I asked specifically the question whether or not this authorization would go beyond the 30th of June and neither Secretary Dulles nor Mr. Hollister could give me an answer on it.

Mr. Hollister said he did not think that the authorization would extend beyond the 30th of June but he would make that information available for the committee before we actually considered the resolution.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would be most interested in his answer because I think that the impression is that it is $400 million to be taken away from what the Congress previously authorized and directed in a certain direction and now they want to do it any way they please. $200 million in each of two fiscal years, as I understand it.

Mr. SELDEN. Only $200 million is affected by this resolution—Mr. Hollister stated specifically that any additional funds would be asked for in the mutual security bill. I thought you would be interested in that information since you touched on it in your testimony.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman GORDON. Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you for the privilege of being here.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank you, too, very much.

Chairman GORDON. Our next witness is Mr. Kenneth M. Birkhead, American Veterans Committee.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1957

Rev. Joseph J. Valantiejus, of St. Joseph's Lithuanian Parish, Waterbury, Conn., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Lord of justice and mercy, look down with favor upon us gathered here in the observance of the Independence Day of Lithuania, the land of our fathers—or, rather, in the memory of an independence that today is denied her.

We pray, first of all, for the United States of America, wherein we have found the freedom of life and opportunity with which Thou hast endowed our nature, but which is cruelly repressed in many parts of the world today. We ask Thy guidance upon its leaders, not only that they may lead our country in the ways of peace and prosperity, but that they may achieve that which we believe to be the destiny of America—to extend the blessings of freedom and peace to all the peoples of the world.

We pray for our mother country and for her hard-pressed children; for those who, whether by choice or by force, have remained in that unhappy land, and are both witnesses and victims of an alien domination that outrages their every national, cultural, and religious aspiration, as well as for those whom circumstances have compelled to abandon their native soil and their homes. Grant to them, O Lord, strength and courage to bear the burdens and the hardships that are put upon them, but do Thou also strengthen our efforts to come to their relief and assistance.

We are particularly mindful this day of the words of Thy vicar on earth, our Holy Father, that Lithuania is the most northerly outpost and bulwark of Thy church in Europe; and we dare to hope that this is indeed the mission which Thy divine providence has in store for her. Wherefore, with all the greater confidence do we pray that she remain not subject to a power which does not acknowledge Thy law, and oppresses Thy church, but that the agony which she today endures may be the promise of a more glorious resurrection unto her appointed place among the free Christian nations of the world, and unto the mission which Thou hast designed for her.

In Thee, O Lord, do we place our hope, and we know that it shall not be confounded. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 11, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Mansfield D. Sprague, of Connecticut, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

PROTOCOL TO INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR REGULATION OF WHALING—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive E, 85th Congress, 1st session, a protocol to the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling signed at Washington under date of December 2, 1946, which protocol was signed at Washington under date of November 19, 1956, for the United States of America and 16 other governments, and that the protocol, together with the President's message, may be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message may be printed in the RECORD.

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

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the Protocol to the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling signed at Washington under date of December 2, 1946, which Protocol was signed at Washington under date of November 19, 1956, for the United States of America and 16 other Governments.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the Protocol.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 14, 1957.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Certified copy of the Protocol to the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing with illustrations and binding of proceedings in connection with the acceptance of the statue of the late Chief Justice Edward Douglass White; and

S. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution to print for the Committee on Public Works certain data on the Arkansas, White-Red River Basins and water resources of the New England-New York region.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs are holding joint hearings on the general oil problem. Secretary of the Interior Seaton and Director of Defense Mobilization Flemming testified before the joint subcommittee all morning. I ask unanimous consent that the hearings may be continued during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until Monday next.

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

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar under Rule VIII on Monday next be dispensed with.

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

THE URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], has a report which he desires to file.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations, I report, with amendments, House bill 4249, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, and I submit a report (No. 65) thereon. Of course the bill will now go to the Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the Calendar.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee whether it will be agreeable to him to have action on the urgent deficiency appropriation bill scheduled for Monday next.

Mr. HAYDEN. That will be entirely agreeable.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the Senator from Arizona aware of any controversy over the bill which would require extended debate?

Mr. HAYDEN. No such controversy appeared in the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the bill reported unanimously?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if it is agreeable to the minority leader, it will be the purpose of the leadership to make the bill just reported (H. R. 4249) the pending business on Monday, and to proceed immediately to consider and dispose of it; and then to take up the four contempt resolutions, if that is agreeable to the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations and if they will not involve prolonged discussion. If a prolonged discussion is indicated, the leadership would move instead that the Senate take up the joint resolution on the Middle East, on which we expect to have a report filed from the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee. I expect to have that joint resolution taken up some time on Monday, and then to have the Senate sit in session from day to day until debate is concluded.

