tower information, or barometric readings given over the radio, which may be the fault of this agency itself. It would be unwise to give the agency the right to investigate itself.

For that reason, we felt it would be better to leave the authority in the CAB, which does not have direct operating responsibility for administration of the airways.

We felt that the old Air Safety Board, which many urged should be reestablished, was too far removed from an understanding and knowledge of technical problems existing in today's aviation field. The airline pilots are most concerned with major disasters.

The bill gives the Civil Aeronautics Board the right to request the President to appoint public members to special boards of inquiry, to investigate such major air accidents. Thus the President could call in the finest aviation experts and outstanding men in aviation, like Jimmy Doolittle, Don Douglas, and many others of the same caliber, whose experience and reputation and ability and integrity in aviation are well known. We feel that this will strengthen the overall system of accident investigation.

The bill we have introduced makes no substantive changes of law which are not necessitated by the creation of this new agency and the consequent transfer of functions. I feel that this legislation has been carefully drawn. Further study will be given to it by the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and by the full committee. I hope we will be able to put together a Government framework on which we can build a greater degree of air safety, and prevent, through proper air-traffic control and progress in new electronic devices, many of the accidents which occur today; and that we can go forward toward safer and more effective use of the air space by civilian aviation and by the military. The military can use the necessary amount of air space without endangering the civilian air traffic or risking the lives of our military men, who also must fly many thousands of flights each month to maintain their proficiency.

I hope that the Senate will be able to effect the passage of the bill when it is reported, and that we will be able to complete action on it during this session.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. As a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, it has been my privilege to serve for more than a year under the outstanding leadership of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma in dealing with aviation law and everything pertaining to the advancement of aviation in this country. I wish to commend him for his thorough explanation of the forward-looking bill he has introduced. It is a measure which I believe the American people have needed for a long time. The Senator's explanation of the bill is clear and concise and shows outstanding research, as well as an excellent job of drafting a workable law for the air safety of this Nation.

A unified system of air control is, I think, absolutely necessary. Not only is there no uniformity of control between civil and military aviation, there is a lack of uniformity among the branches of military aviation.

The proposed legislation is needed, not merely because of the recent disasters and tragedies, but even more because of the thousands of near misses which are taking place in this country every year. I think the statistics will show that for every actual crash, there are approximately 1,000 near misses. So it is inconceivable, considering that we have the most advanced personnel in the world, technologically speaking, that we should drift along in this manner without having unified air control. I think such control is long overdue.

I believe Congress will enact the proposed legislation, but I believe its enactment will result more quickly through the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] than any other leadership. I commend him for his determination to start the hearings tomorrow, and I join with him in the hope that before this session of Congress adjourns we will have enacted legislation which is urgently needed to protect not only those who travel on the planes, but also those on the ground, by affording them more protection from the wreckage which falls as a result of crashes.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas, and welcome him as a cosponsor of the bill. I thank him also for his assistance in the passage of other bills, such as the Federal airport bill, and for the help he has given generally to the Subcommittee on Aviation, as a member of the full committee.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. I, too, congratulate the Senator from Oklahoma upon his leadership in aviation legislation and upon the outstanding service he has rendered to the people of the Nation in this field. I do not know of any Member of Congress who has taken greater interest in aviation and has brought more important information to the Senate on this subject than has the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma. I am proud to join with him as a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for his help in the passage of such bills and for his interest in this one. I am certain he will continue to be helpful as the hearings proceed.

FLOOD CONTROL IS VITAL

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, it was very gratifying last week when the Senate Public Works Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control began hearings on the President's veto message of the omnibus bill providing desperately needed authorization for a large number of vital projects in California and virtually all other States of our Nation.

On several recent occasions, I have expressed my own feeling that it is tragic that 3 years have passed without a new authorization law being enacted. It is imperative for the growth of our Nation that such a measure be put on the books during the present session.

Projects under construction in many sections are grinding to a halt as prior authorizations become exhausted. This is notably and regrettably true in the case of certain California projects. When a program in operation has to stop for lack of authorization and therefore appropriations, double damage is done. Men are laid off, bid openings are canceled, related work planned by other agencies of Government is interrupted or postponed. Meanwhile the flood threat continues, and in many cases, such as Los Angeles, where home building goes on week in and week out, additional areas and more people become potential victims of uncontrolled runoff of excessive rainfall.

I have had a graphic illustration of the effect of the inability of Congress and the President to agree on provisions of a new authorization bill.

The Los Angeles flood control district in a recent statement gave the following warning of the immediate effect on the Los Angeles Basin project if addi-

tional authorization is not available by July 1 of this year:

Work on 5 contracts currently under construction, 1 contract now being bid, and 2 more not yet bid, will be halted indefinitely. Layoff of 2,500 or more construction workers will be a direct result and indirectly at least an equal number will be deprived of work during this period of recession. Contract work now under way has removed existing local flood protection on Big Dalton, San Dimas, and Santa Anita washes and Rio Hondo; bridges on intersecting highways have been removed; and several thousand adjacent homes will be threatened by flood disaster next winter to a greater degree than ever due to this emergency.

I very much regret to note that this ominous warning has been borne out. Within the past few days, notices to suspend operations have gone to contractors and word of the impending layoff was passed along to workers.

Urgent appeals for prompt Congressional action have come to me from the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors and the governing bodies and elected officials of many communities in the area which this project would protect. Even more significantly—especially at this time, when it is urgent that every agency do its utmost to provide employment and bolster our national economy—a large number of telegrams warning of the consequences of failure to pass a new authorization have come from labor unions and workmen who know what it means when a going project grinds to a halt.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks the text of a letter which I wrote to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], chairman of the Committee on Public Works, about the dire effects of the failure to authorize the continuance of the Los Angeles project; the text of my letter to the clerk of the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors; sundry resolutions I have received from California cities which are vitally interested in the Federal flood control program; and sundry telegrams from labor organizations in that area, all expressing unanimity of thought that Congress must act in the field of flood control this year.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I said on the floor of the Senate several weeks ago that one of the facts of political life is that Congress is under the control of the Democratic Party, and the executive branch of the Government is under the control of the Republican Party. We have before us something which is completely in the public interest, namely, flood-control work by the Government of the United States. There is not a dime's worth of partisanship in any of it.

I suggest that the time has arrived for Congress and the executive branch to bring their positions into sufficient mesh so that flood-control legislation can be authorized and that the executive branch of the Government can approve it.

To Senators on the other side of the aisle I say that the bill I voted for twice, I will vote for again, if the Democratic leadership will schedule it. But I have always been glad to coauthor proposed legislation in the field of flood control which is tailored along the lines of the veto message of the President, so that we will have an alternative in the event that the vetoed bill does not become law.

EXHIBIT 1

MAY 9, 1958.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Public Works Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DENNIS: On numerous occasions we have agreed that Federal assistance of flood control projects is vital to the safety of the American people and to the development and growth of our Nation. We share the conviction that such undertakings to protect our country against the ravages of nature contribute to the permanent wealth of the United States.

As you know, I participated enthusiastically in writing the bill S. 497 to authorize a large number of urgent flood control projects, as well as river and harbor improvements and beach erosion work, and I deeply regretted the President's rejection of this legislation. To my mind, it was meritorious, overdue, and the best obtainable. I also am a cosponsor of S. 3686 embodying most of the provisions of S. 497, which was introduced in an effort to meet the President's objections.

Both of these bills contain desperately needed authority for continuance and construction of many programs and projects in California. Unless the Congress acts promptly to pass S. 497 notwithstanding the objections of the President or S. 3846 work shortly must stop on some going programs of the utmost importance and desirability.

One of the more essential California programs is that for the Los Angeles County drainage area. This was initiated in 1936 and has been carried forward under additional authorization voted by the Congress on five subsequent occasions. The most recent authorization, granted in 1950, is being exhausted during the current fiscal year. In fact, the Army engineers will be legally unable to expend $1,885,000 of the appropriation for 1958.

I know you are aware of the amazing, continued growth of the Los Angeles metropolitan area and appreciate the compelling reasons for prosecuting the comprehensive, long-range plan for flood protection for the several million residents of thickly settled communities in this basin. You also realize, I know, the unusual kind of flood hazard which exists in that basin, due to the peculiarities of climate and terrain.

I feel sure that you agree with me that the flood-control plan for the Los Angeles area is one of the soundest and best engineered of all programs in which the Federal Government participates and also that the local governmental agencies and taxpayers of the county have borne in fullest measure their responsibilities of cooperation.

Failure of the Congress to authorize continuance of this particular program will be deplorable. Furthermore, it will have the effect of denying scheduled employment to large numbers of workers in an area where every effort is warranted to put people to work. Beyond that, it will bring inevitable delay in the building of flood prevention and control works planned by the Los Angeles County flood control district, for which a $60 million bond issue was voted recently, and it will retard other local community programs designed to contribute to a solution of the flood problem. Many of these county and local programs are intended to dovetail, in the sense of time, with improvements which are the responsibility of the Army Engineers.

Therefore, action by Congress to provide the needed additional authorization will have a dual effect of creating employment opportunities. It would be in complete accord with the action of the Congress earlier this year in urging the Federal Government to expedite public works as a means of sustaining our Nation's economy.

The importance of Congressional action in this field has been the subject of a formal resolution by the board of supervisors of Los Angeles County. The board implores the Congress to enact emergency legislation to prevent interruption of the Los Angeles flood-control program. I am enclosing a copy of that resolution for your information and for consideration of our Public Works Committee.

To my mind, it would be far better for the United States as a whole if the Congress should pass again S. 497 or enact S. 3686 than to attempt to provide authorization for a number of most desirable projects through a process of piecemeal legislation. In referring to you the supervisors' resolution, I wish to urge an early meeting of our committee to discuss the whole matter of procedure so that we may make certain some legislation providing required authorization for continued flood control work can be enacted during the present session.

With warmest regards, I am

Sincerely,

THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
United States Senator.

MAY 9, 1958.

Mr. HAROLD J. OSTLY,
Clerk, County of Los Angeles, Board of Supervisors, Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. OSTLY: As a member of the Senate Public Works Committee which wrote the bill, I am conscious of the serious adverse effect on the Los Angeles flood control program of the veto of S. 497. I thoroughly appreciate the need for enacting some authorization bill at the present session of Congress so that this and many other programs and projects can go forward.

For that reason, I have said I would vote to override the veto and I also have become a cosponsor of S. 3686, an alternative bill introduced recently by my colleague, Senator KNOWLAND, which includes the same authorization for the Los Angeles program as was in S. 497.

The responsibility for scheduling legislation for flood consideration is, of course, upon the Democratic Leadership. To date, the majority has not decided whether to attempt overriding of the veto of S. 497 or to allow other flood-control measures to come up for debate and a vote.

I have called upon the Senate to take action promptly. I also have written Chairman CHAVEZ, of the Senate Public Works Committee, of my feeling that the matter should receive early consideration and I enclose a copy of that letter. I have called to the attention of Chairman CHAVEZ the resolution of the board of supervisors of Los Angeles County.

In my estimation, there is virtually no possibility that the Congress will act in piecemeal fashion on an assortment of bills to authorize individual projects, even though many measures of this sort have been introduced in both branches in the past month. If, which is extremely doubtful, a bill relating only to Los Angeles ever came to the floor of either chamber, members from other States inevitably would attempt to load it with amendments and use it as a vehicle to obtain authorization for a host of other projects, many of which no doubt would be far less urgent, feasible, and well engineered. Such an effort probably would lead to logrolling of the most repulsive kind and the outcome likely would be a piece of legislation which no one could defend wholeheartedly.

I am urging the Senate Appropriations Committee to provide on a contingent basis

funds for 1959 construction in the Los Angeles area. I am enclosing for the information of the Board a copy of my letter to the Committee stressing the importance of voting money for the coming fiscal year.

I shall continue in every practicable way my efforts to obtain the required authorization and the desired appropriation for the important work now going on in the Los Angeles metropolitan area.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely,

THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
United States Senator.

EL MONTE, CALIF., *May 15, 1958.*

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
Washington, D. C.:

At the present time the unemployment problem in the El Monte area is greater than it has been in the past 10 years.

Because of this condition we respectfully urge you to use your influence to move Senate bill S. 3686 from Senate Public Works Committee with a recommendation of passage, and use all your power in having it pass the House and Senate to continue flood-control projects which have been closed down putting a great number of people out of work due to lack of authority to proceed.

Three bridges have been removed and many streets barricaded making it an extreme danger on life and property unless this work is authorized to continue.

Hoping to get favorable action from you on this matter.

Yours truly,

GEORGE TARR,
Business Representative,
Laborers Local, No. 1082.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *May 14, 1958.*

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Request you do all possible to move Senate bill 3686 from Senate Public Works Committee which is authority to continue flood-control projects now shut down. People are out of work because of lack of authority to proceed. In the San Gabriel Valley district five bridges are out and property and transportation are in extreme danger unless this work continues.

WILLIAM SIDELL,
Secretary-Treasurer, Los Angeles County District Council of Carpenters.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *May 14, 1958.*

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
United States Senator, State of California, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Request you do everything possible to move Senate bill 3686 from Senate Public Works Committee with a "do pass" recommendation and use all possible influence toward passage in the Senate. President indicates approval of authorization to continue flood-control projects including work in California. Now shut down. Our people are unemployed account lack of authority to proceed. Bridges are out in Los Angeles area. Property and transportation in extreme danger.

GEORGE E. O'BRIEN,
Business Manager,
Local Union, No. 11, IBEW.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *May 15, 1958.*

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

You undoubtedly are aware of the dire need to have Senate bill 3686 made law. Until this is done much public works in our State and immediate area in particular is suspended, creating property and traffic hazards and delays. Five bridges are out of operation in the San Gabriel Valley area. Will you please devote your particular skills in an all out effort to have this bill released from Public Works Committees with a "do pass" recommendation and then on through to Presidential signature? We need the facilities as well as the employment they will provide.

J. J. CHRISTIAN,
Secretary, Los Angeles Building and Construction Trades.

EL MONTE, CALIF., *May 14, 1958.*

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
Washington, D. C.:

We respectfully request you to do all you can to move bill S. 3686 from Senate Public Works Committee with a do-pass recommendation and exercise all your powers in having it pass the House and Senate since it appears the President will approve of this authorization to continue flood-control projects which will include work in California just started and is now in the process of being shut down. Our people are again out of work due to lack of authority of the contractors to proceed with the work due to the lack of funds. In addition, five bridges are out in the San Gabriel Valley area and property and transportation are in extreme danger unless this work is authorized to continue and funds made available. It is imperative that speedy action be taken at once. Conditions extremely acute and hazardous.

Respectfully,

WILLIAM C. WILLIS, Jr.,
Vice President, International Union of Operating Engineers, Local Union No. 12.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *May 14, 1958.*

Hon. THOMAS KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Los Angeles County Central Labor Council urgently requests you to give full support in obtaining a favorable recommendation on Senate bill 3686 from the Senate Public Works Committee at the earliest possible time. Passage of this bill would permit flood-control projects in California to be reopened and would make it possible to construct five bridges which are out in Los Angeles area which presents an extreme danger to property and transportation.

W. J. BASSETT,
Secretary, Los Angeles County Central Labor Council.

PASADENA, CALIF., *May 15, 1958.*

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Requesting that you do all that you can to move Senate bill 3686 from the Senate Public Works Committee with a do pass recommendation and do everything in your power in having it passed in the House and Senate since it seems that the President would approve the authorization to continue flood control projects which will include work in California which is now shut down and our people are out of work due to the lack of authority to proceed with these projects. In addition there are five bridges out in the San Gabriel Valley and property and transportation are in extreme danger unless this work is authorized to continue.

ED J. EDWARDS,
Secretary, Cement Masons Local No. 923.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *May 15, 1958.*

The Honorable THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully urge you use your influence to move Senate bill S. 3686 from Senate Public Works Committee with do pass recommendation and use all your power in having it pass the House and Senate to continue flood-control projects which will include work in California which is now shut down and our people are out of work due to lack of authority to proceed. Five bridges are out in Los Angeles and property and life are in extreme danger unless this work is authorized to continue. In addition, this is very essential as it will provide work for the great number of unemployed at the present time.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA DISTRICT COUNCIL OF LABORERS.
H. C. ROHRBACK, *Secretary Treasurer.*

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *May 14, 1958.*

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
Washington, D. C.:

We urgently request that you do all you can to move S. 3686 from Senate Public Works Committee with a do pass recommendation and exercise all your power in having it pass the House and Senate. Since it seems the President will approve this authorization to continue flood-control projects which will include work in California which is now shut down. Many of our people are out of work due to lack of authority to proceed, in addition, several bridges are damaged in the Los Angeles area due to recent rains and property and transportation are in extreme danger unless this work is authorized to continue.

CEMENT MASONS LOCAL NO. 627.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *May 14, 1958.*

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Representing several thousand vitally interested construction workers respectfully request that you use your best efforts to move bill S. 3686 from Senate Public Works Committee with a do pass recommendation and use all your power in having it pass the House and Senate flood control, river, and other construction jobs are shut down in California due to lack of authority to proceed resulting in thousands out of work.

E. E. METZINGER,
Secretary, Building Material and Dump Truck Drivers Local, 420

BALDWIN PARK, CALIF., *May 15, 1958.*

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
Washington, D. C.:

The work on the Big Dalton wash in the city of Baldwin Park which has stopped in the very vital flood control project and must be permitted to continue uninterrupted. Four bridges in this city alone are out. Heavy traffic is using too hazardous detours. School kids are using temporary foot bridges which are unsafe. This city is completely without drainage from the mountains on the north and an unseasonal rain of any proportions from ½ inch and up would cause property damage which cannot be estimated, and possible loss of life. We beg of you, our elected representatives in Washington, do not let this stoppage continue.

ED STEPHENS,
Councilman, City of Baldwin Park.

BALDWIN PARK, CALIF., *May 15, 1958.*

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Washington, D. C.:

It is imperative that the city of Baldwin Park have your help in getting the necessary appropriations to finish the already started flood-control work. Now many main streets are closed. One main thoroughfare is entirely closed and two others have hazardous traffic detours. One-half inch of rain could cause loss of life and great property damage.

BALDWIN PARK CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.
HARVEY T. PARKER, *President.*

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *May 14, 1958.*

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the meeting of the council of the city of Los Angeles held May 14, 1958, the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas there has heretofore and now exists extreme flood hazard within the area embraced by the Los Angeles County drainage area project; and

"Whereas during the past 22 years Congress has appropriated funds for, and the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army has undertaken and constructed, various units included in the Los Angeles County drainage area project; and

"Whereas all authorization for expenditrue of Federal funds in the Los Angeles County drainage project has been, or will prior to July 1, 1958, be exhausted; and

"Whereas funds have heretofore been appropriated in the fiscal year 1958 and budgeted for fiscal year 1959, but cannot be expended by the Corps of Engineers until Congress so authorizes; and

"Whereas failure on the part of the Congress to take appropriate action will virtually bring to a halt all flood control construction on the Los Angeles County drainage area project as of July 1, 1958; and

"Whereas such action will cause the cessation of work on important flood control projects throughout the Los Angeles County drainage area, several of which are in, or vitally affect the city of Los Angeles; and

"Whereas such cessation of work will increase existing flood hazard and have grave effect upon the economic conditions in the southern California area, especially as relating to the employment of the many involved in the carrying out of the drainage project: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the Council of the City of Los Angeles respectfully recommends and requests that all Members of the Congress immediately take such action as may be required to effect the enactment of such emergency legislation as may be necessary to allow the uninterrupted continuation by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, of the construction of the Los Angeles County drainage area project; be it further

"*Resolved,* That the city clerk be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Senators representing the State of California and the Members of the House of Representatives from the county of Los Angeles."

Respectfully yours,

WALTER C. PETERSON,
City Clerk.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *April 29, 1958.*

The board of supervisors of Los Angeles County flood control district met in regular session. Present: Supervisors Burton W. Chace, chairman presiding, Kenneth Hahn, John Anson Ford, and Warren M. Dorn; and Harold J. Ostly, clerk, by Gordon T. Nesvig, deputy clerk.

In re flood control: Resolution calling on all Congressional Representatives of Los Angeles County to take such action as may be required to effect enactment of necessary legislation needed to continue Federal flood control work in the Los Angeles area, and related order.

On motion of Supervisor Ford, unanimously carried (Supervisor Hahn being temporarily absent), it is ordered that the following resolution be and the same is hereby adopted:

"Whereas the Congress of the United States after investigation and recommendation thereof by the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, and by the Board of Rivers and Harbors, has approved and adopted a program for the construction of various flood control projects which are of interest and benefit to the entire Nation; and

"Whereas, Federal law required enactment of legislation authorizing the appropriation of funds for construction of portions or units of approved projects; and

"Whereas during the past 22 years Congress has authorized and appropriated funds for and the United States by and through the Corps of Engineers as a part of such program has undertaken and constructed various units of that certain project within the County of Los Angeles which is known as the Los Angeles County drainage area project; and

"Whereas all authorization for appropriation of funds on the Los Angeles County drainage area project has been or will prior to July 1, 1958, be exhausted; and

"Whereas funds heretofore appropriated in fiscal 1958 and budgeted for fiscal 1959 cannot be expended by the Corps of Engineers until said authorization is correspondingly increased; and

"Whereas this board has been advised that a similar situation exists as to construction of some other approved flood control projects; and

"Whereas there has heretofore and now exists an extreme flood hazard within the area which will be protected by the Los Angeles County drainage area project; and

"Whereas the needs of the area being and to be protected by the Los Angeles County drainage area project are yet increasing due to the vast and continuing development of said area; and

"Whereas lacking appropriate legislative authorization virtually all flood control construction by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, on the Los Angeles County drainage area project will cease as of July 1, 1958; and

"Whereas such termination will not only allow continuation, but in some cases will increase the existing extreme flood hazard and will also have grave effects upon the economic situation in the southern California area, especially as relates to the employment of the many involved in the carrying out of the drainage area project during a period of recession: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles and ex officio board of supervisors of the Los Angeles County flood control district,* That and it is hereby recommended and requested that all Members of Congress immediately take such action as may be required to effect the enactment of such emergency legislation as may be necessary to allow the uninterrupted continuation by the Corps of Engineers United States Army of the construction of the Los Angeles County drainage area project; be it further

"*Resolved,* That and the clerk of this board is hereby directed and ordered to transmit fully executed copies of this resolution to the Senators representing the State of California, Members of the House of Representatives from the county of Los Angeles and to the Vice President of the United States. It is further directed and ordered that the chief engineer of the Los Angeles County flood control district transmit copies of this resolution to such persons as he may deem appropriate."

It is further ordered that the Los Angeles County flood control district be, and it is hereby, authorized to submit copies of the above resolution to the cities concerned to encourage similar action by them.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of a resolution which was adopted by the board of supervisors of Los Angeles County flood control district on April 29, 1958, and entered in the minutes of said board.

HAROLD J. OSTLY,
County Clerk.

GLENDALE, CALIF., *May 6, 1958.*

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I am enclosing herewith Resolution 12,910, passed by the Glendale City Council at its regular meeting held May 1, 1958, urging that you lend your best efforts toward providing the necessary Federal funds to enable the United States Corps of Engineers to continue with its construction of major flood-control projects in Los Angeles County, and assigning a higher priority and earlier date for completion of the Burbank-Eastern drain.

Respectfully,

G. E. CHAPMAN, *City Clerk.*

Resolution 12,910

Resolution of the Council of the City of Glendale, Calif., urging appropriation of funds by Congress for continuation of Los Angeles County flood-control plan, and assignment of earlier priority to the Burbank-Eastern drain

Whereas the comprehensive flood-control plan for Los Angeles County, approved by act of Congress on June 28, 1938, and amended from time to time since that date, calls for annual appropriations by Congress to help finance the construction of flood-control projects contemplated by that plan; and

Whereas if the present Congress does not appropriate funds for the continuation of such flood-control projects by the United States Corps of Engineers, the flood-control program will be seriously disrupted and flood-control projects which are direly needed because of the explosive growth in this area will be delayed; and

Whereas the rapid development of important industrial areas in Glendale requires that the Burbank-Eastern drain be built sooner than presently scheduled in order that the growth may continue: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of Glendale, That Senators WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND and THOMAS H. KUCHEL and Congressmen H. ALLEN SMITH and EDGAR W. HIESTAND be urged to lend their best efforts toward:

1. Providing the necessary Federal funds to enable the United States Corps of Engineers to continue with its construction of major flood-control projects in Los Angeles County, and

2. Assigning a higher priority and earlier date for completion of the Burbank-Eastern drain.

G. E. CHAPMAN,
City Clerk.

BALDWIN PARK, CALIF., *May 8, 1958.*

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Washington, D. C.:

The City Council of the City of Baldwin Park, Calif., hereby recommends and requests that the Congress of the United States takes such immediate action as may be required to effect emergency legislation to allow the uninterrupted continuation by the Corps of Engineers of certain flood-control works vitally important to this city as well as other projects in the Los Angeles County drainage area. The uninterrupted improvement of Big Dalton Wash units 1 and 2 in the fiscal year 1958 is of the utmost importance to this city and entire East San Gabriel Valley of Los Angeles County. Discontinuance of this project due to the lack of appropriate legislative authorization July 1, 1958, would cause irreparable damage to the area and create an extreme flood hazard.

Respectfully submitted.

LYNN H. COLE, *Mayor.*

WEST COVINA, CALIF., *May 15, 1958.*
Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: On May 14, the city of West Covina forwarded you a copy of Resolution 1346 pertaining to a serious drainage problem that is now being financed by Federal funds. This is known as the Big Dalton Wash project No. 1 and No. 2. It has come to our attention that this project was to continue until the end of June 1958. We have now been advised, by reliable sources, that this project terminated as of May 1958.

The city of West Covina and other cities in our vicinity need this flood protection, and we urge you to see if additional appropriations can be made available for the continuation of this project. We would appreciate written communication from your office as to the status of this project.

Your sincere interest in our problem is greatly appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE AIASSA,
City Manager.

CITY OF GLENDORA,
Glendora, Calif., May 14, 1958.
Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Anaheim, Calif.

DEAR SIR: I am enclosing a certified copy of resolution 1562 of the council of the city of Glendora, passed on May 6, 1958, relating to the need for additional authorization by Congress for the Los Angeles River Basin.

Yours very truly,

R. R. BAIOTTO,
City Clerk.

CITY OF LA VERNE,
La Verne, Calif., May 8, 1958.

MEMORANDUM OF TRANSMITTAL

To: The Honorable THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Document: City of La Verne resolution 58-39, regarding Federal flood-control work in Los Angeles County.

From: Ruth S. Hogan, city clerk, city of La Verne, Calif.

BURBANK, CALIF., *May 8, 1958.*
Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: There is transmitted herewith a fully executed copy of city of Burbank Resolution 11,549 petitioning the Congress of the United States to enact such emergency legislation as may be required to provide uninterrupted continuation of construction of the Los Angeles County drainage area project of vital importance to the city of Burbank.

This resolution was passed and adopted by the Council of the city of Burbank in regular session on May 6, 1958.

Very truly yours,

NAOMI G. PUTNAM, *City Clerk.*

CITY OF EL MONTE,
El Monte, Calif., May 6, 1958.
Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: Enclosed please find copy of Resolution 2151, entitled "A resolution of the city council of the city of El Monte, Calif., requesting Congress to take prompt action relative to allocation of funds for flood-control purposes," urging your kind consideration to the matter.

Very truly yours,

RUTH BRUTON,
City Clerk.

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK,
Pomona, Calif., May 7, 1958.
Hon. THOMAS KUCHEL,
United States Senate Office,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed is Resolution 5685 of the Council of the City of Pomona requesting continuation of Federal aid in the Los Angeles County flood control program. We trust that you will be able to support the intent of this resolution.

We wish to thank you for your consideration in this and other matters concerning the city of Pomona and the County of Los Angeles.

Sincerely yours,

L. B. THOMAS,
City Clerk.

CITY OF ARCADIA,
May 6, 1958.
Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Post Office,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. SENATOR KUCHEL: You will find enclosed herewith certified copy of City of Arcadia Resolution 3013, in which this city requests Congress to take action relative to allocation of funds for flood control purposes.

Your prompt attention to this matter and the enactment of such legislation as may be necessary will be greatly appreciated by the city council.

Very truly yours,

CHRISTINE VAN MAANEN,
City Clerk.

CITY OF SAN FERNANDO,
San Fernando, Calif., May 6, 1958.
Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
United States Senator,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: On May 5, 1958, the San Fernando City Council adopted Resolution 2978 recommending and requesting all Members of Congress to immediately take such action as may be required to effect the enactment of such emergency legislation as may be necessary to allow the uninterrupted continuation by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, of the construction of the Los Angeles County drainage area project which is of vital importance to this area.

We are enclosing a certified copy of the resolution herewith and urge that you give it your serious consideration and support.

Yours very truly,

LEILA EDWARDS,
City Clerk.

Resolution 2978

Resolution calling on all Congressional representatives of Los Angeles County to take such action as may be required to effect enactment of necessary legislation needed to continue Federal flood-control work in the Los Angeles area

Whereas the Congress of the United States, after investigation and recommendation thereof by the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, and by the Board of Rivers and Harbors, has approved and adopted a program for the construction of various flood-control projects which are of interest and benefit to the entire Nation; and

Whereas Federal law required enactment of legislation authorizing the appropriation of funds for construction of portions or units of approved projects; and

Whereas during the past 22 years Congress has authorized and appropriated funds for and the United States by and through the Corps of Engineers as a part of such program has undertaken and constructed various units of that certain project within the County of Los Angeles which is known as the Los Angeles County drainage area project; and

Whereas all authorization for appropriation of funds on the Los Angeles County drainage area project has been, or will, prior to July 1, 1958, be exhausted; and

Whereas funds heretofore appropriated in the fiscal 1958 and budgeted for fiscal 1959 cannot be expended by the Corps of Engineers until said authorization is correspondingly increased; and

Whereas this council has been advised that a similar situation exists as to the construction of some other approved flood-control projects; and

Whereas there has heretofore and now exists an extreme flood hazard within the area which will be protected by the Los Angeles County drainage area project; and

Whereas the needs of the area being and to be protected by the Los Angeles County drainage area project are yet increasing due to the vast and continuing development of said area; and

Whereas lacking appropriate legislative authorization virtually all flood-control construction by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, on the Los Angeles County drainage area project will cease as of July 1, 1958; and

Whereas such termination will not only allow continuation, but in some cases will increase the existing extreme flood hazard and will also have grave effects upon the economic situation in the southern California area, especially as relates to the employment of the many involved in the carrying out of the drainage area project during a period of recession: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of San Fernando, Calif., That and it is hereby recommended and requested that all Members of Congress immediately take such action as may be required to effect the enactment of such emergency legislation as may be necessary to allow the uninterrupted continuation by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, of the construction of the Los Angeles County drainage area project; be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk is hereby directed and ordered to transmit fully executed copies of this resolution to the Senators representing the State of California, Members of the House of Representatives from the county of Los Angeles, and to the Vice President of the United States. It is further directed and ordered that the city administrative officer of the city of San Fernando transmit copies of this resolution to such other persons as he may deem appropriate.

Adopted this 5th day of May 1958.

WILLARD L. CROSS,
Mayor.

Attest:

LEILA EDWARDS,
City Clerk of the City of San Fernando.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the most vital single function in self-governing society is the election of public officials. Unless the will of the people can be manifested in the election of officials by public choice and by popular choice, there can be no government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Unless this elective process is surrounded by effective safeguards, there can be no real assurance that the will of the electorate will prevail.

The country has thrown safeguards around the casting of ballots, the counting of ballots, and the secrecy of balloting. The country has modified its method of counting ballots and casting ballots in accordance with modern technological progress. Voting machines are now used widely in the United States.

The country has not, however, thrown proper safeguards around financial influence in Federal elections. It has not thrown proper and adequate safeguards around the influence of money in politics. Money is the root of much political evil.

As early as 1870, in accordance with its constitutional mandate, Congress undertook to pass comprehensive legislation to outlaw fraudulent and corrupt practices in the conduct of Federal elections.

Then, in 1907, Congress passed the so-called Tillman Act, which prohibited the making of contributions in connection with Federal elections, by national banks and corporations.

In 1910—for the first time—interstate political committees were required to report campaign contributions and expenditures and to identify the source of all contributions in excess of $100. From time to time, amendments were made to the 1910 law.

Then, in 1925, Congress enacted what currently is known as the Corrupt Practices Act, which continues to form the basis of existing law dealing with the financial aspects of Federal elections.

Since 1925, the costs of campaigns have mushroomed. The practices of vested interests have become a threat to popular government. Yet the Congress has not acted to correct major deficiences in the law. There has been widespread public concern over the threat to the processes of popular government, arising from the improper influence of money in elections.

Only today we see another manifestation of this widespread concern on the part of the public. This afternoon there was a public announcement of an effort by the American Heritage Foundation, through advertising in which the Advertising Council will participate, to solicit public contributions to political parties. This effort has the endorsement of the chairmen of both major national political committees, Mr. Paul Butler and Mr. Meade Alcorn; and it also has the endorsement of President Eisenhower, according to a mimeographed copy of a letter which bears the President's name. I should like to read the letter, which purportedly was written by President Eisenhower, and I do not doubt that it was. The letter reads as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 12, 1958.*

Mr. JOHN C. CORNELIUS,
President, the American Heritage Foundation, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. CORNELIUS: It was good to learn of the program to broaden the base of public participation in the political life of the Nation. I believe this is a healthy move in the right direction.

As our citizens invest money and effort in the political party and in the campaigns of candidates of their choice, they will become more deeply involved in the great decisions of our time. It then follows that they will be more eager to learn the facts and more willing to exert their full influence as responsible citizens.

Congratulations to the American Heritage Foundation and to the Advertising Council for undertaking this splendid educational program.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT EISENHOWER.

Mr. President, I, too, wish to commend an effort to broaden the base of political contributions. That can be beneficial. But if conducted unwisely, it could also have harmful effects.

I should like to emphasize and I should like for the Senate to consider one sentence to be found in the President's letter, as follows:

As our citizens invest money and effort in the political party and in the campaigns of candidates of their choice, they will become more deeply involved in the great decisions of our time.

I should like to reverse the order of the clauses of that sentence, so as to make it read as follows:

"As our citizens become more deeply involved in the great decisions of our time" they will invest more freely, perhaps, "in the political party and in the campaigns of candidates of their choice."

I point out that part of that sentence, as I have just now stated it, is not a direct quotation from the sentence used by the President.

Mr. President, the clause, "they will invest more freely, perhaps, 'in the political party and in the campaigns of candidates of their choice'," describes a practice in which lies the evil of money in politics. As people "become more deeply involved in the great decisions of our time," as vested interests become more deeply involved—as they surely are more deeply involved—in the great issues of our time, the record shows they have contributed more and more heavily to political campaigns.

As an example of how this campaign of the American Heritage Foundation might be conducted unwisely, I wish to call attention to two sample advertisements which were released this afternoon. One of them purports to be a statement by a machinist. Over the statement which is attributed to him, there is a picture which shows him holding a check for $1 made payable to "my political party," and then he is quoted as saying:

I think my dollar is as important as my vote.

Mr. President, I do not believe it. No dollar is as important to any American as is his franchise.

There is another proposed advertisement; this one contains a picture of a lady. The advertisement indicates that she is saying, "I am a farmer's wife." She, too, is shown holding a check in the amount of $1, made payable to "my political party." Then she is quoted as saying:

You have got to pay your way to have your say.

Mr. President, that ought not be true. All men and women who are qualified to vote in the United States have an equal say in the ballot box, whether they have $1 or whether they have $1 million.

I read further from the ad:

As a matter of fact, a dollar can sometimes be as important as my vote.

Now, Mr. President, that is a different matter. One dollar may not be as important as a vote. It is the concentration of dollars with which to conduct propaganda campaigns in newspaper ads, on television, on radio, or on billboards that gives cause for concern. It is the concentration of dollars that serves to thwart the will of the American people. Those who contribute $1 are not guilty of perpetrating this corrupt practice; but as persons become more involved in the great decisions of our times, they tend, as I have said, to contribute more.

Despite this threat to our republican form of government, we have seen no adequate action by the Congress, the enactment of no adequate law, in 33 years.

Mr. President the Corrupt Practices Act of today undertakes to police Federal elections by imposing upon candidates and political committees limitations upon campaign expenditures that may legally be made, and upon individuals a limit upon the amount they may contribute for political purposes. Yet, an investigation conducted by a subcommittee, of which I was then the chairman, revealed political contributions, of record, by one citizen in the amount of $73,000.

How does that compare with the contribution of the farmer's wife or that of the machinist who contributes $1? When we consider that those with fat pocketbooks can contribute today without limit, then the sentiment in this advertisement takes on meaning: "As a matter of fact, a dollar can sometimes be as important as my vote."

In addition, the large numbers of dollars of those with extremely fat pocketbooks usually count far more heavily than do the votes or the dollars of farmers' wives or machinists. Therein lies the danger to our system of the use of money in politics. It is commendable, I say, to solicit small contributions by thousands and millions of American citizens. I do not think it is wise, however, to advertise such sentiments as I have read from the proposed advertisements.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The best and most complete disclosure of what goes on in campaigns in the way of contributions resulted from the work of the able junior Senator from Tennessee in his very searching investigation of campaign expenditures during the last presidential campaign. The investigation certainly showed the crying need for legislation to modernize and to bring about a realistic and enforceable limit of campaign contributions, as well as an effective requirement for their reporting. I remember well that the distinguished Senator introduced a very important bill designed to achieve this objective. May I ask at this time what has happened to the proposed legislation the distinguished Senator introduced immediately after he filed his report? He not only disclosed what went on in the campaign, but he sought to have corrective legislation enacted early in the session, as I recall.

Mr. GORE. First I want to thank the able Senator for his generous compliment. The investigation was not a pleasant task, but it was one which was conducted assiduously by a competent staff. For the first time a public record was made of a substantial portion of the money spent in an American election. The subcommittee report is, I believe, the largest committee report the Government Printing Office ever printed. There is cataloged in that report, not one dollar contributions made by a hundred thousand machinists, not one dollar contributions made by 10,000 farmers' wives; but there is cataloged in that report $33 million in contributions—who gave, who got it, what was done with it, how much of it was spent for television, how much of it was spent for advertising in newspapers, how much of it was spent on radio, how much of it was spent on billboards, and how much of it was spent for other items.

Furthermore, there is cataloged in that report the principal contributors of whom we could learn. I have never asserted that this is a complete report. It is, however, a report which completely discloses the facts which the Senate subcommittee could learn.

It is my view that there were many times as much money spent in the 1956 campaign as this committee report discloses. Yet it discloses expenditures of $33 million.

Again I commend the effort of the American Heritage Foundation to broaden the base of political contributions, but I would not want that effort to excuse the failure of the Congress of the United States to bring under effective legal surveillance campaign expenditures and campaign contributions.

Already I hear rumors of huge "slush funds" in the making for the elections of 1958. People are indeed "deeply involved" in the great issues of our times.

I want to see more people contribute small amounts, but I should like to make it impossible for one family to contribute a quarter of a million dollars. I should like to make it impossible for corporations to contribute directly to a political campaign.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. As I recall the report of the committee, the committee was able to report facts which had never been disclosed before, relating to multiple contributions, State by State. The report showed that these were made for the same ultimate purpose of electing a President, or for the purpose of putting a certain party into control, and these facts proved conclusively that our present antiquated, obsolete law, which has never been vigorously enforced, fails to supply the need of this country for complete disclosure and for accurate accounting. In the making of contributions not only in various States, as I recall the report of the distinguished Senator's committee, but also in the making of contributions to "shadow" political organizations, present limitations on such contributions were evaded in many ways. One method was by the setting up of a half-dozen separate committees for the election of the same candidate for President, and ostensibly independent citizens committees for the election of the same individual. All of the committees had different titles, but it was possible legally to evade the purpose of the law, by dividing large contributions among them. Only by investigation, and disclosures such as those contained in the report of the committee, was this matter brought to public attention. Then the bill to prevent that type of evasion was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. I say to the Senator with conviction that the country might be better off without any law at all on the subject than it is with the present law. The law is wholly inadequate, utterly unrealistic, and completely ineffective.

In my considered opinion, under the present law, one man, if he had the amount and the desire, could have legally contributed every dollar of the $33 million accounted for in this report. Yet the Congress has failed to take remedial action.

The Senator asked me what happened to the bill I introduced. That particular bill is still in the bosom of the committee to which it was referred. I want to say, however, that the Committee on Rules and Administration soon thereafter reported a bill, which was the bill introduced by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]. The bill was not as strong as the bill which I introduced, but it has merit. Senators will find the bill on the calendar. The bill has been on the calendar of the United States Senate for nearly a year, but we have not yet voted on it. I hope we will take the bill up for consideration, and I urge the Senate to give consideration to this threat to popular government, to this threat to the people's right to be the masters of their own destiny, to this threat of the moneyed interests to usurp the will of the people.

The present act seeks, by requiring that certain reports be filed, to bring about public disclosures of campaign contributions and expenditures, thus, in theory, exposing to public view the degree to which the conduct of a political campaign is influenced by money.

The underlying philosophy of the Corrupt Practices Act was sound when the act was enacted, and it is sound today. The law, however, suffers from serious defects which, as I have said, render it completely ineffective. The limitations on contributions and expenditures, as set forth in existing law, are completely unrealistic. The maximum permissible campaign expenditures specified for candidates for the House of Representatives and for the Senate, set at 1925 levels, do not take into account the cost of campaigning under modern conditions. These expenditure ceilings applicable to Congressional candidates are so worded as to include only those expenditures made by the candidate personally or by a committee acting under his personal and direct supervision. These ceilings can be and invariably are circumvented by the simple process of setting up an additional committee about which the candidate is assumed to have no knowledge, as the able junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has stated. This leads to the ridiculous fiction that a candidate has no legal knowledge of a television program on which he himself appears.

The able junior Senator from Oklahoma had the unpleasant task, as chairman of a Senate subcommittee, of investigating two senatorial campaigns. I believe his committee found that under State law in the State of Ohio only approximately $2,500 can be legally expended, yet I believe his committee disclosed the expenditure of several hundred thousand dollars in the campaign. Is that a correct understanding?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is approximately correct. I think the expenditures ran up into many hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Mr. GORE. I am not sure the expenditures did not reach the million-dollar mark.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes. It was admitted that expenditures were at least as large as the hundreds of thousands of dollars. The State laws and the Federal laws are so drafted as not only to encourage evasion but also, in many cases, to prevent the candidate from controlling expenditures. The law requires that the candidate have no personal knowledge of the additional campaign funds, and many of the big money raising operations are done without the candidate's approval, because the candidate must not know, if he is going to sign an affidavit with respect to the matter.

The friends of the candidate know about the matter, and the candidate may find after the election is over that money went into his campaign which he would not have permitted to go into his campaign. He may subsequently learn that money went into the campaign from sources and in amounts he would have declined. Yet his friends think it smart to raise a large "slush" fund and spend it on behalf of the candidate, sometimes leaving the candidate in the dark as to things being done in his behalf.

Only by authorizing expenditures in realistic amounts, which must be reported, can the matter be controlled. It is acknowledged that the cost of advertising has increased. The inflationary impact has decreased the value of the dollar limitation in the act itself by about one-third. The dollar will purchase about one-third of what it purchased in World War I. I think that was about the time when the present limitations were set. Since then we have had about a 3 for 1 inflation.

The limitations which were set those many years ago are completely unrealistic today. If Members of the House of Representatives and Members of the Senate are permitted to spend realistic amounts, the problem can be worked out.

Today television is a necessity. Television is a good influence upon the voters. It is good for voters to be able to see the candidate. If the candidate puts

his foot in his mouth, it is worth a lot of money to the public to know that candidate X puts his foot in his mouth when he comes before the public. It is also good for the public to hear candidates on the radio. Those things are of great benefit to the public.

Campaign expenditures, per se, are not evil, but a public disclosure of the amounts which people are contributing will do a great deal to police against the attempts to buy influence through overgenerous campaign contributions by certain interests which have axes to grind.

Mr. GORE. It is my considered opinion that there are no legal limits on the amount which a person or an organization can contribute to political campaigns today.

There are no legal limits to the amounts which candidates, parties, or committees may expend in a political campaign. I mean that there are no effective limits on either expenditures or campaign contributions.

In 1907 the Congress enacted a law to prohibit campaign contributions by corporations. Yet I have a record showing that the Justice Department has taken the position that it cannot prosecute a certain corporation which spent more than $9,000 urging the election of candidates of its choice in the last Federal election. The committee report on page 16 relates that a corporation which publishes the Minneapolis Star and Tribune—it may have other interests, although I do not so state in any accusative way—bought a full page advertisement, before the election, in the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, the Washington Post, the Chicago Daily News, the Detroit Free Press, and the Philadelphia Bulletin. The cost of those advertisements, as the committee report shows on page 17, was $9,115.

The subcommittee obtained details with respect to this effort to influence the election by use of the money of a corporation. The subcommittee requested an opinion from Assistant Attorney General Warren Olney III concerning the nature of this publication, and on November 1, 1956, was advised by Mr. Olney as follows:

DEAR SENATOR GORE: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of October 27, 1956, referring to an advertisement by the Minneapolis Star and Tribune which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald, and other papers.

The matter has already been brought to our attention from another source.

He did not indicate the other source.

We immediately requested the FBI to conduct an investigation under section 610 of title 18, United States Code, the results of which should serve to assist us in answering the question as to whether or not the insertion of the advertisement constituted political activity of a corporation.

Upon completion of our investigation we will be in a better position to consider your request for our views as to the applicability of sections 302 and 306 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. We will communicate further with you when our investigation is completed.

Sincerely,

WARREN OLNEY,
Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of letters which I send to the desk.

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

APRIL 5, 1957.

The Honorable WARREN OLNEY,
Assistant Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. OLNEY: During the course of the study of the 1956 general election campaigns by the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of which I was chairman, I referred to your attention an advertisement which appeared in the Minneapolis Star and Tribune on or about October 22, 1956.

On the date of November 1, 1956, you informed me by letter of receipt of my communication and the advertisement enclosed therewith and stated that the FBI had been immediately requested by you to conduct an investigation under section 610, title 18, United States Code, and that you would communicate with me further when the entire investigation was completed.

According to our records, there has been no further communication from you in this matter and I, therefore, request to be informed of the result of this investigation at your early convenience.

Sincerely,

ALBERT GORE.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington.

Hon. ALBERT GORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Reference is made to your letter dated April 5, 1957.

The investigation of this matter is now completed. We are now evaluating the investigative reports for the purpose of determining the course of action to be taken by the Department. We shall keep you further advised.

Sincerely,

WARREN OLNEY III,
Assistant Attorney General.

APRIL 24, 1958.

The Honorable WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Attorney General of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: In October of 1956, during the course of a study of the 1956 general election campaign by the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections in the United States Senate, of which I was chairman, I referred to the then Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Olney, an advertisement which appeared in the Minneapolis Star and Tribune on or about October 22, 1956.

Under date of November 1, 1956, Mr. Olney acknowledged my communication and stated that the Federal Bureau of Investigation had been requested to conduct an investigation for the purpose of determining whether a violation of section 610, title 18, United States Code, had occurred.

In response to a further inquiry, Mr. Olney advised me, under date of April 16, 1957, that the investigation of the matter had been completed and that the Department of Justice was at that time evaluating the investigative reports for the purpose of determining the course of action to be taken by the Department. According to my records, I have received no further report on this matter since Mr. Olney's letter of April 16, 1957.

I would appreciate it if you would look into this matter and advise me of what action, if any, has been taken or is proposed by the Department of Justice as a result of its investigation.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT GORE.

MAY 8, 1958.

Hon. ALBERT GORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GORE: This refers to your letter to the Attorney General of April 24, 1958, asking about the status of the matter involving the Minneapolis Star and Tribune Co., which was referred to this Department for consideration under title 18, United States Code, section 610.

As former Assistant Attorney General Olney advised in his letter to you of June 3, 1957, this Department has been concerned with the uncertainty of the validity and reach of the law in view of the Supreme Court's decisions in *U. S.* v. *CIO, et al.* (335 U. S. 106 (1948)), and *U. S.* v. *International Union United Automobile, etc., Workers (UAW-CIO)* (352 U. S. 567 (1957)).

We had hoped to obtain a conviction on the retrial of the latter case and thereafter to secure a resolution of the constitutional issues on appeal. But the acquittal of the defendant on November 6, 1957, of course, ruled out that possibility. Since that acquittal we have given careful attention to the Minneapolis Star and Tribune Co. matter but have concluded that the facts developed by investigation would not support prosecutive action and clarification of the constitutional issues.

We are, of course, continuing to give careful attention to all other cases under title 18, United States Code, section 610 which come to our attention.

Sincerely,

W. WILSON WHITE,
Assistant Attorney General,
Civil Rights Division.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I should like to read the last letter which I received, dated May 8, 1958:

DEAR SENATOR GORE: This refers to your letter to the Attorney General of April 24, 1958, asking about the status of the matter involving the Minneapolis Star and Tribune Co., which was referred to this Department for consideration under 18 U. S. C. 610.

I digress to note that this is not a question involving the freedom of the press. This did not involve an expenditure of $9,000 to publish a newspaper.

This involved an expenditure of more than $9,000 by a corporation to influence the election of candidates of its choice.