Let me ask the Senator from California whether that schedule is agreeable to him.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That schedule is agreeable, Mr. President.

So far as the urgent deficiency appropriation bill is concerned, I believe that normally, under our procedure, it would have the right-of-way.

I do not believe there will be prolonged discussion of the contempt resolutions, in view of the general understanding the majority leader has indicated, to the effect that there will not be prolonged discussion. Otherwise, I can see no objection to holding them over until after the Senate disposes of the Middle East joint resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let me state to the Senator from California that I cannot assure him that there will not be prolonged discussion of the contempt resolutions; but I do assure him that if there is prolonged discussion, we shall put over those measures until after the Middle East joint resolution is disposed of.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Does the schedule which has been announced mean that there will be a regular session of the Senate on Washington's Birthday?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to make an announcement on that subject later in the day, after I have conferred with the minority leader. My present view is that there will not be a regular session on Washington's Birthday; but on that point I should like to be informed of the wishes of the minority leader and the views of the administration and the views of the chairmen of the committees. If the Senator from New York will permit me to do so, I shall confer with those mentioned, and shall talk later to the Senator from New York, and then shall make an announcement to the Senate.

Mr. IVES. I thank the Senator from Texas.

MORNING BUSINESS

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 VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PROPOSED REPORTS ON ACREAGE PLANTED TO COTTON

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for reports on the acreage planted to cotton, to repeal the prohibitions against cotton acreage reports based on farmers' planting intentions, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering contracts negotiated under sections 2 (c) (11) and (16) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, for the period July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON SURVEY OF BACKGROUND, OPERATIONS, AND ADMINISTRATION OF STOCKPILING PROGRAM

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting pursuant to law, his report covering a survey of the background, operations, and administration of the basic stockpiling program (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF SECOND LIBERTY BOND ACT, RELATING TO INTEREST RATE ON UNITED STATES SAVINGS BONDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act to authorize a change in the maximum interest rate permitted on United States savings bonds (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY FOR ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to clarify the general powers, increase the borrowing authority, and authorize the deferment of interest payments on borrowings, of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CERTIFICATION OF ADEQUATE SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION, HAYDEN LAKE UNIT, IDAHO

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Hayden Lake unit, eastern division, Rathdrum Prairie project, Idaho, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON TRINITY RIVER DIVISION, CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the status of negotiations with prospective purchasers of the falling water to be produced by the Trinity River division of the Central Valley project (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

JOSEPH CHITTO ET AL. v. THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings in the case of *Joseph Chitto et al., members and as the representatives of and on the relation of the Choctaw Indians east of the Mississippi River* v. *The United States* have been finally concluded (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF MARCH 3, 1911, RELATING TO RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF SPRINGFIELD CONFEDERATE CEMETERY, SPRINGFIELD, MO.

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1077), to remove restrictions on the use of a

portion of the Springfield Confederate Cemetery, Springfield, Mo., and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD AND MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Maritime Board and Maritime Administration, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLICATIONS ENTITLED "STATISTICS OF ELECTRIC UTILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES, 1955" AND "ESTIMATED FUTURE POWER REQUIREMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES, 1955–80"

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of its recently issued publications entitled "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1955" and "Estimated Future Power Requirements of the United States, 1955–80" (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO PUBLIC AIRPORTS IN ALASKA

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska," as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Chung-Liang Liang from a report transmitted to the Senate on January 16, 1956, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, with a view to the adjustment of his immigration status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JOE KAWAKAMI

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Joe Kawakami (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ROBERT BURNS DEWITT

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Robert Burns DeWitt (with an accompanying paper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CAPT. THOMAS C. CURTIS AND CAPT. GEORGE L. LANE

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Capt. Thomas C. Curtis and Capt. George L. Lane (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuand to law, a report of the Commissioner of Education, including a detailed statement of receipts and disbursements, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

STATEMENT OF PENALTY MAIL

A letter from the Deputy Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing the number of envelopes, labels, wrappers, cards, and other article bearing penalty indicia procured or accounted for through that Department, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 9

"Memorializing Congress to take action on flood control embracing the valley of the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River in West Virginia.

"Whereas the valley of the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River in the State of West Virginia has recently been visited by a flood disaster which might have been averted to a marked degree by a proper system of flood control; and

"Whereas the recent flood has caused damage to the extent of at least $10 million in the valley of the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River; and

"Whereas other floods have occurred at great frequency during the past few years in said valley, resulting in damages to the extent of many millions of dollars; and

"Whereas the distressing conditions due to floods tell a more powerful story than any that might be calculated in terms of the cost of a proper flood-control system: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the house of delegates concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to take such action as will provide a suitable and proper system of flood control in order to avert another such disaster in the valley of the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River; and be it

"*Resolved further*, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to forward attested copies of this resolution to the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the West Virginia delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 9, adopted by the legislature on February 7, 1957, according to the official records in my office.

"J. HOWARD MYERS,
"*Clerk, Senate of West Virginia.*"

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Resolution 45

"Relative to Federal aid to Del Puerto Road

"Whereas there are no east-west highways between the San Joaquin Valley and the seacoast between the Altamont Pass and the Pacheco Pass, a distance of over 50 miles; and

"Whereas such a crossing would be of inestimable value as an escape route should there be a need for dispersal of the citizens of this State concentrated on the heavily populated peninsula below San Francisco in case of an atomic attack or other invasion of our shores; and

"Whereas the Del Puerto Canyon offers an excellent route for such a highway to connect the cities of Patterson and San Jose; and be of great economic benefit to the coast counties and the northern part of the San Joaquin Valley; and

"Whereas, in addition to the national defense benefits of such a highway, it would also contribute substantial economic benefit to the areas involved: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of California*, That the President and Congress of the United States are respectfully memorialized to provide for Federal funds to construct the Del Puerto Canyon Road between Patterson and San Jose, Calif.; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative of the State of California in the Congress of the United States.

"I hereby certify that the above resolution was adopted by the Senate of the State of California on January 25, 1957.

"J. A. BEEK."

A resolution adopted by the City Council of Denver, Colo., relating to the rising price of gasoline, and so forth; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The petition of Edward A. Smith, of Vero Beach, Fla., relating to a reduction in Federal expenditures; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Two resolutions of the Alameda, Calif., County Coordinating Republican Assembly, relating to the retirement of Senator KNOWLAND, and unqualified support to President Eisenhower's Middle East doctrine; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. BENNETT:

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

"Senate Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution of the senate and house of representatives memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish a realistic program of active duty basic training for the Army National Guard

"Whereas the Army National Guard of the State of Utah has attained the unprecedented peacetime strength of 4,443; and

"Whereas the Army National Guard of the State of Utah is organized into 57 units and organizations located in 27 communities in this great and sovereign State; and

"Whereas the Army National Guard of the State of Utah is the exclusive military force of this State and under the command of the Governor as provided by the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas the Army National Guard of the State of Utah has served its country with distinction in time of emergency; namely, the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, and in the Korean emergency; and

"Whereas the Secretary of the Department of the Army of the Government of the United States has directed that all non-prior-service enlistees of the Army National Guard of this State be required to undergo a period of 6 months' active duty training with the United States Army as a condition precedent to their enlistment; and

"Whereas this proposed action is an administration determination by an executive branch of the Federal Government; namely, the Department of Defense which appears to negate legislative intent of the elected representatives of the people in the United States Congress; and

"Whereas this requirement is unreasonable, unrealistic, exceedingly detrimental to the Army National Guard of the State of Utah and will cause a serious reduction in the strength thereof; and

"Whereas the 6 months' active duty training program can be accomplished in approximately 3 months with efficient organization and the omission of unnecessary features; and

"Whereas a 3 months' active duty basic training program as a condition of enlistment is acceptable to the Army National Guard, and would encounter little if any opposition from industry, educators, religious groups, and the parents and the young men of the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah*, That it views with great alarm and disapproval the unwarranted action of the Secretary of the Army of the Government of the United States and that the Congress of the United States be called upon to establish a realistic program of active duty basic

training for the National Guard; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Members of the State of Utah in the National Congress."

By Mr. PASTORE (for himself and Mr. GREEN):

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution 28

"Resolution memorializing Congress to reduce the cabaret tax

"Whereas experience has indicated that the 20-percent carbaret tax is self-defeating in that there has been a steady decline in the number of restaurants and hotels offering good food plus entertainment; and

"Whereas since 1940 over 25,000 musicians have lost their employment in establishments subject to such; and

"Whereas such tax is blighting on normal, healthy outlets for social life throughout the country; and

"Whereas the United States Congress has recognized the self-defeating purpose of the amusement tax on other categories of shows and entertainment by reducing said tax to 10 percent of the admission charge: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island takes cognizance of the danger which is confronting the amusement and entertainment facets of our economy and now does respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to reduce the entertainment tax on cabarets from 20 percent to 10 percent; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, urging them to use their good offices in seeking the passage of such legislation."

THE ARMY AND THE AIR NATIONAL GUARD—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF KANSAS LEGISLATURE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas Legislature, which is now in session, has adopted a concurrent resolution relating to the Army and Air National Guard.