I continue to read:

As former Assistant Attorney General Olney advised in his letter to you of June 3, 1957, this department has been concerned with the uncertainty of the validity and reach of the law in view of the Supreme Court's decisions in *U. S.* v. *CIO et al.* (335 U. S. 106 (1948)), and *U. S.* v. *International Union United Automobile, etc., Workers (UAW-CIO)* (352 U. S. 567 (1957)).

We had hoped to obtain a conviction on the retrial of the latter case and therefore to secure a resolution of the constitutional issues on appeal. But the acquittal of the defendant on November 6, 1957, of course, ruled out that possibility. Since that acquittal we have given careful consideration to the Minneapolis Star and Tribune Co. matter but have concluded that the facts developed by investigation would not support prosecutive action and clarification of the constitutional issues.

We are, of course, continuing to give careful attention to all other cases under 18 U. S. C. 610 which come to our attention.

Sincerely,

W. WILSON WHITE,
Assistant Attorney General,
Civil Rights Division.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Has the distinguished Senator made inquiry to ascertain whether the amount paid for this advertisement was deducted as a business expense in the income tax return of the corporation?

Mr. GORE. I have not. Perhaps I have been derelict in that regard.

Mr. MONRONEY. The distinguished Senator will perhaps remember that only recently the Treasury Department ruled that the cost of advertising of a political nature, or advertising of a nature not directly and appropriately related to the business in which the corporation engages, is not deductible; and many of the public utilities are now conducting a campaign, or lobby, among small newspapers, claiming that they are being denied the right to deduct the cost of their political advertising attacking public power, rural electrification, TVA, and other things, because of this Treasury ruling. I wondered if the Treasury had looked into the question. As the distinguished Senator knows, he cannot deduct his advertising expenses for political purposes. Neither can the junior Senator from Oklahoma, or any other individual or corporation. I wonder if these things were being overlooked.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator. I shall immediately make inquiry of the Treasury. But even without a favorable ruling in behalf of the corporation named and other corporations in that regard, the Justice Department has now given the green light for American corporations to advertise to an unlimited extent for the election of candidates of their choice. Let me remind the Senator that these interests are deeply interested in the outcome.

Perhaps we will get a ruling from the Treasury that this is institutional advertising. That has been the dodge heretofore. I shall make inquiry of the Treasury and shall inform the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senate as to the answer I receive.

This is an alarming invitation leading to bigger and bigger sums of money in politics, and an invitation and a green light, not for $1 contributions by the wives of farmers or machinists, but for thousands of dollars and millions of dollars from corporations to influence elections and to usurp and thwart the popular will.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The case the distinguished Senator has cited was never brought even into a lower court, by the Justice Department, as I understand. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. It was not brought anywhere. Except for my repetitious inquiries over a period of 2 years, I am not sure that even a letter would have been written about it.

I have obtained permission to insert the correspondence in the RECORD. I hope the Senator will have an opportunity to read it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Did the Justice Department give any indication that because it lost one case, which may have had a completely different set of facts and a completely different relationship, they should not try again? As a rule it is clear that corporations are prohibited by law from making expenditures for political purposes.

Mr. GORE. Well, the letter says in effect that because they could not convict a labor union, which was according to the attestations of the labor union, exercising freedom of speech, they would not prosecute a corporation. I am not prepared now to discuss the issues involved in the CIO case, but I deny that the Justice Department is warranted, for loss of that case, to whitewash vast expenditures by corporations to influence elections.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is the Senator saying that there was no estoppel against the Justice Department in bringing another case and finding out if the law would be interpreted to mean what it appears to mean, or whether, for some strange reason, corporations might be exercising the right of freedom of speech in publishing a newspaper advertisement advocating the election of a certain person for President?

Mr. GORE. Before I respond with accuracy to the question of the able Senator from Oklahoma, I should like to ask him to interpret and define estoppel. I know of no legal estoppel or impediment. There may have been other kinds of estoppel. I referred earlier to certain bills which have been referred to the committee. The Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, as I have said, conducted a study of campaign contributions and expenditures in the 1956 elections. As a result, a bill was introduced, to which the able Senator from Oklahoma has already referred.

The Select Committee to Investigate Political Activities, Lobbying, and Campaign Contributions, under the chairmanship of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], held year-long hearings, as the Senator will recall, covering operations under the Lobbying Act and questions concerning campaign contributions and expenditures. A report of this committee was submitted to the Senate in the spring of 1957. I believe the senior Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of that committee, likewise introduced a bill. Another bill was introduced under the sponsorship of our distinguished majority leader, the distinguished minority leader, and 83 other Senators. I believe this bill established a record for cosponsoring. Today there is a bill on the subject on the calendar. I hope it will be considered. I hope we can secure adequate legislation in this regard.

I would not like to have my remarks interpreted as a condemnation of the purposes of the American Heritage Foundation program. If conducted wisely, it can be very helpful, making untold millions of people more conscious of their political responsibilities and more conscious also of their political heritage. Unless it is conducted wisely, it could serve as a means for the continuation of the unconscionably large contributions which now seek to influence American elections.

In the statistical phase of its study, the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections concentrated its attention on the period September 1–November 30, 1956. The subcommittee through its staff made every effort, within the limits of time and facilities available, to accumulate the fullest possible information about campaign spending during that period. Reports were requested from all national political committees, from all statewide political committees of whose existence the subcommittee could become informed, and in some instances from committees operating at the county level. After compiling the information from all reports received and eliminating duplications, the subcommittee accounted for the expenditure of about $33 million, of which $20.5 million was spent by Republican candidates or committees and $11 million was spent by Democrats. The remainder was spent by labor and miscellaneous organizations.

The most obvious conclusion reached by the subcommittee was that total campaign spending far surpassed the sums reported to it. Indeed, under existing law, I believe it would be impossible to arrive at anything more than a bare estimate of the total sums expended for political activity during a national political campaign. The statistical information obtained by the subcommittee was sufficient, however, to indicate certain trends and patterns in campaign expenditures and campaign contributions which give rise to serious concern and which, if left uncorrected, can undermine the basis of our representative form of government.

Among the patterns of campaign contributions and expenditures revealed by the report was the evidence of contributions of substantial size coming from persons affiliated with large business interests which went predominantly to candidates or political committees which supported candidates of the Republican Party. On the other hand, direct expenditures of labor organizations were almost entirely in support of candidates of the Democratic Party. The subcommittee viewed this situation as constituting an unhealthy state of political affairs. Unless a way can be found to secure more broadly based participation in the cost of political campaigns, there will undoubtedly be an increasing degree of influence over the outcome of elections traceable to the financial contributions of distinct economic groups or economic classes.

The report also revealed a surprising degree of geographic concentration of political contributions in amounts ranging from $500 up. Of $8 million in contributions of such size reported as received by Republican candidates and committees, more than $2 million was reported as having been contributed by persons listing an address on Manhattan Island. A similar situation, percentagewise, existed with reference to Democratic contributions of this size. Of

$2,382,000 received by the Democrats in contributions of this size, $870,000 likewise came from Manhattan Island. Without in any way attributing ulterior motives to those from this portion of New York City who contributed these sums, it appears obvious that this small area, by virtue of financial contributions, exerted an influence over the outcome of the elections somewhat out of proportion to that normally exercised by other areas possessing approximately equal population.

The report reveals the significant degree to which senatorial campaigns are financed by contributions from persons and organizations outside the State in which the election is held. In my opinion, it is the prerogative of citizens of a given State to select Representatives and Senators of their own choosing. This prerogative is in danger when Congressional campaigns are unduly influenced by substantial sums of money from out-of-State sources. This situation is particularly acute in the less populous States in which outside funds in relatively moderate amounts can sometimes have a decisive influence.

The report points up the fact that there is a substantial degree of political activity both on the part of labor unions and of corporations, despite the fact that section 610 of title 18, United States Code, would appear to prohibit expenditures by such organizations for the purpose of influencing the outcome of an election. Both corporations and labor unions insist that there is a wide area of permissible activity on the part of both, under proper interpretation of the language of section 610, and in the light of constitutional guaranties. Judicial interpretation of section 610 appear to support this view. Certainly, here is an area in which legislative clarification is required.

In some instances the subcommittee undertook to compare information concerning individual contributions as taken from reports filed with it with information voluntarily submitted by the individuals themselves. In some cases information submitted by the individuals was irreconcilable with information concerning those same individuals submitted by committees reporting to the subcommittee. This but emphasizes the deficiencies of existing law concerning the reporting of campaign contributions.

Present law requires such reports only by national committees. Committees operating locally need not report the results of their operations or even their existence to any Federal agency, notwithstanding the financial contribution they may make to the Federal election campaign of a political party or parties. The difficulty experienced by the subcommittee staff in securing comprehensive, standardized information, and, indeed, the inability of the staff to secure more than fragmentary information, despite the general willingness to cooperate, both on the part of candidates and of political committees, illustrates the impossibility of the individual citizen securing information concerning the extent and the source of the financial backing of a particular candidate or of a particular political party.

This report, the largest ever submitted by a subcommittee of the Senate, contains factual information covering many additional aspects of political activity, including the cost of advertising, the cost of television and radio programs, and other costs, all of which fully support the need for realistic revision of existing law. Indeed, Mr. President, the facts presented in the subcommittee study make a mockery of existing law. In some respects, we would perhaps have a healthier situation if we had no law at all, because the ease with which present statutes purporting to limit campaign contributions and expenditures, and to require their public disclosure, can be and are circumvented and evaded, tends to create disrespect for and contempt of law.

It seems to me that if we are to preserve the necessary safeguards surrounding the election of our President, our Vice President, and Members of the Congress, we must by law regulate the financial aspects of political campaigns just as closely and just as zealously as we seek by law to safeguard the individual rights of citizens in connection with the act of casting their ballots.

In my opinion, legislative reform, if it is to be realistic, must be drafted within the framework of certain basic criteria. We must extend the law so as to cover primaries, caucuses, and conventions. Otherwise, in a number of States there will continue to be no effective application of Federal law to the determinative contest in the selection of Members of Congress.

We must establish reasonable limitations on campaign contributions and expenditures, and, once having established them, insure their enforcement by incorporating in the law workable administrative provisions. No such effective, reasonable limitations now exist. That is the challenge to Congress. In the field of individual contributions, there must be an overall ceiling on the amount that may be legally contributed by any individual to any and all political candidates and committees during the calendar year. On the question of expenditure ceilings, I feel strongly that there should be an overall ceiling to include all sums spent, both by and in behalf of a candidate. Within the limits of constitutional requirements we must impose upon the candidate the responsibility for sums spent to bring about his election. Unless this responsibility rests upon the candidate, it rests upon no one, and there will be no effective ceiling. It is admittedly difficult to work out the administrative details and formulae which would insure an equitable allocation of expenditures made by a committee on behalf of more than one candidate. But, Mr. President, the mere fact that a task is difficult is no excuse for shirking it. It can and it must be done.

In the area of monetary ceilings, I feel that the law should properly curb existing excesses in the transfer of political contributions designed to influence a Congressional election in a State other than that of the contributor.

Perhaps equally important to the establishment of contribution and expenditure ceilings is the need for adequate dissemination of information to the public about the source and application of campaign funds. The senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] recently stated, in debate on the floor of the Senate, that sunlight is a great disinfectant. This is particularly true in the field of political contributions. A contribution made for the purpose of influencing improperly an election, or the actions of the candidate in whose behalf it is given, will simply not stand the light of day. Any legislative proposal in this area, if it is to be effective, must provide not only for the filing of reports, but must insure their accessibility to the press and the public in order that the contents of such reports may be made known to the electorate with the least possible delay.

Mr. President, in addition to the suggestions to which I have referred, designed to police the conduct of elections insofar as money is concerned, other suggestions have been advanced involving changes in tax law, changes in law governing communication facilities, and in other areas, all of which are designed to encourage widespread participation in political campaigns, and to insure an electorate well informed concerning campaign issues. These suggestions are worthy of prompt consideration by the Senate.

As I said earlier, Mr. President, this subject is one which has been studied intensively by committees of the Senate during the past several years. Not only have the committees studied the problem; they have also acted in the light of the information obtained during the course of those studies, but Congress has not enacted an effective law. On June 22, 1955, the Rules Committee reported favorably to the Senate, S. 636, sponsored by the present distinguished chairman of that committee and other Senators. This bill remained on the calendar for the remainder of the 1st session and throughout the 2d session of the 84th Congress.

On February 28, 1956, the distinguished majority leader introduced a legislative proposal for election reform. He was joined by the distinguished minority leader and 83 other Senators as sponsors of that bill, S. 3308, in the 84th Congress. Despite the fact that 85 Senators publicly endorsed the need for comprehensive legislative reform, and despite the fact that during the entire period of the second session of the 84th Congress there was on the calendar awaiting action a bill favorably reported by a standing committee of the Senate, no action was taken.

During the first session of the 85th Congress, the Committee on Rules and Administration continued its study of this matter in the light of additional information presented by the McClellan committee and the study of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. On July 3, 1957, this committee again reported to the Senate a comprehensive bill to bring about needed election law reforms. This bill, S. 2150, listed as No. 585 on the calendar, is now in order for

consideration, subject to the will of the Senate.

Very shortly, Mr. President, we shall again be engaged in a national political campaign. Failure to act on legislative proposals in this field can but be interpreted by the public as disinterest on the part of the Senate in any bona fide effort to improve the situation. I urge, Mr. President, that there be no further delay in the consideration of legislation vital to the preservation of our democratic representative form of government.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on previous occasions I have addressed myself to the question of statehood for Alaska, and have given at some length my reasons for feeling that the admission of Alaska to the Union is vital to the interests of the country.

These are urgent hours for the cause of Alaskan statehood, and the fate of statehood for Alaska now hangs in the balance.

The House of Representatives is now considering a bill under an extraordinary procedure. Owing to that fact, and to the fact that the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives has taken a position which I regard as adverse to the bill and as different from that officially taken by the Republican Party and publicly taken by the President of the United States in the formal endorsement he has given to the statehood cause, I had delivered to the President this afternoon a letter which I shall read into the RECORD. The letter is as follows:

MAY 21, 1958.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

MR. PRESIDENT: Statehood for Alaska is a part of the platform of the Republican Party as it is of the Democratic Party. Secretary of Interior Fred A. Seaton, a member of your official family, has effectively and forthrightly worked for statehood legislation and has reflected great credit upon your administration in these efforts.

On April 12, 1957, I wrote you about statehood, stating my fear that "unless you actively undertake to support your endorsement with the full potential of your high office" statehood would fail.

A bill to admit Alaska to the Union is now the pending business of the House of Representatives. I am disturbed to note that the leadership of your party in that body has not supported your position with respect to taking up this bill, and I fear now, as I feared in April 1957, that your determined and persistent support is requisite for success of this struggle.

I hope that the American citizens in Alaska, so long denied statehood, may receive this support now. Next week may be too late.

Respectfully,

FRANK CHURCH.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 21, 1958, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 728. An act to authorize the acquisition of certain property in square 724 in the District of Columbia for the purpose of extension of the site of the additional office building for the United States Senate or for the purpose of addition to the United States Capitol Grounds;

S. 847. An act to amend the act of June 5, 1944, relating to the construction, operation, and maintenance of Hungry Horse Dam, Mont.;

S. 2557. An act to amend the act granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation of certain compacts by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and South Dakota in order to extend the time for such negotiation;

S. 2813. An act to provide for certain credits to the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association and the Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District in consideration of the transfer to the Government of property in Phoenix, Ariz.;

S. 3087. An act to provide for the establishment of Fort Clatsop National Memorial in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; and

S. 3371. An act to amend the act of August 25, 1916, to increase the period for which concessionaire leases may be granted under that act from 20 years to 30 years.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 22, 1958, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 21, 1958:

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Lawrence L. Seal	Dale V. Bedenkop
Larry H. Clark	Joel P. Porcher
Allen J. Lewis	Richard G. Hajec
Vastine C. Ahlrich	William A. Hughes
G. Thomas Susi	Joseph M. Rodgers
James K. Richards	James R. Schwartz
Jordan S. Baker	Verle B. Miller
Richard H. Garnett, Jr.	

To be ensigns

Richard E. Alderman	Ronald L. Newsom
James B. Allen	Harvey A. Peterson
Karl R. Anderson	Edward L. Talbot
Lawrence S. Brown	James A. Ten Eyck
Charles A. Burroughs	Charles K. Townsend
David Cummings	Richard L. Turnbull
Glenn DeGroot	Phillip W. Ward
Wesley V. Hull	J. Dunston Wingfield, Jr.
Frederick A. Ismond	
Arthur C. Korn	David I. Wolsk

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 21, 1958:

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Ira A. Dixon, of Indiana, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for a term of 4 years expiring June 30, 1962.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate May 21, 1958:

POSTMASTER

Doris Opal Garner to be postmaster at Van Horn, in the State of Texas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Romans 8: 31: *If God be for us, who can be against us?*

Eternal God, our Father, Thou art the wise Holy One, the supreme source and answer to our deepest longings and loftiest aspirations.

We humbly acknowledge that the forces of evil, which are arrayed against us, are terrible but not too terrible for Thy divine righteousness and power.

Thou alone can'st lift our minds and hearts out of the darkest fears and lead us into the light and liberty of Thy presence and peace.

Inspire us with a greater faith in the coming of the golden age when weary and heavy laden humanity shall find their rest in Thee.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KIRWAN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 10746) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 61]

Buckley	Fenton	Powell
Burdick	Granahan	Radwan
Carnahan	Gregory	Rivers
Christopher	Gross	Scott, N. C.
Clark	Hays, Ark.	Scott, Pa.
Colmer	Henderson	Sheppard
Davis, Tenn.	Hillings	Shuford
Dent	James	Sieminski
Dies	Jenkins	Spence
Dowdy	Kearney	Steed
Durham	Knutson	Trimble
Eberharter	Lennon	Watts
Engle	Morris	Willis
Fascell	Nimtz	Wilson, Calif.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 386 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ADMISSION OF ALASKA INTO THE UNION

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and pursuant to rule

XI, clause 20, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7999) to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 days, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] and one-half by the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] to limit general debate on the bill?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a point of order.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object to the unanimous consent request as to the division of the time?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I want to submit a point of order at this time that the bill is not privileged and, therefore, the motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union is not in order at this time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, if this bill, H. R. 7999, is privileged at all, it is privileged under clause 20 of rule XI, authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to bring in a bill for admission of a new State. It must conform in every respect to the rule, or its privilege is destroyed.

But, Mr. Speaker, this bill contains matter that is not privileged and under the very familiar rule with which all of us are thoroughly cognizant, the presence of unprivileged matter in a bill destroys the privilege of the bill. This bill carries provisions which are not privileged and, therefore, the entire bill is unprivileged and the committee has no authority to bring it to the floor at this time or in this manner.

For example, Mr. Speaker, the bill, although reported out by a legislative committee, carries appropriations.

Lines 9 to 17 provide for payment of moneys, which under title 16, United States Code, section 631 (e), would otherwise be covered into the Public Treasury. Lines 3 to 8 of page 8 of the bill provide for payment to "said State" of certain proceeds which otherwise, under title 48, United States Code, section 306, would go into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. Section 28 (a) of the bill requires the payment to the Treasury of Alaska of funds which otherwise would be deposited in the Treasury of the United States, title 48, United States Code, section 439. And on the last page of the bill lines 7 to 11 require payment of Federal funds to the State of Alaska.

I am certain that no one on this floor will deny that these provisions are wholly without privilege and under the rules of the House have no place in any legislative bill. One unprivileged matter in a privileged bill destroys the privilege of the entire bill. Any one of these unprivileged provisions destroys any privilege the bill might otherwise possess. That is self-evident. This is clearly appropriating language and is, therefore, not in order on a legislative bill.

It will be argued, Mr. Speaker, possibly in the citation which has just been laid before the Speaker that under the rule giving privilege to certain bills reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, nonprivileged matters included as necessary to the accomplishment of the purpose for which privilege is given are in order. But note, Mr. Speaker, the significant word "necessary." Any such nonprivileged material, in order to qualify under this decision, must be necessary—must be necessary to the accomplishment of the purpose of the bill.

Conversely, under the same rule, Mr. Speaker, matters which are not privileged and which are not necessary to the accomplishment of the purpose destroy the privilege of the bill. And again I emphasize the word "necessary."

Are any of these unprivileged provisions—or all of them—necessary? Are they necessary to the act of admission? Are they essentially accessory? Are all of them—or any one of them—necessary? Are they necessary in order to confer statehood under this bill?

Mr. Speaker no one can successfully contend that any of them are necessary in order to accomplish the purpose of the bill.

Therefore, it follows that being unprivileged—which no one will deny—and not being necessary to accomplish the act—which no one will affirm—they destroy the privilege of this bill and it cannot be brought to the floor by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs under the rule cited by the gentleman here this afternoon.

Page after page in this bill can be cited in which there are unprivileged matters and which cannot be admitted under the theory that they are incident to the accomplishment of the purpose; that they are accessory to the purpose which the bill purports to accomplish.

I hope I may have the attention of the Speaker who has looked all along as if he had made up his mind and was not going to change it. I trust he will give attention with an open mind.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you: Who is there who will say here this afternoon that the making of all these appropriations and the many other unprivileged provisions embodied in this reprehensible bill are necessary—necessary, Mr. Speaker—to the purpose of conferring statehood as provided by this bill?

There are many other nonprivileged provisions of the bill that might be cited—although they are incident—which are not necessary to the accomplishment of the objective from which the bill would otherwise derive its privilege; and being unprivileged the rule and the precedents conversely make this bill unprivileged.

This is an iniquitous bill. It is loaded with unprivileged matter—matter wholly unnecessary to the accomplishment of the act of conferring statehood. And it seeks to give away under guise of a privileged bill such vast amounts of property as have never been given away in the history of the admission of any State to the Union. And for that reason, because they are unprivileged and because they are not necessary to accomplishment of the privileged purposes of the bill, this whole bill is unprivileged and this committee has no right to report it to the House at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] is recognized.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, speaking in opposition to the position taken by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who is known for his great talent in such matters as this, I wish to state first that this bill is brought up at this time under rule XI, clause 20, of the Rules of the House of Representatives. This particular area is of jurisdiction now given to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and not to the Committee on Public Lands. It is under that rule that we proceed today.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has made two objections to the bringing up of the bill at this time. One is that this is not an admission bill, and the second is that it contains unprivileged matters.

Mr. Speaker, the objection that the bill is not an admission bill and, therefore, could not qualify under the rule I have cited is not tenable. H. R. 7999 is the last step in the Congressional process. No further action by the House will be required. All that is required is an election by which the qualified voters of Alaska agree to accept the boundaries of the State as fixed in H. R. 7999, and consent to the various reservations of rights and powers as set out in the bill. If, as expected, the election is in favor of this proposition, the President will so proclaim.

The pattern set out in the bill in this respect is very similar to that which has been employed in other admission cases. The provision of rule XI, with which we are here concerned, was first adopted in 1890.

The best index that we have to its meaning and proper construction is what the Congress was familiar with at the time of its first adoption.

Twenty-nine States were admitted to the Union after its formation and before 1890. Nine of these were in the period 1860 to 1889. Of these 9 only 1, Kansas in 1861, was a simple, complete, outright admission. In all other eight cases, West Virginia, Nebraska, Nevada, Colorado, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, Congressional action was completed in the same way as provided in H. R. 7999 for Alaska, but it was left to the President to proclaim that the conditions attached to the admission had been met by the local electorate or the local legislature.

These nine cases were those with which the Members of the 51st Congress were most familiar when they voted on the adoption of the rule with which we are now concerned. It makes little sense to say that they adopted a rule which did not cover 8 of the 9 admissions that had occurred in the immediately preceding years. It makes no sense to say that the 51st Congress regarded the bills

which laid the groundwork for admitting these States as not being admission bills.

This is the background of rule XI, clause 20. We would be doing ourselves and our predecessors an injustice to urge that H. R. 7999 does not come within the privilege granted by it.

In answer to the gentleman's second objection, an examination of the bill will dispel that it contains so-called unprivileged matter which would permit a point of order to be upheld.

Moreover, I call attention to section 4637 in volume 4 of Hinds' Precedents where it is made clear that:

The rule giving privilege to reports from the Committee on Public Lands (a predecessor of the present Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs) permits the including of matters necessary to accomplishment of the purposes for which privilege is given.

I call attention also to Mr. Speaker Reed's observation in dealing with another bill——

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I hope the gentleman will emphasize the word "necessary"——

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado has not yielded yet.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I call attention also Mr. Speaker Reed's observation dealing with another bill reported from the same committee—volume IV, section 4638—that the provision giving privilege to its reports "has always had a liberal construction."

And I point out that our committee is given the same latitude in reporting "bills for the admission of new States" that the Committee on Ways and Means is given with respect to "bills raising revenue."

Mr. Speaker Longworth said with respect to the latter—volume VIII, section 2284:

If a major feature of a bill reported from the Ways and Means Committee relates to revenue the bill is privileged, and matters accompanying the bill not strictly raising revenue but incidental to its main purpose do not destroy this privilege.

The reason for all this is obvious. The privilege is not to be whittled away by a niggardly approach to it. It has been granted for a purpose and it must be read with that purpose in mind. The purpose is to permit consideration of matters of transcendent importance to be expedited, to prevent them from being bottled up behind matters of less consequence, and to assure that they are not defeated through sheer inability to move the machinery which is an inescapable part of the legislative process for run-of-the-mine bills.

Let us look at H. R. 7999 in the light of the pronouncements I quoted before, in the light of the usual requirements of germaneness and relevancy, and in the light of the standard contents of bills for the admission of new States to the Union.

To put the matter briefly, H. R. 7999 covers three subjects:

First. Those describing the territorial boundaries of the new State; providing that its constitution shall always be republican in form and consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Declaration of Independence; and setting out the procedural steps to be followed before the President proclaims its admission to the Union.

Second. Those providing, so to speak, the new State's dowry, and requiring it to disclaim any right, title or interest in any Federal property which is not given to it.

And may I call the Speaker's attention to the fact that the State of Wyoming was admitted under the same privileged rule, although the bill admitting the Territory of Wyoming to statehood provided means of appropriation and provided that 5 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands should go to the State. The Wyoming bill appropriated $30,000 to defray the cost of a State constitutional convention.

In other words, the question of appropriation may be a question of degree, but it does not destroy the privileged right that the bill has.

Third. Those that will provide for a smooth transition from the status of Territory to that of State, namely, (a) the continued effectiveness of already enacted laws until they are displaced by other legislation; (b) the nonabatement of pending litigation and causes of action; (c) the continuation in office of officials until new ones are chosen and the holding of the first election of the new State's Congressional delegation; (d) the adjustment of certain Federal statutes to the new status of Alaska—for example, the statutes dealing with the judicial system, the Federal Reserve System, and immigration and nationality matters.

Some of these may differ in degree, but they do not differ in kind from the many earlier bills for the admission of States. All of these provisions, I contend, are completely germane to the subject of Alaska as a State.

Mr. Speaker, there are other data and precedents which I might offer for the purpose of showing that many of the various provisions in former bills are included in this bill; that there are, in fact, some new provisions in this bill, but it is simply because of the fact that Alaska is now asking for statehood at a later time when these provisions are germane to any bill proposing statehood.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard for a moment on this.

Mr. Speaker, it does not appear that in any of those cases that were cited by the gentleman from Colorado this question that he has raised with reference to the things that might be included was raised or ruled on in a privileged bill of this character.

Mr. Speaker, this bill contains, as the gentleman from Missouri has so ably said, numbers of appropriations. For instance, on page 7, commencing on line 8, there is a direction annually to turn over to the State "70 percent of the net proceeds, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, derived during such fiscal year from all sales of sealskins or sea otter skins * * *." The same sort of thing applies to every bit of that operation. The bill itself contains all sorts of matters which are in violation of clause 4, rule XXI of the House, limiting the reporting of appropriations to the Committee on Appropriations. I do not believe that anyone could say that these appropriations could stay in the bill because of the fact that they are being reported in a bill providing for statehood. No incidentals of that character are allowed.

I think perhaps the point of order should be supplemented with the language that "it contains appropriations," and that question, under clause 4, rule XXI, can be raised at any time. It seems to me that the point of order that the gentleman from Missouri has made should be sustained.

There are a very considerable number of decisions in section 738 of the manual on privileged questions. The presence of matter not privileged with privileged matter destroys the privileged character of the bill, and there are 7 or 8 different decisions, all of which sustain that position cited at that point.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this point of order should be sustained.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to be heard?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes, Mr. Speaker; I would like to be heard on the points of order. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I reserve all other points of order against the bill and I should like at this time to make one more point of order directed to the language on page 11, line 10, which reads as follows:

All grants made or confirmed under this act shall include mineral deposits.

Mr. Speaker, the question which was presented by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is a very simple question. As a matter of fact, two points of order have been raised and I want to address myself first to the point of order which the gentleman from Missouri raised first; that is, that this bill contains an appropriation, and the language, therefore, is not in order in a legislative bill. The language reads as follows:

Commencing with the year during which Alaska is admitted into the Union, the Secretary of the Treasury, at the close of each fiscal year, shall pay to the State of Alaska 70 percent of the net proceeds, etc.

That might in some minds raise the question of what constitutes an appropriation. I believe the unfailing criterion is that any language in a bill which orders the payment of money from the Treasury without the requirement of further action by the Congress is undoubtedly an appropriation.

There are, as stated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], a number of other points in this bill of a similar character. But here is one where the appropriation is direct, where the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations has been clearly invaded by a legislative committee and the payment is directed immediately from the Treasury by the Secretary of the Treasury, and no further action, of course, is required on the part of the Congress; but it is the final action of the Congress in appropriating this money for all time in the future to be paid in annual installments.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the Speaker would rule on that question first. I do not want to belabor the point and take up unnecessary time, because that is so obvious and so incontrovertible that it would seem to me we could dispose of that simple question first. Here is an appropriation. It is subject to a point of order. If that point of order is sustained, as I am sure it has to be sustained, then I should like to discuss with the Speaker the further point of order raised by the gentleman.

I do not know whether the Speaker is ready to rule on that point of order or not, because the other one follows immediately behind it and I am prepared to discuss that, also.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman making two points of order?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No, sir; the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] made two points of order. There are two distinct points of order. One: Is this an appropriation contained in a legislative bill? If it is—and it is—then it is subject to a point of order and it must go out.

The second point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that the presence of nonprivileged matter in a privileged bill destroys not only that language but destroys the privilege of the bill. It does not destroy the bill; the bill goes on the calendar and the bill may be taken up under proper procedure. But it does destroy the privilege.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to cite authority concerning which there is not the slightest conflict on this subject. It will take me some little time. I hope the Speaker, if he has any doubt on this question, will bear with me, because I have made a very complete study of that question.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If I have that privilege, yes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does not the gentleman feel that the question of appropriation and some of the other matters relative to a statehood bill are minor matters and are necessarily there because the bill proposes to bring a new State into the Union; and naturally, to do that, it must have some conditions under which it would come into the Union?

Does the gentleman feel those practical matters not privileged must be a part of the bill if we are going to complete the bill successfully?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I would be glad to discuss that question.

It is true, as the gentleman from Nebraska so well said, that in this class of cases there must be some leeway. The only exception to the rule that I am laying down is that this point of order would not be sustained as to certain matters which might be essential to the purpose and necessary to carry out the purpose of making a State out of the Territory of Alaska, and no point is being made as to those things.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, I think this bill necessarily invades the jurisdiction of nearly every standing committee of the House. It was necessary to do so because it was essential to the central purpose of the bill. It invades the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency, for instance. On as many as 10 pages of this bill there is reference to various and sundry laws which are amended, so that it might not be necessary to rewrite a great number of laws to make them conform in making Alaska a State.

Those things are essential to the purpose of the bill. But when it comes to paying money out of the United States Treasury to the State of Alaska, that is another thing. It could be just as good a State and just as complete a State without that language as it could be with it. It is not essential to make Alaska a State to do the unprecedented thing that this bill does under the point of order I have just raised, that is, grant to the State of Alaska all of the vast mineral rights of that vast Territory, mineral rights which are vital to the defense of this Nation. Alaska can be a State without grabbing off to itself all of the valuable mineral rights of that great area. That is not essential to it. So that the point is very clear, Mr. Speaker, in the books, both Hinds' and Cannon's Precedents, that only those things which are essential to the central purpose of the act can be in order.

Mr. Speaker, I have brought here with me a very eminent authority on this question, both Hinds' Precedents, and Cannon's Precedents. If the Speaker has any doubt on the question at all I should like to go into it. Let us take for instance section 4633 of volume IV of Hinds' Precedents. This was a case on construction of the rule giving privilege to this committee, which was formerly called the Committee on Public Lands and which had this jurisdiction to report statehood bills. It states:

> The insertion of matter not privileged with privileged matter destroys the privileged character of a bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, if an appropriation by the Public Lands Committee is not in order, if those six lines are subject to a point of order, then under that precedent the whole bill is subject to a point of order so far as its privileged, and only so far as its privileged, status is concerned.

> Mr. George E. Adams, of Illinois, raised the point of order that the bill contained matter not privileged, and therefore had no privileged character.
>
> The Speaker held: The Chair thinks that is a correct proposition: That a bill which contains two separate matters, one of which is privileged under the rules of the House and the other is not, is subject to the point of order; that is to say, the insertion of matter which was not privileged destroys the privileged character of the other.

I next refer to section 4640 of volume IV of Hinds Precedents.

That was a bill brought in by the Committee on Accounts relative to the contingent fund. It included matter not privileged.

The Chair held that that destroyed the privileged character of the bill.

It is still a good bill. It still can go on the calendar. It can still be taken up when the House so desires, but it does not have the privilege.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many of these citations that I think rather than trespass on the time of the Speaker, I will just read the memorandum that I have on it, and I can go into them further in each case, if it is necessary. But, I do not want to delay the consideration of this matter.

In volume 8 of Cannon's Precedents—Cannon's Precedents by the way are the Precedents written by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri who raised this point of order.

> The resolution enlarging the powers and increasing the duties of a standing committee through the employment of a clerk to be paid from the contingent fund was held not to be within the privilege given the Committee on Accounts to report at any time.

Then, the decision goes on to say, and this is repetition, but it runs all through the books and you will not find one single Precedent in any of Hinds' Precedents or Cannon's Precedents that is contrary to what I am reading to you now. It says:

> A resolution against which a point of order has been sustained is no longer before the House and amendments therefore are not in order.

Paragraph 2302 of volume 8 of Cannon's Precedents:

> A resolution fixing salaries of House employees was held not privileged when reported by the Committee on Accounts.

Volume 8 of Cannon's Precedents, paragraph 2297:

> Privilege conferred on bills reported by the Committee on Printing is confined to provisions for printing for the two Houses, and an appropriation for such purpose destroys the privilege of the bill.

In volume 8, paragraph 2300:

> Unprivileged matter in a resolution otherwise privileged vitiates the privilege of such resolution.

In Hinds' Precedents IV, paragraph 4622:

> In exercising the right to report at any time, committees may not include matters not specified by the rule as within the privilege.

In Hinds' IV, paragraph 4623, we find this language:

> The text of a bill containing nonprivileged matter, privilege may not be created by a committee amendment in the nature of a substitute not containing the nonprivileged matter.

In Hinds' IV, paragraph 4624, we find:

> The including of matter not privileged destroys the privileged character of a bill.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest here to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado in reply to the point of order made by the gentleman from Missouri. There is nothing in his argument that in anywise is contrary to or in conflict with the authorities I have cited to the Speaker.

May I just conclude with this statement, Mr. Speaker, that this and other items in this bill are clearly appropriations on a legislative bill. As appropriations on a legislative bill, they are subject to a point of order without any question of doubt. I know the zealousness with which the Speaker, who has

been Speaker longer than any other man who ever occupied the Chair, as I say, I know his zealousness in preserving the integrity of the rules of the House. To rule that an order for the payment of money out of the Treasury, an appropriation, is in order on a legislative bill strikes the very foundation from under the rules of the House that have governed the House for 150 years. I am sure it must be obvious to the Speaker and to the membership that it is an appropriation and it is therefore subject to a point of order.

Objection has been made to it on that ground, and it simply is not in order. When we have disposed of that point of order, of course the other point of order naturally arises, which is equally well established by all the precedents written by Hinds and by Cannon from the beginning of parliamentary law in this country down to date. They hold that the presence of nonprivileged matter in a privileged bill, while it does not destroy the bill itself it does destroy this privileged status.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to inject myself into the discussion which so far has been confined to experts in the parliamentary field, but as the discussion developed there did come down to the nonexperts in this Chamber the fairly obvious fact that all of these attacks by these distinguished gentlemen have not been aimed primarily at the bill itself but at rule 11, clause 20. If the Speaker is to accept the extremely narrow limitation which would be imposed by those gentlemen, it would be impossible in modern times ever to bring a statehood bill to this floor under rule 11, clause 20, because we would have to have a rule, unless we were willing to come to the floor with a meaningless scrabble, without any appropriation, without any provision for the land. So, Mr. Speaker, I contend the attack is not upon the status of the bill itself but upon rule 11, clause 20.

The SPEAKER. Unless some other Members desire to be heard, the Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair was not notified by anyone that a point of order would be made against consideration of this bill; but anticipating that such a point of order would be made, the Chair, in company with the Parliamentarian of the House, has made a research of decisions of Speakers heretofore.

The Chair might say at this point that some of the decisions cited here do not apply to a statehood bill, and if there is a remedy that remedy would be in Committee of the Whole.

The Chair has thoroughly considered this matter, and trusts everyone believes, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] so kindly said, that this occupant of the chair, after long experience in the House and quite some experience in this position, believes in the integrity of the rules of the House and intends at all times to do his best to preserve and defend them.

Clause 20 of rule 11 provides in part as follows:

> The following named committees shall have leave to report at any time: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, bills for the admission of a new State.

The admission of a new State into the Union is not the question here.

The question, here presented, is one of procedure.

The history of the rule may be found in volume IV of Hinds' Precedents, section 4621. It is stated in that section that in the revision of the rules of 1890 privileged status was given to certain reports from the Committees on Rules, Territories, and Invalid Pensions.

In the 52d Congress the privilege of the Committee on Territories was dropped, but in the 54th and 55th Congresses the privilege was again restored to the Committee on Territories to report bills providing for the admission of new States. That privilege accorded to the Committee on Territories was continued in the standing rules of the House until 1947 when, under the Legislative Reorganization Act, the jurisdiction of the old Committee on Territories was given to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and that privilege continues until the present date.

It is interesting to note that the bill providing for the admission of the Territory of Wyoming as a State was reported in 1890 as a privileged bill. No question of order was raised as to its privileged status.

The bill providing for the admission of the Territory of Utah as a State was reported to the 53d Congress by filing with the Clerk, inasmuch as the privileged status given to the Committee on Territories did not exist in the 52d and 53d Congresses.

The bill providing for the admission of the Territory of Idaho as a State was reported during the 51st Congress by delivery to the Clerk, inasmuch as the Committee on Territories at that time did not enjoy the privilege of reporting a bill at any time.

The bill providing for the admission of the Territory of Oklahoma as a State was reported as privileged from the Committee on Territories, and no question of order was raised as to the privileged status.

Bills providing for the admission of the Territories of Arizona and New Mexico as States were reported in the 61st Congress as privileged by the Committee on Territories.

In the 62d Congress the joint resolution providing for the admission of the Territories of Arizona and New Mexico as States was reported as privileged, called up as privileged, and passed under the provisions of the rule giving privileged status to certain committees to report at any time as now provided in clause 20 of rule XI.

It is contended that in the exercising of the right to report at any time committees may not include matters not specified by the rule within the privilege.

Mr. Speakers Carlisle, Reed, and Longworth had on various occasions to pass upon phases of this question, although they did not pass specifically on the question of the privilege of the Committee on Territories with respect to bills providing for the admission of new States.

In 1888, Mr. Speaker Carlisle—Hinds' Precedents, volume IV, section 4637—held that the rule giving privilege to reports from the Committee on Public Lands permits the including of matters necessary to accomplishment of the purpose for which privilege is given.

That would be the reply to a great deal of the argument that has been made as to the germaneness of this matter.

Mr. Speaker Reed, in 1896—Hinds' Precedents, volume IV, section 4638—in passing upon a similar question stated:

> The Chair thinks that this provision has always had a liberal construction, and will decide that it is a privileged matter.

Mr. Speaker Longworth, in 1927—Cannon's Precedents, volume VIII, section 2280—in passing upon the privilege of the Committee on Ways and Means to report at any time, stated:

> If a major feature of a bill reported from the Ways and Means Committee relates to revenue the bill is privileged.

This bill relates to the admission of a new State into the Union.

And matters accompanying the bill—

Further quoting Mr. Longworth—

> not strictly raising revenue but incidental to its main purpose do not destroy this privilege.

The bill before us is one to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union. Upon a close examination of the bill it will be found that all of the provisions contained therein are necessary for the accomplishment of that objective. It may be argued that some of them are incidental to the main purpose, but as long as they tend toward the accomplishment of that end, such incidental purposes do not destroy the privilege of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to report and call up the pending bill.

It may be said, therefore, that where the major feature—and the Chair hopes the Members will listen to this—that where the major feature of the bill relates to the admission of a new State, lesser provisions incidental thereto do not destroy its privilege when reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and, therefore, for these and many other reasons, the Chair overrules the point of order.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I raise the question of consideration and demand a vote on the question of consideration.

The SPEAKER. The question of consideration, the Chair is informed, cannot be raised against the motion. That is decided on the motion itself. The Members will vote on whether or not they are going to consider this bill, if they ask for a rollcall. The question now is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. May I submit a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Under what circumstances can the question of consideration be raised?

The SPEAKER. The Chair tried to say a moment ago that it cannot be raised against the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole, because that is tantamount to consideration, and the House will have an opportunity to vote on that motion.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. In other words, if we demand a vote on that question, then that will be tantamount to raising the question of consideration?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 217, nays 172, not voting, 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

YEAS—217

Addonizio	Fogarty	Morrison
Albert	Forand	Moss
Allen, Calif.	Ford	Moulder
Anderson, Mont.	Frelinghuysen	Multer
Anfuso	Friedel	Natcher
Ashley	Fulton	Nimtz
Aspinall	Garmatz	Norblad
Ayres	Glenn	O'Brien, Ill.
Bailey	Gordon	O'Brien, N. Y.
Baker	Gray	O'Hara, Ill.
Baldwin	Green, Oreg.	O'Konski
Baring	Green, Pa.	Osmers
Barrett	Griffin	Passman
Bass, N. H.	Griffiths	Patterson
Bass, Tenn.	Hagen	Pelly
Beckworth	Hale	Perkins
Bennett, Fla.	Haskell	Pfost
Bentley	Hays, Ohio	Polk
Berry	Healey	Porter
Blatnik	Hébert	Price
Boggs	Heselton	Prouty
Boland	Hill	Quie
Bolling	Holifield	Rabaut
Boyle	Holland	Reece, Tenn.
Bray	Holmes	Reuss
Breeding	Holtzman	Rhodes, Ariz.
Brooks, Tex.	Horan	Rhodes, Pa.
Broomfield	Hyde	Riehlman
Brown, Mo.	Ikard	Robison, N. Y.
Brownson	Jarman	Robsion, Ky.
Byrd	Jensen	Rodino
Byrne, Ill.	Johnson	Rogers, Colo.
Byrne, Pa.	Jones, Mo.	Rooney
Canfield	Judd	Roosevelt
Carrigg	Karsten	Santangelo
Celler	Kearns	Saund
Chamberlain	Keating	Saylor
Chelf	Kee	Scott, Pa.
Chenoweth	Kelly, N. Y.	Seely-Brown
Christopher	Keogh	Sheehan
Church	King	Shelley
Clark	Kirwan	Sisk
Coad	Kluczynski	Smith, Calif.
Coffin	Knox	Spence
Collier	Krueger	Staggers
Corbett	Laird	Steed
Cunningham, Iowa	Lane	Sullivan
Curtin	Lankford	Talle
Curtis, Mo.	Lesinski	Taylor
Dawson, Ill.	Libonati	Teague, Calif.
Dawson, Utah	Lipscomb	Teague, Tex.
Dellay	Loser	Teller
Dennison	McCarthy	Tewes
Denton	McCormack	Thompson, N. J.
Diggs	McFall	Thompson, Tex.
Dingell	McGovern	Thomson, Wyo.
Dixon	Machrowicz	Thornberry
Dollinger	Mack, Ill.	Tollefson
Dooley	Mack, Wash.	Udall
Dorn, N. Y.	Madden	Ullman
Doyle	Magnuson	Vanik
Dwyer	Mailliard	Van Zandt
Eberharter	Marshall	Vorys
Edmondson	May	Walter
Evins	Meader	Weaver
Fallon	Merrow	Westland
Farbstein	Metcalf	Widnall
Fascell	Miller, Calif.	Wier
Feighan	Miller, Nebr.	Wright
Fino	Mills	Yates
Flood	Montoya	Young
	Morano	Zablocki
	Morgan	Zelenko

NAYS—172

Abbitt	Gary	Mumma
Abernethy	Gathings	Murray
Adair	Gavin	Neal
Alexander	George	Nicholson
Alger	Grant	Norrell
Allen, Ill.	Gubser	O'Hara, Minn.
Andersen, H. Carl	Gwinn	O'Neill
Andrews	Haley	Ostertag
Arends	Halleck	Philbin
Ashmore	Harden	Pilcher
Avery	Hardy	Pillion
Barden	Harris	Poage
Bates	Harrison, Nebr.	Poff
Baumhart	Harrison, Va.	Preston
Beamer	Harvey	Rains
Becker	Hemphill	Ray
Belcher	Henderson	Reed
Bennett, Mich.	Herlong	Rees, Kans.
Betts	Hess	Riley
Blitch	Hiestand	Roberts
Bolton	Hoeven	Robeson, Va.
Bonner	Hoffman	Rogers, Fla.
Bosch	Holt	Rogers, Mass.
Boykin	Hosmer	Rogers, Tex.
Brooks, La.	Huddleston	Rutherford
Brown, Ga.	Hull	Sadlak
Brown, Ohio	Jackson	St. George
Broyhill	Jennings	Schenck
Budge	Johansen	Scherer
Burleson	Jonas	Schwengel
Bush	Jones, Ala.	Scrivner
Byrnes, Wis.	Kean	Scudder
Cannon	Kilburn	Selden
Cederberg	Kilday	Sikes
Chiperfield	Kilgore	Siler
Clevenger	Kitchin	Simpson, Ill.
Cooley	Lafore	Simpson, Pa.
Coudert	Landrum	Smith, Kans.
Cramer	Latham	Smith, Miss.
Cretella	LeCompte	Smith, Va.
Cunningham, Nebr.	McCulloch	Springer
Curtis, Mass.	McDonough	Stauffer
Dague	McGregor	Taber
Davis, Ga.	McIntire	Thomas
Delaney	McIntosh	Tuck
Derounian	McMillan	Van Pelt
Devereux	McVey	Vinson
Donohue	Macdonald	Wainwright
Dorn, S. C.	Mahon	Wharton
Elliott	Martin	Whitener
Everett	Mason	Whitten
Fisher	Matthews	Wigglesworth
Flynt	Michel	Williams, Miss.
Forrester	Miller, Md.	Williams, N. Y.
Fountain	Miller, N. Y.	Wilson, Ind.
Frazier	Minshall	Winstead
	Mitchell	Withrow
	Moore	Younger

NOT VOTING—40

Auchincloss	Gregory	Scott, N. C.
Bow	Gross	Sheppard
Buckley	Hays, Ark.	Shuford
Burdick	Hillings	Sieminski
Carnahan	James	Thompson, La.
Colmer	Jenkins	Trimble
Davis, Tenn.	Kearney	Utt
Dent	Knutson	Vursell
Dies	Lennon	Watts
Dowdy	Morris	Willis
Durham	Patman	Wilson, Calif.
Engle	Powell	Wolverton
Fenton	Radwan	
Granahan	Rivers	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Colmer against.

Mr. Bow for, with Mr. Scott of North Carolina against.

Mr. Hillings for, with Mr. Wolverton against.

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Auchincloss against.

Mr. Carnahan for, with Mr. Jenkins against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Fenton against.

Mrs. Granahan for, with Mr. Radwan against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. James against.

Mr. Engle for, with Mr. Dowdy against.

Mr. Burdick for, with Mr. Trimble against.

Mr. Wilson of California for, with Mr. Hays of Arkansas against.

Mrs. Knutson for, with Mr. Dies against.

Mr. Sieminski for, with Mr. Gregory against.

Mr. Dent for, with Mr. Watts against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Lennon with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Gross.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7999) to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] for 1 hour.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Gladly.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, I heard the Chair recognize the gentleman from New York for 1 hour. Can the Chair tell me how much time is expected to be consumed on this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not within the knowledge of the Chair, and it is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MORANO. What is the parliamentary situation with respect to time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has been recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MORANO. Does that mean that every other Member of the House can be recognized for 1 hour?

The CHAIRMAN. He may use all or part of it. He may use less than an hour if he wishes to.