The resolution calls upon the Kansas delegation in Congress to take every action which might be necessary to bring about an accelerated 3-month training program for the Army and Air National Guard.

As this is the view of the elected representatives of the people of the State of Kansas in their own legislature, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

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

House Concurrent Resolution 11

Concurrent resolution relating to the Army and Air National Guard

Whereas the Congress of the United States in the Reserve Forces Act of 1955 deemed it wise to increase the preparedness of our country for national defense by ordering all the Reserve forces, including the National Guard to take not less than 3 nor more than 6 months' basic training, and the Army National Guard has repeatedly requested the Secretary of Defense to implement an accelerated 3-month basic training program as well as a 6-month program to enable young men who wish to continue their education to obtain this training without sacrificing a semester from their educational program, and the Secretary of Defense has, since the passage of that act, and continues to refuse implementing such program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the Senate concurring therein), That we call upon the Kansas delegation in Congress to take every action which may be necessary to bring about implementation of an accelerated 3-month basic training as an alternate to the 6-month program now in effect for those members of the Army and Air National Guard who wish to take advantage of same in order to continue their education without interruption; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state is authorized and directed to send an enrolled copy of this resolution to each member of the Kansas delegation in the Congress.

RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I present, for appropriate reference, resolutions adopted by the General Court of Massachusetts entitled "Resolutions Memorializing the Congress of the United States Against Granting Concessions on Textile Imports From Foreign Countries" and "Resolutions Memorializing the Congress of the United States Against Granting Concessions on Textiles and Fish Imports From Foreign Countries."

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States against granting concessions on textile imports from foreign countries

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to pass no legislation granting concessions on textile imports from foreign countries; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

Senate, January 31, 1957, adopted.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk*.

House of Representatives, February 5, 1957, adopted, in concurrence.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk*.

A true copy.
Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States against granting concessions on textiles and fish imports from foreign countries

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to pass no legislation granting concessions on textiles and fish imports from foreign countries; and be it further

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

House of representatives, January 31, 1957, adopted.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk*.

Senate, February 5, 1957, adopted, in concurrence.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk*.

A true copy.
Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF MONTANA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Senate Joint Memorial No. 1 passed January 29, 1957, by the Montana Legislature. The memorial deals with the control of infestations and outbreaks of grasshoppers on range and grazing lands.

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

Senate Joint Memorial 1

Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to Dwight D. Eisenhower, the President of the United States; to the Honorable James E. Murray and the Honorable Mike Mansfield, Senators from the State of Montana; to the Honorable Lee Metcalf, and the Honorable Leroy Anderson, Representatives from the State of Montana; to the Honorable Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture of the United States; relating to infestation and the control of grasshopper outbreaks on range and grazing lands

Whereas grasshoppers constitute a threat to range and grazing lands each year, with the intensity and scope of infestation varying from as much as 380,000 to 7,500,000 acres from one year to the next and from less than 100,000 to 2 million acres in a similar period with no particular pattern of infestation evident in any succession of years nor any relationship between geographic areas or intensity within a given infestation that can be used as a basis for prediction; and

Whereas during years of low grasshopper populations, infestations are confined to relatively small acreages which can be handled by the landowners themselves. In years of widespread outbreaks each individual infestation, which taken together constitute an outbreak, is so large that the total holdings of several farmers or ranchers may be involved. With the large acreage involved, which is usually accompanied by low precipitation and consequent lower yields, an economic situation is created whereby the landowner cannot combat the problem with his own resources; and

Whereas by administrative decision, the present Federal-State Cooperative program authorized under Public Resolution 91 of the 75th Congress is based on the theory of outbreak prevention and on the concept that outbreaks can be predicted from existing infestations and that all grasshopper in-

festations spread to adjoining areas from existing infestations; and

Whereas comprehensive research has shown that infestations develop through unpredictable changes in conditions existing in the areas so infested; and

Whereas comprehensive research has shown that the extent of damage done is not necessarily a result of the number of grasshoppers present, but appears to be related to the species of grasshopper present and the growing conditions of the plants, making it impossible to predict damage prior to its onset following the hatch of grasshoppers; and

Whereas hatching dates differ so widely from one area to another, even within the same species, that damage may be severe in one area before it appears in another; and

Whereas the present administrative decisions upon which the Federal-State Cooperative program is based do not consider the problems posed by populations of those grasshopper species which infest nor the added problem of acres diverted to the soil bank which could become breeding grounds for the migratory species; and

Whereas the present administrative decisions allow only 33⅓-percent Federal participation in the cost of control on privately owned lands which is inadequate to bring the cost down to a level that can be economically borne by the landowner under widespread outbreak conditions; and