Mr. MORANO. Can every other Member of the House be recognized for 1 hour, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the situation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I believe before we went into the Committee of the Whole it was agreed that the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] would control half of the time and the gentleman from Nebraska half of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection was made to that request.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I can clear up the situation a little bit. It is my understanding that each Member could be recognized for 1 hour, which would mean a total of over 400 hours, but I know that this is a very reasonable body, and I assume that after reasonable debate a majority would vote to limit the time. I would hope that that would be by tomorrow.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. The gentleman then expects to move, after reasonable debate, that the debate be terminated?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Yes. I might add that there has been some discussion on both sides on that subject,

and with people who are opposed to the legislation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, can the gentleman tell me whether that has to be done in the Committee or in the House?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. In the House, it is my understanding.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I understand the procedure, at the appropriate time someone may make a motion, the gentleman or some member of the committee, that the Committee rise, and then when we go back into the House, the House could then determine and agree on time and go back into the Committee of the Whole again. That is my understanding.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful as an individual and as a Member of this House that the distinguished House of Representatives voted by a rather substantial margin to hear the arguments for and against statehood for Alaska. I think, Mr. Chairman, that that decision was in the fine tradition of the House. It would have been unthinkable to many of us that we would have refused to hear the arguments for or against such a vital matter as the admission of a new State in the Union.

I would like to say at the outset, Mr. Chairman, that I have been assigned the task of making the first presentation of the arguments for the admission of Alaska to statehood. It is a difficult subject and I should like to cover some of the arguments which already have been made in various places against statehood; and for that reason, and so it may be understood that there is no discourtesy on my part, I do not propose to yield, if any Member feels impelled to ask that I do so, during the next several minutes.

One thing I should like to make very clear. I do not think anyone in this House has a higher regard or a deeper respect for the members of the distinguished Committee on Rules than I have, and the presence of this bill on the floor under its present privileged status was not an impertinent gesture on the part of those who favor statehood for Alaska. It was a gesture, if you will, of last resort. We felt—in fact, we were told rather plainly—that if there was a rule, it might be in August, but there was some question whether or not there would be a rule. We felt, and I think fairly, that when the two major parties of this country——

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for the correction of an impression he may have left?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. In view of the fact that the gentleman has mentioned the Committee on Rules, the inference might have been left that all members of the Committee on Rules were opposed to statehood for Alaska. That is not true. As a member of the Rules Committee I wish it recorded that I am for this legislation.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. If that was the impression I left, I regret it and I withdraw it, because I know that there are some members of the Committee on Rules who favor statehood for Alaska. And I might say for the benefit of those who oppose it, my respect and regard for them is not lessened in any degree, especially those who have very firm, very strong feelings on the subject. My only quarrel, if I have one today, is with those Members who might be so indifferent on this major issue that they will be swayed by minor and irrelevant arguments. And I should like to proceed shortly to some of those minor and irrelevant arguments. But I have one further explanation at this point.

Some Members may wonder why the bill H. R. 7999 bears the name of the Member from New York and not that of the distinguished Delegate from Alaska who has worked so long and so hard in this field. I want to tell you that my name on the bill was, in a sense, the gift of the Delegate from Alaska. He requested that I report my bill. I know one of his motives. He wanted the bill to come before the House in the name of a Member from the State with the largest population in the United States so that we could demonstrate that in the large States such as New York, Pennsylvania, California and others, there are Members of this House and citizens of those States who do not look down their noses at the smaller population in Alaska and say, "We want no part of you." I do not know whether it occurred to the Delegate from Alaska or not, but I think there is a little significance in the fact that my home district is Albany, N. Y., which was writing pages of American history 150 years before the shots were fired at Lexington and Concord. Not too long ago we adopted a resolution in this House as a tribute to Benjamin Franklin declaring Albany, N. Y., the birthplace of the Union.

I do not say this as a chamber of commerce member might, but merely to point out that in my district, a part of the Union from the very beginning, we do not accept the concept that this Nation would have been better off if the Thirteen Original States sat like haughty dowagers on their eastern seaboard and regarded the rest of the Nation as a fishing or hunting preserve or, perhaps, a place of exploitation as Alaska has been for so long.

I say to you today that we have more than just another bill before us.

We have in a sense a rendezvous with our future. We are going to decide something here today that is not so important to you and to me, certainly not so important to those of us who have passed midlife, but it is of vital importance to those who will follow us.

I say to you, too, to those who might suggest, "Well, this is not the year, maybe next year, maybe 2 years from now," that Alaska has been listening to that for 42 years. I tell you that it is my conclusion and sincere belief that if we reject Alaskan statehood this year it is dead for a generation, because this year we have a certain amount of extra steam, if you will, behind this measure.

We have editorial support from 679 newspapers in my district and in yours. We have the support of 12 out of 13 of the residents of the United States who have expressed views on the subject. Members of this House who have followed the practice of sending questionnaires to their constituents have been surprised in many instances to discover very overwhelming favor for statehood for Alaska. In my own district it is eight to one. I might say that was demonstrated not by my questionnaire but because a local newspaper published the questionnaire from the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG]. He wanted to know. I do not know what the result in his district was but I know what it was in mine.

On that same questionnaire there was this question:

Do you favor a reduction in Federal taxes by reducing nonmilitary expenditures?

Three to one favored that, a substantial margin, but far short of the eight to one who favored statehood for Alaska.

I daresay that in the districts of 75 percent of the Members of this House the people want statehood for Alaska.

One of the problems is, they want it but they do not get angry enough about it. We are able to stand up and say, "Oh, yes, my district favors it, but I am against it." That is fine. I think Members should be independent. I think you are entitled to say to the public, if you want to, "You do not know what you are talking about. Papa knows best." But let us fit this public approval into the mosaic, if you will. If we reject public opinion as uninformed, then we must necessarily turn to those who are informed.

In this House you give the responsibility for the Territories to our committee. We do not claim to be experts, but we do claim to be practiced, we do claim to know the facts, and our committee 24 to 6 reported out this bill you have before you.

The Secretary of the Interior favors this bill, and I think that flies in the face of the idea that a Federal official never wants to disgorge any authority once given to him. The Secretary of the Interior knows the conditions in Alaska.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and that is important because we have a large military establishment in Alaska, testified that statehood not only would not hamper our military effort in Alaska but would aid it by granting stability in the area where the military operates so largely.

I realize that some of the most effective and powerful men in this House do not agree that Alaska should be a State. I know their arguments. I have heard them. But I should like to suggest that the history of statehood in this country is a sordid chapter in the sense of deals, and compromises.

Now we have a chance, just once, to say to a single Territory, "On your own merits, without regard to what happens to any other Territory anywhere else, you are admitted because it is for the good of the United States."

I say from reading the record of the past, that those distinguished gentle-

men who will follow me in opposition are in distinguished company, indeed. I often read, as all of us do, the writings on the wall in back of me in the Chamber here. I do not know whether Daniel Webster would have chosen the quotation which you see here in this Chamber as the one quotation of all the things that he said. But, I am rather happy that this one has been chosen because in this quotation he said,

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

If Daniel Webster were in this Chamber today, I am very sure he would not want to be remembered for his statement that we should not push into the West and that the Republic itself might topple and fall if we had anything to do with those wild men west of the Missouri. Well, in that territory to which Daniel Webster was opposed, we have some of the greatest States in the entire Nation today. I say to the modern day Daniel Websters, and I sincerely believe they belong in that category, make very sure, if you are quoted one day on the walls of this Chamber, that you will not be quoted as saying that Alaska has no future in our national scheme because I predict that if you give Alaska statehood within a quarter of a century there will be a minimum of 10 million people in that great land. A very good friend of mine in this House, one of the principal opponents of statehood advanced the rather novel idea that because, as he says, there are a lot of Communists in Hawaii, Alaska should not be a State. That is a very difficult argument to answer unless you fall back upon your old training in school and employ the principle of reductio ad absurdum. You might say that all Germans west and east are Communists because some Germans in East Germany are under Communist control. You might say that because there are Communist dominated countries in Europe, therefore, England and Ireland and all the rest of the countries are Communists also. I am rather happy that the gentleman has raised this question because so far as Alaska is concerned, and the testimony will show it, in this great land under the frowning eyes of the Russians themselves, a land which extends to Siberia, there are fewer Communists than anywhere in the United States. Only yesterday I spoke to a former United States Attorney from Alaska and he told me that in spite of the special care because of our great military installations there that there had not been one single case of attempted sabotage of our military installations. Ten suspected Reds in all of Alaska—1 to every 20,000 and, yet, the distinguished gentleman from New York, which has 1 Communist for every 1,600 people, would have you believe that because there is a certain labor leader in Hawaii, Alaska is communistic. We have separated the Alaskan and Hawaiian bills deliberately.

They should not swing upon one another. Each is entitled to a decision on its own merits. I know someone will say before this debate is over, "Where is Hawaii? This is discrimination. This is politics." But I defy any Member of this House, including members of our committee, to show where in one instance I have played politics on this issue. They know that, but they want to mention Hawaii for this reason: Once you inject Hawaii in the debate, then you get the response, "Won't we one day be asked to admit Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, then Jupiter and Saturn and Mars?" forgetting that the same House which is making the decision on Alaskan statehood this week holds the key to any future attempt by any area anywhere to come into the Union. We are deciding only on Alaska. I am not opposed to Hawaii. I shall do all in my power, if Alaska is given statehood, to bring the Hawaiian bill before this House for fair and full consideration. We see what happened 3 years ago when we had a shotgun wedding in this House; when Hawaii and Alaska were picked up by the seat of the pants and thrown into one bill. No one ever talked about Alaska. All we had were pictures of alleged Communists in Hawaii.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is making a very fine exposition of this bill and I think there should be a quorum present to hear him. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. THORNBERRY). The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-six Members are present; not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 63]

Auchincloss	Gregory	Powell
Bass, Tenn.	Gross	Radwan
Buckley	Gubser	Rivers
Burdick	Hays, Ark.	Scott, N. C.
Carnahan	Hillings	Sheppard
Carrigg	James	Shuford
Celler	Jenkins	Sieminski
Colmer	Kearney	Spence
Davis, Tenn.	Keating	Springer
Dent	Knutson	Teague, Tex.
Dies	LeCompte	Trimble
Dowdy	Lennon	Vinson
Durham	Michel	Vursell
Engle	Miller, Calif.	Willis
Fenton	Morris	Wolverton
Granahan	Moulder	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having assumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7999, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 379 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the gentleman from Virginia for the temporary respite and particularly because I was about to discuss a matter which I know to be of very grave concern to him. I know the distinguished gentleman from Virginia is opposed to this bill, but I think it would be a very bad mistake to assume that because the gentleman is opposed to the bill that some of the matters he raises in opposition are not matters of grave concern. I know that the gentleman is and has been concerned about what have been described as giveaways. I would like to point out, if I may, that when we are considering statehood for Alaska, we have to throw away our ordinary concepts of geography. We are talking about a territory one-fifth the size of the United States, a territory, if the distinguished Members from the State of Texas will forgive me, which is twice the size of Texas and everybody knows that Texas is big indeed. So when we talk about land grants we cannot talk in terms of 1 million or 5 million or even 10 million acres. We are all aware that if you drop a million acres into the middle of Rhode Island, it would be quite a hunk of ground. In Texas, it would probably be a ranch and in Alaska, it would be a garden patch. Especially, when we figure the land must be selected from land which will not serve any purpose to the new state. We have in this bill, as I recall, a land grant of approximately 184 million acres.

That is a staggering figure, but I suggest that we consider it in percentage terms. It means that the new State will still have control of less than one-half of its own land and that of the more than 50 percent which will be retained by the Federal Government, there is included some of the richest oil land in Alaska. Furthermore, and I can speak only for myself, when we arrive at a point where the bill is open to amendment, I shall cheerfully accept personally an amendment which would reduce the acreage to 101 million or 102 million. That would be substantially less than one-third of the land in Alaska turned over to the new State. You might say what about these minerals and what about this loot that might be given away if we give the new State power to select mineral lands. It is my considered judgment that these mineral lands will have more protection when we give them to the State of Alaska than they have now because the Federal Government presently leases those mineral lands and also grants patents for those lands. The new State of Alaska under its own constitution is forbidden to grant patents. May I say that if there is a giveaway, with which I do not agree, it is already taking place because 90 percent of the revenue that the Federal Government presently collects from mineral leases in Alaska is turned back to the Territory of Alaska. My advice to the new State would be not to select mineral lands—to select other land and if I may emphasize just a little bit more what I had in mind about the great expanse of territory and the necessity of using percentages figures, some years ago we passed a bill in the House giving 100,000 acres of land to the University of Alaska to help support that great institution. The latest advice I have is that from those 100,000 acres, and that is a lot of acres, they have not received enough revenue to equip their basketball team. So when you talk about a million acres in Alaska, you have to consider the millions of acres which are not given to the new State.

You have got to consider the millions which are retained by the Federal Gov-

ernment, and you must consider that those retained acres include the richest oil land. It has always been my impression, though not spelled out in law, that land in an incorporated territory, in an embryonic State, is actually held by the Federal Government in trust for the future State. So in that sense it is not a question of Uncle Sam tossing a lot of minerals and a lot of oil to an unscrupulous leadership in a new State.

I think the question comes up: Can Alaska, with 212,000 people, support statehood? In the considered judgment of the committee who listened to all the witnesses, it can and will. And with the provisions we have in this bill dealing with the land tax base, with the seal fisheries, and so forth, the additional cost of statehood over and above the present cost of Territorial government will be approximately $2 million a year. I am not belittling $2 million, but I assert that it is within the means of the people of Alaska. I know some people up there oppose it. I know the suggestion will be made that the people of Alaska way down underneath do not want statehood. We have had polls which indicate that they do not want it. But every time they have gone to the voting place on any question dealing with statehood, the vote has been for statehood, up to and including the most recent primary in Alaska, where there was a candidate who favored the commonwealth. In Alaska you can cross party lines in a primary. There was no contest on the Democratic side, so the Democrats could easily, if they opposed statehood, have gone over the line and voted for this commonwealth candidate who was a Republican, a gentleman who favored a commonwealth—a commonwealth is a tempting status—and they polled only 10 percent of the entire vote cast in the Alaska primary. But we are willing again to compromise. If it is the sense of this House that we have an amendment providing for a plebescite when the statehood bill comes to the voters of Alaska, we are willing to go along with it, because we have no desire to jam statehood down the throats of any people. Nor do we accept at face value the "aginners," because away back in the Revolutionary War there were some people who did not believe this country could get along as a separate nation. The Tories were not entirely disloyal. They felt that they were sound in their judgment, but they were opposed to independence. We have Tories in every State and in every Territory—people who just love the status quo, who think that maybe it will cost them a little more to be a State, and they think that the price is too high here for the great honor, the great privilege of being a full citizen of the United States, qualified to vote for President and Vice President and their own Governor.

Now I would like to go into the question of what this means to all of us. I think that we could very well today forget this talk of colonialism, forget that Alaska has been hanging fire in the limbo of an unincorporated Territory for 90 years, forget the aspirations and hopes of the people there; and think selfishly, if you will, of our own districts and the rest of the Nation. I tell you that I believe, as far as my district is concerned, statehood is a must.

Small population? Every State that has come into the Union has added to the wealth and population of my State, and I feel that this great Territory properly developed will pour its benefits out over every one of the 48 States of the Nation. I think we will save money in the long run; I think we will reduce the cost of our Military Establishment in Alaska.

There are those who say that Alaska is too far away, that it is a Never-Never Land, a fabulous place up north which has polar bears and Eskimos. Unfortunately, some of the things about our modern civilization are already in Alaska, neon lights and other things which interfere with the intrinsic beauty of the place.

Here is a Territory which is not a forgotten outpost, which has its own university, which devotes half of its budget to education. It is composed of people from your State, your city, my State and my city. These people are loyal Americans in every sense of the word, and the only difference between them and us is that they have preserved some of the pioneering spirit of which we speak so highly in this country. The men and women of Alaska are our kinfolk; they are the pioneers of 1958. We talked with them, we talked with them in every part of that enormous land. In 1955 we went into tiny fishing villages; we went into the modern cities of Anchorage and Fairbanks, and even went to Point Barrow up in Eskimoland.

When we talk about people it is the concern of this House. I can describe what they are in no better way than to paraphrase an editorial which had to do not with statehood for Alaska but the recent celebration of the 100th anniversary of the statehood of Minnesota. The editorial told of all the material things in Minnesota, but then it added, and I shall use Alaska instead of Minnesota in reading this:

> Alaska is people. They represent the finest part of the pioneer tradition of which we are so proud. They were ready and eager to face a climate that is sometimes less than benign, to work a soil that could be responsive. They wanted to make a new world in something of the pattern of the old one. They brought with them a dignity, fidelity, and industry that did not brook compromise.

Then the editorial continued, and I think this is significant to us who come from other parts of the country:

> Each one of us may have his own little part of the country to which he is especially devoted. There is no reason to be ashamed of these local prides and loyalties, but there is reason to be gratified by the splendor of regions other than our own; and because we are so proud to be Americans, it is good to know that Alaska and its people may be a part of us.

I think we all have been disturbed from time to time, those of us who live in congested areas, by the fact that we are living in this country, many parts of it, upon our capital, as it were. In some areas of this country water must be used over again because of the shortage. In another generation, perhaps more specifically by the time my eldest grandson is old enough to serve in this distinguished body, we are told that we will have 70 million more people in the United States. I suggest that it is a responsibility of our generation to make very sure that the gates to expansion and opportunity are not closed. I suggest that many of those 70 million, our children and our grandchildren, will find that opportunity in the great new State of Alaska.

May I suggest this, too. We have been alarmed, some of us, recently by the reception given to our Vice President in South America. And, as I read of the stones and the filth which were cast not upon RICHARD NIXON the individual but upon every man and woman in this country whom he represented there, I thought of a people far to the north of South America, a people who do not have to be bribed or given foreign aid or cajoled, people who are loyal to us now. And I thought of how true were the words of Shakespeare when he suggested that "The friends thou hast, and their adoption, tried, grapple them to thys soul with hoops of steel."

I have one final thought. I have not covered all of the arguments against this bill or all of the arguments for it, because others more able than I will follow. But, I was handed a few days ago an old copy of a wire service story. I will not read it, but I will simply tell you that it quoted Molotov, wherever he is now, Outer Mongolia, as saying that the Communists in Russia never agreed to the sale of Alaska to the United States, implying that they still have a claim, perhaps to be asserted sometime in the future.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-six Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 64]

Anderson, Mont.	Dowdy	Michel
Auchincloss	Durham	Morris
Bailey	Eberharter	Moulder
Bentley	Engle	Powell
Blatnik	Evins	Radwan
Brooks, La.	Fenton	Rivers
Buckley	Gray	Scott, N. C.
Burdick	Gregory	Sheppard
Carnahan	Gross	Shuford
Celler	Gubser	Sieminski
Christopher	Haskell	Smith, Kans.
Clark	Hays, Ark.	Smith, Miss.
Coffin	Hillings	Spence
Colmer	James	Springer
Davis, Tenn.	Jenkins	Steed
Dawson, Utah	Kearney	Teague, Tex.
Dellay	Kilburn	Thomas
Dent	Knutson	Trimble
Dies	LeCompte	Vinson
Dingell	Lennon	Watts
	Lesinski	Willis

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill

(H. R. 7999) to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, finding itself without a quorum he directed the roll to be called, when 366 Members responded to their names, disclosing a quorum to be present, and he submitted herewith a list of the absentees for printing in the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] is recognized.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I was very close to the concluding point when the gentleman made the point of order of no quorum. The interval did permit me to think of one final argument which has been advanced against statehood for Alaska. I think perhaps deep down in our minds it is the prevailing objection, perhaps the most important to many Members. Very simply put, it is this: Should 212,000 people have 2 representatives in the United States Senate when a State such as New York, with 16 million people, has the same number? I know that is difficult to answer. If we assume that there should be geographical representation in the United States Senate, if we accept that, then we are turning back the clock 171 years. We are also saying directly or indirectly: "We from New York, why should not we have nine Senators? Why should not many of the smaller States have only one, or none, if you will?" Yet, when we look at what some of these smaller States have produced in our United States Senate we are very happy about the geographical representation.

I know that I, as a resident of a small State, would resent rather deeply the suggestion, directly or indirectly, that I had two representatives in the United States Senate because we made a mistake somewhere along the line. That is a reflection upon the membership in the House; it is a reflection on some of these distinguished and most able ladies and gentlemen from smaller States.

You know, as well as I, that many States came into being with populations smaller than that which Alaska now has. If you will look at the record of population totals you will discover a very significant thing, and that is the tremendous growth in population in each of those States following admission to statehood. For example, to select one, Ohio: Population at time of admission, 80,000; population at succeeding census, 230,000. Indiana: At time of admission, 63,000; population at succeeding census, 147,000.

I could recite others, but they all fall into the same pattern, and I am convinced that if you suffer this small population in Alaska to have 2 spokesmen in the United States Senate, within a very few years those same 2 Senators will be representing millions of people, because the potential in Alaska is as great as or greater than it was in these other States.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield.

Mr. HOSMER. In order that the figures that the gentleman gave may be in proper perspective, to wit, those with regard to Indiana and Ohio, I would like to say that at the time those States were admitted into the Union, and from a column that does no show in the report, Indiana's population at that time was 1.5269 percent of the total United States population. At the time of Ohio's admission her population represented 3.187 percent of the population of the United States. At the present time the population of Alaska represents only .0853 percent of the total population of the United States.

So under those circumstances there is a considerable difference when you compare sizes of population at the time of admission than there is when you use the bare unweighted numbers.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The gentleman will recall that I was discussing only the growth which followed admission to statehood to support the contention of our committee that statehood has never been a failure in the United States. But if the gentleman wants to press the point percentagewise, then when we get into that field where he compares his State of 14 million with some of the smaller States I wonder if he would have in mind the desirability of taking from those States one or both of their Senators and giving them to the great State of California? I know it would not be constitutionally possible, but surely the thought must be there when you are applying a population argument to the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. On the question of contiguous territory, at the time California and Oregon were admitted to the Union there was a tremendous area separating California and Oregon from the other States of the Union. They were not contiguous to the States of the Union at that time.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. The gentleman is so very, very correct.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to reply to the statement by the majority leader. I think that is one of the subjects that I did not touch upon because another Member will handle it. But, when we use the word "contiguous," surely it must be a relative term. Surely, with a territory which in these modern days is close enough with modern transportation to permit this individual to listen to a world series game on the radio in a hotel in Juneau, Alaska, and then on the next afternoon to see the second game of that series on television in my hometown in Albany, N. Y., you will have to admit that Alaska today is much closer to the rest of the United States than even some of our Midwestern States were at the time of their admission. I stated or intended to state that for 20 years the Soviet Government has been feeding to the Russian people the deliberate lie that the Czar had no right to sell Alaska to the United States; that actually the money, the $7.2 million, was only a reimbursement to Russia for the expenses incurred by the Czar in sending Russian fleets to San Francisco and New York at a time during the Civil War. Well, we know that we are never going to concede that argument. But, I suggest, added to all the other arguments which have been or will be advanced, that it might be a fine gesture by the United States to meet this challenge from the Kremlin once and for all, and the simplest way to do it is to plant right on the Siberian border in Alaska the American flag with 49 stars.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Gladly.

Mr. ASPINALL. I just wish to compliment and congratulate my good personal friend and colleague on the committee and of this great body for his presentation here today. It is my opinion that he stands today as the No. 1 man in the study of Alaskan matters and Alaska's quest for statehood. He has been doing an admirable job.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I am indeed very grateful.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to the Delegate from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I would like to say that my subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New York, has made an eloquent as well as a powerful speech in behalf of Alaska statehood. He has completely persuaded me, by the way. I want him to know that all of the Alaskans, meaning most of them, who are for statehood, particularly appreciate what he is doing for us now and what he has done for us before. Now, the gentleman said awhile ago "Protect your Alaska." Is it not true that during the hearings over which you presided some 600,000 words of testimony were taken down and later reduced to printed form?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Yes; the gentleman is correct. We did take 600,000 words of testimony. We covered I do not know how many thousands of miles, and we covered the whole subject of Alaska so thoroughly that we could think of but one description for the title which emerged, and that was "Alaska, 1955."

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, let me ask the gentleman this, if I may. Did he have opportunity on that trip to talk to, and be talked to by, the people who were against statehood as well as those resident in the Territory who were for statehood?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I would like to say to the distinguished Delegate that we sought out people who were opposed to statehood because it was too easy to find people who supported it. We had to look for opponents, and even the opponents, our record will show, conceded that the vast majority of the people in Alaska disagreed with their views.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PILLION. The gentleman, I am sure, is aware of the fact that the Constitution does not permit any State to be

deprived of its two Senators; perhaps it is one section of the Constitution that is unamendable. The gentleman is aware of that?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Yes.

Mr. PILLION. The gentleman is aware of the clause that provides for the possibility of one State having less than two Senators; in other words, a State may consent to have less than two Senators. So that the framers of our Constitution did have in mind the possibility that there might be less than two Senators, and that portion of the Constitution also is unamendable. The gentleman is aware of that?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I concede that the Constitution does not permit any State, having 2 Senators, to lose 1 of them. I merely wanted to suggest, when I raised that point, that if we were logical, we would be quarreling with the fact that somewhere along the line we did not provide 9 Senators for our State, perhaps 7 for California, and 7 or 8 for Pennsylvania, which would leave some of our States in very bad shape, indeed. I do not concede the gentleman's point that there is a provision in the Constitution permitting a State to have less than two Senators, although I know the gentleman's arguments in that direction, and I know he will explore them fully when he takes his place in the well. All I can say is that I violently disagree with the idea of admitting half a State or of giving a Territory half of statehood. It is all or nothing, and I am very calmly confident that if the time ever came when the two Senators from Alaska, representing whatever number of people they represented, were voting on a great national issue, they would vote in the public interest. And I am very sure that there is just as great a possibility of Alaska producing another Borah as did Idaho, or of producing another MANSFIELD, as has Montana.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the man who has, in my opinion, done more to promote the cause of statehood for Alaska than any other one person who is a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Subcommittee on Territories. I think the gentleman from New York has been a very able leader and has been a true advocate of statehood. I know that he has endeared himself not only to the people of Alaska but to all people of the United States who are interested in looking at statehood for Alaska as a national problem and not on a small, selfish basis as are some of the opponents, in my opinion.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. I have a question which has nothing to do with the pros or cons of statehood, but for the purpose of information. What will happen during the period when Alaska becomes a State, as far as a limitation on the number of Representatives in the House is concerned? Would they have representation or would they not?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I am glad the gentleman raised that point. The bill provides that until after the next census, the membership of the House would be increased by one; and after the next census the figure would go back to 435.

I have had people suggest, "Well, maybe that might be my seat." With the changes that are going to take place around the country after the next census, I think it is straining at a gnat if we are worrying about what seat will go out as a result of admitting Alaska to the Union. I may say to the gentleman that I have a very strong suspicion as to whose seat it will be. I think it might very well be that of the gentleman from New York, who is now speaking.

Mr. PELLY. Will the gentleman explain as to the other body? Would there be any temporary changes in the other body?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. No; because the representation in the Senate has nothing to do with population. There would be two Senators for the State or, as the gentleman from New York has suggested, and if he is correct, maybe one.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, Alaska was promised statehood when it was annexed in 1867.

The promise was clear and explicit.

It is found in article III of the treaty with Russia signed March 30, 1867, by Secretary of State William H. Seward and ratified by the United States Senate.

Article III reads as follows:

> The inhabitants of the ceded Territory, according to their choice, reserving their natural allegiance, may return to Russia within 3 years; but if they should prefer to remain in the ceded Territory, they, with the exception of uncivilized native tribes, shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States, and shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion. The uncivilized tribes will be subject to such laws and regulations as the United States may, from time to time, adopt in regard to aboriginal tribes of that country.

The essence of that pledge is contained in the words "the inhabitants shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States."

There is only one way in which those inhabitants of Alaska can be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States. That way is to admit Alaska to statehood. There is no other way.

For it is clear that only by statehood will the people of Alaska be able to enjoy—

The right to vote for President and Vice President, which they cannot do now;

The right to be represented in the Congress by two United States Senators and a Representative with a vote, which they do not have now; and

The right to be freed from a variety of restrictions including those imposed upon them by the Organic Act of 1912 and by the act of Congress of July 30, 1886, which prescribed various prohibitions for American Territories, still sufficient in number to be subsequently formed into 10 States.

The pledge made in the Treaty of Cession, 91 years ago, conveys a solemn obligation. A treaty was then and still is the highest law of the land.

The actions of Congress subsequent to ratification of the treaty give further substance—if such substance were needed—to Alaska's right to statehood. That right to statehood inheres in the ratification of the treaty also by the House of Representatives in the following year, 1868, when the House authorized and appropriated the $7,200,000 purchase price. It inheres in the extension to Alaska of the laws relating to customs, commerce, and navigation, and the establishment of a collection district in the newly acquired Territory.

By these acts—the United States Supreme Court decided in the so-called "Insular Cases" early in this century—Alaska was incorporated into the Union in 1868. As an incorporated Territory it became an "inchoate State." As such it cannot by any act of Congress be alienated, given independence or any other political status, as can be done and has been done with unincorporated territories or insular possessions. These never paid Federal taxes, while Alaska pays all Federal taxes and under the uniformity clause of the Constitution cannot be relieved of them. Taxation without representation should, obviously, be terminated. The destiny of Alaska, an incorporated Territory—taken, literally, into the body of the Union—can only be statehood. However, those important Supreme Court decisions in the Insular Cases, while buttressing Alaska's right to statehood beyond peradventure, are not needed to strengthen the explicit commitment of the treaty with Russia made 91 years ago.

The only questions then to be answered to determine the time of Alaska's admission to the equality of statehood are whether the Territory has met and can meet the tests of political maturity and economic sufficiency.

Or, to put it in another way: First, are Alaskans capable of self-government? And, second, are their resources sufficient to support a State?

I am deeply convinced—as a member of the committee dealing with our Territories for 14 years, and as its chairman in the last 2 Congresses, which has given me ample opportunity to become familiar with this important issue—that Alaska is fully qualified on both counts.

Let us look at the first question. Are Alaskans politically mature? They ought to be after 90 years of incorporation, the longest duration of pupilage

in our history. Let us take a look at that history.

Our fellow citizens who went west to become Alaskans went of their own free will. They went, in part, in quest of greater opportunity and greater freedom. They went, inspired, in part, by the love of adventure which lies deep in every American heart. They went westward into the unknown, open and emptier spaces of our land as generations of Americans had before them. And they went beyond their predecessors. Settling America's farthest west and farthest north they wrote the final chapter in the greatest epic of all history—the American epic. Yet, it was final only in the sense that they had reached land's end and could go no further.

But if theirs was a concluding chapter in the westward course, it was but the beginning of a great new episode, a still greater adventure—and one of national import. For those pioneers who braved every hardship, who conquered the wilderness, have set themselves in those northernmost latitudes and westernmost meridians of our continent to establish a great and worthy outpost of American life. Overcoming great natural obstacles and still greater distantly manmade handicaps, they have laid the foundation of a robust society whose destiny it is to be not merely a bulwark of defense for the Western Hemisphere but a citadel of democracy and freedom.

How timely their purpose in this hour of world crisis.

And how appropriate their role in what was once Russian-America and lies within sight of Siberia. Siberia, which to the free world has always signified exile, imprisonment, and death, and never more so than under the tyranny of the Soviet police state.

The Alaskans were and are well qualified to carry out their purpose. They brought with them their traditions of self-government. Imbued with the pioneer spirit, self-reliant, energized by the frontier, hardy in body and independent in spirit, they are the rugged individualists of the type who from earliest days have helped mold America.

Handicapped by 45 years' delay after the treaty before receiving any workable self-government—the longest period of Federal neglect of a Territory in our history—they made the best of the limited form of government given them by the Organic Act of 1912.

A second 45 years have now passed since that first Territorial legislature convened in Juneau in 1913. Its membership of 24—its numbers determined by Congress—was a typical cross-section of an American legislative body of that day. Eighteen of its members were born in the States. The remaining 6 had their birthplaces in 6 countries whose ideas of freedom and self-government are akin to ours—England, Ireland, Canada, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland.

How did they perform? And how have their successors performed in the 22 biennial sessions since then?

In those 45 years the successive Territorial legislatures have gradually set up and now maintain a complete structure of Territorial government. It renders all the services needed in Alaska—the services performed by any State excepting those few which Congress, in the Organic Act of 1912, specifically prohibited.

Before evaluating the present structure of Alaskan government, it might be well to note that those legislators were pioneers in thought as well as in action. They had been elected by male suffrage only. Their first act—Act No. 1 of the First Alaska Legislature—was to enfranchise women. They wasted no time in anticipating by 7 years for Alaska what the 19th amendment would do for the entire Nation.

The forward look has characterized many of Alaska's legislative acts since that time. And what better evidence of political maturity.

The first and second Territorial legislatures provided what was probably the first old-age pension adopted by any legislature, thus anticipating locally, in a token and modest way, the national social security legislation of 20 years later.

Serving well in both world wars—exceeding its quotas both of men in uniform and war bonds—Alaska was the first political entity after World War II to enact veterans' legislation. In a special session called for the purpose early in 1946 the legislature passed an admirable act which enables returning servicemen to reincorporate themselves in civilian life by providing either a cash bonus, dependent on length of service, or a loan to enable them to buy a home, a farm, a fishing boat, or to set up a business. Financed by a temporary sales tax which ceased when a sufficient fund had been collected, the service to Alaska veterans continues through the repayments of principal and interest, and has been extended to Korean war veterans.

Federal and State Governments have been wrestling with the billboard issue, and Congress recently enacted some provisions which still remain to be tested and implemented. Alaska solved that problem 9 years ago by a legislative act banning billboards from all highways.

In anticipation of statehood and gravely concerned about the depletion of the Pacific salmon under Federal bureau management, the 1949 legislature established its own department of fisheries in order to be prepared for the full conservation responsibilities under statehood.

Anticipating the discovery of oil—which took place more than 2 years later—the 1955 legislature enacted far-reaching oil and gas conservation and regulation measures, drawing on the experience of California, Texas, Oklahoma, and other oil-producing States.

Anticipation of problems, rather than attempting to cope with them after they have arisen—the essence of good government—has been a frequent Alaskan legislative characteristic. Nowhere has this been more clearly shown than in the field which Alaskans deem of foremost importance—education.

Alaskans early forestalled the problem of teacher shortage which has troubled nearly every State, by paying its teachers salaries that exceeded those in the States, thereby showing a true appreciation of the men and women to whom they entrusted the training of their children. Each successive Alaska Legislature has increased teachers' wages. Nor is that all. Each school district has the authority to add to the pay provided in the Territorial scale, and often does. The result is that Alaska's public schools rank high.

Alaskans were the first to grasp the great strategic importance of Alaska to the Nation. From the earliest days of his arrival here, in 1933, Alaska's former Delegate, the late Anthony J. Dimond, whom some of the older Members will remember appreciatively, pleaded for Alaska defenses. He pleaded in committee, on the floor, and in the War and Navy Departments. Four years before Pearl Harbor he prophesied in this body that the Japanese would attack without warning. Unfortunately his vision and wisdom were not heeded. Despite his unceasing efforts, Uncle Sam's Military Establishment in Alaska up to 1940 consisted of 1 obsolete infantry post surviving from the gold rush days, as useless in modern warfare as our western forts dating from the Indian wars. Had Tony Dimond's warning been heeded, Alaska would not have been the only American area invaded. Had the Alaskans' counsels on this national issue been accepted by Congress, our people would have been spared the cost and casualties of the Aleutian campaign to expel the Asiatic enemy from our continent.

Finally I should cite as an example of political maturity the recent action of Alaskans to hasten statehood. Impatient at the delay in the fulfillment of treaty and party platform pledges, their 1955 legislature appropriated $300,000 for a convention which would draw up a constitution for the State of Alaska. After a spirited election 55 delegates—the same number that met in Philadelphia in 1787 to draft the Constitution of the United States—met for 75 days at the University of Alaska. There they drafted a constitution which political scientists assert compares favorably with any similar document. The people ratified it at an election in April 1956. At the same election they approved an ordinance authorizing the election of 2 United States Senators and a Representative to go to Washington and knock at the door of Congress for admission. In this procedure they followed the stirring example of Tennessee, whose people, impatient because the first 3 Congresses had not granted them statehood, called a constitutional convention in 1796, elected 2 Senators and sent them to the National Capital to demand Tennessee's admission. A similar procedure was followed next by Michigan, then by Iowa, and by my own State of California. California, even less patient than Tennessee, jumped right over the period of territorial tutelage into statehood. Three other States, Minnesota, Oregon, and Kansas, have followed the same procedure, but none have exhibited the 90-year Job-like patience of Alaska.

Yes, Alaskans are mature. Indeed, they bring far more experience to their

prospective government than was available in many earlier Territories at the time they became States. I am confident they will contribute greatly to our national counsels, bringing first-hand knowledge of a vast and important area, the only terrain under the American flag which extends both into the Arctic and into the Eastern hemisphere.

There remains the question whether Alaska can support statehood. Alaska can.

Alaska's present revenue structure is based principally on an income tax designed on a percentage of the Federal income tax. It thus permits flexibility, the percentage being altered by each legislature according to need. It obviates for the taxpayers the headache of having to figure out two different income tax returns; it makes for ease of checking, since the territorial tax department has access to the Federal returns; it saves thereby collection costs. It is a wonder to me that States which have State income taxes have not adopted Alaska's formula.

Other taxes are a per case tax on salmon based on the value of pack, business license taxes, and a variety of excises on liquor and tobacco as well as a head tax on every adult receiving income in the Territory. There is a 5-percent gas tax earmarked for highways. There is neither a territorial property tax nor a territorial sales tax. These are left to the lesser political units—municipalities and school districts—but they remain as aces in the hole should more revenue be needed to support statehood.

Alaska has no indebtedness. Alaska has no counties and hence no county taxes. Alaska now conducts, as stated previously, all the needed services of government except those which Congress has specifically prohibited. These, which will be added under statehood, and the estimated annual costs of operating them are, in round figures, as follows:

Courts, $2 million; fisheries and wildlife management, $2 million; Governor's office and legislature, $500,000, totaling an additional $4½ million a year.

But against these additional liabilities there are substantial offsets.

Part of the cost of managing the fisheries and wildlife is already being expended by the territorial department of fish and game with a $400,000 annual appropriation.

Approximately $1,500,000 annually will be forthcoming from 70 percent of the net revenues of the Pribilof Islands seal fisheries. This has for 47 years been wholly a Federal operation in which, though an Alaskan resource, Alaska has not shared. The statehood bill properly provides for such sharing.

Fines, fees, and forfeitures of the court system, revenues derived from the State lands, and miscellaneous receipts make up an amount estimated at $500,000 annually.

Last year, Congress, in anticipation of statehood, and in lieu of participation in the Federal reclamation program, awarded Alaska 90 percent of gross receipts from the oil, gas, and coal leases on the public domain. Oil was struck last summer on the Kenai Peninsula, and since then oil leases at the present rate of 25 cents an acre have been filed on 25 million acres, which though only one-fifteenth of Alaska's area and a small part of its potential oil lands, already presents an accrual of approximately $2 million a year. Moreover the filing is continuing.

With the establishment of a second pulp mill—another year-round industry—at Sitka, which will go into operation in 1960, national forest receipts now running to about $150,000 annually, will be doubled.

Alaska was never included in the Federal aid highway program during its first 40 years, from 1916 to 1956. Alaska had to depend on its own revenues and on annual Federal appropriations which were never substantial except during a 5-year period when a few highways required by our defense program were constructed. Alaska was finally included, in 1956, in the old Federal highway aid program, but not in the thruway program, although paying all the new taxes to support it in the States.

However, the formula for Alaska's participation in the old highway aid program was changed to reduce the area on which the allotment was based, to one-third of Alaska's actual area. In return for this considerable reduction Alaska is to be permitted to use the funds for maintenance as well as for new construction. Alaska's matching share will be about $1,500,000, which can be more than met by Alaska's gas tax which now produces $3,500,000 a year or $2,000,000 more than required for Federal matching.

Thus it will be seen that the safely anticipated revenues closely approximate the added costs of statehood. To meet any additional costs, the State of Alaska can, if it wishes, levy a property tax and a sales tax. They supply an ample margin for additional income. But Alaskans' expectations, which I consider warranted, are that the greatly increased development brought about by statehood will substantially augment the existing sources of revenue.

The many positive advantages of granting statehood to Alaska I shall leave to others to develop. I will rest my case for statehood on these three undeniable facts:

First. We have solemnly pledged statehood for Alaska, and good faith at long last requires the fulfillment of the various pledges we have made.

Second. Alaskans have fully demonstrated their capacity for self-government.

Third. Alaska has the revenue and the resources to support statehood.

The time to admit Alaska as the 49th State is here and now.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour or any part thereof.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of great regret to find myself in opposition to the amiable and distinguished gentleman from New York who has so ably presented and expounded the case for statehood here today.

This bill is of vital importance to the future course of this Nation's history. It strikes at the vitals of our constitutional structure.

Essentially, statehood involves the question of what constitutes an equitable apportionment of political power. All governments, good or bad, merely represent different systems for the distribution, the separation, and the execution of power.

The civilian population of Alaska is 160,000. The combined vote of the Republican and Democratic Parties in the last, 1956, election was only 28,266.

This bill would grant to this handful of Alaskan citizens, first, the power to select and be represented by 2 Senators in the United States Senate; second, the power to select and be represented by 1 Member in the House of Representatives; third, the power to select and be represented by 3 electoral voters in the choice of a President.

This grant of power to Alaska is not a newly created power. This sovereign power now rests in the people of the 48 States. Statehood will deprive the people of the 48 States of their present representative power in the House, in the United States Senate, and in the election of a President.

Before making this decision, we ought to ask ourselves:

Does this bill conform to the spirit and the intent of our Constitution?

Will this bill tend to perfect this Union?

Will this bill promote the general welfare of the Nation's people?

Statehood would grant 2 United States Senators to 160,000 people residing in Alaska. They would possess the power of representation for their interests, in the ratio of 1 Senator for each 80,000 people.

Alaska's 2 Senators and its excessive power, for example, would potentially nullify the will of California's 14 million people, of Illinois' 10 million people, of Georgia's 4 million people, and of the voters of each of the other 48 States.

The voters, in Alaska, would have three electoral votes. An average of 1 electoral vote for each 50,000 inhabitants. The people of the 48 States average 1 electoral vote for each 300,000 population.

This is not the effective political equality for each citizen that we believe in.

The framers of our Constitution founded a Republic. They attempted to combine the best features of both, the Federal and National, types of Government.

The powers granted to the Federal Government were limited. Residual sovereign power was reserved to the States and its people. The plan of two Senators for each State Government conformed to the Federal nature of our Union. The Senators were envisioned to act as protectors of States rights against encroachment by the Federal Government. The selection of United States Senators by the State legislatures was coupled with the design of accounta-

bility to the State Governments rather than to the people of the States.

The 17th amendment to our Constitution was ratified on April 8, 1913. This basic change in the mode of the selection of Senators destroyed the rationale for the distribution of two seats to each State. It is interesting to note that no State has been admitted to the Union since the adoption of the 17th amendment.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-six Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 65]

Anderson, Mont.	Dies	Morris
Auchincloss	Dingell	Powell
Bass, Tenn.	Dowdy	Rivers
Bentley	Durham	Robeson, Va.
Buckley	Eberharter	Scott, N. C.
Burdick	Engle	Scrivner
Carnahan	Fenton	Sheppard
Celler	Gordon	Shuford
Chiperfield	Gregory	Sieminski
Christopher	Gross	Smith, Kans.
Clark	Gubser	Springer
Coffin	Hays, Ark.	Steed
Colmer	Jenkins	Teague, Tex.
Davis, Ga.	Kearney	Trimble
Davis, Tenn.	Kilburn	Vinson
Dawson, Ill.	Knutson	Watts
Dent	LeCompte	Willis
Denton	Lennon	
	Lesinski	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7999), and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 378 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, the Senators, today, are accountable only to their constituents. They are, no longer, responsible for preserving the powers of their States. Their prime interest must lie in expanding national power to satisfy their areas with Federal funds.

The Senate, today, is a second popular legislative body. Its election continues, however, to be based upon the theory of an equality among States of a Federal Republic instead of equality among citizens of a national democracy.

The 12th amendment upheld the right of political parties to require Presidential electors to pledge support for the party's nominee for President. The President, for practical purposes, is a popularly elected President.

He, no longer, exclusively represents the Nation, independent of political pressures.

As the recognized head of a political party, the President is called upon to compromise the national welfare, with sectional and local political practicalities.

The 16th amendment provides a source of unlimited taxing power to our National Government. It has encouraged the assumption of powers wholly beyond the original concept of our Constitution.

There is no measurement of naked political power. However, expenditures and taxes are a fair estimate of the exercise of political power.

The people of this country pay a total tax of more than $100 billion per year. The National Government takes more than 75 percent of this. The remaining 25 percent goes toward the support of our State, local, and school governments.

We have, step by step, evolved from a Federal Republic into a national democracy.

Twenty-five States, with a population of 31 million people, constituting 18 percent of the Nation's population, control 50 votes and have the majority power in our Senate.

This imbalance of political power is a prime factor in our huge Federal bureaucracy, its wastages, and the consequent burdensome Federal taxes. Every question in Congress, and even in the executive department, is tinted with practical politics.

Our Constitution was not shaped for our present form of government. The imbalances of power, the removal of restrictions upon national power, are fatal weaknesses in our present constitutional structure. We function as a national democracy under rules that were designed for a federal republic.

The grant of 2 United States Senators and 3 electoral votes to Alaska's 28,000 voters is repugnant to the proper apportionment of representation in a national democracy. It violates the spirit and intent of our Constitution. It is incompatible with the ideal of political equality for our citizens.

The equitable measurement of representation for a dominant national government is that of representation in proportion to population. It is the only protection of a majority against a preponderant power of a minority.

Statehood by increasing the power of the minority will tend to break down our two-party system. It leads to coalitions based on sectional interests.

Statehood will accentuate the separation between political power and the voting citizens. It encourages legislation by political expediency instead of sound principle.

This bill will not make a more perfect Union of our States. It will not promote the general welfare.

It can only produce future injustices and further weaken the Nation's welfare.

Can the constituents of the individual Members of this House rely upon the Senators and the Representatives of Alaska to protect and advance their interests?

Are we willing, do we have the moral right, to take the basic voting rights away from our constituents and transfer them in an excessive and disproportionate degree, to this small group of citizens?

Mr. Chairman, it is most disturbing to read the incessant flow of slogans and flammatory statements coming from the overzealous advocates of statehood.

"Patriotism," "right to vote," "colonialism," "second-class citizens," "taxation without representation," "the promise of statehood," "discrimination."

These are charges that we hear repeatedly. If true, they would be a reflection upon the integrity and the wisdom of this Congress. Particularly, upon the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I will attempt to shed a little light on these charges.

This publicity emanates from the Alaska and the Hawaii Statehood Commissions. These two public bodies have spent more than $1 million in the last 10 years of taxpayers' funds to lobby this Congress for statehood. They are, by far, the biggest spending lobbies in this country.

The propriety of a Territorial or State government, using vast public funds to publicize and promote a purely political objective, is most questionable.

The election by Alaska of three Tennessee plan Congressmen was not only presumptuous but it is also a brazen attempt to coerce this Congress.

The Alaska Statehood Commission has published this claim:

"In two World Wars and in Korea, they have fought, in number exceeding the national per capita average."

My figures only include World War II inductees. In that war, according to the Library of Congress, there were only 3,482 draftees from Alaska. This is about 50 percent of the ratio of the national contribution to the armed services.

We certainly cannot justify the claims that one segment of our Nation is more brave or more patriotic than any other. This issue is irrelevant to the political question of statehood. Certainly, Alaska should not be denied statehood, despite the poor mathematical showing in World War II.

COLONIALISM

The proponents of statehood advocate statehood claiming that it would avoid the stigma of colonialism.

The question of statehood is solely and wholly a domestic problem. It is an admission of abject weakness to allow foreign opinion to decide the conduct of our internal affairs.

We should not fear to disappoint our foreign enemies. Our friends need no explanations.

PRECEDENT

The advocates of statehood rely upon the use of precedent to lend validity to their claims.

Actually, legislative bodies do not recognize precedent. That is a principle applicable only to the judiciary.

The Tennessee plan for the admission of States originated with the Northwest Ordinance. This ordinance provided for the admission of States upon attaining a population of 60,000 people. But, at that time, the population of the country was only 3,600,000.

When Tennessee was admitted, it had a population of 105,000, or one-fiftieth of the Nation's 5,300,000 people.

According to this ratio, Alaska ought to have a population of over 3 million before it could qualify for statehood.

It is claimed that Alaska has an inchoate status of statehood because of a

pronouncement by the Supreme Court that it is an incorporated Territory.

This is another fictional doctrine of the Supreme Court. The problem of statehood is exclusively a political one. This is another attempted intrusion by the Supreme Court into legislative functions.

GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE

The impact of publicity favoring statehood is well illustrated by this recital of the official actions of the governors' conferences.

Resolutions favoring statehood for Alaska and Hawaii were adopted at the annual governors' conferences, successively from 1947 to 1952.

In 1953 a memorandum was sent to each governor of the 48 States indicating the loss of representative power for each State. Since 1952, no resolution has been adopted by the governors' conferences recommending statehood for either Alaska or Hawaii.

PROMISE OF STATEHOOD

The supporters of statehood claim that there has been either an expressed or implied promise of statehood.

Actually, no one could possibly make a valid promise, expressed or implied, on behalf of the Congress and the President. These assertions are merely self-serving wishful delusions.

POLITICAL POWER OF TERRITORIES

Alaska, today, possesses general legislative power to enact laws relating to its property, affairs and government. Its powers are similar to the powers of our sovereign States.

Although Congress has reserved the right to disapprove Territorial legislation no law passed by either Alaska or Hawaii has ever been disapproved by Congress.

There are two differences, both relatively minor, in the functioning of the Alaskan Territorial government and that of our State governments.

The Governor of Alaska is appointed by the President instead of being elected by the people of the Territory.

The regulation of fishing is retained by the Federal Government.

Alaska does not appear to seriously want either an elected Governor nor additional power to regulate its fishing rights.

Alaska has not presented a comprehensive program for additional powers. The proponents of statehood have concentrated upon their drive for power in Congress.

In fact, Alaska is most ably represented by its distinguished Delegate. Most Members of this House are limited to serving on one major standing committee. The distinguished Delegate from Alaska enjoys the unique advantage of membership on four committees, Agriculture, Armed Services, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

No Member of this House has the opportunity of serving on this imposing list of committees.

The record of the distinguished Delegate from Alaska indicates exceptional successful service on behalf of the Territory. His constituents are not second class citizens.

I am positive that any time the people of Alaska decide to seriously present corrective legislation for their exaggerated ills, they will find a sympathetic and receptive committee and Congress.

A small clique of Alaskan residents strenuously claim the right to vote.

Let us examine the complexion of its population:

The civilian population of Alaska is 160,000; this excludes about 55,000 members of the armed services.

There are approximately 20,000 dependents of members of the armed services.

There are 16,000 noncitizen Federal employees and about 16,000 noncitizen dependents of Federal employees.

There are about 20,000 transient and seasonal employees.

The permanent citizen population is less than 90,000 people.

Out of this population, 35,000 are Aleutian, Eskimo and Indian natives. These people do not want statehood.

Certainly, the great influx of its present population was aware of the political status of this Territory.

They certainly cannot claim that their "right to vote" is being unjustly withheld. These recent arrivals are the most vociferous in their drive for political power.

THE ECONOMY OF ALASKA

The advocates of statehood paint a most fanciful picture of the promised land if Alaska is only given statehood.

It is most disheartening to see the political and business leadership of this great land delude themselves and the people with this political panacea.

The development of Alaska is not dependent upon statehood. The wealth of Alaska or of any other land is not contained in her lands or lakes or forests.

The wealth of any land lies in the hearts, the minds, and the muscle of her people.

The drive for statehood is a political diversion that keeps Alaska from seriously examining into the causes of her economic sickness.

The income of Alaska for the year 1956 was distributed as follows:

Mining, income was	$24,000,000
Forestry, income was	34,000,000
Fishing, income was	78,000,000
Farming and miscellaneous	8,000,000
Private-nongovernmental income totaled	144,000,000
Defense and Government spending	356,000,000
Total of all income	500,000,000

Private business totaled less than one-third of her income. More than two-thirds of her income was derived from Government spending.

The Federal Government spent more than $122 million in fiscal 1958 for purely civilian purposes. Military construction amounts to about $100 million a year in addition to the regular defense spending.

This civilian Federal aid and Federal defense spending amounts to $2.50 for every $1 of private-enterprise income.

Alaska is a glaring example of the failure of the welfare state. Its total Federal taxes are only $45 million a year. It receives in Federal nonmilitary handouts about three times what it pays into the Federal Treasury.

It seeks more political power in order to squeeze more Federal feeds out of Washington.

Alaska is long on politics and short on economics. It suffers from both political and economic illnesses. Alaska has an artificial economy. It is a land of scarcity of goods and an overabundance of political oratory.

The political atmosphere in Alaska is hostile to the creation of wealth and job opportunities. It has one of the highest tax rates of any State.

The cost of living in Alaska is fantastically inflated. This is partly caused by unionized monopolistic high wages, and a lack of economic productivity.

There is relatively little savings or profit for capital investment for the creation of productive wealth and jobs.

The labor force in Alaska varies from about 30,000 in the winter to about 50,000 in the summer. About 21,000 of these, or one-half of the peak labor force are union members. Only one-fourth of the labor force in the 48 States are union members.

Of course, the high laboring wages in Alaska are rationalized by the theory that Uncle Sam pays the bill, so the sky is the limit. The citizens of Alaska fail to see that these high wages also retard sound economic development by small business and entrepreneurs who cannot compete with Uncle Sam.

Outside capital refuses to come into Alaska because of its high tax rates, its immature politics, and its hostile radical unionism.

Yes, there is discrimination in Alaska. However, the discrimination is in favor of the Alaskan people and is a discrimination against the taxpayers of the 48 States.

JONES ACT

The Alaskan people have made political capital out of the Jones Act. They claim that they are being discriminated against. They say that there is a monopoly to fix high transportation charges.

Actually, Alaska is in the same position as every other port. Foreign ships cannot carry cargo between United States ports which includes Alaska.

The only exception to this law is that Canadian railroads can be used to ship between two American points, such as Detroit to Seattle. But, Canadian railroads cannot be used to ship between Detroit and Alaska.

Canadian ships do carry cargo to the ports of Hyder, Haines, and Skagway. There are three lines carrying cargo to the ports of Whittier, Seward, and Anchorage. There is plenty of competition for this business.

The Jones Act is not the bugaboo that the Alaskan people would have us believe. I cannot believe that the Merchant Marine Committee would be so unsympathetic that they would not recommend legislation to relieve the people of Alaska if they could present a reasonable case.

Let us examine the mismanagement of Alaska's unemployment compensation laws.

Alaska has the dubious distinction of being the only State or Territory whose unemployment compensation funds are insolvent.

Alaska borrowed $2,630,000 from the Federal Government in January 1957. It borrowed another $2,635,000 in February 1958. It appears almost certain that Alaska will again be forced to borrow another $2 million or $3 million before the end of the year. None of these funds have been repaid as yet. The prospects for repayment are not very promising.

The unemployment payroll deductions are 3 percent. The only other State with that rate is Rhode Island. Alaska also levies 5 percent on employees. Only two other States levy a tax on employees for unemployment compensation.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. This deficit in the unemployment fund, as I understand, amounts to over $5 million.

Mr. PILLION. Yes. As of right now it is over $5 million.

Mr. HOSMER. Would that be an obligation of the new State?

Mr. PILLION. Yes, it would, at the end of about 4 years. But, they will have to borrow again. They are broke now or very close to it. They are down to about a $200,000 reserve.

Mr. HOSMER. That amounts to a pretty fair share of the annual tax collection, then, I take it.

Mr. PILLION. It shows the political way in which they handle unemployment funds, not based on an actuarial basis but a political situation.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-seven Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 66]

Albert	Durham	Morris
Arends	Eberharter	Moulder
Ashley	Engle	Powell
Auchincloss	Farbstein	Radwan
Bailey	Fenton	Rains
Barden	Gordon	Rivers
Bass, Tenn.	Gregory	Robeson, Va.
Bentley	Gross	Scott, N. C.
Breeding	Gubser	Scrivner
Buckley	Haskell	Sheppard
Burdick	Hays, Ark.	Shuford
Byrnes, Wis.	Hays, Ohio	Sieminski
Carnahan	Hillings	Siler
Celler	James	Smith, Kans.
Christopher	Jenkins	Spence
Clark	Jensen	Steed
Coffin	Kearney	Trimble
Colmer	Kilburn	Vinson
Davis, Tenn.	Kluczynski	Vursell
Dawson, Ill.	Knutson	Watts
Dent	LeCompte	Wharton
Dies	Lennon	
Dowdy	Magnuson	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7999) to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, finding itself without a quorum, he caused the roll to be called, when 352 Members responded to their names, disclosing a quorum to be present, and he submitted herewith a list of the absentees for printing in the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] is recognized.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, just previous to this rollcall I had stated that the total payroll deductions for unemployment tax in Alaska amounted to 3 percent from the employers and one-half percent from the employees.

The average payroll deduction in the 48 States is only 1.4 percent.

The average weekly wage in Alaska is $138. Their unemployment compensation benefits range from $45 to $70 per week.

This maximum unemployment benefit of $70 per week is higher than the average weekly wages in 17 of our States.

This is a partial answer to Alaska's high cost of living, the failure to attract business capital, and her other economic and political troubles.

It is claimed by the proponents of statehood that Alaska's economy is depressed by the mismanagement of public lands by the Department of the Interior.

Congress has already passed a law giving Alaska two sections—Nos. 16 and 36—out of each township. Surveys have been made upon 230,000 acres which are now being held in trust for Alaska.

Oil leases are being signed at the rate of 5,000 a year. Alaska is entitled to 90 percent of all royalties which amount to 37½ percent. The backlog here is about 5,000 applications.

The Small Tract Act allows individuals to purchase up to 5 acres at an appraised value of about $10 per acre for the construction of homes. There is no backlog in this program.

There is no holdup or backlog on mining leases. A prospector can file on a location or a mine anywhere.

Any person can homestead 160 acres for himself and 160 acres for his wife, by living there 2 years. There is no backlog in this program.

The Territory of Alaska has never presented any detailed or specific complaints or recommendations for any improvement in the administration of the public lands of Alaska.

Her general, vague, unsupported, unverified charges are merely a diversionary tactic in their battle for the political power of statehood.

Mr. Chairman, statehood for Alaska will not solve the problem of representation in Congress for all of our citizens. It will only open the door to and create a series of additional insoluable situations.

If Alaska with a civilian population of 160,000 is granted statehood, what justification can there be for denying statehood to these other areas:

First. Hawaii with a population of 500,000 citizens where Mr. Bridges and the Communist-controlled ILWU will certainly influence or control the selection of 2 United States Senators and 2 Representatives.

Second. The District of Columbia with 830,000 citizens. If the right to vote is our only test, then how can we deny these people 2 Senators and 3 or 4 Representatives in Congress. The inhabitants, here, are citizens too.

Third. The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico has 2,500,000 citizens. By the way, this island, I am informed, is a hotbed of communism. What reason do we have to deny these people statehood with 2 United States Senators and 8 to 10 United States Representatives.

Fourth. The Pacific island of Guam has a total citizenship of 65,000. They have their own Territorial legislature. They have repeatedly passed resolutions asking that a Delegate be sent to our Congress.

That is the first demand toward statehood with 2 United States Senators and 1 Representative.

Fifth. The Virgin Islands, with 30,000 citizens, is also seeking a Delegate to our Congress.

If we grant statehood to Alaska, we should also be prepared to met these additional demands. To grant statehood to Alaska and deny statehood to these other citizens will only aggravate our problems, and justly intensify the pressures for statehood and representation in Congress for these other citizens.

Mr. Chairman, Alaska's difficulties are primarily economic, and not political. She must seek to reorient her economy if she wants to cure her ills. Statehood is only a political diversion.

For the 48 States, statehood would be a tragic political misadventure. It is not the proper or the wise solution to this problem.

This bill ought to be recommitted for the good of both the citizens of Alaska and the citizens of the 48 States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I notice the gentleman referred to Guam, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico as possible new States. Does the gentleman feel that we have made any commitments at all to Alaska and Hawaii relative to statehood?

Mr. PILLION. None whatever; no one can make a commitment on behalf of this Congress or the President.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman recognize that Franklin Roosevelt, and Harry Truman, and Dwight D. Eisenhower have all recommended statehood for Alaska?

Mr. PILLON. They are all fine gentlemen, but it is rather far afield when the power to grant statehood lies wholly within the House and the Senate, and no one can bind the Members of this Congress in a matter such as that.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I agree with the gentleman. Does the gentleman also realize that both political parties for 12 years at their conventions adopted resolutions in which they favored statehood for Alaska?

Mr. PILLION. It is an unfortunate situation that political platforms are drawn up in the heat of campaigns or just before an election for the purpose, as the gentleman knows, of attracting votes. It would be much better if our political parties drew up their platforms

at a time when they were not seeking votes and could consider these matters objectively and not for the sole purpose of attracting votes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PILLION. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman realize that all Gallup polls taken in the last 10 years have shown overwhelmingly, in all sections of the country, that the people themselves feel that Alaska is entitled to statehood?

Mr. PILLION. Well, unfortunately, the Gallup polls do not always reflect the mature judgment of the people who are polled. I happened to take a poll in my district on the question of whether the people in the district wanted to delay statehood. There were 110,000 questionnaires sent out, and the returns, surprisingly, were 2½ to 1 in favor of delaying statehood until communism was eradicated from Hawaii and there would be no chance of Mr. Bridges and Mr. Foster and Khrushchev having 2 representatives in the United States Senate and 2 in this House.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I sent a questionnaire to the Fourth District in Nebraska, also some 80,000. There were some 20 questions on the questionnaire. One of them was, "Do you favor immediate statehood for Alaska?" Seventy-eight percent of the votes returned, a large group of them, said "Yes."

Mr. PILLION. Well, the difference, I think, lies in the fact that year after year I have told the constituents of my district about the Communist situation in Hawaii, what Mr. Bridges has done there, the control he has over the Territorial legislature, and have told them recently of the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii extending an offer of a public office to Jack Hall, the convicted Communist lieutenant of Harry Bridges, a key figure in the international Communist conspiracy. And he was tendered a public office by the Republican Governor in the Territory of Hawaii. It indicates the strength, the political influence, of the Communist Party in Hawaii. Of course, after the people know the facts, both sides, you do not find them so eager for statehood; you do not find them voting 4 or 5 to 1 for statehood. Of course, the Hawaii Statehood Commission, as I stated here before, has spent $1 million or more in the past 10 years publicizing only the fine music, the delectation of visitors, the rhythm of the Hawaiian music, all of which is very nice but has nothing to do with the political problem of statehood.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In our report on page 34 in reporting this bill it says:

> The Constitution itself provides that Congress shall decide when and how new States shall be admitted. * * * In a long series of cases, the Supreme Court of the United States has held that an unincorporated Territory is "an inchoate State," the ultimate destiny of which is statehood.

Mr. PILLION. As I stated in my statement here, I feel that the question of statehood is purely a political one, exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Congress, and any pronouncement such as was read by the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska is an attempted intrusion on the part of the Supreme Court to tell this Congress what to do and what not to do. And it is time the Supreme Court limited itself to its proper function and not attempt to establish political policy for the United States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Of course, you and I live in a country where honest and sincere men and women, may, can, and do differ in their thinking, their political thinking.

Mr. PILLION. Surely.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. We would not have it any other way.

Mr. PILLION. Naturally.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is natural. And the gentleman made a scholarly address as to his position on Alaska. To me it is almost convincing.

Mr. PILLION. I am sorry about that word "almost."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. But I am trying to point out that all the Gallup polls and our Presidents have all recommended statehood. Perhaps they also may be right. At least we ought to give those who support statehood the right to an expression of opinion.

Mr. PILLION. I certainly concede the sincerity of the motives of the persons who favor statehood. I have no quarrel whatever with those persons who do.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield.

Mr. SAYLOR. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not he believes in States rights?

Mr. PILLION. Yes; of course.

Mr. SAYLOR. If the gentleman believes in States rights, why does he make such a point of the fact that the unemployment-compensation fund being raised by employers and employees in Alaska is not the same as it is in New York State or in Pennsylvania? That is a matter for the people in Alaska to determine; is it not? What business is it of this Congress?

Mr. PILLION. Will the gentleman permit me to explain that?

Mr. SAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. PILLION. It would, of course, not be any of our business if they ran a solvent insurance fund, but when they go broke, when they go bankrupt, and call upon the citizens of the gentleman's State and the citizens of the other States, the taxpayers, to lend them money, which money I do not think will ever be repaid, because repayments do not start for 4 years, and they have a rate at which they pay out the funds and a rate at which they collect the funds, that do not meet, that do not match, that is what makes it different. If we lend them $2½ million each year for the next 4 years, they will owe us $10 million. I can see no prospect of Alaska, under our law, repaying the $10 million. It is just another means by which they receive moneys that they are not entitled to.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on that, because, looking at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I found that the gentleman from New York just a week or so ago voted that his State and other States of the Union could do just what he is complaining about Alaska doing—that is, borrow funds.

Mr. PILLION. They are solvent. That is why they can borrow.

Mr. SAYLOR. If they were solvent, they would not have to call upon the Federal Government for funds, would they?

Mr. PILLION. In fact, New York State has something like $900 million in her unemployment fund.

Mr. SAYLOR. I would like to ask another question. I know of no Member of this House of Representatives or of the other body in favor of communism, wherever it may be found. But the argument the gentleman just made is that we should not admit Alaska or Hawaii to statehood until communism has been stamped out; is that so?

Mr. PILLION. That is very much so. I think it would be a great tragedy to permit Hawaii to come in and to permit Harry Bridges to select 2 Senators for the Senate and 2 Members for the House.

Mr. SAYLOR. J. Edgar Hoover just made the statement a short time ago that there are more Communists in New York City, and in the State of New York, than in all the rest of the country put together. Is the gentleman in favor of carrying his argument to its logical conclusion, of excluding the State of New York, its 43 Members of this House and 2 United States Senators, from representation in this Congress, until the people of New York stamp out communism?

Mr. PILLION. The number of Communists has no meaning in this problem. It is the power that they wield. If one of them were the head of the security forces in the country, that would be as significant as having 1,000 card-bearing members of the party who did not have the power. There they have the power and they use it. That is the important thing. They are using it in Hawaii to the fullest extent. They consolidated their strength in the labor-union field. They consolidated their strength in the political field, where the ILWU is stronger than either the Republican or the Democratic Party in Hawaii. They control the politics of Hawaii. That is what is important.

Mr. SAYLOR. Am I correct, then, that the House at the present time is considering H. R. 7999, a bill to provide for the admission of Alaska as a State into the Union? Is that the bill that we are considering at the present time?

Mr. PILLION. That is correct.

Mr. SAYLOR. Then the gentleman's argument seems to be that because Harry Bridges has some effect, in the gentleman's opinion, in Hawaii, Alaska should not be made a State. I should like to find out the logic of the gentleman's position.

Mr. PILLION. A few years ago, as the gentleman will remember, Hawaii was the Territory that should have statehood. It was the Territory that qualified in every respect, not Alaska. Alaska was in the background. The strategy of the proponents of statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii is to let Alaska run interference for Hawaii, so that Alaska can come in. The issue of Communists is not important there. But once Alaska

is in, the stampede will be on to give Hawaii statehood next. If you grant statehood to 160,000 people in Alaska, what justification could there be for denying statehood to 500,000 people in Hawaii?

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. The distinguished gentleman from New York who preceded the gentleman made some reference to the so-called shoehorn argument, that Alaska's statehood would act as a shoehorn to achieve Hawaiian statehood. Is that the item to which the gentleman is speaking at this moment?

Mr. PILLION. There is no question about it. Alaska is just running interference for the idea of bringing in Hawaii immediately thereafter.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. I was interested in the gentleman's observation that Hawaii would be the next on the list. May I ask the gentleman if he happens to have on his desk a pamphlet similar to the one I have on my desk, which states that Puerto Rico also wants us to consider statehood for it?

Mr. PILLION. Guam and the Virgin Islands—they are all in there. They all want representation in our Congress. Once we go along with statehood for Alaska, following the 17th amendment we have a principle now we can stand on until we can adjust our situation with regard to representation for these peoples. Once we grant statehood for Alaska then, of course, the others will say they, too, are entitled to two Senators in the United States Senate.

Mr. FORRESTER. I did want the gentleman to know I did have that pamphlet, and that Puerto Rico is now figuring to ask for statehood also.

Mr. PILLION. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BEAMER. I think the gentleman is to be congratulated on his very forthright statement, and I wish to compliment him. I was going to ask the other gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] a question, but perhaps the gentleman now on the floor can answer it. There are many questions that I think should be answered about this specific bill. I hope item by item it will be discussed by members of the committee.

On page 11, at the bottom of the page, subsection (j), and continuing onto page 12, there is indication that any funds that will be used for school purposes shall be prohibited from use for parochial schools. Is that in the gentleman's opinion going to be discriminatory against Catholics or any other people who are religiously and diligently trying to educate the people of this country?

Mr. PILLION. I do not know. I really do not know about that.

Mr. BEAMER. I think it is something that should be answered.

Mr. PILLION. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] perhaps can answer it.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Is the gentleman suggesting that a bill that I am supporting here is written so as to be antagonistic to any religious group?

Mr. BEAMER. I am merely asking the question. I was wondering if it might be so implied. I do not know.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. No. The committee considered the separation of church and state, in which I very firmly believe, and that is in the bill.

Mr. BEAMER. Suppose, then, we have some Federal-aid-to-education proposal as we have had in the past. Are we going to eliminate any parochial schools from such aid which might go to Alaska in the event it becomes a State, or any other present Territory becomes a State? I think we should project that into the future and determine whether or not we are answering all the questions in relation to this particular issue.

Mr. BARTLETT. If the gentleman will yield, my recollection is that that provision to which the gentleman from Indiana alludes is exactly the same as is found in other enabling bills for States.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I was interested in the gentleman's colloquy with the other gentleman from New York with respect to the Constitution in relation to having so many Senators or less. Because of that, let me ask the gentleman this question:

It is about a matter that is being talked about, that some of the larger States, if this condition is made, that the people there might have to go to the device of dividing their States into two or more States in order to regain their proportion of representation in the other body. Under our Constitution, would it be possible for some of our existing States to divide in order to secure or in order to resecure for themselves representation in the other body to which they are now entitled?

Mr. PILLION. As I understand it, the only State might be Texas, but as a practical proposition it would be a rather difficult situation.

Mr. HOSMER. As I understand it, in about 1860 a resolution was passed by my own State of California to divide into two States and enabling legislation was passed here in the Congress, which I think is still on the books, although the California law was taken off the books some 20 or 25 years later.

Mr. PILLION. I regret to say I am not enough of a constitutional authority to give the gentleman a definite answer.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. I have asked the gentleman to yield simply to advise the members of the committee that the gentleman from Oklahoma who is now going to address us will take 5 or 10 minutes of time and not more than that, and then it will be the intention of the gentleman from Colorado to move that the Committee rise. I understand there are many Members who have important engagements.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, there are more eyes upon this House today, across the world, than there have been on any matter before us this year.

They are not only the eyes of our American people, who have indicated by every poll on the question that they favor, overwhelmingly, Statehood for Alaska.

They are also the eyes of free men in all parts of the world—who look to see if America still stands for what we stood in 1776.

LET US END COLONIALISM IN ALASKA

No American should ever forget that this Nation of ours was the first colony in history to free itself from colonial rule.

The decision made, our fathers proclaimed to the world the principles which guided them, and us, ever since. These principles include the equality of men, the inalienability of their rights, their consent to be governed. Another principle which had lighted the torch of revolution over a year earlier, was "no taxation without representation." These principles have guided us to national greatness.

Today, we are flouting those basic principles and have been for some time. I refer to Alaska. By the standards our fathers set, and by a long train of other abuses similar to those against which they revolted, Alaska is a colony. This is an unwelcome, hardly credible fact. Today, we have the opportunity to rectify it by giving to Alaska—as we have 35 times to other areas since our Union was founded—the equality of Statehood, and government by consent, and representation in their taxation. Unless we do this, the taxation Alaskans have borne for 45 years will continue to be taxation without representation, which our pioneering forefathers correctly identified as tyranny.

There are various ways of defining a colony. We can draw such a definition from our own colonial experience. A colony is a dependent area in which the important political decisions are made somewhere else. When those decisions also adversely affect the colony's inhabitants—especially if for the benefit of residents of the superior or colonial power—then the latter is guilty of colonialism. The use of political power to create economic advantage for nonresidents of the colony is the quintessence of colonialism. That is happening in Alaska today.

Forty-two years ago Congress passed the Federal-Aid Highway Act—a highly important and beneficial piece of legislation. Alaska was excluded from it—except in the national forests—although Hawaii and even Puerto Rico—which pays no Federal taxes whatever—were included. Instead, Alaska got an occasional, wholly inadequate handout, in annual special appropriations, which were appreciable for only a few years, when national defense required them.

Congressmen with votes deliberately excluded Alaska—which had no vote—from participation. Even in the case of the national forest highways, the Congress, for some years, reduced Alaska's share under the established formula, depriving Alaska of some $7 million—which was not returned to the Federal Treasury but divided among the States with national forests, whose Congressmen had the votes to switch this sum to their States. Every Alaskan was shortchanged thereby for the benefit of stateside constituencies. This was a plain and unvarnished act of colonialism.

Another more recent example: The Interstate Highway bill, enacted in 1956, contained some new and additional taxes on trucks, trailers, tires, and gas. Alaska was excluded from the benefits of this great supplementary highway program, but included in the taxation, despite the wholly reasonable plea of Alaska's voteless Delegate, that Alaska should be either included in both, or excluded from both. Today, in consequence, whenever an Alaskan goes to his gas station and says, "Fill 'er up," he is paying a cent a gallon to build the superhighways in every State of the Union from Alabama to Wyoming, but not in Alaska. That is colonialism.

Under the same act, he is paying an additional 3 cents a pound on tires—likewise for throughways not in Alaska. There is a striking analogy between that 3 cents a pound on tires that Alaskans must pay, and the 3-pence-a-pound tax on tea which caused our colonial forefathers to dump it into Boston Harbor. It was colonialism then in the Thirteen Colonies. It is colonialism now in the Alaska colony. Alaska has since been included in the old Federal Aid Highway Act, though on a reduced formula. But the years of Alaska's exclusion from participation have left it with a negligible highway system—3,500 miles, in an area one-fifth as large as the 48 States.

Thirty-eight years ago, Congress passed what is officially known as the Merchant Marine Act of 1920. In Alaska, it is known as the Jones Act, after its sponsor, the late Senator Wesley L. Jones, of the State of Washington. The act continued for shippers of freight across the country and the oceans beyond, the beneficial alternative for use of either domestic or foreign carriers—foreign meaning principally Canadian. But in section 27 of the act were inserted the words "excluding Alaska," which meant that of all areas—foreign and domestic—Alaskan consignors or consignees of shipments were denied the benefits of these provisions. The purpose of this discriminatory language was to benefit, instead, some of Senator Jones' constituents engaged in the shipping, transfer, and wharfage business in his home city of Seattle. This it did, but at the expense—the heavy expense—of Alaskans. Budding Alaskan enterprises, which had been shipping their manufactures through the port of Vancouver and over Canadian railways, were compelled by the act to ship through Seattle, tripling their costs and putting them out of business.

Subject ever since to the Seattle steamship monopoly, with rates specially high for Alaska only, in the transfer charges from railway to dock, for wharfage, and then for ocean freight to and from the Alaskan community of origin or destination, Alaska's cost of living has soared, until it is the highest under the flag. If anyone questions that this imposition by Congressional Act was not a flagrant example of colonialism, let him wait a moment to hear that fact judicially confirmed.

For the Alaska Territorial Legislature, meeting the following year, and highly indignant at this discrimination, ordered the Territorial attorney general to take the matter to court. The legislators believed that the discriminatory language of the Jones Act was a violation of the commerce clause in the Constitution, which, in section 9, limits the powers of Congress, and in the sixth paragraph declares:

> No preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one State over those of another.

Ultimately, the case came before the United States Court. Alaska's attorney general argued that the Jones Act had deprived Alaskans of the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States, guaranteed them by the treaty of cession with Russia, and that furthermore, the Constitution had been specifically extended to Alaska in section 3 of the Organic Act of 1912. To Alaskans, it looked as if Senator Jones had overreached himself in his desire to benefit his constituents at the expense of Alaskans, and they waited, with hopeful confidence, that the highest Court in the land would do them justice.

The case for the Government and against Alaska was presented by the Solicitor General of the United States, a distinguished Philadelphia lawyer, James M. Beck. Let us note well the words of his concluding argument:

> If the Fathers had anticipated the control of the United States over the far-distant Philippine Islands, would they, whose concern was the reserved rights of the States, have considered for a moment, a project that any special privilege which the interests of the United States might require for the ports of entry of the several States should by compulsion be extended to the ports of the colonial dependencies.

What the United States Department of Justice was arguing was that any special privilege which the interests of the United States might require, should prevail over any rights claimed for the people of a colonial dependency. The colonial dependency in this case was Alaska. Colonialism could not have been avowed more frankly than it was by the executive branch of the Federal Government, defending the action of the legislative branch before the judicial branch.

And the Supreme Court agreed with that view. Mr. Justice McReynolds, rendering the opinion for the Court, said, "the act does give preference to ports of the States over those of the Territory," but that the Court could "find nothing in the Constitution itself or its history which impels the conclusion that it was intended to deprive Congress of the power so to act"—*Alaska* v. *Troy* (358 U. S. 101, February 27, 1922).

So the highest Court of the land, now housed in a beautiful edifice, over whose portals is deeply chiseled in marble the legend "Equal Justice Under Law," decided that it is legal and constitutional to discriminate against a Territory. Can anyone, any longer, assert that justice is equal for the residents of the colonial dependency, Alaska? Do we need still further proof that Alaska is a colony, and its inhabitants victims of colonialism?

For 38 years, ever since the passage of the Jones Act, Alaska's voteless Delegates have introduced bills to remove from it the discriminatory words "excluding Alaska." In vain. Those interests that enjoy the "special privilege," to which the Solicitor General of the United States made reference, have the votes to retain it. It has cost—and continues to cost—the people of Alaska millions of dollars annually for the benefit of these vested interests in Seattle, who had the political power to write this discrimination into the law, and the political power to keep it there. That is colonialism, as crude—if not cruder—than any against which our forefathers poured out their blood and treasure.

But that still is not all. The astronomical Alaskan costs of living are further raised by another manmade, stateside discrimination of long standing. We have seen colonialism at work to the disadvantage of the colonials in the Alaska dependency in two important fields of transportation—highways and steamships. We shall now see it in a third field—railways.

About half a century ago, the railways of the United States started developing so-called export-import tariffs, by which the rail part of the haul for overseas shipments was reduced. The areas to which these beneficial, lower rates were extended, were gradually increased until they included every country bordering on the Pacific Ocean, except Alaska. Thus, the tariff on the rail haul from any point in the United States to the port of exit, Seattle, is substantially higher—sometimes over 100 percent—if the tag on the shipment indicates that its ultimate destination is in Alaska. For the same article, originating in the same factory, shipped in the same way, even in the same car—in other words, for the identical service—the charge to Alaskans is higher than if the tag shows the shipment is destined for Hawaii, Japan, Australia, the West Coast of Mexico, Central or South America, or even Communist China. Alaskans began, 10 years ago, to protest to the railroads against this exclusive discrimination. They got nowhere. Five years ago, they were encouraged by enlisting the support of the General Services Administration. Its concern was aroused not so much for Alaskans in general, but because the Federal Government itself was being charged the higher rate on supplies and materials destined for the military bases in Alaska. The General Services Administration was likewise unable to per-

suade the railroads to give Alaska the same treatment accorded all other areas in the Pacific. The General Services Administration then started a formal proceeding before the Interstate Commerce Commission. Docket No. 31755, entitled "United States of America against Great Northern Railway Company et al."—the "al" being nearly all the other railways—was decided last June 6. It need surprise no one that it was decided adversely to Alaska.

So again we have a situation where interests in the United States—in this case, the railways—levy discriminatory rates against the residents of the colonial dependency Alaska.

Statehood would put an end to the discrimination in the Jones Act. That much is implicit in the Supreme Court's decision. It might not automatically secure for Alaska the export-import tariffs enjoyed by every other area in the Pacific. But give to the new State of Alaska an Alaska Congressional Delegation, with votes, and all of us know that discrimination would not long endure.

Surveys by the U. S. Civil Service Commission, made public last January, show that the cost of living was 41.7 percent higher in Juneau than in Washington, 56.7 percent higher in Anchorage, and 66 percent higher in Fairbanks. These figures are already obsolete, for since they were issued the Seattle Steamship monopoly has demanded—and secured, over the protests of Alaskans—another 15 percent increase in freight rates.

These are only a few of the instances of colonialism visited on Alaska.

Another flagrant example is in the salmon fisheries, once Alaska's greatest natural resource, and the Nation's greatest fishery resource. Alaska was the one and only Territory denied the right to manage its fisheries and wildlife. The canned salmon industry, headquartered in the Puget Sound area, has fought every Alaska attempt to increase the limited amount of self-government afforded by the Organic Act of 1912. They were sufficiently influential to keep the control of the fisheries in a Federal bureau—where they wanted it. For 45 years, ever since their first legislature, Alaskans have pleaded with Congress to transfer the fisheries to Territorial control and to prevent thereby the depletion which they foresaw and which has now taken place, with tragic consequences for the Alaskan fishermen, and the Alaskan public generally. From a high of over 8 million cases in the middle 1930's, the pack has dropped to less than 3 million cases in each of the last 3 years. So serious was the decline, that the Eisenhower administration felt obliged—for 3 successive years—to declare the fishing communities to be disaster areas.

The Alaskans' principal grievance is directed against a device—the fish trap—a large structure anchored in the path of the salmon, which catches them in large quantities—too large for conservation. The fish traps have been abolished in the other Pacific salmon areas, British Columbia, Washington, and Oregon, where the people control the resource. The fish-trap ownership is concentrated chiefly in a few absentee companies. The 23 successive legislatures, memorials, directed at Congress, have requested the abolition of the traps. Bills introduced in each Congress by Alaska's voteless Delegate, have made the same request. Finally, in a desperate effort to be heard, the people of Alaska, on a referendum in 1948, voted 19,712 to 2,624—a ratio of over 7 to 1—for trap abolition. All of this was in vain, however, and there has been no Congressional action.

The Federal agency supposed to regulate the salmon fishery—for the last 18 years the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior—despite its manifest failure to check the steady decline in the resource and carry out its prescribed conservation function, does not object to retention of the traps. Thus, in a conflict between the few stateside fish-trap beneficiaries, and virtually the entire population of Alaska, the Federal agency throws its full weight and authority on the side of the special privilege in the colonial power, and overrides the far greater interest of Alaskans. That is colonialism. But let no one doubt that the entire American people are not also the victims in the loss of tax revenue, in the cost of disaster relief, and in the destruction of a once great national resource.

These are by no means all of the examples of colonialism which have hampered the development of Alaska, and which should have long since have been ended. It would take hours to relate them all.

Is it not regrettable that at a time when colonialism is agitating the world as never before in its history, and is so clearly on its way out—except within the orbit of Russian imperialism—the United States has missed this great opportunity to be true to its traditions and give mankind a clear example, by action, of what our Nation has so long stood for?

Is it not a paradox that while we have failed to take this obvious course, Great Britain appears to have appreciated the world tide, and has been rapidly granting her form of self-government to her former colonies? Consider the list of new governments which have been granted independence either within or without the British Commonwealth: India, in 1947, Pakistan and Burma in 1948, Ceylon in 1955, and Sudan in 1956, Ghana and Malaya in 1957, and the West Indies Federation in 1958.

It is high time that we Americans put an emphatic and decisive stop to colonialism—which we now practice in unfair and oppressive form against the pioneering Americans of Alaska—and provide by action here for admission of Alaska as our 49th State.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman has founded his remarks on the idea of colonialism. Of course, we have Puerto Rico and something over 2 million people as opposed to some 80,000 in Alaska. I would like to know if the gentleman proposes to give statehood to Puerto Rico, to the Virgin Islands, to Hawaii, to Guam, and to any other outlying Territories on the ground that otherwise we are guilty of what the gentleman thinks is such a terrible thing as colonialism.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I will say to my good friend that I do not think we can establish in the case of these other areas a case for colonialism that is clearly established in our treatment of Alaska. I do not believe, until you have that kind of case established, that you can make a case for justice and equity in these other places as you can in Alaska.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Would the gentleman not agree that at least 70 percent of the people in Puerto Rico do not want statehood; that if we are discussing colonialism in relative terms, they have more self-government than the incorporated Territory of Alaska because they elect their own governor and they keep their own taxes? Alaska, which is an incorporated Territory, the highest status next to statehood, has less self-government than Puerto Rico.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman has made a very nice speech, particularly to readjust these freight rates. But I think he has been in something of a semantic shuffle on the matter of colonialism. I would not like to see this record go with that unchallenged. Colonialism as it is known as a word throughout the world today is something entirely different from the situation that we have in Alaska. It is the domination by one nation of a people of a different land, of supposedly a lesser economic and social development. The gentleman relates this to the people of the United States who rebelled in 1776 and if he does, he relates it to something that was entirely different, because it was 151 years before 1776 that the people came to this continent and started the creation of a new and separate culture, government, and environment.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I disagree with my friend, and I do not yield further, for a speech.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PILLION. Can the gentleman tell us how much tonnage would be shipped to Alaska that is not being shipped now because of the Jones Act discrimination?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I have no information on that point. I can only presume, in answer to that question, that if freight rates were lower there would be an increase in freight shipments to that area.

Mr. PILLION. Freight rates, of course, do not enter into this. As far as the bill eliminating the Jones Act discrimination is concerned, to which the

gentleman referred, is there any idea how much would be shipped up to Alaska?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am sorry I cannot supply that information to the gentleman, but I think it is a fair assumption that a lowering of freight rates would bring about greater business interests in that area, greater population, and greater traffic in freight.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7999) to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills, a joint resolution, and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1342. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helen Harvey;

H. R. 1466. An act for the relief of Dr. Thomas B. Meade;

H. R. 2763. An act for the relief of Hong-to Dew;

H. R. 4215. An act amending sections 22 and 24 of the Organic Act of Guam;

H. R. 4445. An act for the relief of the estate of Mr. Shirley B. Stebbins;

H. R. 6176. An act for the relief of Fouad George Baroody;

H. R. 6528. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lyman C. Murphey;

H. R. 6731. An act for the relief of Harry Slatkin;

H. R. 7203. An act for the relief of Dwight J. Brohard;

H. R. 7645. An act to provide for the release of restrictions and reservations contained in instrument conveying certain land by the United States to the State of Wisconsin;

H. R. 8039. An act for the relief of Edward L. Munroe;

H. R. 8071. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey an easement over certain property of the United States located in Princess Anne County, Va., known as the Fort Story Military Reservation, to the Norfolk Southern Railway Co. in exchange for other lands and easements of said company;

H. R. 8433. An act for the relief of Capt. Laurence D. Talbot (retired);

H. R. 8448. An act for the relief of Willie C. Williams;

H. R. 9012. An act for the relief of Alexander Grossman;

H. R. 9109. An act for the relief of John A. Tierney;

H. R. 9362. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to Post 924, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States;

H. R. 9395. An act for the relief of Cornelia V. Lane;

H. R. 9490. An act for the relief of Sidney A. Coven;

H. R. 9514. An act for the relief of Valleydale Packers, Inc.;

H. R. 9738. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Macon, Ga., a parcel of land in the said city of Macon containing 5.39 acres, more or less;

H. R. 9775. An act for the relief of William J. McGarry;

H. R. 9991. An act for the relief of Felix Garcia;

H. R. 9992. An act for the relief of James R. Martin and others;

H. J. Res. 586. Joint resolution to authorize the designation of the week beginning on October 13, 1958, as National Olympic Week;

H. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 232, 84th Congress; and

H. Con. Res. 228. Concurrent resolution auorizing the printing as a House document of the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government. What is it? How Does It Function?"

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5836) entitled "An act to readjust postal rates and to establish a Congressional policy for the determination of postal rates, and for other purposes."

POSTAL RATE READJUSTMENT

Mr. MURRAY submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5836) to readjust postal rates and to establish a Congressional policy for the determination of postal rates, and for other purposes.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority leader if it his purpose to call up this conference report tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. The conference report will be the first order of business tomorrow, and thereafter the consideration of the Alaska statehood bill will continue.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight, May 21, to file a report on the bill H. R. 12591, including, of course, supplemental views.

Mr. MARTIN. Is the gentleman also incorporating in his request provision for a minority report?

Mr. MILLS. Yes; all supplemental views, including minority views.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ASTRONAUTICS AND SPACE EXPLORATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration may have until midnight Saturday to file a unanimous report on H. R. 12575, a bill to provide for research into problems of flight within and outside of the earth's atmosphere, and for other purposes; in other words, the so-called outer space agency that will be established.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LIBERALIZING OUR SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, in the past 6 years, on numerous occasions I have spoken on the floor of this House to urge that we liberalize and humanize our social security system.

During my three terms in Congress, I have introduced and spoken in support of a number of my bills which would:

First. Lower the retirement age to 60 for men and 55 for women.

Second. Eliminate the age limit for total and permanent disability benefits.

Third. Strike out the "work clause" for persons over 65.

Fourth. Increase the minimum monthly benefits.

Fifth. Provide a 10 percent increase in all benefits.

Sixth. Eliminate the penalty for women who retire at age 62; and other corrective and necessary measures.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to again speak in behalf of my bill, H. R. 2865, which was reintroduced January 1957. Briefly, it will provide full social security benefits to men at age 60 and women at age 55. I am convinced that the task at hand is to improve and alleviate the condition of many of our senior citizens who, because of factors beyond their control, are unable to work or find employment. My bill is an important means to this good end.

As I have stated on prior occasions the purpose of our social security system is to further the social, economic, and psychological well-being of the people in such a way that consideration is given to their individual capacities and their basic needs. It is becoming continually more apparent that our present retirement age requirements intensify the social problems of thousands of neglected, needy persons in this country.

The objectives of my proposal do not present a radical change in the primary purpose of the Social Security Act. But, I believe, the legislation would give the system the ability to be more responsive to the widely differing needs of older workers in our country. Moreover, with a lower retirement age many of our younger people, among the 5 million unemployed, will have an opportunity for work that is not presently within their grasp.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe for 1 minute that there would be mass retirement of employed workers in response to my legislation. It is difficult to imagine that a healthy and happily employed worker of 60 will leave his job for a chance to collect a monthly re-

tirement check of $60 or $80 or even the maximum benefit of $108.50. The incentive to do this is simply not there. It is a fact that those who work and can work remain on the job far beyond the minimum retirement age. And the great majority of those who do retire, do not do so by choice but because of poor health, family decisions and other reasons. A small 5 percent retire voluntarily while they are in good health to take advantage of the benefits they are offered.

I am aware of the fact that this proposal will cost money. But, at a time when we badly need an increase in consumer purchasing power, it would seem to be the best kind of economic, as well as humanitarian policy, to put this money into the hands of people who will spend it immediately for the necessities of life.

Undoubtedly the enactment of this legislation will call for some adjustment in the social security tax schedules, but I believe that the workers of this country will be willing to make these increased contributions with the knowledge that this is a form of investment in their own future protection.

Mr. Speaker, since 1953 when I first came to Congress, I am happy to say, we have made much progress in improving and liberalizing the social security system. In 1956, we eradicated for all time the bugaboo—that 65 is the only age of retirement—which had hamstrung the system since it was established back in 1935. The action of the House of Representatives in reducing the eligibility age for women to 62 was a first step in a realistic retirement policy.

Mr. Speaker, although many inequities were created by granting actuarially reduced benefits to women workers and wives, and full benefits to widows, one good thing resulted—the days when our retirement-age figures have gone unquestioned—and age 65 remains inviolate—were ended. The response of the American people to the reduction of the retirement age, and the institution of disability benefits brought about by the 1956 amendments, shows that they know that retirement is not linked to any traditional age but depends, in large part, upon the vicissitudes of life.

Mr. Speaker, although the artificial age barriers to employment are no measure of an individual's ability to work, it has been shown conclusively that many of our older citizens are too old to be employed but much too young to be eligible for social-security benefits. I believe that this is a situation which we cannot tolerate here in the United States. The basic problem of the present is to see to it that the disadvantaged of this country obtain their share of America's abundance, a larger freedom from insecurity, and a better cushion against job discrimination because of age.

It is my firm belief that the American people want this Congress to act favorably on this legislation. My bill will enable us to take another step forward in our social security system—a system which is based on the principle that contributions throughout working life shall provide the kind of retirement income which preserves dignity and individual security for the deserving citizens of the United States. I hope the Ways and Means Committee will give thoughtful and favorable consideration to this bill now. By doing so, we will alleviate many hardships in millions of American homes.

THE NEED FOR AN EXPANDED PROGRAM FOR FORESTRY RESEARCH

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill which is designed to expand our present program of research in forestry and forest products, and for other purposes. This bill is declaratory of the present policy of the Congress to promote the efficient production, marketing, and utilization of the products of the forest. For the attainment of this policy, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to conduct and to stimulate research in the development, conservation, and management of forests and the production, marketing, and utilization of forest products in their broadest aspects.

To implement this Congressional policy the Secretary of Agriculture by the terms of this bill is authorized to cooperate and enter into contracts with colleges, school and universities and with other public and private organizations and individuals. Any contracts or agreements made pursuant to this authority shall contain requirements making the results of research and investigation available to the public through dedication, assignment to the Government, or such other means as the Secretary may determine. In entering into such contracts or in making cooperative arrangements the Secretary may arrange for the utilization of graduate students in the research performed under such contracts or agreements and shall take such measures as he deems appropriate to stimulate interest by graduate students in the development and application of all phases of forestry and forest products utilization research.

In carrying out the intent and spirit of this bill, the Secretary shall emphasize to the extent practicable special and early attention to the development of new uses and products for low-value timber, wood residues, and other products, in the improvement and more efficient production, harvesting, processing, marketing, and use of timber, lumber, and other wood products, and the development of new and improved scientific and technical methods and equipment for the development, conservation, and management of forests and for producing, marketing, and utilizing forest products. The emphasis on expanded forestry research programs is well placed. Forestry is not a short-time proposition. Where this Nation stands in timber supply at the end of the century depends largely on actions taken during the next two decades. Rapid acceleration of recent encouraging forestry trends is vital if the timber resources of the Nation are to be reasonably abundant 50 years hence. Because of the magnitude of potential demand, and the difficulty of extending more intensive forestry to the millions of small holdings, time is important. The potential of the land is adequate. Our challenge is to make better use of it soon.

My study reveals that the greatest need for research in forestry not now being met is for basic or fundamental work. Progress in the solution of the many problems facing our forestry today depends on constantly increasing knowledge obtained by research and experience. I am happy to report that a very considerable amount of research, especially applied research, is now being done by the Federal and State governments, and by private and industrial interests. However, because of the pressure exerted on these organizations for immediate results having direct practical application in the management of forest properties are in the harvesting and utilization of the timber crop, they can be expected to do little research of a really basic nature. If this sorely needed basic research is done, it will have to be performed by educational institutions, especially private colleges and universities, and the more forward looking private interests, through outright grants, fellowships, and particularly research assistanceships.

It is reassuring to note that for the first time in many years, our forests are growing more wood than we are using. Annual wood growth is increasing at an accelerated rate. Our commercial forest area is expanding. The practice of good forestry on private forest lands—farm, industrial, and other—is spreading rapidly. Some of the most intensive forest management is on the lands of wood-using industries and other private owners.

These facts, bright as they are, do not necessarily mean we shall have more wood than we can use in the years ahead. Our population is growing; our consumption of wood is increasing. Industry and government estimates indicate we will use wood in an increasing rate in the years to come. To keep forest growths ahead of our timber needs is our forestry job today. Many of us fail to realize the significant role our forests play in our economy from day to day. Like so many things, we have taken our great forest resources for granted. In my own State of Missouri, the forests have always played an important part in the economy of Missouri. The half of the population living in cities is not as acutely aware of their dependence on timber crops as are those living on farms and in small communities, but they nonetheless affected by the condition and productivity of the forests and forest industries. A recent survey published by the United States Department of Commerce shows that 3 out of every 100 persons employed in the industries, trades, and businesses of Missouri were employed in industries directly dependent on timber for their raw material. Add to that figure the dependents of those so employed, and the

relation of the forests to the State's welfare becomes apparent. These statistics when multiplied by 48 give us a better understanding of the importance of our forests to our overall economy.

Fundamental research is essential in determining the basic facts and principles upon which forest management and the utilization of forest products depend. Research of this type is basically of general application and as such is a matter for public participation. Federal forest research has placed greater emphasis on forest inventory, forest protection, the economic aspects of forest management, and the utilization of forest products. This should be done through a reorientation program and not through increased appropriations. State and private agencies should be encouraged to expand their programs of forest research. Better coordination to avoid competition and duplication between Federal, State, and private agencies should be effected through the establishment of a National Forest Research Advisory Council representative of private, State, and Federal organizations interested in forest research. The results of research investigations and studies of forest management and utilization should be readily available and currently disseminated to all public and private forest agencies, and the forest industries and landowners. The bill which I have introduced today is a step in the right direction. To provide for the needs of the future we must plan and think in terms of the needs of the future. This can only be accomplished by a properly programed plan for the future.

Starting almost from scratch at the beginning of this century, American forestry has made remarkable advances in the past 50 years. What men of vision half a century ago saw in the years ahead fell far short of what actually came to pass. They failed to fully foresee the astounding developments that have taken place in science, agriculture, and industry. They could not know that a half century would bring two world wars. All of these things made their impact on the forests and on the course of forestry. Forestry, then, should go steadily forward. Its potentialities for contributing to national prosperity, security, and progress are very great. Fifty years from now, as today, the strength of the Nation, will lie in its people and in its resources.

SAFETY IN THE AIR

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the tragic aircraft accident involving a civilian plane and a National Guard jet in the Washington area yesterday, the second of its kind in a short period of time, most forcibly emphasizes the need for Congressional action designed to minimize and possibly eliminate these terrible accidents.