Whereas the administrative decisions under which the present Federal-State program operates are so rigid that the program cannot be effectively adapted to the unpredictable situations which occur from year to year and its objectives of control from the standpoint of outbreak and migration prevention are not only inconsistent with research findings, but do not allow for the most effective use of available moneys at a time and in such places that the landowners can derive the maximum benefits: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 35th Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the House of Representatives concurring), That we respectfully recommend and urge the President of the United States, the Senators and Representatives from Montana and the Honorable Secretary of Agriculture to secure the reconsideration and revision of the administrative decisions upon which the present Federal-State Cooperative program is based to the end that it will better serve the needs of range landowners and provide an adequate and fairly administered program of range land protection; be it further

Resolved, That consideration be given to conducting cooperative Federal-State control programs on the basis of range land protection rather than outbreak prevention and that the rancher-farmer be given the opportunity to elect when, where, and by whom the work shall be done; that the Agriculture Department of the State of Montana, in conjunction with the United States Soil Conservation offices, cooperate in the work and administration necessary to attain the objectives contained in this program; be it further

Resolved, That Federal moneys be made available to the extent of 50 percent of the cost of control on a matching basis regardless of the source of the matching money; be it further

Resolved, That the program be administered to the end that everyone participating in grasshopper control receives his proportionate share of the public moneys available regardless of their course; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of the Senate of the State of Montana to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the Honorable James E. Murray and the Honorable Mike Mansfield, Senators from the State of Montana; to the Honorable Lee Metcalf and the Honorable Leroy Anderson, Representatives from the State of Montana, and to the Honorable Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture of the United States.

PAUL CANNON,
President of the Senate.
EUGENE H. MAHONEY,
Speaker of the House.

CHAPLAINS' DAY—RESOLUTION OF NORWALK (CONN.) FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a resolution sent to me which was adopted by the Norwalk Aerie of the Fraternal Order of Eagles of Norwalk, Conn., on February 6, 1957, which is entitled "Chaplains' Day Resolution."

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

CHAPLAINS' DAY RESOLUTION

Whereas on February 3, 1943, the U. S. S. *Dorchester* was sunk in the North Atlantic, during World War II, with the loss of more than 600 American lives, including 4 chaplains of 3 great religious faiths; George L. Fox, Protestant; John P. Washington, Catholic; Alexander L. Goode, Jewish rabbi; and Clark V. Poling, Protestant minister; and

Whereas these 4 chaplains gave up their lives that others might live, going down together on the deck of the U. S. S. *Dorchester*, to give to the world for all time a dramatic example of human brotherhood, courage, and selflessness, and an inspiring demonstration of interfaith unity and understanding; and

Whereas in order that the meaning and significance of their heroic deed may be perpetuated each year, memorializing not only the supreme sacrifice of the 4 chaplains, but the supreme sacrifice of all chaplains who gave up their lives for others, inspiring all Americans by their example of faith and courage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the Congress of the United States to set aside the first Sunday in February each year, as Chaplains' Day, and that the day be devoted to the dedicated memory of the 4 chaplains of the U. S. S. *Dorchester* and all chaplains who gave their lives for our country.

Above resolution adopted by Norwalk Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, on February 6, 1957.

WALTER G. SMITH,
Worthy President.
WM. K. MALKIN,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF NIAGARA COUNTY, N. Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Niagara County, N. Y., relating to the development of additional power on the Niagara River.

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

Whereas by the collapse of the Schoellkopf station of the Niagara Mohawk Corp. on June 7, 1956, a serious power shortage has occurred in the Niagara frontier which represents a considerable financial loss to the citizens, residents, and industries of the Niagara frontier and further that it seriously jeopardizes production for the defense of the United States of America; and

Whereas there has been introduced in the Congress of the United States legislation to grant the New York State Power Authority power to develop the available water supply on the Niagara for the purposes of hydroelectric power as allocated by the treaty between the United States and Canada of 1950, together with additional sources of water supply as heretofore allocated the Niagara Mohawk Power Corp.; and further

Whereas this matter has been before the Congress of the United States for some 6 years; and further

Whereas the Board of Supervisors of the County of Niagara are seriously concerned about the failure in the development of the water resources located within the boundaries of the county of Niagara: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this board of supervisors does seriously urge the Congress of the United States to enact into law legislation authorizing the State power authority to develop the waterpower resources upon the Niagara River; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to the Honorable IRVING M. IVES, the Honorable JACOB J. JAVITS, United States Senators from the State of New York; Hon. WILLIAM E. MILLER, Congressman; the chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee; and the Public Works Committee chairman of the House of Representatives.

Respectfully submitted.