While it is true that Congress has given considerable attention in the past to the general problem of regulating air traffic, both military and civilian, the occurrence of these accidents appears to indicate that final solutions must be found at the earliest possible moment.

The problems involved here are not easy of solution since they concern military as well as civilian aviation. Due consideration must be given, to be sure, to both of these branches of our great aviation system. Obviously, security considerations and the farflung operations of military aircraft must be kept in our minds, but it is also true that the safety of civilian aircraft and their passengers must be safeguarded.

I hope and urge that the various Congressional committees having jurisdiction over air traffic in these respective fields will be prompted by these recent accidents to take immediate action in order to provide a definite, workable system under which air traffic can be effectively regulated in the interest of the national security and public safety.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AN INDEPENDENT AVIATION AGENCY

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, another air tragedy occurred yesterday which again emphasizes the compelling need for immediate action to place authority and responsibility in someone to coordinate the use of air space by civil and military aircraft.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, another airliner bashed out of the skies by a military jet—12 dead. Only last month a similar mishap in Nevada killed 49.

Therefore, I have today introduced legislation to establish an independent aviation agency with complete jurisdiction over the flight of all types of aircraft.

This is no hastily conceived proposal. It is based on extensive hearings on air safety by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It is a step urged by leading experts in aviation.

Recent tragic midair collisions dramatically underscore the need for this legislation.

As the committee pointed out in its report to the House on its investigation of the Grand Canyon accident 2 years ago, the old "see and be seen" principle of preventing midair collisions is out of date in this jet age of high-speed, high-altitude flight.

Regulations and procedures were tightened following the committee's investigation of the Grand Canyon accident and subsequent mid-air collisions. Amazing progress has been made in modernizing our civil airways for the jet age.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as the legislative committee concerned with the policy considerations involved in this problem, has, over a period of years, given a great amount of attention to various aspects of the air safety problem. It was primarily through the efforts of our committee that the military and civil officials of the Government were induced to reconcile the two different systems of air navigation being pursued separately—TACAN, VOR/DME—and that is now being accomplished—see House Report No. 592, 84th Congress, 1st session. However, there still exists a need for unified control of airspace use and for further coordination of air navigation and traffic control responsibilities in the executive branch of the Government. The committee, in January of 1957, submitted a report to the House—House Report No. 2972, 84th Congress, 2d session—pointing out that new equipment and new concepts of air traffic control must be adopted to meet existing and future problems.

In addition, the Commerce Appropriations Subcommittee of the House, under the able chairmanship of the Honorable PRINCE PRESTON, has recognized the serious nature of this problem, and fully supported the increased budget requests by the Civil Aeronautics Administration for funds to speed up the improvement of existing airways. In its most recent report on this subject that committee said:

> The ultimate objective should be the creation of one civil aviation agency with complete jurisdiction over the use of airspace by all types of aircraft.

Again, in the 85th Congress a further report on airspace use problems—House Report No. 1272, 85th Congress, 1st session—was submitted by the Commerce Committee, pointing up the relationship of airspace use problems to the continued safe and orderly development of civil aviation. In this report the attention of the House was called to the Curtis recommendation for an independent Federal Aviation Agency, as an ultimate requirement, and to his interim recommendation for an Airways Modernization Board.

The need for action now was pointed out in the report submitted by the Civil Aeronautics Board Monday in which 971 valid near-miss reports for 1957 were discussed.

The airspace over the United States is one of our great natural resources. Civil and military aviation must share that airspace. Because of divided authority between civilian agencies and the military, there has been a lack of coordination on the allocation of airspace.

As the CAB pointed out in its report, every day 200,000 or more persons fly safely through the airspace over the United States. They are entitled to the maximum protection that can be provided. The hazards resulting from essential operation of military aircraft must be reduced to the minimum.

I am confident that new procedures and rules of the air can be worked out to reduce those hazards. What we need to do is create an agency to control our airspace and give that agency the personnel and the tools to get the job done.

Dispersion of authority and responsibility has been one of our great problems. Efforts to solve traffic-control problems have been delayed or bogged

down in a labyrinth of Federal agencies. The situation has been one ideal for buckpassing and confusion.

And all this time we have been depending on the airplane to defend our country and to play a role of growing importance in the national transportation system.

At the time of our hearings on the proposal to create an interim Airways Modernization Board—Public Law 85-133—I expressed a desire to hold hearings on this proposed permanent aviation agency this year; however, in view of the anticipated report from the executive branch, on January 15, 1959, we had deferred taking up this matter to allow the executive branch to complete its study and come forward with a detailed legislative recommendation. Recent events make it perfectly clear that we can no longer wait for this recommendation, although I do believe that sufficient time and progress has been made by the executive branch so that they can indicate their specific recommendations on this problem.

There has been plenty of study of the problem. On December 31, 1955, William B. Harding submitted his report to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, recommending that a study of aviation facilities requirements be made to provide for more efficient use of national airspace, integrate civil and military expenditures for aviation facilities and to determine what kind of Government organization is required to control use of the airspace. Subsequently, the President appointed Edward P. Curtis as Special Assistant for Aviation Facilities Planning and directed him to make such a study which was completed on May 10, 1957, and submitted to the President.

The report contained recommendations for meeting the Nation's requirement for aviation facilities and presented an organizational program.

The Curtis report came to the following conclusions:

First. Airways operations and control must be modernized through a comprehensive and continuous research and development program.

Second. The program must be implemented with a Government organization geared to meet the modern-day requirements of both civil and military aviation.

Third. Such a Government organization should include the following:

(a) An Airways Modernization Board to handle the research and development aspects of the problem—this was accomplished by Public Law 85-133, which became effective on August 14, 1957.

(b) The appointment of a special assistant to the President on aviation matters until a permanent organization can be created. This was accomplished on June 14, 1957, by the appointment of Elwood P. Quesada.

(c) The establishment of an independent Federal Aviation Agency into which are consolidated all of the essential management functions necessary to support the common needs of the military and civilian aviation of the United States.

The principal functions of the Federal Aviation Agency would be the following:

First. Development of long-range airspace programs, national airspace policy and the assignment of all United States airspace.

Second. Establishment and operation of the air navigation and traffic control system of the United States.

Third. The research and development functions temporarily assigned to the Airways Modernization Board.

Fourth. The prescription and revision of all air safety regulations.

Fifth. Investigation of air accidents, including military aircraft involving civil damage.

Specifically, this bill would amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to do the following things:

First. Establish an independent Federal Aviation Agency headed by a civilian Federal aviation administrator. The CAA, which is now part of the Department of Commerce, would become the nucleus of the new Federal Aviation Agency.

Second. The functions of the Airways Modernization Board would be transferred to the new Agency.

Third. The authority to prescribe civil air regulations and air-traffic rules would be transferred from the CAB to the new agency; however, appeal to CAB would be provided from proposed rules which would, in the opinion of users of the airways, impose undue burdens on them.

Fourth. The responsibility for the allocation of United States airspace would be vested in the Administrator.

Fifth. Provision is made in the bill for staffing the new Agency with civilian personnel, but calling for appropriate liaison with the military in order to accommodate national defense requirements. The Administrator is authorized to establish such military advisory groups as he may deem necessary in this connection.

Sixth. The Administrator would have the authority to disapprove the location of military, civil and joint civil-military airports as well as runway layouts, in order to avoid airspace and traffic-control problems which would result from inappropriately located or uncoordinated airports and facilities.

Seventh. The CAB would continue to have as its major responsibility, the economic regulation of commercial air carriers, and assume almost completely a quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative role.

Eighth. The CAB would retain its present function of aircraft accident investigation, except to the extent that it might delegate this responsibility to the Federal Aviation Agency in the case of minor accidents; as well as the responsibility of reviewing airmen certificate denials, revocations, and suspensions. Certificates would be issued by the Federal Aviation Agency in the field of civil aviation.

This bill makes no substantive changes in the law not necessitated by the creation of this new Agency and the consequent transfer of functions.

INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on May 8, 1958, I introduced H. R. 12397, to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase benefits by 15 percent across the board. I sincerely believe that this modest increase in social security benefits is essential if the system is to fulfill its purpose as set forth by one of its founders, Michigan State's Edwin E. Witte, namely, "to assure all Americans in all contingencies of life a minimum income sufficient for existence in accordance with prevailing concepts of decency."

Specifically this bill would have the effect of, first, increasing the minimum monthly benefit payable to a retired or disabled individual or survivor or dependent from $30 to $34.50; second, increasing the minimum family benefits from $50 to $57.50 per month; third, increasing the maximum monthly family benefit from $200 to $230; and fourth, increasing the maximum lump-sum death payment from $255 to $292.50, with the 15 percent increase to apply throughout the benefit structure between these minimum and maximum amounts.

The present average benefit for a retired aged individual is about $65 a month, for a totally disabled person over 50 it is about $75 a month and for an aged widow it is only about $50 a month. I contend that these amounts are shockingly low in times like these and are insufficient to provide subsistence for most of these people. Even the maximum individual payment of $108.50 is barely adequate in these days of ever-rising prices for food, shelter, and medical care.

The simple fact is that the social-security benefit structure has not kept pace with the rising cost of living and increased wages. Therefore, the relative economic position of our retired workers, dependents, and survivors is steadily deteriorating. The original act in 1935 provided for a range of monthly benefits from $10 to $85 to take effect in 1940. This was not considered luxurious at that time when the cost of living was only about 59.9 percent of the 1947-49 level. In the 18 years since 1940 the cost of living has gone up more than 100 percent to 122.5 but the maximum social-security benefit has lagged shamefully, having increased only about 35 percent.

The last increase in social-security benefits was voted in 1954. But between 1954 and 1957 disposable per capita income went up 12 percent and average weekly wages in manufacturing went up 14.6 percent. As we are all painfully aware, the consumer price index has risen 6.7 percent from 1954 to date. But this figure does not tell the whole story. The elements of the cost of living for an elderly retired person are

quite different from those for a younger person. While the older family may spend relatively less than the average for homes and home furnishings they spend substantially more for medical care, and medical costs have risen more rapidly than any other element of the cost of living. These costs in November 1957 were 40 percent above the 1947–49 level while the overall consumer price index rose 21.6 percent in the same period. The impact of this serious increase in medical costs can be appreciated when we realize that, according to a nationwide survey, persons over 65 incur 57 percent greater medical costs than does the general population. And hospital expenses for the average person in this age group are 92 percent greater than for the population as a whole.

So much for the overall problem. Let us look at the situation from the standpoint of an individual retired family. Several years ago a labor union in my State of Michigan worked out a budget for an elderly couple in Detroit. It was not an extravagant budget in any sense—for example, it allowed one-eighth of a pound of butter per person per week, one work shirt and 1⅓ other shirts per year for the husband, 1 house dress per year, 1 umbrella every 20 years and eighty-five one-hundredths of a handkerchief per year for his wife. Yet this modest budget in 1955 prices amounted to about $200 per month which is just about twice what the average retired worker and his wife are now receiving from social security.

Moreover, who can ignore the distressing circumstances which led a woman to write to syndicated columnist Ray Henry this winter:

> My father is 75 and collects $53 a month from social security. That's his only income. I've been taking care of him for 14 years but now find it necessary to place him in a nursing home. Could he collect any other Government benefits to help with this added expense?

The answer to this question was that he might be eligible for the federally aided old-age assistance program. But is public assistance with its needs test the answer to the problem of pitifully inadequate social security insurance benefits? Obviously not. Congress has expressed its views repeatedly on this issue as in the report of the Senate Committee on Finance on the social security amendments of 1950, which reads:

> Unless the insurance system is expanded and improved so that it in fact offers a basic security to retired persons and to survivors, there will be continual and nearly irresistible pressure for putting more and more Federal funds into the less constructive assistance programs. We consider the assistance method to have serious disadvantages as a long-run approach to the Nation's social-security problem. We believe that improvement of the American social security system should be in the direction of preventing dependency before it occurs, and of providing more effective income protection, free from the humiliation of a test of need.

And again in 1954 the report of the House Ways and Means Committee on the social security amendments of 1954 stated:

> The protection afforded by the (Social Security) program may be considered adequate only when benefits are high enough, when added to savings and assets normally accumulated, so most beneficaries will not have to apply for public assistance for the ordinary expenses of living.

I have not even touched on the present unemployment situation which of course has been another serious blow to the economic well-being of the older worker who has always had difficulty finding a job. Thus more and more of the people who are able and willing to work after 65 are being forced to retire and rely entirely on income from social security.

I feel we can no longer brush aside this problem which is fast becoming a national disgrace. We must keep faith with our older citizens and relieve their distressing economic plight. I therefore urge every member to support this bill.

LEGAL MAZE CONFUSES EMPLOYMENT OF RETIRED MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, at least 35 dual-employment and dual-compensation statutes are now in effect. It is a practical impossibility to administer them, let alone avoid repeated cases of inadvertent hardship and injustice.

The Army, Navy, Air Force Journal for May 17 editorialized on the situation as follows:

LEGAL MAZE CONFUSES EMPLOYMENT OF RETIRED

A most serious effect of the plethora of laws which bar retired officers from many categories of employment is that it prevents industry and the Government from making use of the skill and experience of this outstanding group of trained executives. This is particularly important at this time when our shortage of manpower in many professional areas is a matter of grave concern.

As the article on the first page of this issue reveals, the dual-compensation, dual-employment, and conflict-of-interest laws, many of which date back into the 19th century, prevent the Government and industry from utilizing these valuable men and, at the same time, hold the retired officers back from incomes which could supplement their small retired pay.

The Department of Defense would do well to initiate a complete restudy of the entire problem with a view to presenting Congress with a comprehensive report of the evils of the present laws and recommendations for repeal.

So tangled is the situation that a study I made of it last year consumed 18 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to explain. That study was the basis of H. R. 11744 and its predecessor, H. R. 1943, which I have introduced. The later bill was introduced making slight changes in the earlier bill, with which changes Chairman Harris Ellsworth, of the United States Civil Service Commission advised the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service there would be no objection from the Commission to passage of the legislation.

Since this is a subject which needs rectifying, and since there is no objection to the means I have initiated to accomplish it, I am in hopes that committee action on H. R. 11744 will be soon forthcoming. The same issue of the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal carried, as mentioned in the editorial, the following article which enforces my position:

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT MAY STEP IN TO EASE SERVICE CONFUSION OVER CONFLICT LAWS

Confusion and conflicting service policies confront and bewilder retired military officers who seek employment with the Government or with private firms doing business with the Government.

One critical problem is that the three service judge advocates disagree on many points of law concerning dual compensation, dual employment, and conflict of interest. In these areas, Pentagon legal authorities say, the three services hold almost irreconcilable positions.

The situation now is such that a retired officer from one service could, under certain circumstances, forfeit his retired pay for selling a 10-cent comb to another military department, but suffer no penalty for signing a multi-million-dollar research and development contract.

Officers from the other services might be penalized if they performed either of these actions.

Further confusing the retired officers' problem are conflicting decisions of the courts and Comptroller General, both of whom can override retired policies set by the military departments.

To avoid risking their retired pay and rights, and even stiff jail terms, retired military people must place their primary reliance upon the decisions of their respective judge advocates. These authorities, in turn, concede they are not quite sure of what many of the laws affecting retired people really mean.

As a consequence of this muddled state of affairs, it can be expected that the Department of Defense soon will take a hand in straightening out postservice employment problems for retired military officers. It will not be able to achieve complete uniformity among all the services, officials say, because some conflict-of-interest laws apply only to one service.

AN URGENT NECESSITY

The urgent requirement for clear-cut decisions is pointed up in new charges by the president of the New York City Bar Association. He said the present conflict-of-interest laws provide loopholes for the unscrupulous and traps for the honest but unwary.

President Louis M. Loeb of the New York bar group declared this week that most of the conflict-of-interest laws were enacted in earlier, simpler days. "Now," he said, "they are inadequate to protect the Government from subtle forms of corruption and unreasonably discourage able persons from taking Government positions."

Mr. Loeb's assertions were nothing new to retired military officers. They have been confounded by similar restrictions for decades.

Similar attacks on the dual compensation, dual employment, and conflict-of-interest laws echo yearly through the halls of Congress, but with little practical effect.

MORE THAN 35 STATUTES

Pinpointing the need for revision of the statutes relating to the employment of retired military officers, Representative CRAIG

HOSMER (Republican, of California) told the House of Representatives last year that "at least 35 dual employment and dual compensation statutes are now in effect. It is a practical impossibility to administer them, let alone avoid repeated cases of inadvertent hardship and injustice. This is a situation badly needing a remedy."

The Pentagon in 1956 went before Congress to urge outright repeal of the dual employment and dual compensation statutes.

Service officials described the laws as extremely complicated, discriminatory, overlapping, and unrealistic.

Chairman PAUL J. KILDAY (Democrat, of Texas), of the Special House Armed Services Subcommittee which considered the 1956 charges, agreed that there is room for considerable improvement.

None has been forthcoming.

At present, the scores of unrelated restrictions on the employment of retired officers add up to a series of ever-tightening barriers. Lack of knowledge about any of these might cost an officer loss of his retired pay, a stiff jail sentence, or both.

EIGHTEEN HUNDRED AND NINETY-FOUR BARRIER STILL UP

The basic restrictions upon post-service employment of retired military officers prohibits them from holding Government positions if either their retired pay or Government salary would equal or exceed $2,500 per year. Contained in the Dual Employment Act of 1894 (28 Stat. 205, as amended, 5 U. S. C. 62), these restrictions apply almost exclusively to Regular officers and warrant officers retired for length of service.

Enlisted men advanced to officer grade upon retirement, pursuant to an act of Congress, do not usually fall under the prohibitions of the act. If, however, they were appointed as officers on the retired list by the President, they become subject to the dual employment limitations.

Reserve and National Guard officers are not restricted by the 64-year-old statute. This discrimination is reserved solely for Regulars with at least 20 years' service.

Exemptions to the Dual Employment Act, if listed together, might fill a good sized telephone book. They apply to: elected officials of the Federal Government; officials appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, certain types of temporary employment; and a multitude of other positions exempted by the Congress, courts, and Comptroller General.

THE SECOND BIG HURDLE

When and if a retired officer finds he is eligible for Government employment under the Dual Employment Act of 1894, he has only jumped the first hurdle. The next step to clear is the Dual Compensation Act (47 Stat. 406, as amended, 5 U. S. C. (Supp. IV) 59a (1955)), which dates to the 1932 depression.

This act basically provides that when the combined retired pay and pay from a civilian Government job exceeds $10,000, the officer affected must forfeit any portion of his retired pay which brings him over the limit. If the civilian job pays $10,000, he forfeits all his retired pay for the period concerned. If it is less, he may receive only the difference between his civilian salary and the $10,000 limit.

The Dual Compensation Act does not apply to retired warrant officers, retired Reserve, or retired National Guard officers.

Also exempted from its provisions are: officers retired for disability incurred either in combat or by an instrumentality of war during specified periods of hostilities; and officers who pursue intermittent employment on a fee basis, when the job is not considered to be an office or position of the United States.

COMPTROLLER OVERRULES COURT

Other types of intermittent and temporary Government employment may fall under the prohibitions of this act and could result in a prorated forfeiture of the officer's retired pay during the period of his employment.

Disability retired officers who are not covered in the initial exemptions of the Dual Compensation Act, have been able to get around it by waiving their retired pay in favor of receiving Veterans' Administration compensation. By doing this they avoid all salary restrictions.

A wider area of Government employment would be open to retired officers if the Comptroller General followed United States Court of Claims and Supreme Court decisions defining an "officer of the United States." These decisions would allow all retired officers to work for corporations wholly owned by the United States, such as the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The Comptroller has been adamant. He says that retired Regular officers cannot work for these corporations. The military departments have abided by the Comptroller's decision.

ANOTHER WAY OUT?

From the foregoing it appears that the retired officers' problem of post-service employment might easily be solved by completely forgetting about Government employment and seeking a position in private industry. This is far from true.

Rising from the dark crevasses of the United States Code come the conflict-of-interest statutes, which follow him wherever he may go. These statutes should be etched upon the mind of every retired officer, for they apply even to the most unlikely situations.

As a starter, all retired Regular officers are prohibited for 2 years after retirement from selling, contracting to sell, or negotiating to sell "any supplies or war materials" to any of the services, the Defense Department, Coast Guard, or Coast and Geodetic Survey. The penalty for violating this law (67 Stat. 437, 5 U. S. C. (Supp. IV) 59c (1953)) is loss of retired pay.

Navy authorities consider supplies and war materials to include any conceivable item, including "pocket combs and soft drinks." An "important exception" is made by the Navy in the case of professional services, "such as plans, specifications, designs, or drawings," which it does not consider to be supplies or war materials within the meaning of the above statute.

This presents the interesting possibility of one retired Navy officer being deprived of his pay for selling a comb to the Air Force, while another may continue to receive full pay and benefits when contracting for research contracts, plans, specifications, designs, drawings, or any other professional services.

Air Force officials interpret the above statute more strictly. They say they could not follow the Navy interpretation. If an Air Force officer were selling drawings to the Navy within 2 years after retirement, they said, his retired pay would be stopped immediately. In some cases, they said, they would ask for a Comptroller General ruling on the subject.

Army authorities report they are still researching the point of what constitutes "supplies and materials" within the meaning of the conflict-of-interest restriction.

THE ROAD TO JAIL

Added restrictions on retired officers' activities are imposed by the criminal conflict-of-interest laws, especially the one contained in title 18, United States Code, section 281 (1949).

This statute provides a $10,000 fine or up to 2 years in jail if an officer represents anyone, including himself, in the sale of anything to the Government through the department in which he holds retired status.

The effect of this restriction is disputed among service legal authorities.

Specific quarrel with this provision is taken by the Navy in its Reference Guide to Employment Activities of Retired Naval Personnel. Here the Navy Judge Advocate notes that of all the major laws restricting the employment activities of retired officers, "these criminal statutes are the most ambiguous and it is often extremely difficult to predict with any degree of certainty whether proposed activities will violate these provisions."

The Navy says, in effect, it does not know what the statutes mean. Retired Navy officers may not learn what the statute means until they find themselves in trouble—possibly even in newly issued, striped uniforms.

Similar criminal statutes apply to officers who, within 2 years after retirement, act as agents or attorneys or who assist in prosecuting claims against the United States, especially when they concern subject matter with which the officer was directly connected while on active duty (18 U. S. C. 283 (1949)). These provisions seem to hit especially hard at JAG officers.

NO ACTION IN CONGRESS

With regard to dual employment and dual compensation revisions, little action is expected in this session of Congress. A number of bills have been introduced and referred to committees, but have been given no further consideration.

Prospects for revision of Federal conflict-of-interest policies are better as a result of a recently issued special staff report on the subject to the House Judiciary Committee.

The judiciary report emphasizes that "existing conflict-of-interest law comprises overlapping, inconsistent, and incomplete provisions, which not only differ among themselves with respect to the classes of persons covered, but are also subject to numerous general and special exemptions. These exemptions in turn often contain their own limitations on exempted conduct.

"Despite the importance of the subject which today affects millions of Americans directly," the report continues, "there has been little judicial interpretation on the conflict-of-interest statutes, and almost no such interpretation of the exemptions and their scope.

"All this," the report concludes, "makes existing laws extremely difficult to construe."

No legislation has yet been introduced to implement the report's recommendations for a sweeping revision of the conflict-of-interest area.

UNCORRECTED INJUSTICE IN THE MILITARY PAY BILL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President signed the military pay bill. I am delighted this bill has become law. It was greatly needed to give assurance to the people of our country that our military forces will continue to have highly qualified officers and military personnel to conduct the operations of national defense.

Although this legislation is greatly needed, I regret extremely it does not correct the discrimination involved in the failure to permit all officers of the military services to credit training time in the computation of their longevity

retired pay. Some can credit this time, while others cannot, due to the fact they did not take their training at a certain time. Now this seems to me to be an inequity that should have been corrected, and since it was not corrected, something should be done about it. The situation is unjust and unfair.

In regard to this inequity, I should like to focus the attention of the entire Congress upon a news article which quite clearly points up this injustice and is in accord with efforts I have made to try to correct this wrong.

In the most recent issue of the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal, dated May 17, 1958, there appears on page 1 a most interesting and enlightening article. It deals with an area of disparity or discrimination which the recently enacted military pay bill fails to correct. I request unanimous consent that this brief article be printed in its entirety in the body of the RECORD at this point:

TEN THOUSAND DOLLARS DISCRIMINATION AGAINST SERVICE ACADEMY GRADUATES CONTINUES; PENTAGON PONDERS PROBLEM AFTER PAY DELAY

The Pentagon, which understandably sidetracked requests for remedial longevity legislation in order to streamline action on the pay bill, now must make up its mind what to do—if anything—about the continued pay discrimination against graduates of the service Academies and ROTC programs.

Thousands of Academy and ROTC officers today are denied longevity pay benefits available to other officers.

The denial of longevity credit to these officers for time spent at the Academies and in ROTC programs creates a disparity of an estimated $10,000 for each officer over a 30-year career, based on the present pay scales.

Here is the story:

From 1884 to 1912, service Academy time was counted for longevity pay purposes. Legislation passed in 1912 stipulated, however, that only active commissioned service could be counted.

The equity of this action was breached in 1942 with the passage of pay legislation authorizing longevity credit for active duty and virtually any and all inactive service in some 16 different Reserve components—but not Academy or ROTC time.

For example, officers who prepared for their commissions in V-12 and similar World War II programs receive longevity credit. So do those who graduate from officer candidate programs, or whose college time was spent while members of the Navy Reserve officers candidate program and the Marine Corps platoon leaders class.

Longevity credit is given also for Air Force and Navy aviation cadet programs. College students who are members of Reserve, National Guard, Air National Guard, or Coast Guard Reserve units also benefit.

A curious anomaly is that an Academy cadet or midshipman who fails an Academy course and then enlists in the armed services can count the Academy time for longevity. But he can't count the Academy service if he graduates.

The Academy time is creditable for civilian retirement from the Government; it also counts for Congressional retirement.

Interesting fact is that thousands of young men who enlist for only 6 months active duty under the Reserve Forces Act and who then attend college receive longevity credit during their educational careers, since they are members of the Reserve.

Had the new pay legislation eliminated longevity entirely, the inequity would have been resolved. But longevity was not eliminated.

Though modified, it remains a major factor in determining a military man's pay.

Thus, it would seem likely that the Defense Department, having asked in 1956 for remedial action on the Academy-ROTC issue, would now be moved, with the passage of the pay bill, to reexamine existing discriminatory laws.

The original Pentagon proposal would have restricted longevity credit for Academy and ROTC time to officers with at least 4 years active service, thereby assuring rewards exclusively for career people.

No military officer would object to such a restriction. Unless the Pentagon takes the initiative anew to eliminate inequities in officer pay, it is certain there will be cause for dissatisfaction and the feeling that Academy and ROTC graduates still are receiving second-class consideration when it comes to pay.

This article is very closely related to an amendment I offered on the House floor on March 25, 1958 when the military pay bill, H. R. 11470, was before this body for consideration. The Army, Navy, Air Force Journal's article also is closely related to a letter dated April 3, 1958, which I wrote to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the other body enclosing a proposed amendment to H. R. 11470 which I requested the chairman of that committee to cause to be considered when his committee took action on the military pay bill of 1958, H. R. 11470.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter of April 3, 1958, to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the other body, together with the enclosed proposed amendment, be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 3, 1958.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: On Tuesday, March 25, 1958, there came to my attention a matter which constitutes a very clear area of disparity or inequity in the treatment of several hundred persons now on the retired lists of the uniformed services in regard to the crediting or noncrediting of certain service for purposes of computing their longevity retired pay; particularly is this true by comparison with the more-favored treatment long enjoyed by some hundreds of others likewise on the retired lists of the uniformed services.

You will recognize the matter as not a new one. The very length of time that this inequitable situation has existed compounds and aggravates the basic unfairness involved. Upon having this unnecessary disparity recalled to your mind, you would, I sincerely believe and trust, desire to take the lead in removing it, for no just person will fail to support as fundamental the American principle of equality of treatment for all.

The matter that I have in mind, I wish to reemphasize beyond possibility of misunderstanding, relates specifically and only to the retired lists. It is this:

(a) On the retired lists of the several uniformed services there is a sizeable group of retired career officers who very properly enjoy the privilege of crediting, for longevity retired pay purposes, their years of service as cadets or midshipmen at West Point, Annapolis, or the Coast Guard Academy at New London. I say "very properly" because over the years the courts of the land, including the United States Supreme Court as well, have unequivocally held such service to be in fact full-time active military service during which the cadets or midshipmen were, and still are, 100 percent subject to military (including naval) jurisdiction, military discipline, and military law. The retired officers in this group are fortunate enough to have graduated from their respective service Academies in the classes of 1916 and prior thereto.

(b) On the very same retired lists of the uniformed services there is another body of less fortunate retired officers—officers different from the first group only in the fact that they graduated from their respective service Academies in classes subsequent to that of 1916; no other distinction exists between the two groups. But by laws enacted in 1912 and 1913, sparked by a misguided economy drive over 45 years ago, the post-1916 group is incomprehensibly even now denied credit for the same identical class of full-time active military service that is, and always has been, creditable for the preceding group.

So obviously unfair and inconsistent is this situation that I very earnestly hope and urge that you may cause a simple, appropriate, corrective amendment to be written into H. R. 11470, the currently pending Military Pay Adjustment Act, when your Committee acts upon it. I enclose herewith a suggested self-justifying amendment to accomplish the desired aim.

The eminently fair and sensible action which you took on the Senate floor March 31, 1952, in accepting an amendment to the Armed Forces Pay Raise Act of 1952 (H. R. 5715, 82d Cong.), an amendment which Senator HAYDEN offered in order to revive the right of some 300 older retired officers to have their Academy service count for retired pay purposes, strongly suggests to me that if Senator HAYDEN's amendment had been drawn in terms broad enough to encompass the Academy service performed by any and all retired officers, and thus eliminate the existing inequitable artificiality that grants it to some while denying it to others, your action would have been equally as fair, sensible, understanding, and directly effective as it was with respect to the narrower Hayden amendment that you did accept.

Further to emphasize the ridiculous aspects of the situation as it now exists, permit me to cite the following groups of persons who do now enjoy, for retirement pay purposes, the right to credit for any service they may have performed at any time as cadets or midshipmen at our service Academies:

(1) United States Senators and United States Representatives.

(2) Civil-service employees.

(3) FBI agents after 20 years of FBI service.

(4) All enlisted men of the uniformed services (any service as cadets or midshipmen that they may have performed at any time is creditable in computing both their active duty longevity pay and their retired pay as well).

(5) Officers now on the retired lists who were appointed to West Point prior to August 25, 1912, or to Annapolis prior to March 5, 1913; that is, the classes of 1916 and prior classes.

By remarkable contrast, the only persons who are now deprived, unfairly deprived, of the right to credit their cadet or midshipman service in computing their longevity retired pay are career retired officers whose only offense is to have been born too late to become members of the more favored classes prior to 1917.

The Senate Armed Services Committee in April 1948 recognized the absurdity of this situation when it favorably reported, and the Senate passed, a bill (S. 657, 80th Cong. considerably broader than the amendment that I urge; it was a bill to credit

"Service as a Cadet, Midshipman, or Aviation Cadet for Pay Purposes" applicable not only to the retired list but also to the active list as well. The committee report (S. Rept. No. 1154, 80th Cong., 2d sess.) estimated the annual cost to the Government of that bill, embracing both active and retired payrolls, to be less than $2,275,000. Since the amendment that I urge applies only to the retired lists, the cost of my proposal will obviously be considerably less than that estimated for S. 657 in 1948; therefore, I doubt if it would exceed $500,000 annually.

After passing the Senate in April 1948, S. 657 was favorably reported by the House Armed Services Committee (H. Rept. No. 1908, 80th Cong.) May 11, 1948; in that report the following significant language appears:

"The proposed legislation will eliminate an unjust discrimination now in existence with respect to persons who served as cadets, midshipmen, or aviation cadets. Under existing law, every other type of active or inactive military and naval service is credited for longevity pay purposes."

(Then, after listing all the various types of service—Regular, Reserve, National Guard, Organized Militia, Naval Militia, Philippine Scouts, Philippine Constabulary, and numbers of others—creditable for computing both active and retired pay, H. Rept. No. 1908 goes on to say:)

"Thus, under existing law, cadets, midshipmen, and aviation cadets are the only group of persons in the military and naval service who do not now receive full longevity credit for all active duty. And yet, personnel in these capacities serve on active duty in every sense of the word. They are amenable to military or naval law, and are subject to all orders of their superior officers.

"The argument that these persons receive free education at Government expense overlooks the fact that the training they receive is of a specialized nature. It prepares them for the profession of arms, in the interests of national security. This type of training is especially designed to fit them solely for military or naval careers, and not for other professions."

(And in conclusion the 1948 House report states:)

"The Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force all concur in the proposed legislation and the Bureau of the Budget offers no objection."

Despite the strongest possible endorsement of S. 657 in 1948 by the Armed Services Committees of both the Senate and the House, this bill was passed over "without prejudice" when it came up on call of the House Consent Calendar June 8, 1948; Congress 12 days later adjourned on June 20, 1948, without completing action to relieve the long-standing unjust discrimination at which S. 657 aimed.

Now in 1958, 10 years later, the superb opportunity presents itself to remove that discriminatory aspect which relates to the retired lists by adopting some such simple amendment as I earnestly urge be written into the pending Military Pay Adjustment Bill. I only regret that this entire matter came to my attention too late to permit thorough, adequate research, preparation, and effective action when H. R. 11470 came before the House on Tuesday, March 25, 1958.

In passing, it may be well to recall that throughout their entire active service careers, credit for their cadet or midshipman service was very properly accorded in computing the military pay of Generals MacArthur, Eisenhower, Bradley, Arnold, Spaatz, Kenney; Admirals Leahy, King, Nimitz, Halsey, Spruance, Denfeld, Fechteler, Radford, Carney, Lynde McCormick, and others too numerous to mention—all solely because they were lucky enough to have entered West Point or Annapolis prior to the 1912-13 arbitrary and discriminatory cutoff dates over 45 years ago.

In closing please permit me once more, in the interests of simple fairness and justice to the deserving retired career officers who have sustained this inequity, to urge very earnestly that you may undertake to offer, and to secure approval of, the indisputably fair amendment that I enclose herewith. Whether you employ the language of the proposed amendment as I have drawn it, or revise it completely to attain the same worthy end is entirely immaterial to me; I simply and strongly hope that the ends of fairness and equity sought may now be achieved while this magnificent opportunity presents itself.

I am sending a carbon copy of this letter to Senator BRIDGES with my earnest request that he give his fullest, active, aggressive support to the end that this worthy objective now belatedly may be gained.

With very friendly regards and all best wishes, I am,

Very sincerely,

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Member of Congress.

AN AMENDMENT TO H. R. 11470, THE MILITARY PAY ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1958

At the appropriate place insert the following: "Notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other act, any type or class of full-time active military or naval service that is creditable in computing the longevity retired pay of any retired members of the uniformed services who are entitled to receive such pay under this or any other act shall be creditable in computing the longevity retired pay of all retired members of the uniformed services who are entitled to receive such pay, and who have performed the same type or class of full-time active military or naval service; and this credit shall be applicable to the provisions of sections 202, 411, 412, 511, 512, and 520 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (Public Law 351, 81st Congress): *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed as authorizing the longevity retired pay of any such retired members to exceed 75 percent of their corresponding active duty longevity basic pay."

And finally, to add emphasis to the disparity and discrimination that still exists even under the new military pay bill, under unanimous consent, I ask that a brief two-paragraph article appearing on the back page of the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal issue of May 17, 1958, entitled "Comptroller Credits Reserve Service," to be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point:

COMPTROLLER CREDITS RESERVE SERVICE

The Comptroller General has ruled that service in the Auxiliary Reserve may be counted in computing longevity for retired pay purposes.

Basing his decision (B-135426) on section 202 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, the Comptroller awarded Col. Bert B. Kuss, USAF, retired, the difference between retired pay based on 26 and 30 years' service.

I hope that the Congress, and that the Department of Defense, may in the near future act to remove the area of disparity and discrimination which the foregoing articles from the Army Navy, Air Force Journal and my letter and amendment seek to illuminate and eliminate.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Army, Navy, and Air Force Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PATRIOT'S DAY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, since the colonial days in New England until the present, countless Americans from the six New England States left their original homes, pushed their way across the Adirondacks into the vast lands of America. Many of these people were among the original settlers of new territories which later became new States in the Union. They helped to establish new communities all the way from Massachusetts Bay to the Golden Gate.

Today, American citizens with a New England heritage may be found in almost every State and community in the country. In view of this fact, plans have been underway for well over a year to encourage these people and their families to come back to their New England homeland for a visit. This general invitation is known as Yanke homecoming. It is hoped many Americans will visit the New England States during the next several months.

Yankee homecoming had its official beginning on Patriot's Day, April 19, 1958, at the celebration in front of the Minute Man statue on Lexington Common. Mr. Speaker, following are my remarks which I made on this occasion:

SPEECH OF HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, PATRIOT'S DAY, APRIL 19, 1958, LEXINGTON, MASS.

Mr. Chairman, reverend clergy, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, to come here again on this great day to celebrate the birth of our country's freedom is tremendously inspiring. For many, perhaps some of you, who pass over this precious ground every day, its deep significance may be lost in the rush of busy responsibilities. Many times during the year I pass by Lexington Common and I want you to know that every time I do so I feel a great and deep sense of honor and pride in the fact I am an American.

There are three inspiring monuments which seem to constitute great oases of inspiration for the people of our Nation.

In the constantly changing light of the dawn, of midday, and of evening, the Washington Monument, reaching into the sky, makes us proud we are Americans.

Then there is that magnificent temple on the Potomac wherein sits the great Lincoln looking out over the Nation. When we look up into the face of President Lincoln, we know America has a soul and that peace is our Nation's cornerstone.

The third monument stands here at the apex of Lexington Common. Materially, it is not a great structure. Comparatively, it is small in physical size. It is inexpensive in cost. When we look at this monument, we see this small pile of stone upon which stands the embattled farmer in his clothes of the soil looking straight at the world in front of him. When we look at him we know America has courage.

Thousands and thousands and thousands of Americans from all sections of this great country come to Washington each year to see that towering monument of simplicity to Washington that gives out truth, determination, and glory. And they go to visit President Lincoln, from whose great inspiring

face they receive strength and friendliness and a sense of safety and goodness.

Just as these thousands of Americans visit these two great oases of inspiration in our American life, I wish they would also plan to visit this Minute Man soldier standing on the apex of this precious ground of Lexington Common. From this noble figure everyone would receive courage—courage to face up to the problems of today and tomorrow, courage to face man's world, and courage to do the right. I urge my fellow Americans wherever they may be to come to Lexington and experience this inspiration.

This is the 19th of April and on this day in 1775 the small group of farmer patriots of this farm community, represented by this noble Minute Man statue, joined together to stand their ground. They had made their decision, they nobly dared to be free. When they fired, the whole world heard the crack of their muskets. This was the day freedom was born.

Every square inch of soil on this Common here at Lexington is very precious. It is something to see, to feel and to think about. Today as we celebrate this first battle for freedom, we are beginning here an invitation and an urging of Americans everywhere to come to visit, in the form of a kind of Yankee homecoming, a coming home to where this precious, oh this very precious, thing we call freedom, was born. Today I welcome everyone who is visiting Lexington Common. I hope Americans throughout the Nation will come home to freedom's birthplace soon and enjoy the thrill, the inspiration, and the glory of this birthplace of freedom.

As you stand on Lexington Common, in the mind's eye you will envision this group of young American farmers assembled with their muskets ready to meet the British as they marched in from Boston. You can see the determination in their faces, you know they could not take one step backward. And as you envision them standing here, you all of a sudden comprehend and know why America is great. You know that as long as America is strong, the freedom that was born here will not perish from this earth.

As the shadows of eventing strike their long lines across this Common, we know it will soon be forgotten what some of us say here but Americans can never forget what they did here.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a speech I delivered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ASYLUM FOR POLITICAL REFUGEES: THE CARE OF HSUAN WEI

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, there are many who are critical of Vice President NIXON's recent trip to South America. While they do not criticize his courage or composure, for he showed these to a very high degree, they question the wisdom of his having gone at all to countries where it was certain he would run into trouble and where his visit would aggravate, rather than allay existing hostilities.

As a good-will mission, the visit can only be described as a failure. It was foredoomed to failure because over the past few years the foundation for good will between the United States and the Latin American countries had all but crumbled. Our relations had deteriorated to such extent that the good-neighbor policy had become a bad-neighbor policy, and in the words of our colleague, Congressman REUSS of Wisconsin, "Stones have been hurled at American officials and American installations in Venezuela, Lebanon, and Algeria, but I suggest that those stones were not hurled at individuals or at libraries. They were hurled at an image of an America that to those people seems unconcerned with human rights; an America that seems preoccupied with military might; an America which lets interest in wheat and wool, in lead and zinc, in copper and oil obscure our good neighborliness; an America that too often is identified with foreign colonialism or with corrupt native dictators."

To send even as august a personage as the Vice President of the United States, bringing only himself and his charming wife instead of a concrete policy or a program to establish the basis for better relations, was to court disaster, and disaster occurred.

But regardless of whether there may be disagreement as to whether the trip should or should not have been made, certainly we concur completely with the Vice President in his assertion upon his return that the trip served a very useful purpose in bringing out the weakness of our foreign policy in the way in which our Government has been doing business with dictators.

In a statement appearing in Sunday's press, the Vice President declared:

> The problem of dictatorships in Latin America is a ball and chain around the necks of the United States.

And that—

> The United States must be extremely careful not to appear to be trying to keep the dictators in power.

The article continues:

> Mr. NIXON takes the position that the emotional feelings against dictators is so powerful in Latin America that the United States cannot afford to give the impression that it is placing its arms around authoritarian rulers.

In this respect, the Vice President is quite right. A foreign policy which embraces dictatorships is built on shifting sand, and any attempt to rationalize our relationship with dictators because they profess to be anti-Communist should not cause us to lose sight of this reality. Anticommunism, while desirable, cannot of itself vitiate acts of oppression, repression, or tyranny which mark the police state nor prevent the opprobium which such actions bring in the minds and hearts of the peoples of the world. A foreign policy which is aimed at benefiting the United States and which seeks to engender good will for us with other nations of the world must sustain the truths upon which our Nation was founded. A world caught in turbulent ferment remembers well and with approval the dynamics surrounding the birth of our Nation. Rabbi Morris Adler, of Detroit, Mich., had occasion to recount them recently at a celebration of George Washington's birthday, and he did so most eloquently. This is what the Rabbi said:

> The most important single event in our early history, the event which preceded our organizing into a Nation was a revolution. We began with a revolution. We began by rebelling against tyranny. We began by opposing the inherited and entrenched privileges of royalty and the aristocratic class which it supported. We began with a fight—a fight against oppression, and the whole world must know that the Revolution of 1776 has not yet ended in 1958; that there is still in the American spirit and outlook, a rebelliousness against all tyranny; a revolt against any sheik or monarch or president or dictator who abridges the inalienable rights of people; who curtails their freedom; who deprives them of those freedoms and liberties which were meant for every human being who draws breath. What it would mean to the undecided and uncommitted portions of the world if in their negotiations with us they recognized that we are not only a country of power, but that we are a country of revolution.
>
> What America represents is not simply an army, but a system of ideas, a system of values, a system of convictions which will ultimately spell the doom of every oppressor, of every tyrant, of every czar, of every dictator anywhere. How millions of little people hungering for nothing more than the sunlight, freedom, and humble opportunities, would be heartened if they saw America not only as a country with millions and billions of dollars in trade, but as a country that is the eternal opponent, the everlasting adversary of all dictatorship, of all tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, this is the basis for a good American foreign policy. Mr. NIXON's statement is noteworthy, Mr. Speaker, because it bring into focus the very important matter of our relationship with authoritarian governments. The Vice President declared in South America that all dictators were "repugnant to Americans." One wonders what the Vice President meant by that statement. Did he mean that all authoritarian governments were repugnant to Americans? Did he refer only to South American dictators? Or was he speaking about the repressive methods of government with which dictatorships are identified?

Mr. Speaker, what should be our relationship with other authoritarian anti-Communist governments whom we recognize, as for example the government of Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa? I have selected this government for consideration because there is in my office the case of Hsuan Wei, the Chinese Nationalist marine captain who has filed an application for political asylum, which is now pending with the Attorney General, and on whose behalf I have filed a private bill. The application for asylum is based upon Hsuan Wei's fears that he will be subjected to physical persecution if he is returned to Formosa, for having made statements critical of the government of Chiang Kai-shek. I shall discuss this at greater length in a few moments. But this case does raise the problem of what our Government should do when an authoritarian government seeks the return of one of its citizens who has had occasion to criticize the government, and for that reason is subject to punishment.

In other dealings with authoritarian governments, the need exists for co-

operation in many matters. But to my mind the need for such cooperation does not require us to accept or to condone totalitarian practices or repressions of individual freedom which may parallel those of the Communist state which is Chiang's avowed enemy. Heretofore, our Government has tended to look the other way on such occasions, in the hope that Chiang's administration could in time be persuaded to adopt more democratic methods, and some progress has been made and is being made in this respect. Unfortunately there still exists too great a disregard for the rights of the individual and if we continue to overlook these, particularly when we are called upon to take a position either for or against that government's undemocratic procedures, we must continue to be subject to censure for having approved—tacitly, if not otherwise—the type of dictatorial methods which Vice President NIXON described as being repugnant to all Americans. We do no service either to ourselves or to Chiang's government if we surrender our beliefs to his.

This is what we are called upon to do in the case of Hsuan Wei. Mr. Speaker, as the facts have been presented to me, Hsuan Wei is now 29 years old. He lives today in Evanston, Ill., has a bachelor of science degree from Northwestern University in mathematics, and is presently enrolled in its graduate school of mathematics. He has been employed by Marshall Field & Co. for the past 3 years as a cash register checker. He has supported himself and put himself through Northwestern University by his own efforts.

Hsuan was born somewhere in Russia of a Russian mother and a Chinese father. He was graduated from Tientsin High School in 1944 and then entered the Chinese West Point from which he was later graduated as a second lieutenant. During his enrollment in the Chinese Military Academy, and thereafter until he was evacuated to Formosa in 1950, he was engaged in combat, first against the Japanese and later, against the Chinese Communists. At the time of his evacuation to Formosa he was a first lieutenant in the Chinese Marine Corps. He served on Formosa from 1950 through September 1952 as the liaison officer between the Chinese Marine Corps and the American Military Mission to Formosa.

In September of 1952 he was sent to the United States for training under the Military Defense Assistance Program, having a passport and visa valid through August 1954. During this time he served at Norfolk and at Quantico, where he engaged in friendly discussions with his American classmates, who asked him questions about Formosa. He expressed himself frankly, venturing the opinion that the Chinese Government on Formosa was a police state and Chiang Kai-shek a dictator; that as long as these conditions existed, he did not feel that the Nationalists could return to the Mainland because they could not and would not be able to capture the sympathy and imagination of either the overseas Chinese or the American public.

In response to other questions about the accusations of Dr. K. C. Wu about the Chinese Nationalist Government—which were similar to Hsuan's own observations—he stated that in his opinion Dr. Wu's thesis was correct. Such frank, such perhaps indiscreet expressions of opinion brought threats on several different occasions by Captain Liu, the Chinese Naval Attaché in Washington at the Chinese Embassy, that Hsuan's life would be a forfeit when he returned to Taiwan. Captain Liu told him that K. C. Wu was a traitor and inasmuch as Hsuan had criticized Chaing Kai-shek and the Nationalist Government, he, Hsuan, would be executed when he returned to Taiwan.

Rather than return to certain death, Hsuan applied in April of 1954 for relief under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. In May of 1954 he refused to return to Formosa and wrote a letter to the Minister of National Defense of the Chinese Nationalist Government stating that he could not return to Formosa until a democratic government existed on the island. He then went to Evanston, Ill., and contacted Dr. Wu who found him a place to live.

Subsequently thereto, in November of 1954, a hearing was held on his application for permanent residence under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. At this hearing, Dr. K. C. Wu, Lt. Col. R. B. Carney, Jr., head of the American Marine Corps Mission to Formosa at the time Hsuan was there, and Capt. R. F. Henderson, another Marine who served in that Mission on Formosa, testified in substance that in their opinion, as a result of Hsuan's political expressions, it was probable that he would be executed upon his return to Formosa. Nevertheless, the application was denied by the Department of Immigration and Naturalization.

I was requested to file a private bill on his behalf, which I did. That bill is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary. It will receive a hearing in the event Hsuan Wei's application for political asylum under section 243 (h) of the immigration law is rejected by the Attorney General. The Attorney General has the right to grant political asylum under the law, and that is why I am making this speech today, Mr. Speaker—to suggest to the Attorney General that the application should be granted. I suggest to the Attorney General that this case offers the opportunity to carry Mr. NIXON's statements into reality by showing the world that America is still the land which grants refuge to a political dissenter.