G. K. BOYER,
Majority Leader.

RESOLUTION OF CLEVELAND DENTAL SOCIETY

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Cleveland Dental Society at its council meeting on January 31, 1957, relating to taxes for certain self-employed persons.

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

Whereas a proposal known as the Jenkins-Keogh bill can give the professional man some of the tax benefits denied to him since the Internal Revenue Code was enacted; and

Whereas the principles of this bill have been before our national legislators for over 6 years in some form or other and have favorably impressed these lawmakers by their soundness and fairness; and

Whereas under this bill, the self-employed individual would be able to set aside money for future retirement, tax free, such as corporations now set aside for their pension plans; and

Whereas such savings thus set aside would present a definite hedge against inflation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Cleveland Dental Society support the principles of the Jenkins-Keogh proposal and urge the 85th Congress to enact them into law; and be it further

Resolved, That the Cleveland Dental Society urge Senators JOHN BRICKER and FRANK LAUSCHE, Representatives MICHAEL FEIGHAN, FRANCES BOLTON, CHARLES E. VANIK, and WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and Representative JERE COOPER, chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means to use their support and influence to secure an early enactment of this proposal.

Respectfully submitted.

JAMES M. GENTILLY,
W. J. STERLING,
HARRY J. GEURINK,
Chairman, Legislative Committee of the Cleveland Dental Society.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. Res. 24. Resolution to amend rule XIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (Rept. No. 71).

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

S. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress (Rept. No. 66);

S. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of additional copies of hearings held by the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary (Rept. No. 67);

S. Res. 75. Resolution to authorize additional clerk hire for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (Rept. No. 69); and

S. Res. 93. Resolution authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the report on an investigation of airpower, and providing for additional copies (Rept. No. 68).

COOPERATION WITH NATIONS IN THE MIDDLE EAST—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 70)

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, sitting in joint session, I report favorably, with amendments, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

I understand the majority leader has indicated that the joint resolution will be considered on next Monday.

The report of the joint committee will be filed later today.

I call the attention of Senators to the fact that the two volumes of committee hearings on the joint resolution have today been sent to all Members of the Senate. The hearings have been marked with different press release dates.

Subsequently, Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, jointly, submitted a report (No. 70) on the above joint resolution.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Christian A. Herter, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of State.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 1181. A bill to provide for the construction of a new Federal building in Newnan, Ga.: to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1182. A bill to prescribe the procedure of courts of the United States in the issuance of injunctions and the punishment of disobedience thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 1183. A bill to amend chapter 21 of title 28 of the United States Code with respect to the jurisdiction of the justices, judges, and courts of the United States; and

S. 1184. A bill to establish qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 1185. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1186. A bill for the relief of certain dependents of the late Darwin Philo Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1187. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps commemorating the 150th anniversary of the founding of the city now known as Hot Springs National Park, Ark.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1188. A bill to amend title II of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, with respect to the settlement of labor disputes resulting in national emergencies; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 1189. A bill to amend section 10 of the Federal Airport Act of 1946 to provide for increased Federal participation in the acquisition of runway clear zones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1190. A bill to authorize purchase of certain bonds issued by States and local units of government to finance the development by such States and local units of government of facilities to transport water for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1191. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange lands at Olympic National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1192. A bill for the relief of Irma B. Poellmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1193. A bill to amend subparagraph (c), paragraph I, part I, of Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases becoming manifest within 3 years from separation from service; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1194. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Myrtle Golden, of Milnesand, N. Mex.;

S. 1195. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Carl Bedwell, of Yucaipa, Calif.;

S. 1196. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Richard L. Robinson, of Jal, N. Mex.;

S. 1197. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Walter T. Linam, of Hobbs, N. Mex.;

S. 1198. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Elmer M. Gandy, of Lubbock, Tex.; and

S. 1199. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Joseph E. Shipp, of Snyder, Tex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (by request):

S. 1200. A bill to authorize funds for the improvement by the Secretary of Commerce of the Pentagon Road Network and that portion of the Henry G. Shirley Memorial Highway in Arlington County, Va., and to provide for the transfer of such highways to the Commonwealth of Virginia; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. GREEN (for himself, Mr. BUSH, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PURTELL, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1201. A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 1202. A bill for the relief of Arsene Kavoukdjian (Arsene Kavookjian);

S. 1203. A bill for the relief of Lydia Anne Foote;

S. 1204. A bill to provide for the incorporation of the National Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, organized 1883, 74 years old; and

S. 1205. A bill to recognize the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., a national nonprofit, nonpolitical war veterans' organization, for purposes of bestowing upon it certain benefits, rights, privileges, and prerogatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