The United States has always given sanctuary to political refugees. Most recently it has granted political refuge to Perez Jiminez, the hated dictator of Venezuela, and Pedro Estrada, his brutal chief of police. These men were the prime causes of the hostility flung at Mr. NIXON on his recent visit to Venezuela. According to last Sunday's New York Times:

> Washington's explanation was that in granting asylum to Perez Jimenez and Pedro Estrada, it did no more than it had done for other Venezuelan refugees in the past.

For such men, who have been powerful dictators and tyrants, the Attorney General has granted political asylum. For Hsuan Wei, a political dissenter, no. Why? Why this double standard, Mr. Speaker? Why do we grant protection to the mighty who have been identified with everything which is repugnant to Americans; and why, Mr. Speaker, do we refuse to grant it to a humble individual who, in the American tradition, is in difficulty for exercising his right to speak?

I would remind the Attorney General that the cornerstone of the American system of jurisprudence is "equal justice under law."

I would remind the Attorney General, too, of the story told of Abraham Lincoln, with whom petitions for pardon were frequently filed. These applications for pardon were generally supported by letters of families and influential people, but one day, such an application for pardon came in to which there were no supporting letters attached. Lincoln turned to an aide and said: "What—does this soldier have no friends?" His aide answered: "No, Mr. President; not one." Lincoln's reply was instantaneous. "Then, by Heaven, I will be his friend."

Lincoln knew that the glory of the democratic form of government is its devotion and respect for the individual.

It is contended, however, that Hsuan Wei is not a political refugee, that he is only a deserter from the Chinese armed forces. This argument is advanced by Chinese Ambassador Hollington K. Tong, in a letter to the Washington Post of January 22, 1958. Mr. Tong wrote:

> His (Hsuan's) decision not to return to Taiwan is motivated entirely by personal reasons, and there is no truth whatsoever in the allegation that he, when repatriated, will be exposed to personal harm. As the matter stands, it is a case of desertion according to Chinese law * * * for this reason he will be subject to * * * imprisonment for an appropriate duration of time of not more than 3 years.

The Ambassador's position apparently has been adopted by Gen. J. M. Swing, Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, before whom Hsuan Wei's case for asylum has been pending.

In a letter to Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, on February 4, reporting on my bill, Commissioner J. M. Swing said:

> The beneficiary is considered to be a deserter from the armed forces of the Chinese Nationalist Government which has requested his return to Formosa. His application for withholding deportation to Formosa under section 243 (h) of the Immigration and Nationality Act will be given careful consideration. However, if this application is denied, I propose to enforce the outstanding order of deportation.

And then, General Swing concluded with this statement: "I am sure that you will agree that the circumstances call for such action."

I protested to General Swing against a precipitate action which almost amounted to a prejudging of the case,

and I received another letter from General Swing, dated February 10, 1958, in which he said:

FEBRUARY 10, 1958.

DEAR MR. YATES: I assume that you are aware that Hsuan Wei, beneficiary of your bill H. R. 10042, is a captain in the Nationalist Chinese Marine Corps and came here in 1952 solely for training under the joint-defense program of this country and the Republic of China, which was financed mainly with United States funds. Of the more than 2,400 Formosan military personnel who received such training, only 6 have not returned pursuant to military orders. Captain Hsuan is 1 of these 6.

Hsuan has asked that his deportation to Formosa be withheld because he fears physical persecution if returned there. Although the indications are that he will be prosecuted rather than persecuted, he will be afforded every opportunity to submit evidence bearing on this question. * * *

This alien has been permitted to remain here since the completion of his training in 1954 while seeking judicial and legislative relief from deportation—to no avail thus far. Inasmuch as the Chinese Nationalist Government has now requested his return, further unnecessary delay would seem to involve questions of international relations.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to General Swing's last sentence. The Chinese Nationalist Government wants Hsuan Wei returned. The Commissioner apparently finds, therefore, that he has no alternative except to send him back. In taking this position the Commissioner disregards completely the purpose of section 243 (h) of the immigration law which requires him to determine whether the applicant—Hsuan Wei in this case—will be persecuted upon his return to his homeland. Any refugee in this country who applies for sanctuary because he would be subject to physical persecution from any country activates that provision of the law and requires the Commissioner, as the Attorney General's fact-finding agent, to decide whether the possibility of physical persecution actually exists. If the threat of such persecution does exist, he must decide whether the applicant may stay in our country.

Mr. Speaker, the Commissioner of Immigration is a general himself. Therefore, he may be impressed by the fact that Hsuan is a military person, to whom he would concede no right to asylum because no reason exists in the military not to obey the order of superior authority. Failure or refusal to obey such an order—in this case to return to his homeland—may be classified as desertion. There is no doubt that this is the usual rule, but it can no longer be regarded as absolute when we recall the statements made by two of our top-notch military leaders in 1953 on the occasion of our refusing to repatriate soldiers of the Communist North Korean Army. It was then that Mr. Eisenhower himself established the right of political asylum for military personnel when he declared on May 7, 1953:

People who have become our prisoners cannot by any manner or means be denied the rights on which this country was founded—the right of political asylum against a persecution they fear. To force these people to go back to a life of terror and persecution is something that would violate every moral standard by which America lives. It would be unacceptable, and it cannot be done.

It was then, too, that Gen. Mark Clark, one of our negotiators, also made our position clear when he said:

Thus, the United Nations Command has given the only answer it can give. It stands on the principle that no human being shall be sent into the control of a regime he fears and detests.

Moreover, the Commissioner has overlooked the fact that Hsuan Wei was not a deserter when he committed the offense which provoked the threats that he would be executed. He was still a marine officer when his statements resulted in the threat by Captain Liu, of the Embassy, that he would be shot upon his return to Formosa. He was not a deserter at that time. The death penalty was suggested, not for desertion but because he had uttered what the Chinese naval attaché considered seditious and treasonable utterances. Having thus been promised death upon his return for having spoken his mind, Hsuan Wei decided not to return. It was only then that he became a deserter, only when desertion became the alternative to death. Perhaps Ambassador Tong is correct in stating that Chinese Nationalist law does provide for imprisonment up to 3 years for desertion, but the statement is not relevant. What is the punishment for utterances considered to be seditious or treasonable? It should be noted that the Ambassador makes no reference to Hsuan Wei's statements as constituting sedition or treason, nor to the punishment which might be applicable thereto.

Mr. Speaker, although it is appropriate to discuss the provisions of Nationalist China law which might be applicable to Hsuan's offense, I suggest that there have been instances of extra legal punishment having been accorded by the Nationalist Chinese Government to citizens who have had occasion to disagree with it.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it is asserted that if Hsuan Wei is not returned to his Government for punishment it will place all exchange programs with all countries in jeopardy. It is said that the President is opposed to permitting those who have come to this country to receive educational or military training, to remain here, because it would violate the agreements under which they came. The purpose of the programs is to permit those selected to come to this country not only to improve their education or to learn how to use modern weapons, but to bring back to their homelands the spirit of democracy with which they come into contact during their visit to the United States. In this way, the benefits of democracy would be spread through every nation of the world.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very good argument for most cases, but it is not applicable in the case of Hsuan Wei. He comes from a nation which uses authoritarian methods. Such nations should realize that when they send their bright young people to the United States where they are given the opportunity to witness in action, the principles of individual freedom and human dignity which are the tenets of our democracy, they will be unhappy with the prospect of becoming subject once again to regimentation. Freedom to think and to speak freely are dangerous morsels with which to tempt those who have known previously only a totalitarian form of government.

The concepts of freedom and democracy that are learned and absorbed in this country cannot be forgotten easily.

I appreciate the problem which Hsuan Wei's defection may cause in our relations with Nationalist China. But we have our own ideals to sustain. I suggest that Hsuan Wei did not desert his country. He has stated that he will return to his homeland when more democratic practices are adopted. It is an unfortunate fact that systems of government like Chiang's can only lose their idealistic young people until major reforms are placed in effect. The Chinese Nationalist Government knows this well, for in the April 1957 edition of the Free China Review, which is published in Taipei, Taiwan, China, there is an editorial entitled "Returned Students Do Not Return." This is what the editorial says:

We are used to calling people who have received college education in America or Europe returned students. This expression is fast becoming archaic if the present trend to stay away from home among the Chinese students abroad is to continue. Since the war, the United States has become the mecca of our outgoing students. Every year hundreds of our young men and women would go to America for higher education, but less than scores of those who have finished their studies, if that many, would return. The majority of them would find employment in the States. Those who cannot find any job will knock around one campus after another till they get a handful of academic degrees.

The editorial concludes with this statement:

Education in the United States must no longer be a one-way traffic for our young men and young women.

It is interesting, too, Mr. Speaker, that on page 6 of the same publication there is published a Chinese proverb which reads:

No tragedy is greater than death of the heart; death of the body is second to it.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Attorney General consider what possible value would be served if Hsuan Wei were to be returned now to Formosa to be punished. What would happen to him?

First, he might be executed, as he contends, which is certainly not desired by this country and would be against our wishes.

Second, he might be imprisoned for many years, which is certainly not desired by our country, or

Third, he might be imprisoned for a term up to 3 years, as was suggested by the Chinese Nationalist Ambassador, as punishment for desertion.

Presuming that Hsuan's punishment is as indicated by the Chinese Ambassador, and that nothing unusual happened to him during his period of imprisonment, what would be his position when he was released? What message of democracy could he carry to the people of

his country? Even if he wanted to, can it be assumed by the remotest stretch of our imagination that he would be permitted to do so? The individual rights which he experienced in America—freedom of thought and freedom of speech and the right to dissent—could he exercise these in Formosa or urge that they be adopted? Would not these be considered dangerous doctrine, seditious, and treasonable material, in fact, under current regimentation? And would he not be put away again as a troublemaker?

Mr. Speaker, let us ask ourselves this simple question. In which society, in that of the Nationalist Chinese under present conditions or in our own, will Hsuan Wei be able to make a better contribution to his fellow citizens and to himself?

Mr. Speaker, the Chinese Nationalist Government demands the return of Hsuan Wei. If we send him back, will it not be an offering on the altar of expediency? Do we not perform a more noble service to the cause of democracy, to the cause of all free people when we indicate that we respect those who have the courage to rebel against totalitarian principles and espouse the cause of freedom?

I would remind the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, of another trial, a trial held in our country even before the Revolution, in which John Peter Zenger was threatened with the loss of his liberties for having dared to utter what the the Colonial Governor deemed to be seditious libel, and I would quote to the Attorney General from the statement of Andrew Hamilton to the jury on August 4, 1735, as follows:

It is said, and insisted upon by Mr. Attorney, that government is a sacred thing; that it is to be supported and reverenced; it is government that protects our persons and estates; that prevents treasons, murders, robberies, riots, and all the train of evils that overturn kingdoms and states and ruin particular persons; and if those in the administration, especially the supreme magistrates, must have all their conduct censured by private men, government cannot subsist. This is called a licentiousness not to be tolerated. It is said that it brings the rulers of the people into contempt so that their authority is not regarded, and so that in the end the laws cannot be put in execution. These, I say, and such as these, are the general topics insisted upon by men in power and their advocates. But I wish it might be considered at the same time how often it has happened that the abuse of power has been the primary cause of these evils, and that it was the injustice and oppression of these men which has commonly brought them into contempt with the people. The craft and art of such men are great and who that is the least acquainted with history or with law can be ignorant of the specious pretenses which have often been made use of by men in power to introduce arbitrary rule and destroy the liberties of a free people

Mr. Hamilton continued:

Men who injure and oppress the people under their administration provoke them to cry out and complain, and then make that very complaint the foundation for new oppressions and prosecutions. I wish that I could say there were no instances of this kind. But, to conclude, the question before the court, and you, gentlemen of the jury, is not of small nor private concern; it is not the cause of a poor printer, nor of New York alone, which you are now trying. No! It may, in its consequences, affect every free man that lives under a British Government on the main continent of America. It is the best cause; it is the cause of liberty; and I make no doubt but your upright conduct, this day, will not only entitle you to the love and esteem of your fellow citizen, but every man who prefers freedom to a life of slavery will bless and honor you as men who have baffled the attempt of tyranny, and, by an impartial and uncorrupt verdict, have laid a noble foundation for securing to ourselves, our posterity, and our neighbors that to which nature and the laws of our country have given us a right—the liberty of both exposing and opposing arbitrary power (in these parts of the world at least) by speaking and writing truth.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the Attorney General that the cause of Hsuan Wei in 1958 is not unlike the cause of John Peter Zenger in 1735, I suggest to the Attorney General that he has the power and the opportunity to maintain and uphold before the world on behalf of the United States the cause of individual liberty in the same manner as did the jury in the trial of John Peter Zenger.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Does the gentleman not agree that it would be in the best interest of the United States if, as soon as possible, we took action and expelled Jiminez and his entire entourage out of the United States?

Mr. YATES. Certainly it would better relations with our neighbors to the south.

AT THE BOTTOM OF THE WELL

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, this is a speech, as revised, which was delivered at the 67th annual congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution on April 17, 1958:

Distinguished guests, my subject was Have You a Pet Federal Aid Program? After attending two of the sessions of the Daughters of the American Revolution Congress, and on further reflection, I know that most people have had their pet Government dole. They have received some of the corrupt proceeds that always come from any Government socialized project. I have learned, also, that you are all heartily ashamed of that, and that you intend to reform.

Your resolutions, so carefully prepared, are headed for the bottom of the well when they arrive in Congress on Capitol Hill.

Nearly all the people's petitions and resolutions to reduce debts and taxes and stop Socialist measures are ignored. It is about as useless for them to petition Congress in these matters today as it was for your ancestors to petition Parliament and King George in 1775.

WHAT SHALL WE DO?

Now what shall we do?

What we need to do now, my friends, is to imitate—to see to it that the great genius of organized American men and women—especially the businessmen—gets into the political battle. Their present organizations are the only forces in America that can possibly save us from an expansion of our present labor-Socialist government.

Here is how labor does it:

Mr. Meany says, "Politics is labor's big job." Top officers spring into political action. AFL-CIO is put in fighting trim.

Here is a little book: "How to Win" elections, the best book published.

Sixty-two percent of the labor press is devoted not to just talk, but to political and legislative action.

HOW TO WIN

As you carry your resolutions back home to get some action of your own, drop by the CIO-AFL offices and get a copy of "How to Win." They sell it to their workers for 50 cents. They will charge you $3, but it is worth it.

Then go to the political leaders in your county and say to them that you heard down in Washington that we are now designating candidates for Congress.

You'll find some young lawyer who would like to make the fight, but he has no money and no organization. If he runs he has to go out and get himself elected.

So, he doesn't run. Why should he?

He knows that he will be opposed by an organized political machine directed by extremely practical professional politicians who work for the leaders of organized labor. He knows that they have at their disposal more than 300,000 paid workers, in addition to millions of men and women who are so misled by our custom of misnaming socialism until they believe in it. He doesn't know how many are already working in the district, but he does know they are dedicated to work against him.

The potential statesmen of tomorrow—they may be your sons—are staying out of politics today because they know that they alone cannot possibly win out against labor's political power. That must be your deep concern.

CALL A MEETING

Call a meeting of all the people you know who believe in America and in what your ancestors fought and died for in those long-ago days.

Get the professionals who work for local conservative organizations. Get the paid secretaries of the local chamber of commerce, the local employers associations, the medical society, the dental society, the bar associations, along with the elected officers of these organizations.

This local group can start now to develop the mechanics of political action.

This takes time. It takes planning. You will need professional help. You should be thinking about providing TV time, radio shows, getting together the money for newspaper ads, campaign literature, and direct mail to voters. Start holding rallies, picnics, coffee hours, and the other social activities which cement together people with a common objective. Provide the candidates with an opportunity to find out what you want your Congressman to be and see if the candidates measure up. Think about outdoor advertising, posters, buttons, bumper stickers on automobiles, match books, pencils. They all cost money, but they are the mechanics of politics.

WHAT IS THE LAW

You may be told that these activities are against the law.

The most recent court actions are that you, the DAR, or any other association or group, or corporation, can spend money in such activities for the purpose of informing members, customers, stockholders, suppliers, and so forth, of their views on public issues, and the effect on their affairs and of the election to office of candidates who share or oppose those views.

Such organizations may use any mediums of communication known to mankind for this purpose.

Do not, as a matter of law and as a matter of practical commonsense, go around endorsing candidates. Such endorsements, without more, are of utterly no value in a political campaign.

LOCAL ACTION

Your local group must do actual work in the election districts. You will need voting records of incumbent legislators, National, State and city councils. You will need information as to political spending by organized groups in your last elections. You will need authoritative discussions of the issues. You cannot rely solely on the news that comes out of Washington to give you the kind of information you need. Your local paper is more likely to give you the kind of information you need than the big city dailies. Furthermore, your local newspaper will look upon you as a potential advertiser.

All of this material is now available from public sources, from official reports, here in Washington. Steps are being taken now by several organizations to provide you with the kind of material which will give you the substance for political action.

Only the local people—you and you and you—can come up with the manpower and the money and the enthusiasm that will even begin to offset labor's political strength.

NATIONAL ACTION

National organizations can, and God knows I hope they will, provide you with the material for you to use (as you best can decide) in selecting and electing to office the kind of men you want in office.

You, the DAR, cannot do it alone. You must persuade, demand, cajole all of the conservative organizations to lay aside their normal competitive instincts to engage in an organized, planned campaign that will encourage intelligent and conservative young people to go into public life. Many are now convinced that men of principles who believe in America and her former system of government are not wanted in public office. You must convince them otherwise.

Time is short. Labor leaders now have at their beck and call probably less than 2 million political workers out their total of 18 million dues payers. This relatively small number has been organized calculatingly in exactly the places where it will bring about the most far-reaching political results.

Your job is to offset that organized minority. You can improve upon my suggestions as to how to run a political campaign. For a mere man to even assume superiority in any area over women, with their inborn instinct—their motherhood instinct to preserve the race—is ridiculous.

YOU ARE IN THE FIGHT

How can you do nothing in this fight? If you go home and stay inside, you will be doing something. You will be doing precisely what Walter Reuther and those others whose activities bring joy to the hearts of world communism want and expect you to do.

Bob Welch, whose reputation you all know, tells me that there is only one danger which the Communists face today and only one thing they fear. That is, for the American people to be awakened sufficiently, too soon, to the very nature and methods and existence and progress of the Communist conspiracy itself.

By doing nothing you and you and you will have become another ally of world communism.

Now, before we sound another "call to arms" to organizations like yours, to business, and to the vast millions of loyal Americans who are unconsciously following the persuasive propaganda of the labor leaders, what is happening in Washington:

Instead of reducing spending and taxes, and ending Government powerplants and irrigation projects, food subsidies, Government housing, vast and unprofitable Government lending and vast foreign aid, we get more and still more, and besides some 700 other Government projects.

WHY IS THIS?

Last month, one of the most distinguished leading manufacturers in this country came to see me as ranking Republican member on the Labor and Education Committee. He wanted five perfectly sound, greatly needed amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act that we have been trying to get since 1947.

I told him, "Why, don't you know that you haven't a ghost of a chance to pass any such laws? We haven't the votes. * * *"

He looked surprised.

Another man came in and said, "We have been working on a tax-reform bill for years. We must take this incredible load of Government off the backs of the American people."

Neither of these men seemed to know, and indeed very few of us know that in the last election we, and especially the businessmen, spent millions—we don't know how many millions—to elect a President of the United States.

THE AFL–CIO CONGRESS

But the AFL–CIO political action knew that they could not elect Mr. Stevenson, so they went to work to elect a Congress, and did it. * * *

Now we have, after 10 years of their organized political action, this situation: At least 175 Members in the House of Representatives today owe their seats, wholly or partially, to the money and the work of the CIO–AFL and their allies. We now have 216 Congressmen and 45 Senators (that is, a working majority) who vote most of the time for the legislative programs of the Americans for Democratic Action. This is the front organization for labor bosses. This is the descendant of the Socialist Party in America, and the financial beneficiary of large sums from the CIO–AFL.

Free Enterprise, care of We, the People, put out a little pamphlet which you can get that gives the votes of all the Congressmen. The red votes are for the ADA propositions; the black marks are against them. It is remarkable how completely red some of our States have gone by the votes of their Congressmen. That is, they vote consistently for labor-Socialist measures * * *.

Walter Reuther is not going to be President of the United States some time in the future as some fear. He does not need to be President. Labor bosses have already taken over, in critical areas, and are now dominating Congress. When the elections are over this fall, they will have, in all probability, 25 to 30 more Members beholden to them, on the floor of the Houses of Congress. They will have been financed and selected and then elected by CIO–AFL. They expect to have no opposition by you or any other women's organizations or any businessmen's groups organized for political action.

WHAT IT MEANS

How does the AFL–CIO political action and control by a labor-Socialist government in America affect you, the Daughters of the American Revolution?

It is perfectly obvious. You have passed certain important resolutions. * * * They will not receive the consideration that they deserve * * *. They represent the wisdom that resides in you, as delegates and officers. They are important and have been for years. I know of no organization whose judgment I respect more than the Daughters of the American Revolution. * * *

WHAT SOCIALISM IS

We have gotten to the point that such things as a billion-dollar increase in Government lending authority is no longer socialism in the minds of most of our people. You know better. Your resolutions show that you know better and you must, above all, continue to meet, to discuss, and continue to tell America that our Government today is almost at the mercy of worldwide socialism. And that America, too, is Socialist in everything but name.

But you are prepared to see the Congress of the United States drop your resolutions to the bottom of a well.

You can be sure labor-dominated Congress will continue to press for more and more appropriations for public power projects, food subsidies, public housing, irrigation, credits, and loans. Additional burdens will be laid on every taxpayer—now and for generations to come.

We must all begin to fight in the same manner that the labor leaders fight to extend their control over our great Nation.

Dean Manion, an old and cherished friend of mine, calls my attention to a quotation from the Book of Proverbs:

"Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set."

What is the landmark? What must we do if we had the votes?

We can restore the Constitution, and reassert its provisions so that even the Supreme Court of the United States cannot misinterpret it.

We can limit the power of Congress to tax, as it was limited until the 16th amendment.

We can take away—if the face of the Congress is changed—those things which the Federal Government is now doing which are immoral, unconstitutional, illegal, and outrageous.

We can once more set the free mind of America, the foundation, the creative, the atomic power of America, free America, further from the restrictions, the management of man over man, the compulsions, the propaganda, the deception, the unlimited, unconscionable power of government.

Almost 6 years ago Senator Taft and Candidate Eisenhower signed a manifesto of principles. This is what it says, in part:

"The greatest threat to liberty today is internal, from the constant growth of big government through the constantly increasing power and spending of the Federal Government. * * *"

God help us as we organize for the peaceful revolution to restore constitutional government in our land.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WATTS (at the request of Mr. PERKINS), for 10 days.

Mr. ALLEN of California, for May 22, 1958, on account of official business.

Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), indefinitely, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. YATES, for 45 minutes, today.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, for 10 minutes, on tomorrow and Friday and Monday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. CHIPERFIELD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MERROW and to include an address by the Secretary of State before the Atomic Power Institute in Durham, N. H., on May 2 sponsored by the Council of World Affairs notwithstanding the cost is estimated by the Public Printer to be $182.25.

Mr. POAGE.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri (at the request of Mr. DIXON) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWENGEL (at the request of Mr. DIXON) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SANTANGELO in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ABBITT (at the request of Mr. MARSHALL) and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6940. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse owners of lands acquired for developments under his jurisdiction for their moving expenses, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7930. An act to correct certain inequities with respect to automatic step-increase anniversary dates and longevity step-increases of postal field service employees;

H. R. 8547. An act to authorize the disposal of certain uncompleted vessels; and

H. R. 11519. An act to authorize the use of naval vessels to determine the effect of newly developed weapons upon such vessels.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 728. An act to authorize the acquisition of certain property in square 724 in the District of Columbia for the purpose of extension of the site of the additional office building for the United States Senate or for the purpose of addition to the United States Capitol Grounds;

S. 847. An act to amend the act of June 5, 1944, relating to the construction, operation, and maintenance of Hungry Horse Dam, Mont.;

S. 2557. An act to amend the act granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation of certain compacts by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and South Dakota in order to extend the time for such negotiation;

S. 2813. An act to provide for certain credits to the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association and the Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District in consideration of the transfer to the Government of property in Phoenix, Ariz.;

S. 3087. An act to provide for the establishment of Fort Clatsop National Memorial in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; and

S. 3371. An act to amend the act of August 25, 1916, to increase the period for which concessionaire leases may be granted under that act from 20 years to 30 years.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6940. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse owners of lands acquired for developments under his jurisdiction for their moving expenses, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7930. An act to correct certain inequities with respect to automatic step-increase anniversary dates and longevity step-increases of postal field service employees;

H. R. 8547. An act to authorize the disposal of certain uncompleted vessels; and

H. R. 11519. An act to authorize the use of naval vessels to determine the effect of newly developed weapons upon such vessels.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 22, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1936. A letter from the Manager, Development Loan Fund, relative to the establishment of a loan of not to exceed $10 million from the Development Loan Fund to the Industrial Development Bank (IDB) of Turkey has been authorized, pursuant to title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1937. A letter from the Manager, Development Loan Fund, relative to the establishment of a loan of not to exceed $3,200,000 from the Development Loan Fund to the Taiwan Railway Administration of the Government of the Republic of China has been authorized, pursuant to title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1938. A letter from the Deputy Manager, Development Loan Fund, relative to the establishment of a loan of not to exceed $75 million from the Development Loan Fund to the Government of India has been authorized, pursuant to title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1939. A letter from the Deputy Manager, Development Loan Fund, relative to the establishment of a loan of not to exceed $15 million from the Development Loan Fund to the Government of Israel has been authorized, pursuant to title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1940. A letter from the Deputy Manager, Development Loan Fund, relative to the establishment of a loan of not to exceed $5,500,000 from the Development Loan Fund to the Government of Pakistan has been authorized, pursuant to title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1941. A letter from the Deputy Manager, Development Loan Fund, relative to the establishment of a loan of not to exceed $900,000 from the Development Loan Fund to the Government of Ceylon has been authorized, pursuant to title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1942. A letter from the Deputy Manager, Development Loan Fund, relative to the establishment of a loan of not to exceed $686,000 from the Development Loan Fund to the Land Bank of Taiwan has been authorized, pursuant to title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1943. A letter from the Deputy Manager, Development Loan Fund, relative to the establishment of a loan of not to exceed $1,600,000 from the Development Loan Fund to the Government of Ceylon has been authorized, pursuant to title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1944. A letter from the Deputy Manager, Development Loan Fund, relative to the establishment of a loan of not to exceed $750,000 from the Development Loan Fund to the Government of Ceylon has been authorized, pursuant to title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1945. A letter from the Manager, Development Loan Fund, relative to the establishment of a loan of not to exceed $2,500,000 from the Development Loan Fund to the Asia Cement Corp. of Taiwan has been authorized, pursuant to title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1946. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration of this Department on the activities and transactions of the Administration from January 1 through March 31, 1958, pursuant to the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7564. A bill to provide that the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii shall meet annually, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1756). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KIRWAN: Committee of Conference. H. R. 10746. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1757). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. McCORMACK: Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration. Report on the national space program pursuant to House Resolution 496 (85th Cong.) (Rept. No. 1758). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1759. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MURRAY: Committee of Conference. H. R. 5836. A bill to readjust postal rates

and to establish a Congressional policy for the determination of postal rates, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1760). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 12591. A bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1761). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 12591. A bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 12592. A bill to authorize an increased program of research in forestry and forest products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 12593. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey by quitclaim deed to the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake City, Utah, certain land of the United States which is not needed for the purpose for which acquired; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 12594. A bill to enable producers to provide a supply of turkeys adequate to meet the needs of consumers, to maintain orderly marketing conditions, and to promote and expand the consumption of turkeys and turkey products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H. R. 12595. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to permit the transfer of 1958 farm acreage allotments for cotton in the case of natural disasters, and other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 12596. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax relief for small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 12597. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to assist small business by providing for a limited rapid amortization of expenditures made after December 31, 1957, and before January 1, 1961, for depreciable property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 12598. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for rapid amortization of depreciable property acquired by small businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 12599. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 10 percent increase in all monthly insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 12600. A bill to provide pension for widows and children of veterans of World War II and of the Korean conflict on the same basis as pension is provided for widows and children of veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 12601. A bill to authorize each Member of the House of Representatives to employ an administrative assistant; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 12602. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to permit the transfer of 1958 farm acreage allotments for cotton in the case of natural disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 12603. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to provide for the release of source material reservations contained in conveyances of public and acquired lands, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 12604. A bill to enable American farmers to conduct their own programs; to establish production and marketing goals at prices fair to consumers and profitable to farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 12605. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to permit the transfer of 1958 farm acreage allotments for cotton in the case of natural disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H. R. 12606. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to permit the transfer of 1958 farm acreage allotments for cotton in the case of natural disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SAUND:

H. R. 12607. A bill to amend the act of July 3, 1926, relating to the issuance and validity of passports, so as to authorize the Secretary of State to cooperate in the enforcement of certain laws relating to the travel of certain minors outside the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 12608. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to permit the transfer of 1958 farm acreage allotments for cotton in the case of natural disasters and other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 12609. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to permit the transfer of 1958 farm acreage allotments for cotton in the case of natural disasters and other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 12610. A bill to extend for 2 years the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 12611. A bill to protect trade and commerce against unreasonable restraints by labor organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 12612. A bill to authorize the withholding from the salaries of Government employees of amounts for health insurance premium payments; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. R. 12613. A bill to designate the lock and dam to be constructed on the Calumet River, Ill., as the "Thomas J. O'Brien lock and dam"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 12614. A bill to provide for a nationally uniform system of automobile registration; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 12615. A bill to repeal or reduce certain excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 12616. A bill to create an independent Federal Aviation Agency, to provide for the safe and efficient use of the airspace by both civil and military operations, and to provide for the regulation and promotion of civil aviation in such manner as to best foster its development and safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 12617. A bill to amend sections 2 and 3 of the act of May 19, 1947 (ch. 80, 61 Stat. 102), as amended, relating to the trust funds of the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. J. Res. 614. Joint resolution to amend section 217 of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. QUIE:

H. Con. Res. 331. Concurrent resolution commending Shattuck School, of Faribault, Minn., on the occasion of its 100th anniversary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. Res. 570. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives on improving and strengthening the relationship, policies, and programs between the United States and Latin America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 571. Resolution adjusting the titles and salaries of certain positions in the office of the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Res. 572. Resolution authorizing additional expenses for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 12618. A bill for the relief of Leland Li-Chung Chou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 12619. A bill for the relief of Ikram Yusuf Dughman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 12620. A bill for the relief of American Hydrotherm Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H. R. 12621. A bill for the relief of Sooren Alexander Skender; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 12622. A bill for the relief of Dr. Miklos Kornel Berenkey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 12623. A bill for the relief of Adela A. Nones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 12624. A bill for the relief of Palmer-Bee Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 12625. A bill for the relief of Stavroula Stavropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 12626. A bill for the relief of David Chu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUND:

H. R. 12627. A bill for the relief of Konstantina G. Gianibas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

635. By the SPEAKER: Petition of R. P. McGarity and others, Benton Harbor, Mich., requesting passage of House bills 1008, 4523, 4677, and 5974, pertaining to the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

636. Also, petition of the county clerk, Wailuku, Maui, T. H., relative to endorsing the stand of the executive committee of the National Association of Postmasters of the United States, and urging the enactment of legislation that will prohibit and make illegal the distribution through the United States mail of all obscene literature and pictures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Hon. William F. Knowland Before American Feed Growers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address which I delivered at the American Feed Growers Association conference luncheon in Chicago, Ill., on May 20, 1958.

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

SPEECH OF UNITED STATES SENATOR WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND DELIVERED AT THE AMERICAN FEED GROWERS ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE LUNCHEON, CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 20, 1958

This is not the year for men of little faith to dominate our thinking or our actions.

It was only a few short months ago that men of little faith were prepared to accept the false notion that the godless men in the Kremlin had an economic, a political and a military ascendancy over the United States because they had sputnik and mutnik in the air and we had none.

In November of last year I stated in my home State of California:

"This is no time for either defeatism or complacency. It is no time to sell America short."

In the intervening months our Nation has successfully put into orbit Explorer I, Vanguard II, and Explorer III.

It is, of course, always dangerous to underestimate the opposition. It can also be fatal to overestimate it.

We must not take our constitutional form of government or our free enterprise system for granted.

Neither fall into the category of something that can be locked in a safe deposit box and kept forever secure. Each generation must be prepared to make the necessary sacrifices to maintain them that our Founding Fathers were prepared to make in the first instance.

Other nations have been or now are larger in land area, in population and in natural resources. Yet they have not been able to give to their people the freedom and the standard of living Americans have enjoyed.

As important as is the productive capacity of our Nation and its military strength, these are not the factors which alone could preserve our freedom or enable us to maintain a Free World of free men. The inner strength of America has not been its great cities, its huge industrial plants, its extended transportation systems or its variety of natural resources as important as these are.

The factors which made America an inspiration to the rest of the world grew out of our Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States and the spiritual values which the founders of our Republic recognized and by which they were guided.

We have recognized that there is a higher moral law to which governments are also accountable. We have humbly acknowledged the divine inspiration which has made and preserved us as a nation.

America is still the authentic revolution. The flame of freedom which was struck at Concord and Lexington still is an inspiration to the enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

But it is also an ageless lesson that no outsiders can win independence for a people. They must be willing to pay the price in blood and resources to gain their our freedom.

We do recognize, however, that when freedom is destroyed anywhere a bit of freedom is destroyed everywhere.

We have read of and been inspired by the action of George Washington in kneeling in prayer during the dark days of Valley Forge and of Lincoln seeking divine guidance during the dark days of the Civil War.

The priceless ingredient for our people has been our constitutional form of government which guarantees our religious, personal, and economic freedom.

In my judgment we do a disservice to the Nation and to ourselves when we lose sight of the fact that business profits, wage increases, and other benefits depend upon increases in productivity.

Our objective always should be to increase and put more of our productivity within the reach of more of our people. It should also be to leave sufficient incentive and resources, after taxes, for the people to exercise their freedom of choice in the market place.

Big government with confiscatory taxes can deprive them of that incentive.

Big industry and big labor with monopolistic power can also deprive them of that freedom of choice.

No group in industry or in labor has the right to strangle the economic life of 170 million Americans.

This is too much power for responsible men in business or labor to want, and is far too much for irresponsible ones to be allowed to have.

Our political freedom and bill of rights is closely related to our economic freedom. If one is destroyed the other will not long endure.

In no other political or economic system do the people have a greater freedom of choice.

The monopolistic power of business was checked by our antitrust statutes. That of the labor unions in recent years has been unrestrained. The power of the labor boss over the rank-and-file member has in many cases become tyrannical and unchecked.

The tragic and sordid revelations of the Senate's select committee, under the chairmanship of Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, with its uncontested evidence of widespread corruption, arrogance, and abuses in the operations of the unions investigated to date, have, in my judgment, not only shocked the working men and women who make up the membership of organized unions but also the American people throughout the Nation.

The American worker believes in our constitutional guaranties for our citizens. Why then does he tolerate the dictatorship and corruption in some of his unions.

The only reason, in my judgment, is because he does not have the tools to clean house.

How bad has corruption become? Let me quote from two well-known Americans. On Sunday, December 8, 1957, in New York, Francis Cardinal Spellman said:

"Daily we learn the sordid details of corruption and violence featured by newspaper, radio, and television. The close association of some union leaders with known criminals, the creation of dummy locals, the rigging of elections, extortion, acid throwing, graft, and the misuse of union funds—these blatant violations of the trust of their fellow workers make all of us who are friends of labor feel shame and indignation.

"But we must do more than be shocked or feel morally aggrevied. We must act, and, while there is still time, remove from power unscrupulous leaders and their underworld hirelings."

Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN stated the situation as he found it in the following words:

"We have had ample evidence in our hearings of intimidation and victimizing of rank-and-file members by hoodlum control of some of the unions. The hearings have also revealed raids and plundering of union treasuries, violence against workers themselves, as well as instances of violence against management. The continuation of our work will, we are confident, result in legislation of benefit to the country and to the 17,385,000 working people in the United States who are members of unions."

The interim report of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor-Management Field stated:

"As an overall finding from the testimony produced at our hearings, the committee has uncovered the shocking fact that union funds in excess of $10 million were either stolen, embezzled, or misused by union officials over a period of 15 years, for their own financial gain or the gain of their friends and associates."

I believe in and unqualifiedly support:

1. The right every American worker to join a union.

2. The right of collective bargaining.

These rights are now and will continue to be protected by law.

The right of every union member to have a free voice in the administration and activities of his or her union is a vital civil right of the first magnitude. If the union does not act in the best interests of the membership, the individual should be able to express his dissent without fear of coercion of retaliation.

I have introduced legislation in the Senate, and support similar legislation in California, which will guarantee democratic control by union members over the officers and

activities of their respective unions. This legislation does the following:

1. Guarantees the election of union officials by secret ballot and assures that the ballots cast are those that are counted.

2. Provides for the recall of union officials who misuse their positions of trust and responsibility.

3. Prevents conspiracies between management and union officials that work against the welfare of union members.

4. Protects union members' welfare and pension programs.

5. Requires that where unions are permitted, under law, to represent all employees in an industry or plant, all employees must be admitted into the union if they should desire union membership.

6. Provides that union members shall have a voice in the conditions, terms, and duration of strikes.

7. Prevents arbitrary control over local unions by trustees appointed by national or international unions.

8. Provides for regulation by union members of the actions of their unions on questions of excessive union fees, or assessments.

It is necessary, I believe, to raise the issue of a worker's bill of rights at this time in our Nation's history. It is important to the worker and to the public.

This is not a partisan issue. I have great faith in the ability of the citizens of this Nation to independently see the difference between truth and falsehood.

The stake which 170 million Americans have in democratically conducted unions is a large one.

One hundred and seventy million Americans also have a vital interest in American agriculture throughout the Nation. These farm facts are pertinent:

Income per person on farms last year was highest on record—up 2 percent over 1951, the previous high year.

Farm assets are an alltime high—$188 billion as of January 1, 1958.

Farmers have less than $11 in debts for each $100 of assets. In 1940, the ratio was $19 for each $100.

Owner equities rose 7 percent during 1957 to a peak of $168.4 billion.

Farm ownership is also at a record high. Only 1 in 3 farms has a mortgage.

Not long ago there was a lot of carping criticism of our Secretary of Agriculture.

As for me I have respect and high regard for the ability, courage, and integrity of Ezra Benson.

As a Californian, I have an added interest in agriculture and its future. We are now the leading agricultural State in the Union.

Our farmers produce nearly all of the Nation's almonds, dried figs, olives, and artichokes. California contributes to the country's market basket more than 90 percent of all apricots, dates, grapes, lemons, plums, dried prunes, walnuts, and brussel sprouts.

California's cash farm income—$2,800 000,000 last year—leads the Nation. In 1 year it exceeds the value of all the gold ever mined in the Golden State.

We rank first in the production of 36 products ranging from alfalfa to turkeys. We slaughter more than 2½ million head of cattle annually—more than any other State in the Union. Each year, more than 1 million miles of food labels are printed for the cans that hold the products of the California farmer.

Yes, we have a great interest in agriculture today and the developments that are in the offing. New horizons are always looming up ahead.

For a long time we have referred to farming as a basic industry. It is basic in the sense that over half of all the raw materials consumed in the United States, including industrial consumption, come from the farm.

But the significant fact about agriculture today is that it is almost impossible to separate farming in the pure sense from the great complex of industries which has sprung up about it.

This relationship works two ways.

First, there are the vast food processing and marketing establishments, the great meatpacking houses and other businesses which are essential links between the farm and the dinner table.

Second, there is a huge bloc of industries which came into being purely to meet the needs of the man on the land. These include the fertilizer industry, the farm machinery manufacturers and even the auto makers, for farmers are heavy purchasers of trucks. Also in this group is the vital feed industry.

This country has never been faced with famine. Perhaps that is the reason why the true state of affairs in agriculture has not been fully appreciated by the public.

United States farmers always have produced in sufficient quantities to keep our growing population well fed.

We have acknowledged only casually that unless scientific progress is stepped up our food producers might one day be unable to grow enough for all.

When you attempt to predict the future you deal in tricky stuff. Before World War II, for example, some experts estimated that the United States population would level off at around 165 million after 1975. This figure was exceeded in 1955 and the estimate for 1975 has now been increased to 225 million.

There are risks in making any kind of forecast. But it seems reasonable to estimate that in order to feed that many additional mouths we will have to increase the present rate of production by a least one-third.

If I were to choose one phrase to describe modern agricultural progress, I would pick the agri-dynamics age. If you will look at the record, you will see why it fits so well.

In 1956, production of all crops in this country was about 50 percent above that of 25 years earlier. The dirt farmer of today produces enough for 21 persons. In 1940, he grew enough for somewhat less than 11 persons.

This production miracle stems from advancement on many fronts.

The results reflect tremendous increases in the mechanization of farms, in rural electrification and in marketing methods.

They also reflect advances in the breeding of livestock and poultry, improved control of insect and plant pests and development of better seeds and improved varieties of crops.

The feed industry has been quick to grasp the significance of this scientific revolution in agriculture over the past 50 years. Indeed, it has served as a bridge between scientific advance and the men in the feedlot and the poultry house.

In this sort of progress the consumer has as much at stake as the farmer. It is developments of this kind that help to keep production costs in line.

Few, if any, of us expect the forward surge in agriculture to slow down. Thirty years ago we knew little or nothing about improved fertilizers, antibiotics, better feeds, seeds, and breeds. As Secretary of Agriculture Benson puts it:

"Today the laboratory is as much a part of American agriculture as the barnyard."

Every time the sun rises we have an additional 7,000 mouths to feed. Very soon it is expected that each farmer will produce enough for 25 persons instead of 21. It is highly unlikely that scientific progress will stop there.

You all know that for many years fewer and fewer people have been needed on our farms to meet our constantly growing demands for food.

Today the farm population is only 20 million—less than 12 percent of the total population of the United States. In 1940 we needed 30 million farmworkers, more than 23 percent of the population at that time, to keep us well fed.

Some view this as an indication that the so-called family farm is on the way out.

Actually, our family farms have been developing into larger, more economical units. About 96 percent of all farms and ranches are still family affairs. This is about the same ratio as existed 30 years ago.

It is perfectly sound to speculate that scientific progress to date has merely laid a firm base upon which the family farmer may build toward greater security in the future.

But the farmer himself is not in a position to do the research which will assure his future progress. Historically, this has been done by the land grant colleges and the Federal Government, and now much is being done by private industries associated with agriculture.

The three-way partnership should be continued and strengthened. The outlook is that industry most likely will—and indeed it should—assume an increasingly important role in research.

New acreages that can be drained or irrigated are relatively small when compared with present productive areas. Our cities, towns and industries are expanding outward and eliminating many farms, orchards and ranches. For our future needs our researchers must find new ways to improve production per acre and per animal unit.

This is an area in which the feed industry is particularly well versed. Just one illustration: As late as 1947 it took an average of more than 4 pounds of feed to put a pound of gain on a broiler chicken. Last year the average was down to a little more than 3 pounds of feed per pound of gain. I am told that prospects are good for reducing the average to a pound of gain on 2 pounds of feed in the near future. In fact, many of the better producers already are doing just that.

Similarly great strides have been made in the production of hogs, sheep and other livestock and in boosting output of milk and eggs. Work with beef cattle and sheep now promises advances commensurate with those in other lines. In every instance, animals are being made to put on more weight on less feed. All species now reach market weights in much shorter periods of time than they once did.

Still, one of the greatest needs for more agricultural research lies right in this area. There must be a continuing drive to keep production costs under control.

Industry as a whole is fully alert to the fruits of research. The fact is, it has no choice except to climb on the research bandwagon. Our economic history clearly shows that companies or industries which do not foster a vigorous research program sooner or later expires or declines to a place of minor importance.

There remain vast fields ripe for exploration.

Intriguing opportunities challenge those who would find new uses for food and fiber crops, new ways to improve distribution and marketing of agricultural commodities.

Research must tailor foods to consumer tastes. It is as sure as night follows day that consumers will dictate more and more the kinds of food which reach the market and the form in which they are marketed.

Why cannot all of agriculture cooperate in giving the man in the street a complete concept of the industry and its problems?

Organized labor and consumers as a whole must be shown that they, as well as the farmer, have a vital interest in maintaining a sound base under agriculture. They spend 25 percent of their incomes for food, much more than for any other family necessity.

Consumers must be made aware that farmers have been doing a good job. In 10 years prices of foods have gone up a little more than 16 percent. What about rents? The tenant pays 47 percent more today than he did in 1947. What about transportation? The cost is up 42 percent compared with 10 years ago. What about fuel? The cost has risen 47 percent since 1947.

Food is still one of the better buys. Why is it a better buy? In large measure because scientific progress has helped the farmer to keep his production costs in line.

But agriculture's role in keeping the country well fed at reasonable prices is far from being the whole story of the industry's contribution to the total economy. More and more, farm commodities are supplying the raw materials for finished items on the consumer want list. These include plastics, chemicals, new fabrics, and so on.

Ultimately, the natural oils, minerals, and other resources from which many of these products have been made in the past will be depleted. But so long as the land is properly cared for, it will go on producing crops year after year. Agriculture, therefore, will assume much greater importance in the future as a supplier of raw materials to other industries.

This brings up another point. Few of us have taken time to consider the sweeping changes in production patterns which are altering the whole complexion of agriculture in this country.

The Corn Belt is expanding from the Midwest to the South. Livestock production is now so dispersed that both the South and the Far West are important factors in the beef industry.

How about cotton? California last year produced 75,000 bales more on 716,000 acres than did Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina and Tennessee combined on 1,908,000 acres.

Irrigation helped to make the difference, but efficient and progressive production plans were an important influence, too.

Simultaneously, sweeping social changes have been taking place. Rural life today has been accurately described as city life widespread.

Farm people have come a long way toward attaining many of the facilities, comforts and conveniences that city dwellers long have taken for granted. They spend many billions each year for consumer goods. Agriculture is a great stimulus to other industries.

It brings you up short to realize that 10 million full-time jobs are provided just in the the marketing phases of agricultural products. Another 6 million persons are employed in plants which make materials and supplies for farmers' use.

In terms of dollars, agricultural producers spend $12 to $13 billion each year for production goods and services, and that does not count consumer items.

These facts make the point that agriculture, in its broadest sense, is big business. It is larger by far than any other comparable industry. As of last January 1, farm assets alone were at an alltime high of $188 billion.

With America's traditional respect for bigness per se, it is unthinkable that we can any longer deny an industry of this size the recognition it deserves.

Agriculture must, and will, attain coequal status in our economic structure. Industries associated with the agricultural complex must assume a full measure of responsibility in bringing this about.

This means that concrete action must be taken in at least four directions:

1. To find the best possible solution to the problem of surpluses—through improved nutritional standards, to develop new industrial uses for products, and to fully exploit modern marketing methods.

2. To tell agriculture's story so that consumers recognize the broad area of common interest.

3. To recruit an adequate supply of young brainpower capable of staffing the infinite and expanding variety of jobs throughout agriculture.

4. To foster to the greatest extent possible research, both basic and applied, which will give agriculture the tools it needs to keep the country well fed at reasonable cost.

Future careers in agricultural research will be particularly rewarding. One reason why this is so is that agriculture is the one major field, other than medicine, where it is possible to work almost exclusively with living things—to improve upon nature.

Atomic radiation already is being applied in fundamental research with plants and animals. It can provide us with new and better information on such subjects as how and when to apply fertilizer, or how to further improve livestock and poultry nutrition.

The business end of agriculture must come alive to the intriguing opportunities for improving the preservation and marketing of foods.

For example, milk is still packaged and delivered to the door in much the same way that it was 50 years ago.

As a result of improved refrigeration and transportation, every part of the country now enjoys highly perishable fruits and vegetables the year around.

But billions of dollars' worth of these foods are still lost through spoilage between the truck farm and the dinner table.

The cosmetics industry long ago realized that attractive packaging was a great stimulus to sales. Agricultural processors have made a start toward applying these sales aids to the food field, but the opportunities are still almost limitless.

By using modern merchandising concepts, it is possible to tap hitherto unreachable markets and to stimulate impulse buying. In many parts of the country, machines installed in schools and industrial plants have made large dents in local milk surpluses.

These examples give only a sketchy hint of the broad areas in which leaders throughout agriculture must be up and doing. Legislative fiat alone will never solve all of agriculture's problems.

Agriculture has become big and diverse. The component parts naturally have interests of their own, but they also have some things in common. Advance of the well-being of the industry as a whole is the concern of all.

Again I say, this is no time to sell America short.

We have great problems but also great opportunities.

If we of this generation only use the same courage and commonsense as motivated the men who sat at Philadelphia and with what I believe was divine inspiration, gave us our Declaration of Independence and Constitution of the United States, there are none of our domestic problems we cannot solve and there is no foreign foe we need ever fear.

Poland Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement prepared by me paying tribute to the people of Poland on the anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day.

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

It gives me great pleasure to express my sympathy with the captive Polish nation, on the anniversary of the establishment of its famous constitution of 1791, embodying, like our Constitution, the hopes of men of good will that the world was moving slowly but certainly in the direction of freedom for all nations.

Little did the people of that day or the following century dream that the 20th century would give birth to the most cruel and shameful tyranny the world has ever seen.