S. 1206. A bill for the relief of Antoine Velleman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1207. A bill for the relief of An-Shih Cheng; and

S. 1208. A bill for the relief of Ludwik Abramski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. GREEN, Mr. BUSH, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. IVES, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. COTTON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. POTTER):

S. 1209. A bill to amend titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act so as to further assist the States in extending aid for medical care to persons eligible for public assistance under such titles; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 1210. A bill to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1211. A bill to define the application of the Clayton and Federal Trade Commission Acts to certain pricing practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 1212. A bill for the relief of Evangelos Demetre Kargiotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT (for Mr. WATKINS):

S. 1213. A bill to promote the development and use of improved methods for the humane handling, transporting, and slaughtering of livestock and poultry in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1214. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1215. A bill to permit unmarried annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to elect survivorship annuities upon subsequent marriage; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BEALL (for himself and Mr. BUTLER):

S. 1216. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps commemorating the 300th anniversary of the founding of Charles County, Md.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 1217. A bill to reduce the maximum workweek under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to 35 hours, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1218. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special stamp in commemoration of the opening of the Mackinac Bridge; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1219. A bill to authorize a system of acreage-poundage allotments for tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1220. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 1221. A bill to make the evaluation of recreational benefits and wildlife development resulting from the construction of any flood control, navigation, or reclamation project an integral part of project planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 1222. A bill to provide that any child of a quota immigrant, if such immigrant is entitled to a fourth preference quota, shall also be entitled to a fourth preference quota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1223. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at Fort Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1224. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. SYMINGTON):

S. 1225. A bill to authorize the award posthumously of Congressional Medals of Honor to Chaplain George L. Fox, Chaplain Alexander D. Goode, Chaplain Clark V. Poling, and Chaplain John P. Washington; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1226. A bill to prohibit the introduction of cigarettes into interstate commerce unless each package containing such cigarettes is labeled to indicate every substance or material contained in such cigarettes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BYRD (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON):

S. 1227. A bill for the relief of Stavros Georgas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. McNAMARA, and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 1228. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish as one of the National Institutes of Health a National Radiation Health Institute, and for other purposes; 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. STENNIS:

S. 1229. A bill to provide a loan program to promote the development of forestry on small tracts of forest lands and lands suitable for forest production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1230. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide urban planning fellowships; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. BEALL):

S. 1231. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept the frigate *Constellation* and to provide for her rehabilitation, berthing, and restoration within the area of Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1232. A bill for the relief of Spiros Kaloniktis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 1233. A bill to encourage aviation education and training for cadet members of the Civil Air Patrol; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. J. Res. 54. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on a Just and Lasting Peace; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. PURTELL):

S. J. Res. 55. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating February 16 of each year as Lithuanian Independence Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. J. Res. 56. Joint resolution to authorize the continued use of the horse-drawn caisson in military funerals at Arlington National Cemetery; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of South Dakota when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. J. Res. 57. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating the first Sunday of February of each year as Chaplains' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BEALL when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS):

S. J. Res. 58. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to appropriations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BYRD when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

STUDY OF RATIFICATION OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL MARITIME CONSULTATIVE ORGANIZATION

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 95), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the United Nations organization has been concerned with adverse developments affecting the proposed organization of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization following withdrawal of the Government of Greece, and other maritime nations have previously recorded they could not participate in the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization as presently constituted;

Whereas 9 years have passed since the drafting of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization Convention and it has been accepted by only 4 of the 15 countries having the largest merchant shipping tonnage, including the Government of the United States;

Resolved, That a study would appear desirable to ascertain whether the present ratification status of Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization could be detrimental to the best interests of the United States; said study to be made by the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study of the ratification of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization.

AMENDMENT OF LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, RELATING TO SETTLEMENT OF LABOR DISPUTES

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title II of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, with respect to the settlement of labor disputes resulting in national emergencies.

In this connection, and at this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of a statement I have prepared, which deals with this matter, and also the text of the bill itself.

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

The bill (S. 1188) to amend title II of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, with respect to the settlement of labor disputes resulting in national emergencies, introduced by Mr. IVES, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1188

A bill to amend title II of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, with respect to the settlement of labor disputes resulting in national emergencies

Be it enacted, etc., That title II of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is amended by striking out sections 206 to 210, inclusive, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"NATIONAL EMERGENCIES

"SEC. 206. Whenever the President finds that a national emergency is threatened or exists because a strike or lockout has resulted or threatens to result from a labor

dispute (including the expiration of a collective-bargaining agreement) in a vital industry which affects the public interest, he shall issue a proclamation to that effect.

"SEC. 207. (a) After issuing such a proclamation, the President shall promptly appoint a board to be known as an 'emergency board.'