The memory of Attila the Hun and Ghenghis Khan has come down through the ages, but they were barbarians seeking to lead their hungry people from lands of famine to lands of plenty. What shall we say of our time which has perverted all the intellectual, scientific, economic, and political achievements of the centuries to making tyranny both horrible and successful?

Every bit of knowledge which men have gained in their slow upward climb from barbarism has been used by the Soviet rulers to make a monstrous engine for enslaving all the people within reach of their armies, and chilling with fear and dread all the people within reach of their sleepless propaganda.

No age has ever been confronted with a challenge as great as the Communist marriage of savagery with technology which is dominant for the moment in the world of today.

We shall escape from the fate they plan for us, but we shall not escape until we have grown strong enough and wise enough to use all the economic and political and technical wisdom of our day to bring about a new birth of freedom to regenerate the world.

The Polish nation has the harsh fate of living under the heel of Soviet tyranny, but all the decent nations of the world are as one in being the object of Soviet conquest and the fighters for a new and greater freedom. Poland is the outer frontier of the Soviet Empire. But it is also the front line of the fighters for freedom who must press upon and ultimately destroy the Soviet monster state.

The Italian National Elections on May 25

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, every American, like myself, whose forefathers came to this land from Italy, is looking forward to the 25th of May with hope and expectation. On that day the citizens of Italy will vote for a new Parliament. Our hope is that the Italian nation will rally to support the democratic parties and that a coalition can be formed to continue the postwar development of Italian democracy. We expect that this will happen and that the new Italy will continue to grow as a political, economic, and social democracy with a firm commitment to cooperation in the Atlantic Community.

Since World War II there has been a vast expansion of Italian-American

friendship and of the mutual concerns of our two countries. This has led a great many Americans with no Italian background whatever to be deeply interested in the May 25 elections. The reconstruction of Italy after World War II was the result of the energy and courage of the Italian people and of their Government, but Americans can feel proud that through the foreign-aid program we were able to contribute in a small way to the birth of the new Italy. In the years from 1948 to 1955, the United States extended more than $1½ billion in economic assistance alone to Italy.

Our cooperation has been continued in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization where we are allies in the common struggle to prevent Soviet domination of Western Europe.

Americans in general are more interested in Italy today than ever before. Italian motion pictures have won a warm reception in the United States. The books of Alberto Moravia are on our best seller lists. Capezio shoes and Fontana dresses set the fashions for American women. Even the men are wearing Italian-neck sport shirts, low-cut shoes, and silk suits from Italy. Italian typewriters, cars, and other precision equipment are common in the United States. And, of course, American tourists flock to Italy each year in ever-increasing numbers. All of this testifies to the new burst of Italian vitality and creativeness that has shot up in the last decade.

The new Italy is a land where the old sources of economic dissension are being eradicated and where political and personal freedom exist once again after more than 20 years of Fascist dictatorship. The 10-year Vanoni plan, instituted in 1955, is designed to tackle the twin problems of how to increase the national income and how to decrease unemployment. It places particular emphasis on building up the economy of southern Italy. Reforms have been instituted providing formerly landless farm workers and peasants with good inexpensive farmland which they can pay for over a long period of years. And the per capita national income rose from $296 to $429 in the last 7 years.

I had the good fortune to make an inspection tour of Italian industries during the last 2 weeks of September 1957. In the short space of 2 weeks, from September 14 to September 30, I traveled far and fast examining factories, inspecting plants, talking to workers, and drawing conclusions and impressions. I visited the following cities of Torino, Milano, Lake Como, Vicenza, Venezia, Rome, Frascati, Napoli, Capri, Palermo, Corleone, Pisa, and Larderello, as well as many other small towns and hamlets.

In passing through Italy, I did not fail to note the artistic beauty of Milan, the romance of Venice with its canals and gondolas, the lore and history of ancient Rome, the enchantment of Naples with its resorts of Capri and Ischia, a teeming city without comforts and adequate housing, but whose people still live with a song on their lips and love in their hearts. I did not overlook Palermo, a vibrant city, and its surrounding towns whose people are eager to know when the American immigration barriers would be let down. I could not pass by the opportunity to visit the Vatican City, where a humble and stately figure in white instills peace to all who are fortunate to come within his presence, and who, daily, encourages nations to discard the sword to follow the cross.

I was impressed mainly by the fact that Italy is in the midst of revolution; not a political revolution, but an industrial revolution. Industries are booming and factories are springing up everywhere. I expected to see a country helpless and groaning amidst ruins of devastation of war, but I found very little evidence of destruction caused by World War II. I found a people grateful to the United States for past aid, and a country seeking trade not aid. I found a country and a people asking to be treated not as sick offspring, but as a healthy adult. Communism as a threat has been frustrated in a large measure by the Catholicism of the native people and the ambition to go ahead under democratic principles.

The youth, while yearning passionately to emigrate to the United States, the land of opportunity, are practical. They are not sitting back in resignation, but are aggressively determined to march forward on the economic front with technical skills.

Few countries have accomplished so much with so little resources, and while wages are pitifully low compared to our standard, they have been increasing, and there exists certain social programs which United States industry and Government could adopt with beneficial results, such as, dependency allowances to married workers. Italy has not utilized, however, the full potential of 50 million people, who can be a major purchasing power if their wages were substantially increased and if the unemployment of 2 million was reduced. However, Italy through its L'IRI, the modern Government organism, partly governmental and partly private, together with strictly private organizations, is making a laborious attempt to raise wages, to reduce prices by destroying monopolies and to create employment.

Italy is a land of very rich and very poor. There is no middle class. It is a land of workers with inventive skills and determination born of necessity. Italy lacks the art of public relations insofar as industry is concerned. Too much attention is paid to tourist trade and not enough to its industrial accomplishments.

Italy has emerged from the devastation of the last war. Its industries are booming. American aid has contributed immensely to Italy's development and the people are appreciative of our aid, but Italy has failed to publicize her extraordinary ability to produce much from little and her technological advancement. What the people from Italy want from us now is trade, not aid. Its representatives have not publicized widely its economic works and tremendous developments. Our industries can profit by working with Italian industries. I have confidence that Italy, with its native inventiveness and highly technical skill, will overcome its obstacles and deficiencies in resources and will soon take its proper place among the nations of the world.

Most of the advances which Italy has made in the last decade will be at stake on May 25. If the unexpected should happen and the Communist Party gains the power either to control or obstruct the operations of government, Italy would gradually retreat from its new democracy and its foreign policy would come under the influence of Soviet Russia. On the other hand, if the parties on the extreme right should increase their strength so markedly as to threaten the democratic character of the center coalition of parties, we shall most likely witness the decline of Italian international cooperation.

As an American of Italian origin, I urge my friends in Italy and the friends of Italian democracy and Atlantc cooperation in Italy to support the democratic parties in the forthcoming elections. The new Italy must not falter and the hard won gains of the Italian people must not be sacrificed. Avanti Italia.

Statehood for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House have received a great many letters in behalf of statehood for Alaska. It is, of course, impossible to reply to each one in detail.

I have written to Mr. Miller of Fairbanks and have pointed out what seems to me to be an obvious weakness in the pending statehood bill. I hope that it may be of general interest. The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1958.

Mr. ALEX MILLER,
Democratic National Committeeman for Alaska,
Fairbanks, Alaska.

DEAR MR. MILLER: Let me thank you for your letter of the 12th urging my support of the pending bill for Alaskan statehood. As I see it, we would all make a terrible mistake to pass a bill which does not carry out the sound and historically proven policy of the United States in regard to the creation of new States. The Territory of Alaska is approximately the same size as the original Louisiana Territory which was purchased from France in 1803. I presume that the present population of Alaska is about comparable to the then population of Louisiana and the location of this population is somewhat comparable.

The bulk of the population of the Louisiana Territory was centered around New Orleans, in the extreme southeast corner. The bulk of the population of Alaska is located from Fairbanks southeast. When we created the State of Louisiana we cut off the developed portions of the territory and admitted the State with its present boundaries. It was a hundred years later before we finished

giving statehood to all the area of the territory, but we did give statehood as the various areas developed, as population became large enough and the economy strong enough to support State governments. Oklahoma was the last full State created from the Louisiana Territory, and it was admitted in 1906 but the last portion of the Louisiana Territory was the northeastern portion of New Mexico which was admitted in 1912 (of course the New Mexico territory had been subject to transfer by the United States to Spain and thence back to the United States by Texas).

I recognize that we can today probably justify larger States, territorially, than we felt it was advisable to create 150 years ago, but if we were to admit simply the southeast corner of the present Territory of Alaska as a State we would be giving statehood to most of the people. We would not be burdening the new State with the responsibility of building roads, maintaining schools, courts, etc., over such a vast area as the present bill contemplates. The State government would at least have a far better chance to succeed without Federal subsidy. It would still mean an area something comparable to the area of the State of Texas to be supported by a population which is less than my home county. That of itself is a tremendous undertaking but it holds some prospect of success. To burden this small population with the maintenance of governmental facilities over an area one-third as large as the entire United States, seems to me to be perfectly fantastic. Obviously it can only be accomplished through tremendous Federal governmental subsidies, and here is where I think every citizen of the United States has a vital stake in this question of admission of Alaska.

Is it not absolutely inevitable that within a few years after admission that the new State, if it includes the entire Territory, will be asking the Federal Government to give it special treatment in the way of aid for its State institutions and obligations? How else can the State exist? Once the Federal Government has done this, I, as a practical legislator, know that we will inevitably be forced to extend the same kind of aid to every State in the Union regardless of need. My people in Texas and the people in New York and in California are not going to long remain satisfied to pay taxes to support courts, schools, roads, etc., in the State of Alaska and not get the same kind of aid in the States of Texas, New York, and California. Thus the admission of Alaska, at least on the grand scale contemplated by the pending bill, must mean a further breakdown of our present ideas of the division of State and Federal responsibility. On the other hand, if we would but follow the historically proven formula of admitting new States we could avoid at least a large part of these dangers.

Nor have I been able to understand the attitude of many of the present proponents of this bill. The great majority of those who now favor the admission of Alaska with the gift of eighty-odd million acres of land to the new State, bitterly criticized the quitclaiming of title by the United States of the tidelands to the existing States, even though for generations it has been supposed that the States held the title and the recognition of State title was only a part of the settlement of a good faith dispute.

I find myself completely at a loss to understand the attitude of those who feel that it is "robbing the schoolchildren of America" to let Texas, California, and Florida retain their coastal lands, but who seem to now stand ready to support the gift of a far larger acreage of equal potential mineral value, to the proposed State of Alaska. Apparently they must have been actuated by some venom against the existing States, or they must have suddenly lost their interest in "protecting the schoolchildren."

Personally, I see no objection to giving new States substantial areas of public lands as they are created, but it seems to me that equity requires that we should use a formula which is, at least, somewhat in keeping with that which was used in giving lands to the States that presently make up the western part of the United States. These public lands in the present Territory of Alaska were purchased by the United States of America. They are not the property of any other sovereignty as were the public lands in the 13 Colonies and in the Republic of Texas. They are presently the property of the United States of America. Any grant or gift of these lands is a definite gift of existing public property and it is not made in the settlement of any kind of disputed title. It, therefore, seems almost beyond belief that those who in the past strove so mightily to take the title to the tidelands away from the States, who certainly in good faith believed they owned it, should now come forward and advocate the granting of 1 section out of every 4 to the new State whereas we only gave New Mexico, Arizona, and similar States 1 section out of each 18 which the public or Government owned.

To say the least, Alaska has already made great progress toward securing the specially favored treatment at the hands of the Federal Government which I anticipate will shortly be accorded to any State which may include the entire area of the present Territory.

I am not unmindful of the party platform commitment to which you referred. Of course, the Republican platform contained the same commitment, but I think that these commitments created an obligation on the Congress to present reasonable legislation for the orderly and proper development of this vast Territory—not a commitment to support any legislation which might be proposed.

I stand ready to try to help work out such legislation, but I cannot sacrifice what seems to me to be a sound concept of American government by voting for the admission of the present Territory of Alaska as one new State.

Thanking you, I am

Yours sincerely,

W. R. POAGE,
Congressman.

Our Foreign Policy Seeks To Defend and Advance the Interests of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, delivered before the Atomic Power Institute sponsored by the New Hampshire Council on World Affairs, New Hampshire Hall, University of New Hampshire, Durham, N. H., Friday, May 2, 1958, at 8 p. m., eastern daylight time.

In presenting Secretary Dulles to the New Hampshire audience, I said:

The Honorable John Foster Dulles needs no introduction to any audience either in the United States or abroad. There is no American in public life today who has a clearer grasp of international problems or who has displayed a greater leadership in solving them than Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. In international conference after conference, he has countered successfully Soviet attempts to confuse, to disrupt, and to dominate the world. The country has every reason to be justly proud of the many diplomatic victories he has won and of his leadership in international affairs. His deep insight, his vision, his dedication to the principles for which the United States stands enable him to give us inspired leadership and statesmanship in this troubled nuclear and space era.

I count it a distinct privilege and a high honor to be on the platform with the Secretary this evening. All of us are grateful to you, Mr. Secretary, for honoring the New Hampshire Council on World Affairs, the University of New Hampshire, and our State with your presence at this banquet tonight. Ladies and gentlemen, I present to you the Honorable John Foster Dulles, the greatest Secretary of State in our time.

The address follows:

There is nothing mysterious about the goals of United States foreign policy. It seeks to defend and advance the interests of the United States. These interests are of several kinds:

(1) There is the life of our people and the physical safety of our homeland. These would be endangered by war.

(2) There is the well-being of our economy. This would be gravely impaired if hostile forces dictated the pattern of world trade.

(3) There is the integrity of the principles for which our Nation was founded. Our Nation is more than population, more than real estate. Our Nation represents ideals. These ideals are an integral part of America, to be defended and promoted by our foreign policy.

Now let me comment briefly on these three aspects of our foreign policy.

I. PEACE

We defend our people and our homeland against armed attack by having the power to hit back hard at anyone who attacks us or our allies. This causes any potential aggressor to pause, for he knows that he could not, by aggression, gain as much as he would stand to lose. In order to have that assured capacity to strike back, we need cooperation with other countries.

Potential aggressors need to be put on notice that they cannot, with impunity, pick up nations one by one, leaving the United States to the last, when even we will be relatively weak. Accordingly, we have made collective defense treaties and similar arrangements with nearly 50 other countries. These commit each nation to help the other in the event of armed attack.

A further benefit from these arrangements is that under them the burden of the military effort is shared. For example, the ground forces of the cooperating Free World nations amount to about 5.6 million men. But only about 950,000 of these are American.

Also our Strategic Air Command is afforded well dispersed positions around the world. This dispersal greatly increases the effectiveness of the deterrent.

Our collective security arrangements are serviced by our mutual-security program. It supplies our allies with a certain amount of military equipment. In a few cases it helps them financially to maintain military establishments which are needed but which their economies are too poor to support without some outside help. And we provide development assistance to certain less developed Free World countries. We do that to help them build their societies on the principles of freedom and to escape pressure

to turn to the Communist bloc with the peril of liberty which that involves.

The Soviet Union tries hard to disrupt our defensive efforts. It portrays the United States as militaristic and our collective defense groupings as aggressive military blocs.

Of course, as you and I know, the American people are among the least militaristic of any people in the world. George Washington called upon us to maintain what he called a "respectable defensive posture." By that he meant a military posture strong enough so that others would respect it. Unfortunately, we have not always done that. At times our military strength has been so negligible that militaristic despots treated us as a cipher, not to be taken into account in their aggressive plan.

We are trying not to commit that fault again. We do not intend to make ourselves weak merely because the Soviet imperialists urge that we do so to prove our idealism.

Our collective arrangements are defensive, as specifically authorized by the United Nations Charter. These groupings are more than expedients. They introduce a fresh concept into the structure of world order.

Within our own country and every civilized country, local security is sought on a collective basis. We unite to provide a central police force, a central fire department, and the like.

Now, at last, within the Free World, we are beginning to apply that enlightened collective concept. In that way weaker nations can be made secure from being picked up one by one. In that way a strong nation can avoid having to become a garrison state, and even then, being encircled and strangled, as a result of the smaller nations being picked up one by one. On a collective basis nations get maximum security at minimum cost.

No doubt our people would not hesitate to provide the vast funds needed for our solitary defense and our youth, if necessary, would give a greatly increased measure of their time to military service. But even with that maximum effort we would be less secure.

Every American who wants to see his country safe and solvent ought to get out and actively support our mutual-security program, now before the Congress.

II. ECONOMIC WELFARE

Our foreign policy also tries to assure our people a prosperous home economy. That depends in good part upon foreign trade. Our exports are running at a rate approaching $20 billion a year. Our foreign trade employs about 4.5 million people. Our imports provide many important things that we need and could not readily, or at all, produce here at home. Furthermore, our trade relations help to keep the Free World together. Without ample trade with the United States, many countries would be virtually forced to accept absorption into the Communist economic bloc.

The major expression of our foreign trade policy is the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. The principle of the act was first adopted in 1934 and 10 times the Congress has acted to renew it. Under it our trade has flourished. In 1934 our total foreign trade—exports and imports—amounted to $3.7 billion. Last year it amounted to $32.4 billion, excluding military exports.

The latest renewal expires next month, and further extension is now being sought from the Congress. Failure to extend would be a major disaster. A very few might temporarily benefit. But very many, and, in the long run, all, would suffer gravely.

Surely we do not want to go back to the early 1930's. Then our high tariff and monetary devaluation policies wreaked havoc upon international trade and boosted into power, in Germany and Japan, extreme nationalists who later plunged the world into World War II.

Every American who wants to see his country economically sound, who wants allies, and who wants peace, should work for the extension of our Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

III. IDEALS

Let me speak now about our efforts to promote the ideals of America.

Our Nation was founded by men of religious faith. They believed that our Declaration of Independence was not merely rhetoric but truth, and that all men were in fact endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. They believed that they had a mission to help men everywhere to have the opportunity to exercise their God-given rights.

Under the impulsion of their faith and works, there developed here an area of unusual spiritual, intellectual, and economic vigor. It became known as the Great American Experiment. The ideals that stimulated it have been projected throughout the world. They have more than once helped to turn back the tides of despotism.

America would not be America if it were stripped of such idealism.

The values of personal liberty are, of course, best demonstrated by individuals. It is they who have liberty and it is their use of liberty that can make it a dynamic force. On the other hand, their misuse of liberty plays into the hands of despots. That means that individuals should exercise self-discipline and self-sacrifice, and not turn liberty into license. The individual deportment of free Americans is the most decisive force, for good or evil, in the present contest with despotism.

I do not imply that Government has no part to play. It too, can find ways to reflect the ideals of the people whom it serves.

Government may not interfere in the internal affairs of other countries. That is contrary to accepted international law and practice, and forbidden by many of our treaty engagements.

But your Government can, and does, make clear to all the world what are the ideals for which our Nation was founded.

We can, and do, refuse through our Government to give official sanction to the oppression of other peoples and the denial to them of the rights by which they are endowed by their Creator.

Your Government can, and does, see to it that captive peoples know that they are not forgotten and that their hopes for freedom have the sanction of a vast mass of world opinion.

IV. WORLD ORDER

One of the ways to protect and advance the interests of our people is by strengthening the fabric of world order. Peace will never be secure until there is an adequate body of international law and effective means of enforcing that law and means of changing that law as needed to promote justice.

The United Nations was a great step forward. It was largely a United States initiative. But its Security Council is hobbled by the veto power.

President Eisenhower recently proposed that the permanent members of the Security Council should exercise greater restraint in the use of the veto power. The Soviet Union reacted violently against that proposal. Nevertheless, we shall persist in seeking to strengthen the United Nations.

We seek, under its auspices, a rule of law for such newly developing areas as Antarctica and outer space. A Law of the Sea Conference has just been concluded at Geneva as an effort to create and modernize international law. The 86 nations attending reached agreement on important segments of that law. We are making progress in this field.

Still the United Nations has not yet found the way to guarantee law and order. That is why we have to maintain the system of regional collective defense arrangements to which I have referred, and which the charter authorizes. It is our ardent hope, however, that the United Nations can more and more be the framework within which all may find justice and peace.

V. AGREEMENTS WITH THE U. S. S. R.

In the meanwhile, there is an immediate problem that concerns us greatly: Can we reach agreements with the Soviet Government which would mitigate the sharpness of our conflict and reduce the danger of friction which could flare into war?

I can assure you that that is constantly in our minds. There are, however, great difficulties.

For one thing, the Communists do not look upon agreements as we do. We consider ourselves bound to live up to our agreements. This is important, because nations, unlike individuals, are under no superior force that compels them to live up to their promises.

But the Communists feel no obligation to perform their agreements. They have broken one agreement after another, confirming what Lenin said that, to the Communists, "promises are like pie crusts, made to be broken."

It would obviously be reckless for the Free World to weaken itself merely in reliance of Soviet promises to perform in the future.

A second obstacle is that the purposes of Communist rulers are so basically acquisitive and aggressive that there is very little common ground between them and us.

Recent exchanges of views with the Soviet Union disclose their negotiating goals. They want:

(1) Our acceptance of Soviet Communist domination of the nations of Eastern Europe. They want us to abandon there the concept of our Declaration of Independence, and the explicit provisions of the Atlantic Charter and of the Yalta agreements, that the peoples of these countries are entitled to choose the form of government under which they will live;

(2) Our acceptance of the continued partition of Germany, or its reunification only on conditions that would give the Communist puppet regime in East Germany an opportunity to extend its rule over all of Germany;

(3) Liquidation of our collective defense associations, such as NATO, and abandonment by the United States of the concept and practice of collective security;

(4) United States recognition of Communist China, its seating in the United Nations with veto power on the Security Council, and acknowledgment of the Chinese Communist claim to Taiwan (Formosa);

(5) Elimination of the present trade controls by which the Free World avoids sending strategic war goods into the Sino-Soviet bloc.

Each of these objectives represents an immense gain for the Soviet Union and a great loss to the Free World.

Soviet propaganda suggests that if we would accept these losses, then the Communists might end the cold war. However, Mr. Khrushchev has, in other contexts, stated that it was inevitable that the cold war should go on, and he intended that it should go on.

It would be reckless to weaken the Free World on the gamble that that would end the cold war. It is more likely that it would continue under far more difficult conditions for us.

A few days ago Mr. Khrushchev said in Moscow: "We Bolsheviks are ravenous people. What we achieved through struggles in the past is not sufficient for us. We want more—tomorrow." They already have a billion people—and are still ravenous. I wonder how many more they need before their appetite is sated.

Now I do not, of course, conclude that there are no areas for useful agreement.

In 1953 we made an armistice agreement with the Communists which ended the fighting in Korea.

In 1955, we, with the British and the French, concluded with the Soviet Union, the State Treaty that liberated Austria.

Earlier this year the United States concluded with the Soviet Union, a cultural exchange agreement of limited scope.

We believe that there can be other carefully negotiated agreements of mutual interest. We have been trying hard to get an agreement for reciprocal inspection in the Arctic area. The Soviet Government professed to fear our air maneuvers in the north. It took these alleged fears to the United Nations Security Council and complained of our activities. We explained that we needed to keep some planes in the air all the time because we fear that a massive and sudden surprise attack might be launched over the top of the world. So, to allay both fears, we proposed international inspection on both sides of the Arctic area to give assurance that there could not be any surprise or accidental attack. The matter came to a vote just a few hours ago. Ten of the eleven members of the Security Council supported our proposal. There was only one vote against—that of the Soviet Union. But that one negative vote constituted a veto. So, at the choice of the Soviet Union, the fears and risks continue. They continue for one reason alone, and that is because the Soviet Union rejects international inspection against surprise attack.

The significance of that is frightening. The result is tragic. It means that at the will and choice of the Soviet Union we have to go on living on the edge of an awful abyss, from which we could, so readily, be rescued if only the Soviet Union did not insist upon retaining for itself the possibility of massive surprise attack.

But we refuse to be discouraged. We remain willing to join in any dependable arrangement which will reduce the risk of surprise or accidental attack or, on a fair basis, reduce armaments.

VI. THE STRATEGY OF VICTORY

We must, however, assume that we face a long period of effort, sacrifice, and strain. That will come to an end when the Soviet rulers moderate their imperialist and ideological urges.

Today the Soviet Communist rulers seek to implement their materialistic doctrine. They believe that human beings are in effect material particles to be fitted together as cogs in some well-oiled machine. Also they believe that that fitting together should be carried out through the world under Soviet Communist dictation. They profess to believe that this would assure world harmony, peace, and maximum productivity. All of this is a way of rationalizing the usual desire of despots for more and more power.

Experience, however, is teaching the Soviet rulers what has been taught so many times before, that man is not just a vivacious particle of matter. Men have souls and minds and individuality. They can never for long be forced into conformity. The Soviet Communist Party has undertaken the impossible, as they are beginning to learn.

They are learning a lesson in the satellite countries. A former adherent, Yugoslavia, is independent. In the other Eastern European countries there is a sustained, and growing demand for independence. It has manifested itself in violent outbreaks that occurred in 1953 in East Germany, and in 1956 in Poland and, most conspicuously, in Hungary in late 1956. There has been a constant flow of refugees from East Germany into West Germany.

In the case of the revolts, and in the case of the refugees, it is the youth who figure most largely. Throughout their mature lives they have never known anything but intense Communist indoctrination and discipline. But love of God and love of country still survive. Human differences still persist. No materialistic regime can wholly or permanently crush them out. Sooner or later the Soviet rulers are going to have to face up to these practical facts. Indeed, there are occasional signs that they are already beginning to do so.

Even within the Soviet Union itself the Communist Party finds that human beings cannot be forced into a single mold of conformity. Under Stalin this was sought to be effected by the brutal terrorism of the secret police. There was a revulsion against that, and the system has been moderated. As the Soviet Union competes in the field of modern weapons and modern industrial techniques, increasing numbers have to be given a high degree of education. Thus there is developed an intelligentsia. And minds trained for one purpose cannot be kept thinking merely in the channels that the Party chooses. They think about other matters, including the unsoundness of the Communist dogma and the cheapness of Communist slogans.

There is more personal security and independent thinking within the Soviet Union now than there has ever been since the October 1917 Revolution.

The Soviet economic centralization has proved unworkable, and now there is economic decentralization. This means more local administration of affairs, with more regard to local differences and local habits.

There has also been a change in the foreign policies of the Soviet Union. In 1939, and between 1945 and 1950, it resorted primarily to violence. It attacked Poland and Finland. It took over Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia by military occupation. It assisted, and in some cases instigated, Communist warfare in China, Greece, Malaya, the Philippines, Burma, and Indochina. It used force or the threat of force to take over Czechoslovakia and to blockade Berlin. It backed open war in Korea.

But these violent techniques no longer pay off. They are checked by the Free World network of collective security. So the Soviet rulers now smile, and pretend to be friends, and to adopt what they hope will be winning ways, giving aid in the form of trade, technicians, and loans; and giving pleasure through ballets and the like. In this way the Soviet Union has gained increased influence and acceptability as against the time when it only growled and bared its teeth. But it is impossible to go on smiling for a long time without its having an internal effect on character. In the long run a nation, like an individual, tends to become what it pretends to be.

The essential is that, for this long run, the Free World should stay strong and united. It must be willing to make the sacrifices needed to prevent the Soviet rulers from gaining external victories bringing new victims into the Communist camp. That would enhance the prestige of the Communist extremists and embolden them, and enable them to hold back the evolutionary trends at work within the Soviet bloc.

The United States, as the strongest of the free nations, can contribute immensely to giving evolutionary forces of freedom a chance to make themselves decisively felt.

President Eisenhower, speaking at Paris last December at the NATO meeting, said that "there is a noble strategy of victory—not victory over any peoples, but victory for all peoples."

The essential is that the American people hold fast to the ideals bequeathed us by our founders and implement those ideals with courage that is traditional with us. We shall need a sustained, sacrificial effort. We may have to do some of the things that we do in war—but without the killing and being killed.

Why should we not make that effort? The stakes are perhaps the greatest for which men have ever had to strive, in peace or in war. And, if we strive aright, these stakes can be won in peace, without the awful horror of World War III. Surely for the averting of war and the safeguarding of freedom men should be willing to make a sustained and sacrificial effort. We can do so in confidence that peaceful victory is attainable, and that our efforts can bring the day when the dark shadows which now oppress humanity will give way to an era of light and gladness.

Meeting the Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a speech which I delivered on May 16, 1958, before the 20th District Optimist Clubs in Fresno, Calif.

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

MEETING THE CHALLENGE

(Speech by United States Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL before the 20th District Optimist Clubs, Fresno, Calif., May 16, 1958)

In a gathering of this sort, I assume there is a direct and widespread interest in the role of the Federal Government in our Nation's economy. As men active in business, in industry, and in professions, you have a continuing concern about the conduct of public affairs as they affect the financial health and vigor of our people.

The overwhelming majority of Americans believe in the system of free economic enterprise upon which our country was founded and upon which she has grown to her present position of greatness among the nations of the world. They see every day how we have achieved almost unbelievably high standards of living. They are conscious of the conflict of ideologies—individual initiative and free enterprise versus socialistic slave-state theories—which underlie both our international relations and our domestic problems.

As our Nation has grown, our Government has grown. Decisions in Washington—those embodied in legislation enacted by the Congress and in administrative actions of the executive branch—have profound impact and far-reaching implications on all of us. This is inevitable when you consider that our Government each years spends on the order of $70 billion. That figure is more than 17 percent of our annual four hundred billions a year national economy. When such a vast sum is disbursed for the payment of services, for the employment of people, for the purchase of goods, it necessarily has a tremendous effect upon people and their livelihood.

For this reason alone, only a few short months ago, the fear of runaway inflation was very real. It permeated the thinking of Americans in all walks of life. More recently, there has been discussion, debate, and expressions of alarm about a swing in the other direction. Instead of inflation and sputniks, the recession has been a prime topic of conversation and a motivating factor behind many governmental actions.

We have become painfully aware of some regrettable soft spots in our economy across

this country. Sometimes we say conditions are spotty. Because we are not a one-industry or one-crop State, because we have diversification in most areas, California fortunately has not suffered as painfully the effects of reduced consumer spending, of curtailed buying, which have been deadly serious in some parts of our Nation.

Because these soft spots have shown up and because our national economic structure is so complex, it became imperative for our Federal Government to take actions to help get our industrial and business machine back on the track. Without attempting to catalog all of the actions, I should like to note that a variety of steps was taken to counteract the recession. And even more moves still are under consideration back in Washington. In taking any action, we run into the ideological conflict which I already have mentioned: free enterprise versus socialistic theory.

Early in the present session, the Congress took a position that the Federal Government might check the slowdown by speeding up certain regular activities of Federal agencies. We have undertaken to accelerate purchasing and procurement. We endeavored to channel life-giving dollars into the bloodstream of our economic body. We have passed certain laws to provide a stimulus to some distressed industries and thus to create employment.

One of the earliest efforts was enactment of a new housing law. That was designed to achieve a dual purpose. It was written to improve prospects of families in lower income brackets for purchasing a home of their own. It was designed to loosen credit so builders and contractors would be encouraged to step up their activities. It reduced downpayments and broadened and eased loan features of the Federal housing and veterans' housing programs.

Such action as the housing bill was warranted, in my estimation. It makes for better living and for happier families in America. Although that bill became law only a few weeks ago, I have been told by people in industry and business that already it has helped improve the economic climate. And when we build homes, we not only put carpenters and masons and plumbers and other craftsmen to work, but we create demand for materials that will rejuvenate industry, such as California's economically damaged lumber mills, and steel and cement and fixtures.

The passage of the latest comprehensive highway bill is another achievement which will improve our economic health. I was glad as a member of the Senate Public Works Committee to have a direct hand in framing that legislation. It is designed to put the big, the vital 13-year 41,000 mile, Interstate Highway construction program back on the track. Our Nation requires an up-to-date, soundly engineered network of interstate routes to carry our ever-mounting volume of traffic with greater safety. We must have the best built highways to speed goods to market, to expedite personal travel, and to meet needs of national defense.

This bill did more than improve the chances of building such a highway network on schedule. Provided in part that the historic allocation of Federal financial assistance to the States would be more generous for a limited period of time so that necessary contracts could be let at once and men put to work on the traditional primary-secondary-urban highway projects. By provisions for advances of Federal grants, we helped to create jobs, whether they are in California or Maine or Texas.

In passing, I should like to point out that this piece of legislation also contains one significant innovation. It has a provision with which I had considerable to do and in which I feel a degree of pride. For the first time in history, Congress laid down the policy that you and your families as you drive along the new superhighways shall be able to enjoy the scenery with which God endowed this country. We established the principle of giving States and localities—those instruments of government which have police and zoning powers—an incentive to control outdoor advertising on the Interstate System. There were violent arguments, of course, against this innovation. For my part, I believed that the Congress had a right—indeed, a duty—to do what it could to preserve the scenic beauty and the inspirational and aesthetic values of America's terrain for our people.

The President has moved to accelerate certain other activities in similar fashion. He has requested additional funds for public works of a sound, worthwhile character. At the same time, he has stood firm against proposed leaf-raking and boondoggling programs which drain the National Treasury without resulting in a long-range contribution to America's wealth or health. Additional funds have been voted and more have been requested and are under consideration at this time in Congress for flood control and reclamation projects.

Here, I want to say that I object to—in fact, I resent—a tendency in some quarters to characterize public works as "pork barrel" undertakings. True, now and then some agency embarks on a project of dubious worth which slipped through Congress. But the overwhelming proportion of these projects are essential to the safety of America, to the efficient functioning of our transportation, to the supplying of ever-growing demands for food and fiber. That is why I twice voted for the omnibus bill authorizing river and harbor improvements, beach erosion work, and flood prevention and control projects. That is why, as I have stated on several occasions, I deeply regretted President Eisenhower's veto of our most recent authorization bill.

I have been in accord with the philosophy and principles on which the Eisenhower administration operates. I generally have supported the positions taken by our President. But I also have a duty to the people of California to exercise my own judgment and to vote as I think best for their welfare. For that reason, I stand ready to vote to override the President's veto of our omnibus public-works bill. I do so because my examination shows 96 percent of the projects in that bill had been thoroughly and intensively investigated and found feasible on the basis of both economics and engineering. Only 4 percent of them were open to challenge as to their soundness and reasonableness of cost.

I may have served in the United States Senate a relatively few years. But I say to you that I have been a Member of that body long enough to realize that if I withhold my approval of a bill until it meets my standard of legislative perfection, I will be unable to vote "Aye" very many times in the Congress.

In thus believing the vetoed bill was about the best obtainable, I think of the fact that for 4 years we have not enacted a single authorization for a new flood-control project. Yet, during that time, storms heavily loaded with rain and snow have borne down on our Nation and dumped their burden of precipitation with disastrous effect on numerous sections of our land.

Only a little more than a month ago, farmers and homeowners in these lush central valleys of California and not far away in our thickly settled coastal region were struggling to reinforce levees. Many families were evacuating their homes. The inexorable runoff from our hills and mountains wrought widespread damage and brought much suffering. Just before leaving Washington, I sent the Senate Appropriations Committee a letter in which I pointed out that incomplete and partial figures showed that the worst of our recent series of storms did $34 million worth of damage. Yet, the flood prevention and control works, built by the Federal Government prevented $113 million worth of further potential damage. Expenditures for flood control are an investment which returns tangible and measurable dividends.

In all the recent uneasiness about the state of our national economic health there have been repeated demands for tax reduction. The President several times has said he is studying the wisdom of recommending such action. But he, like all of us, is aware of the problem of maintaining our Government's fiscal soundness. We must be conscious of the immense outstanding national debt. Incidentally, let me recall that early in the present session, Congress was called upon to raise the debt ceiling by $5 billion to afford elbow room in handling the Treasury's financing problems.

I have not joined in sponsoring any bill to reduce taxes. Even though I personally would like to reduce the drain on your pocketbook and mine, I cannot be unconscious of the possible repercussions of such a step. I do not want my daughter or your children to go through life unnecessarily weighted with the necessity of paying the costs of actions which might better not have been taken.

Furthermore, I question the benefits of most reductions which have been advocated. I voted against one attempt to reduce the personal income tax load because I felt it would have cost the Treasury an indefensible loss of income. Beyond that, I was not persuaded that giving the average family a paltry sum such as $50 per year would have a constructive effect on our economy. In view of the mechanical problems involved now that we have a system of withholding, I question the effectiveness of a modest immediate increase in exemption. At least, I doubt that it would be a speedy shot in the arm for our economy.

To talk intelligently about tax reduction, one must know what part of the tax structure is meant. If the administration, after its studies and its weighing possible benefits against disadvantages, recommends action along that line, of course, I will consider it carefully. But, at the moment, I am not persuaded that a nation which last year increased its savings to the unprecedented total of $69 billion should hastily move to chop several billions off its revenues when we already are having trouble keeping within our expanded debt limit.

There are a couple of types of Federal taxation which I do think we might properly consider reducing or eliminating. Both of these would have a long-range beneficial effect as well as, I believe, an immediate result. I question whether we are not doing a greater disservice to the Treasury and our economy by keeping on the books the present percent excise taxes on automobiles and on transportation of persons and property.

The automobile excise tax is a very direct blow at the consumer's pocketbook. More than that, it is a psychological deterrent to spending. There is good reason to believe that the continuing down-trend in automobile sales may be due in large part to reluctance of potential purchasers to sign on the dotted line while there is talk of cutting or wiping out this levy. Curtailed automobile sales not only mean a drop in income from the excise tax, but reduced earnings by manufacturers and dealers and therefore lower income tax payments next year.

The automotive tax is a particularly significant item. No doubt it is a good revenue producer. But it is far from painless. In the last fiscal year, it brought in nearly $1,150,000,000. When the 1959 budget was prepared last December, estimates were it would yield this current fiscal year $1,290,000,000. This latter guess obviously is—as I

was told by a Treasury Department official last week—in need of adjustment. But even before the downtrend in automobile manufacture and sales began snowballing, the Treasury had written down the expected yield for the fiscal year which begins next July 1. The estimate for fiscal 1959 was only $989 million, a drop of $300 million due to the indicated slackening of activity visible last fall and early winter when revenue estimates were computed.

Thus, we might well ask whether it is not better to forego part if not all of the income from this source, stimulate more buying, and therefore more manufacturing, put more workers back on the job, and prevent a progressive decline in Government receipts from individual and corporate income taxes.

In this connection, the role of automobile manufacturing in our total national economy should be taken into account. I have heard that one out of every five persons in our labor force owes his job directly or indirectly to automobiles. It may be time to consider whether an industry with such far-reaching effect on our total economic activity does not warrant the sort of relief, does not qualify for the stimulus to greater productivity that a reduction in the excise tax would provide. At any rate, if tax reduction is to be considered, here, as I view it, is one area for study.

The tax on transportation, on both persons and property, is another which has extensive effects. To us in California, its consequences are particularly obvious. Our agricultural products to a great extent are shipped long distances to market. Many of our industries import raw materials and send substantial proportions of their finished product across our borders to market. The tax on transportation of property thus is an integral part of the sales price of both agricultural and industrial products. In many situations, this levy pyramids, thus unduly influencing the retail price level.

For us in California, a better competitive situation would result if this transportation tax were lifted. Our fruits and vegetables sent to the big cities of the Atlantic seaboard would be on closer parity with those from Florida, Texas, and other competing areas of the East and South. Our fabricated products from Los Angeles, San Francisco, and other industrialized communities would come closer to meeting on even terms similar articles from Illinois, Ohio, Michigan and New England. And for us at home, we would get relief from that footnote we read in so many national advertisements, the line saying "prices slightly higher west of the Mississippi."

There is one field of tax law revision aside from potential rate revision, virtually crying for attention. Our complicated revenue structure imposes many undue burdens on and puts many obstacles in the way of small business. By the phrase "small business," we mean to cover a broad range of enterprises, industrial production, distribution, wholesaling and retailing. These are the establishments typical of the American free enterprise system, the small corporations, partnerships, and family operations. These are the type of organizations which can grow into substantial economic units, given the proper climate and opportunity for development.

Early this session, a comprehensive bill to revise revenue procedure on small business was introduced as the result of nationwide Senate committee hearings. I am a sponsor of this legislation, and I participated in our Small Business Committee hearings.

This bill recognizes that the impact of Federal taxes is not the same on all segments of our economy. This is not class legislation. It does not attempt to set segment against segment. It endeavors to recognize that smaller establishments need more flexibility in dealing with such problems as retention of earnings essential to expansion and in paying estate taxes and in figuring depreciation. It would end double taxation on fledgling enterprises. In essence, tax relief for small business would create opportunity and thereby enable newcomers with initiative and courage to take their place in our national economy. This is an indispensable ingredient of national growth.

Those are some of the considerations which we have faced, and are facing, in the field of our national economy. Congressional action upon some of them, which has thus far taken place has been, I believe, generally good. And in the months ahead, I trust we may, without resorting to too much politics or to unvirtuous extremes, create a climate in which we all may enjoy economic well-being.

The people in attendance at this convention share with all our countrymen the same prayers for the maintenance of liberty under law and for the attainment of a just and enduring peace in the world. We are united in our aspirations that our freedom may be assured and that international conflict may be honorably averted. Politics, American style, do not divide us in these commonly held and exalted hopes; there is nothing partisan about them at all. Indeed, I feel assured that the hearts of plain people of every land beat in unison as they contemplate the nobility of the human life span freed from the fear of another war.

And it is upon our own country—our people and our Government—which passing events have placed the heavy burden of leadership in the ceaseless struggle to attain these goals. The difficulties of this labor are both many and complex, but I think all of us pretty well appreciate both the worth of such exertions and the magnitude of the difficulties.

Within a fairly short number of years, international communism has taken over 17 sovereign nations, in whole or in part, and almost one thousand million people have been swept into the Red orbit to become the subjects of Soviet rule. Nations, great and small, on this side of the Iron Curtain, began to sense the mounting dangers to their own independence. They began to enter into defense agreements, by which it was mutually agreed that any Communist assault upon one would be treated as Communist assault against all. This concept of collective defense, of interdependence among free countries against a continuing potential foe has paid off very handsomely, I think. Not one such country belonging to any of the now farflung mutual security agreements has been subjected to armed attack by international communism. Meanwhile, the techniques of the Soviet have undergone some changes. The danger remains. Some in a position to judge believe it has increased. The challenge to freedom has become more farflung.

Mr. Khrushchev has told America:

"We declare war upon you—excuse me for using such an expression—in the peaceful field of trade. We declare a war we will win over the United States. The threat to the United States of America is not the ICBM, but in the field of peaceful production. We are relentless in this and it will prove the superiority of our system."

And he also told America:

"In 50 years, your grandchildren will ask themselves how you could have been so stupid as to fail to rally to the banner of communism when it is evident that communism represents history and the future."

"I have this certainty," said Khrushchev in one of his speeches, "that in a few years, communism will have triumphed throughout the globe."

The economic, political, and cultural things free peoples stand for, indeed, even the fundamental principles of free religion, are subjected to challenge from communism on economic and political as well as military fronts. In responding to those challenges, free governments need continually to make decisions, sometimes basic, sometimes collateral, but always important, in the fields of defense and foreign policy. If mistakes are made, all of us will suffer for them. And to the contrary, if correct decisions now become the basis for strengthening the Free World's position, then we shall all share in their beneficence.

I said earlier that politics do not divide Americans in their commonly held prayers for peace and freedom. Neither war nor peace distinguishes Republicans from Democrats. Differences of opinion, there are. But differences based on potential partisan advantage in this top-most important area, there are not, and there must not be.

I respect the United States Senate in its attitude, and in its history, in dealing with questions of defense and foreign relations. This is my sixth year in the Senate, and I am proud to attest that the leadership of both parties has always tried to find the basis on which our country's interest might best be served, and the cause of freedom might best be advanced. Disagreements which have arisen came from individual differences and not because of party politics. Senate support, and Senate opposition, for example, to the Mutual Security Act in the last Congress both came on a bipartisan basis. And in the coming weeks in Washington, we will, I feel sure, once again cast our votes on legislation in this area on the same basis of what is best for America as we, individually, see the light.

THE MILITARY CHALLENGE

First, let us look at the military challenge we face. During the years since the war, Soviet Russia has pushed steadily ahead to develop a great warmaking potential equipped with the most modern scientific weapons, including those of a nuclear nature. We saw evidence of Soviet progress during the Korean war, when the performance of MIG fighters left little advantage to us. We have been reminded of Soviet military strength by reports received on their hydrogen testing. Last fall, the extent of Soviet scientific advance was forcibly demonstrated by the launching of the first earth satellites. In the years since the war, the Soviet Union by strict state control has put steel into military equipment instead of into consumer goods on the scale which we have done in the States.

The Soviet military challenge is not being ignored.

President Eisenhower recently focused attention on the need to adapt our defenses to the demands of modern war. He has called for an increased centralization of military control so that the United States can respond to any attack with coordinated and integrated force with each branch of the military services able to act in the area of defense or offense for which it is best equipped.

I shall support the President in his recommended changes for our Defense Establishment. Most particularly in this kind of problem, his experience and his wisdom are unique and unexcelled. Interservice jurisdictional strife would, as it should, under his proposal, be curtailed, without stultifying esprit de corps. Wasteful overlapping would be eliminated. Efficiency would be increased. It is true that some, in and out of Congress, both Republicans and Democrats, oppose the President. But, I was very glad to see Gen. Omar Bradley and Adm. Arthur Radford, who together have 8 years' experience as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testify unequivocally in favor of the President's plan. They have informed the Congress that Eisenhower's proposal is essential to our country's best

interest, and, like the President, are in a position to know what they are talking about. In my judgment, the Senate will give enthusiastic bipartisan majority support to the recommended reorganization. I venture the hope that the House of Representatives would do the same.

We are now in a period of history when war between the two great powers could exterminate all mankind. Until the time comes when an inspection-proof disarmament agreement may be successfully negotiated, we will, unhappily, be required to maintain an efficient, effective—and costly—Military Establishment, of the most modern type, to deter aggression through the sure knowledge on the part of the potential warmaker of what obliterative retaliation his folly would at once entail.

You are acquainted with the constant readiness of our gallant Strategic Air Command and of its powerful retaliatory forces now located at various points around the globe. And you know, too, of our splendid Navy and her expanding nuclear potential, and of the wonderful accomplishment of our great Army, both in conventional and in out-of-space achievements, where all Americans salute her, and in her vast capability for mobility and strength in her ground forces. The Marine Corps will, if called upon, continue to play her dedicated role in our defense, under the new reorganization, exactly as she has in her long history.

I might add that $3 out of every $4 which the President has requested for mutual-security expenditures is for the purpose of supporting the military efforts and forces of our allies. These are allies with bases from which we would operate in the event of attack. These are allies who have permitted us to establish IRBM bases on their territories within range of the Soviet Union. These are allies who have men under arms in greater numbers than do we.

Our modern Defense Establishment is a good investment in security and a sure means of checking the challenge. Overseas bases from which we may operate and from which missiles may be fired are an important part of our defense system. Allies who will stand with us in defense of freedom are a good investment in security for the future as they have been in the past. Just how effective the SAC deterrent is has recently been illustrated by Soviet concern at our state of readiness. Our free friends stood by us in rejecting the recent Soviet attempt to compel us to disarm SAC. And then they upheld our own excellent recommendation that the United Nations establish an inspection and warning system in the vast expanses of the Arctic. It is a tragedy that the inscrutable Russians vetoed this proposal in the Security Council. But unquestionably her veto has served to knit more closely the common bond between our allies and ourselves, and it constitutes a valid measure of the foe of freedom with which we deal.

THE ECONOMIC CHALLENGE

We are challenged, too, on the economic front. The Soviet military challenge must not detract from the Khrushchev boast that the Soviet contemplates overtaking free peoples and engulfing free states. Her economic challenge is two pronged. She places heavy emphasis on her domestic economy. For the first quarter of 1958, for the first time, Soviet steel production was equal to our own, although our own production has been below maximum capacity. The Soviet economy is now expanding at, roughly, twice the rate of our own.

The second economic challenge is in her program of economic penetration. Already we are seeing the Soviet Union searching for export markets and standing ready to import raw materials from abroad, by way of loan repayments or otherwise.

Over the last 3 years the Sino-Soviet bloc has extended some $2 billion of development and military aid to countries outside the Soviet bloc. These countries have been assisted by loans and gifts. Their accompanying indoctrinated technicians are carefully chosen for their ability to spread the Communist doctrine. Nasser's Egypt, astride the lifeline of Europe, has received generous financial and military assistance. Syria, which flanks our NATO ally, Turkey, successfully has been penetrated. Yemen, at the entrance to the Red Sea, where it commands access to oil shipments, has received Russian aid. Ceylon, Indonesia, Laos, all countries which the Communists covet, have had help from Russia or Communist China.

The Sino-Soviet bloc is not helping these countries out of love and affection or of unselfish devotion to the cause of man's freedom. Those countries are receiving aid from Russia, first, to help to make sure they stay outside the Free World camp, and second, to try to put them under Soviet influence and obligation.

I do not believe that we should permit ourselves to be jockeyed into the position of competing with the Soviet Union in supplying aid to any country. And I do not believe that we are. I think the situation is the other way around. We have honestly attempted to extend a helping hand to weak nations and new nations which want to live in peace and whose ideals of human dignity are not dissimilar to our own. In the early days of our own country, we utilized money from abroad by which our own industry originally got underway. One of our policies today is to promote the investment of private capital in constructive projects overseas in friendly lands. But in some such areas, private funds simply are not available because of the risks involved. And by this economic aid program which President Eisenhower has laid down, as part of our mutual security program, the intention is clear: We desire to help ourselves by helping others. We believe it is good for nations which are free to remain free. And we do not believe there is any difference so far as liberty is concerned between a country which goes down the drain through Soviet military occupation and one which goes down the same drain through economic or political subversion. That is the intention by which the President asks the Congress to adopt his economic aid legislation and, here again, as an American, I shall support him.

In discussing the Soviet economic challenge and American economic aid programs, I wish to emphasize that most of our aid—over half—is now on a loan basis. The economic programs for next year calls for total appropriations of $1.3 billion. If this program were to be emasculated by the Congress, I have not the slightest doubt that our own defense appropriation would be considerably increased.

The economic challenge must also be met by a continuation of our reciprocal trade legislation. We cannot grow and prosper in any sanctuary of economic isolation. Our ever increasing labor and productive force cannot be profitably employed to produce for our own consumption alone. And our needs for raw material cannot be supplied entirely from domestic sources.

I believe in reciprocal trade. But, I must say in frankness that I do not believe that the administration of our trade laws has given proper effect to the provisions in our reciprocal-trade laws which deal with the so-called peril point and escape clause. These phrases refer to Federal statutes designed to prevent foreign-trade policies from destroying our own American agriculture and industry. I want to continue mutually profitable international trade, but I do not intend to vote any of my fellow Americans into bankruptcy. I know something about the problems of the American tuna-fishing industry, and something, too, about the fig growers of this Fresno area and the date growers of the Coachella Valley, and the deleterious effects upon them of unfettered competition from abroad.

The Senate Finance Committee will hold extensive hearings on this exceedingly complex problem. And while I tell you that I shall support, as the President has requested, a continuation of reciprocal trade, I trust that the committee may find a proper way to assure that when our own American economy, or any segment of it, is in peril by reason of foreign competition, relief, swift and sure, will be available, exactly as the statutes have ever intended.

THE POLITICAL CHALLENGE

It is difficult, in few words or many, to comment on the political challenge which international communism poses to all. None can honestly question Russia's inexorable desire to communize the globe. Stalinism, then anti-Stalinism, scowls then smiles, collective dictatorship and now, apparently, a return to one-man rule, high-sounding declarations of peace and then the ruthless killing of Hungarians, agreement to Austrian sovereignty, but belligerent opposition to self-determination for the stricken satellites—Russia's Soviet leadership, in international politics, is completely inscrutable. It is also very wearing on patience. The Kremlin is quite unrestrained by moral scruples. She zigs and zags on the basis of what best serves her course at the moment.

Against this formidable, ruthless world power, stand the United States and her allies. Our leadership, in freedom's cause, needs ever to be bold and courageous. It needs to be, as it always has been, honest and forthright, fair to all. We believe in peace with justice for all. And, I think recent events have demonstrated that our proposals for advancing peace have added to our stature. We need to wage peace constantly and with vigor. And it sometimes seems that the very intransigence of the Soviet leaders may, in the long run, contribute to the victory of an honorable peace which we continue honorably to seek.

We will meet the challenge.

Shakespeare's Polonius said it:

"This above all
To thine own self be true
And it must follow, as night the day,
Thou canst not then be false to any man."

Rumania Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement prepared by me paying tribute to the people of Rumania on the anniversary of their independence day.

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

It gives me great pleasure to pay tribute to the people of Rumania on the anniversary of their independence day. We are glad to do our part in celebrating this occasion, for a people who must honor their own patriots in the grim silence imposed by a brutal alien dictatorship.

It has been a long time since the blackness of Communist rule settled down over the people who live in the troubled borderlands that have long protected Western Europe from barbarian invasions. The hope of lib-

eration which swept over the countries on the borders of the Soviet Union when the Nazi tyranny was liquidated was quickly replaced by the more horribly ingenious tyranny of Communist rule. The Soviet rulers made many solemn commitments to the Government of the United States that the people of the states on the Soviet border should have truly free elections. Every one of these commitments has been broken.

President Roosevelt told Stalin that the United States could never consent to abandonment of these agreements, or subjection of free nations to Soviet rule. President Truman and President Eisenhower have made the same pledge.

The American people are firmly committed to the principle of independence for all nations in the orbit of great military powers. That was our belief in 1776. It was our belief when we supported the nations of Latin America against the Spanish power. It was our belief when we supported weak and divided China against the great powers at the beginning of this century.

Because we love our independence we respect the desire of all other nations for their independence. That has always been the policy of the United States and I promise you it always will be our policy as a nation.

A Balanced Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which would give direction and guidance to local communities and States in connection with eligibility requirements for Federal-aided public housing. My bill provides an exemption of all the income of any minor member of a family for admittance and continued occupancy. My bill will bring about balanced communities and prevent a further development of economically poor ghettos.

The Federal Government imposed certain conditions upon States and cities building public housing. Income limits for admission and continued occupancy in public housing are set by local housing authorities, subject to Public Housing Administration approval. Because of Federal and State statutory and administrative restrictions, income of children is, except for $100, required to be included in determining eligibility for admission to public housing. The Federal Government did not direct that income of minor children be considered in determining eligibility for continued occupancy; local communities and agencies like the New York City Housing Authority include income of children in excess of $600 in considering eligibility for continued occupancy. As a result of this action on the part of local authorities, families with industrious children who are in public housing find themselves threatened with eviction. A consequence of these Federal and local policies, which are definitely nearsighted, is to bring about economic ghettos. What we must strive for is a balanced community where people of different economic levels may live side by side. We do not want a community where only the very poor are herded together.

I venture to state that my District, the 18th Congressional District of New York, otherwise known as Yorkville and East Harlem, enjoys more public housing projects than any other district in the United States. Because of this nearsighted policy of local housing regulations, the northern part of my area, which enjoyed the status of a balanced community, is systematically being converted into manors of the very poor. This trend is not desirable and must be halted.

My bill proposes to permit a cross-section of the low-income groups to live side by side. While my bill would exempt the child's income in determining eligibility for admission and continued occupancy, it permits the housing authorities to consider the child's income in the family income for fixing the rental.

I am certain that anyone who wishes to maintain a balanced community will support this bill.

I trust that it will receive immediate consideration.

Parity Prices and Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to make a few observations which were prompted by the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished majority leader, with reference to the current prosperity on the farm. The gentleman says that the administration has broken its promises to the farmer, and intimates that although the Republicans are responsible for the decline in farm income, they have nothing to do with the present upturn in prices.

It is becoming increasingly clear that political management of agriculture does not work very well. By the time Congress can recognize a new situation and enact legislation to deal with it, the situation has changed and the legislation enacted no longer fits.

A rundown on the farm situation in the May 12 issue of Time commented as follows:

The best economic news in the United States last week, bar none, was the boom in United States agriculture. From all over the country reports trickled into Washington showing that the farmer, after being the lowest man on the economic totem pole since 1955, is making an astonishing comeback. Agriculture Department experts scarcely dared believe some of their own figures. As of mid-April, the prices that farmers get are up 9.8 percent over the same time last year. The prices they pay are up, too—some 3 percent. But the net improvement is pushing their annual income to $13 billion versus $11.5 billion last year.

Moreover, the picture in individual farm commodities is even brighter. Items:

"Thanks to a brisk competition between steak-hungry consumers and farmers trying to rebuild their drought-depleted cattle herds by holding back or buying up heifers, beef prices were running 30 percent above last year, spreading joy from Texas to the feed lots of Kansas City."

"Hogs were up 20 percent above last year and holding long after most farm economists expected a seasonal price break; many counties in the corn belt reported the most favorable corn-hog ratio in history—up to 25–1. (Usual make-money point for hog raisers is when 1 hundredweight of live hog sells for 12 bushels of corn.)"

"Even the egg—a big thing from California to Delaware—was selling for 25 percent above last year, so high that many poultrymen feared consumers might rebel."

"Partly because of the Florida freeze, but also because of continued high food demand from city folks, fresh vegetables were selling 40 percent higher than last year."

"And the one heavily subsidized potato was selling, unaided, more than 150 percent higher, carrying the new farm prosperity all the way up to Maine's Aroostook County."

I note with amusement an item in the May 19 issue of Time:

Running unsuccessfully for the United States Senate against Indiana's Republican HOMER CAPEHART 2 years ago, Claude R. Wickard accused the Eisenhower administration of basely betraying the United States farmer. Cried President Franklin Roosevelt's Secretary of Agriculture (1940–45): "I have before me (Candidate) Eisenhower's promise to farmers in 1952 and (President) Eisenhower's veto message of the first 1956 farm bill. Like the man on the flying trapeze, he has switched from one to the other with the greatest of ease."

Last week, with farm prices rising rapidly (Time, May 12), Claude Wickard, no longer running for public office, abandoned agricultural recession as a Democratic issue. Confiding to reporters in Kansas City that his 620-acre farm at Camden, Ind., is making money hand over fist, Wickard said: "I can't complain about $21 hogs. My son-in-law and I sold 10 Holstein cows the other day for $250 each. I didn't believe in Santa Claus until then."

Had we succumbed to the specious reasoning of candidate Wickard 2 years ago—had we been so reckless as to adopt the remedies proposed by candidate Wickard—I doubt that farmer Wickard would today be enjoying the hog and cattle prices he is now receiving.

Farmer Wickard attributes his newfound prosperity to Santa Claus. But his gratitude is misdirected. He should attribute his prosperity to the stubborn persistence of our Secretary of Agriculture in adhering to economic principle and sound commonsense. Had Mr. Benson listened to candidate Wickard, had he chosen to take the easy road of political expediency, I do not think farmer Wickard would have any reason to thank Santa Claus or anybody else today.

Now it is interesting and perhaps instructive to note that the commodities currently making the most contribution to better farm income are the commodities that, comparatively speaking, have been neglected in national farm legislation. They have been neglected largely because no one has been able to figure out practical and workable ways and

means whereby production and marketing controls may be instituted. How fortunate they are.

But there has been no lack of interest in trying to devise schemes for political intervention in the price, production, and marketing of these products. In recent years the Secretary of Agriculture and the Congress have been pressured from time to time to institute programs for beef, for hogs, for poultry products.

Had the Secretary or the Congress responded to these pressures the market outlook for these commodities would be far more pessimistic today. Had we gone along with these pressures, a tremendous stimulation to production would have been provided. We would find ourselves today in the situation that our cold storage warehouses would be full and overflowing with meat products. The problem of rotating stocks would be a major difficulty. We would be seriously debating impractical and unworkable production control programs to keep from being buried by the deluge of meat production encouraged by Government price fixing.

The reason for the new hope in many fields of agriculture today is not what Congress and the Secretary of Agriculture have done, it is what they have avoided doing.

The short run expedient that looks like it will help an existing situation, will often do so, on a short run basis, but it creates long run consequences that are disastrous to the future earning ability and opportunity of farmers.

The May 12 issue of Time went on to report:

Main Street Evidence. But as far as the general United States economy was concerned the best evidence of farm recovery was on the main streets of farm towns. In Oskaloosa, Iowa, a typical midwestern farm market town (population 11,000), where farmers long were sullen and resentful over drought and low farm prices, Time correspondent Jonathan Rinehart found cash registers jingle-jangling more merrily than in years. * * *

Clay Carriker, manager of Green's Ford, said that his new-car sales for the past 60 days were 20 percent ahead of 1957, used cars, 30 percent; highpriced new trucks were slow, but lower-priced used trucks were hot. Another major beneficiary of the farmer's new-found prosperity was the farm machinery business. Owner Don Berkemeir of the Lytle Implement Co., reported that he sold 25 new tractors so far this year; * * * "Business," said Berkemeir, "is within a few dollars of double last year."

Not only has returning farm prosperity benefited virtually every Oskaloosa business (lumber dealer Jim Mathew figures his sales are up 50 percent due largely to farmers fixing up the old home place or repairing the barn), but it has brought a flock of new civic improvements in progress, e. g., three new schools, a $200,000 bowling alley and amusement center. * * *

Oskaloosa's good fortune was not unique. The Central Iowa Farm Business Association completed its annual report on 153 representative farms, reported net income in 1957 averaged $11,200, or 32 percent over 1956's $8,467 and more than 2½ times 1955's low of $4,235. For a national view, the Farm Journal polled its regional correspondents, found business noticeably better in every section except the Southeast, where row-crop farmers have been hit by weather and acreage cuts, but livestock and poultry farmers are prospering.

It is time that the Congress stopped dealing with farm problems in political terms.

It's time to recognize that sound economies must be the foundation of farm programs.

As an Iowan, I am particularly interested in corn, and the livestock products produced from corn. Thank goodness that the corn farmer has gained a relative degree of freedom from Government.

But it is time for Congress to eliminate the present ridiculous program for corn—a program that few farmers comply with except by accident.

The annual establishment of unrealistic corn allotments that nobody pays any attention to, is a waste of money and effort that can be better expended for other purposes. I can see no warrant for the continuation of corn allotments. I hope the Agricultural Committee is not going to come up with proposals designed to tighten up on corn production, or any program based upon the erroneous assumption that price fixing and production control programs will work for corn or other feed grains. They won't.

It is also time for Congress to permit corn price supports to reflect market factors, so that corn producers can produce for the market and market what they produce, and avoid the creation of burdensome surplus stocks. The future of corn producers is not to be found in comprehensive Government programs involving regulation of the production and marketing of corn.

Report of the Honorable Perkins Bass on the Mutual Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a report by Hon. PERKINS BASS on the mutual security program:

Foreign aid or mutual security—call it what you will—this much is certain: No other Government program has been subjected to such constant and intensive critical investigation and study, year after year, by so many different groups and individuals, the motives of most of whom have been, at least originally, severely critical.

And yet, year after year, Democratic and Republican Presidents have recommended multi-billion-dollar military and economic aid programs for countries all over the world.

And, year after year, Congress has first authorized and later appropriated most of the money requested for these programs—almost always reluctantly but nevertheless regularly and substantially in the amounts needed.

As a further paradox, all the evidence points to the conclusion that the mutual security program has been the least popular of any Government activity, in the sense that there's no interested or spontaneous public demand for what so many condemn as a giveaway.

How can one account for this paradox?

I've seen no more effective justification than the simple and direct words of the President last week: "No nation, not even the United States, can isolate itself from its friends and still be secure."

Or in the equally compelling words of the House Foreign Affairs Committee report: "The termination or drastic curtailment of the mutual security program would inevitably mean that we would lose the cold war."

Neither of these views is new. Rather, it is the increasing evidence that these statements are true, which has convinced more and more of our people we need this program.

It has been most revealing over the past 3 or 4 years to watch this conviction sink in. It has been impressively demonstrated in the results of opinion polls taken in their districts and States by a number of once-opposed Congressmen and Senators.

Behind this growing support has been greater public understanding of the fundamental facts of foreign aid—facts which were more effectively brought home in many cases as a result of the studies and investigations their own earlier opposition and questions had caused.

Facts like these: That this is no giveaway program. Instead of sending dollars abroad, we are providing military equipment, food, loans, and technical advice to help strengthen allied military forces and encourage higher living standards in underdeveloped countries.

That without friendly military forces and bases, it would cost the United States about five times as much to station Americans abroad where they would be required for our own security.

That more than 80 percent of all foreign aid is spent immediately in the United States to purchase military hardware, equipment and supplies from our factories. This provides jobs for about 600,000 persons, including 24,000 jobs in New England.

That we are not trying to buy friends, which we know is impossible, but rather we are helping to build genuine independence among weaker countries, based on political and economic stability, as the best way to resist the spread of communism.

That many, but not all, of the weaknesses in the foreign-aid program have been eliminated and its administration tightened up as a result of the constant pressure for better performance directed at the agency by Congress and other public and private watchdog groups.

This year's mutual-security authorization bill included a request by the President for approximately $3.3 billion, which the House Foreign Affairs Committee carefully pruned to $2.96 billion—$1.64 billion for military and $1.32 billion for economic aid.

The most controversial area of foreign aid—assistance to Poland and Yugoslavia—is only slightly involved in this bill. Poland is not included at all, since aid to that country has been limited to the sale of some of our agricultural surpluses and to loans through the Export-Import Bank—two separate programs. No more military aid is scheduled to Yugoslavia, though a certain amount of economic aid is provided in this bill. In view of the fact that Yugoslavia's insistence on her independence is infuriating the Soviet Union, such aid may be justified as a calculated cold-war risk, though I have some doubts about this.

In the last analysis, it seems to me the question of our mutual-security program is nothing less than the question of our national security. We've stopped the Russians and are continuing to hold them in check militarily. But the cold war is now being fought in the shops and factories and steel mills of the world. The prize is the power to guide the industrial and economic growth of the world toward freedom or slavery.

Khrushchev, in his recent declaration of economic war on the United States, bluntly warned that the Soviet threat to the United States is in the field of peaceful production.

"We are relentless in this," he said, "and we will prove the superiority of our system."

Unless we meet them successfully on this ground, ground we always considered our strongest, the alternatives are, as President Eisenhower put it, "grim." "They are," he said in this order, "a fortress America, then a regimented America—finally a defeated America."

These are the reasons why I shall again support this program.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Address by Hon. William M. Colmer, of Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I count it a great privilege to serve in the Congress with the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman of the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives, and the Honorable WILLIAM M. COLMER, Member of the House of Representatives from Mississippi. They are both great Americans and I am proud to call them my friends.

On May 10, 1958, the Democrats of the Eighth Congressional District of Virginia assembled at Fredericksburg, Va., and again nominated Congressman SMITH as the Democratic nominee for the 86th Congress. The Honorable WILLIAM M. COLMER, of Mississippi, was the speaker of the occasion. He made a memorable address—one that I wish every American could read and digest. The address is as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER, OF MISSISSIPPI, AT JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER, SPONSORED BY THE EIGHTH DISTRICT DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEE OF VIRGINIA, FREDERICKSBURG, VA., MAY 10, 1958

Mr. Chairman, Governor Battle, Congressman Smith, my fellow Jefferson-Jacksonian Democrats, it is with considerable humility and trepidation that I appear before you this evening. However, I hasten to assure you that I am not unmindful of the honor which you have bestowed upon me by inviting me to be with you on this auspicious occasion.

Since my early childhood when I first began to read the history of this country, I have been tremendously impressed with the contribution which the people of the Commonwealth of Virginia have made to the founding and preservation of this Republic. That respect and admiration has grown within me as my thinking and ability to appraise the situation has matured throughout the years. And so this evening, as always when I cross the line into the great State of Virginia, I feel that I am on hallowed ground. Certainly no people of any State have, in my judgment, equaled much less excelled this substantial citizenry of Virginia in their contribution to the cause of national security and good government.

Mr. Chairman, I would be untrue to the thoughts that well within me if I did not on this occasion, as well as on every other occasion when the opportunity presents itself, pay homage to him whom you have again today signally honored by renominating him for his seat in Congress, HOWARD W. SMITH. HOWARD SMITH is my distinguished chairman of the powerful Rules Committee of the American Congress, my warm personal friend, my counselor and the true leader in that body of House Members who believe in constitutional government as we have known it. Modest almost to a fault, never seeking the limelight, day in and day out he wields a powerful influence for the preservation of those principles of government for which your immortal Washington and Jefferson, your Madison, your Monroe, your unexcelled Robert E. Lee and the long line of other illustrious Virginians devoted their lives. Possessed of a brilliant and logical mind, a man of indomitable courage, he tirelessly wages the fight against the foes of good government both in committee and on the floor of the House. But, it is in the conferences on strategy, in formulating the lines of defense against the opponents of constitutional government that he renders the greatest service. Like unto the great master of military strategy, Gen. Robert E. Lee, outnumbered in force, his brilliant mind conceives and wins many a successful battle.

Mr. Chairman, it has been my high privilege to serve as a Member of the House of Representatives for the past quarter of a century. In no similar period in the history of the Republic, I dare say, have there been more grievous assaults made on the Constitution and the Bill of Rights which we cherish. For certainly in no similar period have we strayed further from the sound philosphy and the admonition of those great Virginians, Washington, and Jefferson, and men of like mind. A brief comparison of the fundamental principles of the philosophies of the Government's founders and their handiwork—the Constitution itself—with the modern philosphy that now prevails will, I fear, confirm this sad commentary.

Washington urged that we "cherish public credit." He said, "One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible." Today that public credit has been extended to almost $276 billion. This represents an increase of some $250 billion in the past 24 years.

Again, in his farewell address, President Washington admonished: "Avoid likewise the accumulation of debt not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in times of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear."

Yet today, enjoying the greatest national income and burdened with the highest taxes in the peacetime history of the country, we hover on the precipice of deficit spending. Prudence suggests that under such conditions we should be retiring a part of our gargantuan debt and fortifying our fiscal position for the proverbial rainy day. On the contrary, we are now faced, under the guise of a recession, with deficit spending for the next fiscal year of from five to $15 billion. It is often argued that because two-thirds of our expenditures are either to pay for previous wars or to prepare for possible future ones, we cannot retrench; but that we must increase our defense program without limitation for fear of a sneak Pearl Harbor attack. For more than a decade this humble voice has been heard repeatedly in the halls of Congress to the effect that the masters of the Kremlin want neither war nor peace. They are following the blueprint of their idol, Lenin, himself, who wrote in the early stages of the Bolshevik Revolution that the way to conquer the United States was to make it spend itself into bankruptcy. If this be a correct analysis of the sinister Russian objective, they certainly have no more useful allies than the special interests and minority groups who year after year descend upon Washington seeking larger and larger favors from the public till.

Mr. Chairman, I fear the Russian menace less than the danger of collapse of the fiscal structure. I am more apprehensive of inflation than I am of Communist infiltration. For if our economic strength is destroyed, hungary people might well become easy prey to the siren song emanating from the Kremlin.

Along with the peril of unbridled spending and exorbitant taxation, I am sure that you, like I, are justly alarmed with the ever-increasing tendency toward consolidation of power in the Federal Government at the expense of the States and the freedom of our citizens.

Jefferson, who contributed so much to the cornerstone of our freedom, warned: "It is not by the consolidation or concentration of powers that good government is affected. Were not this great country already divided into States, that division must be made, that each might do for itself what concerns itself directly, and what it can do much better than distant authority."

It was to prevent this consolidation of power that the 10th amendment was adopted providing that, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." For more than a century that mandate was scrupulously honored. On the few occasions when Congress, with an excess of zeal, invaded the domain of the States, the Supreme Court firmly pulled it back. Thus, when Congress attempted by the Civil Rights Act of 1875 to exercise the police power of the States by requiring the operators of inns, theaters and other places of public amusement to serve white and colored people alike, the Supreme Court held the measure void. It told Congress that neither the 13th nor 14th amendments conferred any authority for this interference with the conduct of private individuals.

How changed the situation today. Apparently the States no longer have any rights which the Federal Government is bound to respect. Congress, I am sorry to admit, is partially responsible for this development. It has passed laws, expressed in vague general terms, empowering Federal agencies to regulate vast areas of our economy. Immediately these agencies set up all the trappings of bureaucracy. They issue directives, regulations, and interpretations, which as time goes on, bear less and less resemblance to the act passed by Congress.

But the evil wrought by the executive and the legislative branches has been minor in comparison with the transgressions in the past two decades of the nine black-robed gentlemen of the Supreme Court. You won't find anything about preemption in the Constitution, but the Supreme Court, with ever-increasing frequency, is applying that doctrine to whittle down the jurisdiction of the State courts. Of course, in doing this the Tribunal always professes to be carrying out the intent of Congress; the effect is the further centralization of power in the Federal Government. Among the most flagrant examples of this practice in recent months have been the Steve Nelson and Slochower cases. In the Nelson case, the Supreme Court held, under this doctrine of preemption, that Pennsylvania's antisedition law was void. And in the Slochower case, the Court denied the right of the city of New York to discharge a teacher who had invoked the fifth amendment in a Congressional committee investigation concerning his past membership in the Communist Party. If this doctrine is permitted to go unchallenged, our State courts will become but empty shells.

Remedial legislation sponsored by your own Congressman has been languishing in committees of Congress for the past 3 years.

"There is no danger I apprehend so much," Jefferson wrote, "as the consolidation of our Government by the noiseless and, therefore, alarming instrumentality of the Supreme Court."

One can conceive of no more flagrant example of the digression from the doctrine enunciated by Washington and Jefferson than the recent school segregation decision of the Supreme Court, on the one hand, and the passage of the so-called civil rights bill, on the other. In the school case the Court admittedly substituted its own political and social theories for legal precedent. The enactment of the civil rights bill under the guise of protecting the liberties of certain minority groups will result in the further encroachment upon the liberties of all our citizens.

We are now told that centralization is liberalism. Jefferson called it "toryism in disguise." By whatever name called, it can only end in totalitarianism.

The basic principles of human freedom are as invariable as the solar system. They are the same in the jet and nuclear age as they were in the horseback and ramrod and musket days.

And now, Mr. Chairman, we are gathered here this evening to do honor to two truly great Democrats and the contribution made by them to the Democratic Party. Sometimes I wonder, as lip service is rendered unto these great stalwarts of our party, what their own reaction would be if they were permitted to step out of the pages of history on to the current terrestrial scene and view in person the assaults that are being made upon the fundamental principles and philosophy of the party to which they contributed so fully. Yes; I wonder how they would react to the present posture of their beloved Southland within the Democratic Party. What would the reaction of the "Sage of Monticello" be to the advocacy of our Democratic leaders along with the Republican high command, of the use of bayonets for forced integration of our public school system in his beloved Virginia? Would not Old Hickory himself rebel at the continuous whittling away at the foundation of the freedom of the individual by the modern pseudo-liberals in charge of the machinery of both parties?

Surely our beloved Southland finds itself today in a most unenviable position within the party. Notwithstanding the fact that our section and particularly the great Commonwealth of Virgina has contributed so much to the creation and the preservation of the party in both the lean as well as the prosperous years, we are now just taken for granted. Is it possible for instance today for a member of our party from the South to obtain the nomination for President? Can a man of the stature of HARRY BYRD, for instance, receive this recognition?

Whether we like it or not, we must face the facts of life. We have permitted ourselves to be taken for granted so long that we are completely ignored. This is true even though in the last two presidential elections the candidate of our party received the electoral votes of only one State outside of the Solid South. Organized pressure groups under the guise of false liberalism have taken over the machinery of the party. Is it not true that the NAACP, the ADA, and other misnamed liberal minority groups are more powerful in the councils of our party than the so-called Solid South?

To my mind, there is but one answer. The South is the strongest potential minority group in the country. And while I do not like the idea of government by minority groups, I am reluctantly driven to the conclusion that there is but one answer to the problem thus posed. The South must become a militant, aggressive, and crusading organized group dedicated to the preservation of those sound constitutional provisions of government for which so much blood, treasure, and labor have been expended. Then, and only then, will the once strong voice of the South be heard in the smoke-filled rooms of our party's conventions and in the legislative arena.

These, Mr. Chairman, are strong words. But, if the great Democratic Party and the Republic, itself, are to be saved we must fight fire with fire. We in the other States of the South are looking to the statesmen of Virginia. If you will lead, we will follow.

To those of us who believe in the principles of Washington and Jefferson, enshrined in the Constitution, the present posture of affairs would indeed appear discouraging. The distress signals are all about us.

But, surely, we, the beneficiaries of the labor and sacrifice of those who founded the Republic, have the courage, the will, and the patriotism to see to it that this Republic, embodying the most perfect form of human liberty ever conceived by the minds of men, shall not perish from the earth.

Address by Secretary of Defense at Armed Forces Day Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable Neil McElroy, the Secretary of Defense, at the Armed Forces Day dinner held in Washington, D. C., a few days ago.

Secretary McElroy delivered the address before one of the largest gatherings which I believe has ever observed Armed Forces Day at a dinner in the city of Washington. In view of the pendency of the President's proposals for reorganization of the Department of Defense, the address by Secretary McElroy has special significance at this time, and I believe it should be read by all Members of the Senate.

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

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE NEIL MCELROY, AT THE ARMED FORCES DAY DINNER IN WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 16, 1958

We are gathered on this occasion to do honor to the men and women of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard and their Reserve components and auxiliaries.

It is fitting that we should honor them. For to a degree that is hard for us as a peaceloving people to realize, this Nation is dependent today, and in the years to come, on the alertness, dedication, and abilities of our Armed Forces.

We are living in a period almost unique in our history—a period which can be called peacetime but one in which the thought of war is never far from us. For the first time in history, this Nation finds itself still surrounded but no longer protected by vast stretches of ocean, because of new weapons which can cross those oceans in a matter today of hours, tomorrow of minutes. Weapons have been developed which can on short notice bring major disaster to our centers of population. And we know these weapons are in the hands of powerful forces which are committed to world domination.

We have always owed a great debt to our Armed Forces. Throughout periods of peace, they have formed the core around which we could in wartime quickly mobilize the larger Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine, and Coast Guard forces which have so successfully defended this country in times past. But the nature of war has changed. If all-out nuclear war comes—an event which surely all intelligent people throughout the world will work constantly to avoid—it may well last a matter of days or, at the most, weeks. It is unlikely that in such an event we would have time to train our nonmilitary citizens, equip them and make them part of an effective military force. More than ever before, we are dependent on our existing defense forces. They and their weapons must be our shield.

We hear much these days concerning new weapons systems, and indeed they are of immense importance.

The speed with which one technological development outraces another, so that the fantasy of today becomes the practical reality of tomorrow, makes a weapon system obsolescent almost literally by the time it can be produced in sufficient quantities to be widely available to our forces.

The importance of science, of our ability to press forward with vigor our programs of research and development, is immense; our security 5 or 10 years from now undoubtedly rests on the skill and energy with which today we are pursuing the development of weapons of the future. Our very survival as a nation in modern war will depend on our ability to move forward on the technological front.

I would like to interpolate at this point something which you may or may not have noticed in your newspapers, because it has been an example today of just what I've referred to—this tremendously rapid advance in our technological capabilities in the weapons field. Today an Air Force jet boosted the airspeed record a whopping 200 miles per hour by flying between 1,412 and 1,420 miles per hour over a measured course, and this single jet 104A which reached a new speed today is the same type of plane which 9 days ago smashed the world altitude record back from France for the United States. It hit 91,000 feet. I cite this as a typical example of what I'm referring to as the essentiality of our retaining a priority in the new weapons field.

But weapons without people are valueless. It is inevitably true that the strength of any organization, military or otherwise, rests on the people in it. As we employ more and more the advanced equipment and weapons that are so vital to the present military, we need to an ever greater degree people skilled in handling them—people with aptitude who may be trained in the handling of communications equipment, radar, and the other complex equipment involved in the modern airplane, ship, or tank. As the time we are given in which to react is increasingly shortened by new weapons, and as warfare becomes more complex, we need to an ever greater degree men and women who are alert, intelligent, and imbued with leadership qualities as well as the devotion to country and freedom which must be the basis of all military service.

Both Houses of Congress have seen fit to pass legislation which recognizes this need and which increases the pay incentives provided for our Armed Forces personnel. This legislation is now awaiting the President's signature. The revised pay bill embodies principles developed by a committee of public spirited citizens under the very able chairmanship of Ralph Cordiner, chairman of the board of the General Electric Co.

The results of its studies, plus the able and intelligent work done in the Armed Services Committees of both Houses of Congress to build sound pay legislation—and again I should interpolate that on the platform tonight there are members of both of those Armed Services Committees (Senactor FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, and Congressman MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois)—have produced results which can be of great importance in helping to attract to the services in sufficient quantities people with the high qualities of leadership needed, and the capacity to learn the skills required in modern warfare. The military career makes severe demands on those who pursue it: we must see that it offers also the rewards that are commensurate to the high type of service that is demanded.

Of almost equal importance to the quality of people in their ability to work together to achieve common goals. There is great strength in competition; it has been a key vitalizing factor in the development and progress of this country, in industry, education, throughout our society. It has been a constructive force in the military field as well, where the traditions of the individual services have built loyalties and enthusiasms which have contributed much to the strength of these services. Constructive competition must be preserved; but with it must go the overall desire and intent to work effectively together.

The need for cooperation and coordination is a primary one today for many reasons. First, we no longer can think in terms of separate ground, sea and air combat. The developments of modern warfare have obliterated such distinctions, and future wars will be fought with whatever combinations of forces and weapons are needed to win. There must be no confusion of responsibilities, no delay in our responding with all the power that may be required in the form of unified, completely coordinated forces. Second, the size of our expenditures makes it imperative that we get the most we can for our dollars. If we are to buy the sophisticated and increasingly expensive weapons that we must have for our modern defense forces, our budget either will grow to appalling proportions or we must find ways of using our dollars with increasing efficiency. This cannot be done with duplication of effort, overlapping activities and lack of coordination and direction.

Another impelling need for us to work effectively together arises from the fact that our defense activities now call for the services, in the military or working for it, of something more than one-half the people in America who are trained in advanced science and technology. These people constitute one of the Nation's valuable resources; they are needed in industry, in teaching, in medicine, in many fields which are of importance to our normal development as a nation. We cannot be wasteful of their talents; we must organize ourselves to make maximum use of their scientific capabilities.

The reorganization of the Defense Department which has been recommended by the President and legislation for which is now under the consideration of the Congress, recognizes this need for unity.

Again I must interpolate because things seem to move rapidly on Armed Forces Day and Armed Forces Week in Washington, and I must compliment the Armed Services Committee of the House which today brought out a bill to implement the proposals of the President, and in my judgment—and I believe that it was clearly stated also by the President—that a most constructive effort was made by this committee to implement these objectives of the President and with what I think are exceptions that will be—can be—worked out and not the most serious exceptions either, but nevertheless important exceptions, a bill has been brought out which will meet most of the objectives of the President. And I must compliment that committee, of which Mr. PRICE is one of the members. This committee report was adopted 32 to 0, I believe.

It is centered on the concept of the unified command, such as the one which in World War II under then General Eisenhower grouped in Europe the forces of this Nation and its allies into a magnificently articulated, powerful, and fast-moving force. Or the Pacific Command under Admiral Nimitz and the Southwestern Command under General MacArthur which combined our ground, sea, and air forces into two of the most gigantic striking forces in history. The unified command is derived from lessons learned in World War II; it ties in with today's need for quick decisions and greatly stepped up speed of reaction, and it assures full coordination of our available power.

The President's plan proposes to make absolutely clear the authority of a unified commander over all the component units at his disposal. It provides the needed unity in our strategic planning and in the operational direction of our unified commands. It also proposes shortening and clearing the line of command between the President as Commander in Chief and the commander of the unified command. The stepped-up tempo of modern warfare makes this imperative. In every war this Nation has fought during the last hundred years, we have had to change our military organization after the war had started. In the future we will no longer have time in which to revise our command lines or shift from a peacetime to a wartime organization. We therefore propose to make the necessary changes now.

The President has made very clear, and the proposed legislation repeats with assurance, that there is no intent or desire to merge or abolish the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Force. The separate traditions of these services are sources of great strength to the Nation and will be preserved. But, they need not and must not constitute obstacles to the development of truly unified and efficient military commands.

I have spoken of the importance of future scientific developments through research and engineering. I should like to spend a moment on this part of the President's proposal.

Our present rate of expenditure for research and engineering is close to six billion dollars and so far as we can see the rapid advance in technology of all types pertinent to weapons development indicates that there will need to be continued major attention assigned to the research and engineering programs of the Defense Department. In order to make more effective this essential part of the Defense Department's program the President has proposed the creation of a major new position under the title of Director of Defense Research and Engineering. It will be the responsibility of this executive to supervise and direct all Defense research activities, regardless of which portion of the Department may actually be undertaking the projects.

This unified supervision and direction protects the program in two ways: It avoids any possibility of undesirable duplication and overlapping with resultant savings in expense; and also it makes certain that there is no failure to support a needed program because of any doubts as to which of the services might appropriately take up a given high-priority project.

This proposed unified supervision and direction of the program of Defense research and engineering must be accomplished not only to avoid the waste of our resources but also for our very security.

Undoubtedly by far the largest part of our research and development activity will continue to be done by the military departments themselves. These military departments will also continue to have the tremendous responsibility for recruiting, training, equipping, and supporting the component elements of the unified commands. It will leave in the departments responsibilities and functions of major significance—in fact, practically all of those they fulfill now. These departments will remain as today indispensable administrative and operating units, each preparing its parts, human and material, of our Military Establishment.

The defenses of our Nation rest on a great many shoulders. They rest in part on every one of us who pays taxes, a large share of which goes to support our defense budget. The rest in part on the hundreds of thousands of men and women in manufacturing concerns, large and small, which make the weapons, equipment, and supplies needed in our great defense program. They rest in part on the dedicated men and women of science whose steady assault on the boundaries of our knowledge promises to continue the technological advances on which our future security so greatly depends.

Our defense rests also on the thousands of civilians who make up such a large part of this great Defense Department. Day after day and often far into the night these people quietly apply their strength, energy, and intelligence to the many complicated problems of running an enterprise of this scope. Anyone who has had the experience of working with them can have nothing but respect for the high quality of their service and their wholehearted devotion to what they are doing.

But most of all, of course, the security of all of us depends on the men and women in uniform. Although there is strife in many parts of the world and open warfare in a few, at present our Armed Forces are not engaged in active fighting anywhere. But their alertness, their readiness to expose themselves at a moment's notice to any situation that may arise and to make any sacrifices that may be demanded of them is in itself a great shield which permits us all to enjoy peace and security.

The men separated from their families at outposts in the frozen north, those spending endless days and nights in the lonely patrol of our early warning line, the men living in constant alert, ready in a matter of minutes to move resolutely into action, the officers on whose calm judgment may well depend the course of history and the safety of all of us, the countless men and women who are devoting themselves to the manifold stern demands of military life—to all of these, the men and women of our Armed Forces, our debt is beyond all measurement.

They are making many sacrifices for us. They must find much of their compensation in the knowledge that our Nation depends on them, and that we are conscious of the debt of gratitude we owe them.

It is a great privilege for all of us to join here this evening in honoring the members of our Armed Forces. For their services in the past, for their continuing unselfish dedication, let us unite in extending to them an expression of our honor and esteem, and the heartfelt thanks of a grateful nation.

The Watkins Case Reflects Misunderstanding of Congressional Procedures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD

today correspondence which I received from the St. Louis Civil Liberties Committee which contains a plea for limitations on the Un-American Activities Committee. I was quite disturbed with the thesis behind this plea because I feel it is grounded in error. There has been so much misunderstanding about the Watkins case that I feel it important that we take another look at it and for this reason I place in the RECORD my reply.

The correspondence follows:

ST. LOUIS CIVIL LIBERTIES COMMITTEE,
St. Louis, Mo., February 3, 1958.

Mr. TOM CURTIS,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: In view of decisions by the United States Supreme Court concerning the investigating power of Congressional committees we urge that you and other members of the Missouri delegation take early leadership for revocation of the mandate of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The Supreme Court, by its decision in the Watkins case, has made plain the illegality of the resolution creating the Committee on Un-American Activities. The committe is instructed to investigate "un-American propaganda activities." As the Court said in the Watkins case, "Who can define the meaning of un-American"? In addition to this fatal vagueness, "propaganda" as such—speaking and writing is and of itself, whither its source and however offensive to Congress and the public—is not a matter under the first amendment concerning which Congress can constitutionally legislate. Therefore, this area is excluded from Congressional investigation. Investigation of propaganda cannot be saved merely by calling it an investigation of "activities."

The American Civil Liberties Union has never contested the right of Congress to investigate in legitimate areas of its authority, although we have emphasized that such investigations should be conducted with due regard for the right of individuals. We are as deeply concerned as any Member of Congress that the Constitution, and the democratic society it protects, shall not be subverted.

The experience of the last 2 decades makes clear to us however, that establishment of a separate legislative committee for the sole purpose of investigating matters of internal security almost automatically brings by-products destructive of civil liberties and produces little in the way of effective results. If the responsibility for investigation of internal security problems is returned to an established committee experienced in examining into the enforcement and adequacy of the Federal criminal laws, such as the House Judiciary Committee, it is our conviction that investigations relating to the security of the Nation will be far more likely to proceed in a responsible, efficient manner calculated to respect basic individual rights and at the same time produce practical results rather than eye-catching headlines.

In addition to these recommendations, we wish to call your attention to another difficulty concerning not only the Committee on Un-American Activities but Congressional investigating committees generally. This is the problem of the witness who is unable to determine, before criminal prosecution, what would be the consequences of his decision to challenge a committee's right to ask him certain questions. Fortunately, H. R. 259, proposed by Congressman KEATING and adopted by the House Judiciary Committee would alleviate this problem.

This bill would authorize Congressional committees to apply to a Federal district court to pass upon the propriety of a question which a witness has refused to answer. If the court found the question proper, it would order the witness to answer. Under this procedure a witness would have the opportunity to raise all defenses—first amendment, lack of authorization, impertinence, etc.—and obtain a judicial determination of the committee's right to ask the question before facing a criminal prosecution. The Keating bill suggests what might prove to be one of the most significant safeguards yet proposed against investigative abuse, and has the union's support.

Sincerely yours,
SAMUEL B. GUZE, M. D., *Chairman.*

MAY 19, 1958.

Mr. HUSTON SMITH,
Department of Philosophy,
Washington University,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MR. SMITH: Thank you very much for your letter of May 5, 1958, in which you state that "you received from the St. Louis Civil Liberties Committee a letter * * * protesting against the Committee on Un-American Activities and the way it has ignored the Watkins decision." I am happy that you enclosed a copy of this letter as I have checked my files and find no record of ever having received it. Because we receive a hundred letters a day in this office, it is entirely possible that it was mislaid; however, this rarely occurs. Under the circumstances I would appreciate your checking to be certain this letter dated February 3, 1958, according to your copy, was actually placed in the mail.

I am happy to reply to this letter and to your letter of May 5, 1958. I am deeply disturbed by the tone of the letters and the obvious misunderstanding of what the Watkins case decided and the apparent unfamiliarity with Congressional procedures.

I have publicly criticized the Watkins case ever since it was handed down by the Supreme Court primarily on the basis of its unscholarly approach to a serious problem affecting the Nation. There is ample room for disagreement between judges and lawyers about what decision should be reached in particular cases, but there is little room for disagreement about decisions which, on their face, show a lack of scholarly study, of the subject at hand. The Watkins case shows such an ignorance of Congressional procedure that one can only conclude it came from a failure to have made a study of Congressional procedure. Regrettably the decision not only reflects ignorance, which is bad enough; it deliberately misstates facts in some instances and in other instances omits important facts.

In my judgment the Watkins case strikes a new low in legal scholarship on the part of the United States Supreme Court. Having said this, I want to go on to state that in my judgment two wrongs do not make a right and accordingly, I have openly opposed the recent attempts on the part of the Congress to limit the jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court. In other words, I am opposed to the Jenner bill, even as modified.

It is my belief that the basis of civil liberties rests in the maxim that society must be ruled by laws and not by men. The basic structure of the laws of our society is set out in the United States Constitution. The Constitution provides the method for amending it, if at any time the society feels it needs amendment. In spite of the provisions for amendment certain people being so impatient in getting certain things done which they think should be done for the welfare of our society, finding the Constitution blocking their desires, undertake to subvert the Constitution instead of amending it. I am satisfied that the majority of the present members of the Supreme Court generally adhere to the philosophy of amending the Constitution by subverting the English language rather than by amending the Constitution in accordance with the clear cut provisions for amendment. I criticize them greatly for this philosophy. On the other hand, I am convinced that the only way in which the Constitution or any form of government can be followed is through the self-discipline exercised by the individuals who are entrusted with power. So the only manner in which the Congress in pursuit of most of its powers can be restrained to follow constitutional government is through self-discipline. The same is true of the executive and the judiciary. An attempt by either of the three branches of Government to attempt to discipline the other is bound to undermine the very system of Government.

If the Congress wishes to discipline the Supreme Court it should do so through a proposed constitutional amendment. If the Supreme Court wishes to discipline the Congress it should do so as individual citizens by suggesting that the people propose a constitutional amendment. And so if the Executive wishes to discipline either of the two coequal arms of Government he should resort to constitutional amendment.

It comes as strange philosophy from a group which proclaims itself interested in civil liberties to advocate government by men rather than government by law. Because your group does not like what the Congress has done apparently it would encourage the Supreme Court to disregard self-discipline and seek to encroach on the powers of the Congress. I may presume that if the Supreme Court happened to do something your group disliked such as the Dred Scott decision you would propose the reverse procedure and urge the Congress to disregard self-discipline and seek to encroach on the powers of the Court. In other words, it isn't procedure your group is concerned with but specific results. Procedure is government by law; specific results is government by men. I believe every civil-liberties group should have this fundamental belief, embedded in its own constitution.

The letter of February 3, 1958, states "The Supreme Court, by its decision in the Watkins case, has made plain the illegality of the resolution creating the Committee on Un-American Activities." Bad as the Watkins case is, it is not that bad. Nowhere in the decision does the Court state that the resolution creating the Committee on Un-American Activities is illegal. The most that it says is that the resolution is not sufficiently specific to authorize the committee to ask certain questions of a witness.

The Supreme Court in its discussion of delegation of powers by the Congress as a whole to its various committees is completely unaware of the history of the Congress. The oldest committee of the House is the Ways and Means Committee. This committee like most of the committees has never received any clear mandate of its jurisdiction. In fact, it can truthfully be stated that powers and jurisdictions of Congressional committees are almost entirely a development of custom and tradition. This is true in spite of the attempt to define somewhat the scope of committee powers and activities in the reorganization of the Congress. Incidentally, the reorganization of the Congress was done by the Congress itself and required no concurrence on the part of the executive branch of the Government. If the Congress wished to operate under no rules of procedure at all it could do so.

However, the Un-American Activities Committee was set up with considerable more formality than any other committee of the House. Its rules of procedure are probably the most exacting of any committee in either the House or the Senate. (I might state that when I was first assigned to the Joint Economic Committee in the 83d Congress I was shocked to find that this committee

had no rules of procedure whatever. After several months of fussing with the chairman of the committee, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, he appointed me on a subcommittee of two to write the rules. This was done and these rules were adopted in 1955, almost 10 years after the committee had been operating.)

The Supreme Court in the Watkins decision shows a complete ignorance of the history of Congressional procedure and the manner in which Congressional committees operated in the past and in the present. If it looks for formal delegation of authority from the parent group of its committees as is done in the executive branch it will have to look a long time. This is not done and actually would interfere with proper Congressional functioning if it were done. The Supreme Court is naive in trying to make the point that * * * "it is evident that the preliminary control of the committee exercised by the House is slight or nonexistent." It is also making a completely false statement. Every committee must make reports to the House and must come to the House for money to operate. Any committee that goes beyond the bounds of what the House wants is called to task pretty quickly. Actually the Un-American Activities Committee has done what no other committee has done, it has insisted that its authorization and appropriation of funds be approved by record vote in the House. The record votes are there for all to see and only one or two brave souls over a period of years have ever dared vote against the appropriation of the funds the committee requested. And this was after a rather lengthy presentation on the part of the committee on the floor of the House both as to what they had been doing and what they intended to do.

The Watkins decision is so replete with statements made out of ignorance it is difficult to grapple with it on a scholarly basis. I will just point out one more and desist. On page 14 this statement appears: "In the decade following World War II, there appeared a new kind of Congressional inquiry unknown in prior periods of American history." This is untrue, as the statement on page 20 points out: "The authorizing resolution of the Un-American Activities Committee was adopted in 1938 when a select committee under the chairmanship of Representative Dies was created." But even this later statement does not give the real history of the Un-American Activities Committee. The Dies committee was a follower of the select committee set up for the same purposes chaired by the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, now the majority leader of the Democratic Party in the House of Representatives.

Belief in government by laws rather than by men and disbelief in the doctrine that the ends justify the means should be the basis of any group dedicated to civil liberties. I would add another qualifying remark that is implicit in the disavowal of the doctrine that the ends justify the means. Search for the truth is the basis of all true scholarship and leading from ignorance and the tampering with truth is the surest way not only to destroy civil liberies but to stop any advancement into the unknown for mankind.

Yours very truly,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 22, 1958

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

God of all mercies, in a world swept by violent forces which unaided we cannot control, Thou only art our help and our hope. Through all the mystery of life, Thy strong arm alone can lead us to its mastery. Fronting the clamant duties of these volcanic days, steady our spirits with a realization of untapped power available to servants of Thy will if only they go quietly and confidently about their appointed tasks. Forgive us the distrust of ourselves, of life, and of Thee, and the doubts which besiege us when the heights above us are full of the chariots of God.

As we spend our years as a tale that is told, may it be to the last page a tale of service well done, of tasks faced without flinching, of honor unsullied, and of horizons stretched out as daily we fare forth toward journey's end. Then of Thy great mercy grant us a safe lodging and a holy rest, and peace at the last; through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 21, 1958, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the act (S. 3149) to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

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

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate next Monday. I am a delegate to the World Health Conference, which convenes in Minnesota. It is the first World Health Conference to be held in the United States, and it convenes on Monday, May 26. As a delegate I will be in attendance. I therefore ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate during the period of days of this World Health Conference beginning on Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

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 the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Rear Adm. Edward H. Thiel, to be Engineer in Chief of the United States Coast Guard, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Herbert B. Warburton, of Delaware, to be General Counsel of the Post Office Department.

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

MUNICIPAL COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Andrew McCaughrin Hood, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia for a term of 10 years.

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

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the