"(b) An emergency board appointed under this section shall promptly investigate the dispute, shall seek to induce the parties to reach a settlement of the dispute, and in any event shall, within a period of time to be determined by the President, but not more than 60 days after the appointment of the board, make a report to the President, unless the time is extended by agreement of the parties, with the approval of the board. Such report shall include the findings and recommendations of the board and shall be transmitted to the parties and be made public. The Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service shall provide for the board such stenographic, clerical, and other assistance and such facilities and services as may be necessary for the discharge of its functions.

"(c) After the President has issued a proclamation pursuant to section 206 and until the emergency board appointed under this section has made its report to the President, the parties to the dispute shall refrain from engaging in a strike or lockout.

"(d) An emergency board shall be composed of a chairman and such other members as the President shall determine, and shall have power to sit and act in any place within the United States and to conduct such hearings either in public or in private, as it may deem necessary or proper, to ascertain the facts with respect to the causes and circumstances of the dispute.

"(e) Members of an emergency board shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 for each day actually spent by them in the work of the board, together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses.

"(f) For the purpose of any hearing or inquiry conducted by any board appointed under this title, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, secs. 49 and 50, as amended), are hereby made applicable to the powers and duties of such board.

"(g) Each emergency board shall continue in existence after making its report for such time as the national emergency continues for the purpose of mediating the dispute, should the parties request its services. When a board appointed under this section has been dissolved, its records shall be transferred to the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

"(h) A separate emergency board shall be appointed for each dispute. No member of an emergency board shall be pecuniarily or otherwise interested in any organization of employees or in any employer involved in the dispute.

"SEC. 208. In any case in which a strike or lockout occurs (1) after the emergency board has made its report to the President pursuant to section 207 (b), or (2) in violation of section 207 (c) before the emergency board has made its report, the President shall submit immediately to the Congress for consideration and appropriate action a full statement of the case, including the report of the emergency board, if such report has been made, and such recommendations as he may see fit to make. If the Congress or either House thereof shall have adjourned sine die or for a period longer than 3 days, the President shall convene the Congress, or such House, for the purpose of consideration of an appropriate action pursuant to such statement and recommendations.

"SEC. 209. When a dispute under this title has been finally settled, the President shall submit to the Congress a full and comprehensive report of all the proceedings, together with such recommendations as he may see fit to make."

The statement presented by Mr. IVES is as follows:

Once again the national emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act have proved inadequate to deal with a serious labor dispute which has tied up shipping along the Atlantic coast of the United States. The 80-day cooling-off period provided by the present law has expired, and there is no Federal law in existence further to cope with this serious situation.

It seems to me that the primary purpose in any statutory provision aimed to meet the problems inherent in labor-management disputes, which imperil the national health and safety, is twofold. Of first importance is the settlement of the dispute and the reaching of an agreement which is satisfactory to all the parties to the dispute. Of next and almost equal importance is the prevention of a work stoppage attributable to such dispute—or at least the limiting of any work stoppage to such a point that it will not prove damaging to the national health and safety.

As is generally known, the Taft-Hartley provisions, which deal with this type of emergency, provide for a cooling-off period and a fact-finding board, as well as other procedures calculated to bring about settlement of the controversy. However, if the dispute is not settled during the injunction period, the parties are again free to engage in strikes or lockouts. The provisions of the amendment I am introducing today would replace the present provisions of the act covering national emergencies.

Under these provisions, the President would be authorized to find that a national emergency is threatened or exists when a strike or lockout has occurred or threatens to occur in a vital industry which effects the public interest. After issuing such a proclamation, he would appoint an emergency board which would be required to make a report to him within 60 days, including the findings and recommendations of the board, which also would be transmitted to the parties to the dispute and made public. During this 60-day period the parties would be required to refrain from engaging in strikes or lockouts. In the event that a dispute is not resolved before the emergency board has filed its report with the President or if any of the parties have engaged in strikes or lockouts prior to the time that the emergency board files its report with the President, he would be required immediately to submit a full statement of the case to the Congress, including his recommendations as well as the report of the emergency board. If the Congress should not happen to be in session, he would be required to convene it immediately for this purpose.

I believe that this proposal offers a means by which national emergency disputes, such as the present dock strike, can be prevented from endangering the general welfare of the people and the national defense of this country without granting to the Chief Executive a dangerous amount of authority and without burdening the Congress with an excessive obligation.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD following my prepared remarks and the text of the bill, the text of an editorial which appears in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald.

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

AFTER TAFT-HARTLEY WHAT?

It is significant that the longshoremen's strike, which has tied up east coast shipping from Portland to Hampton Roads, began 80 days to the minute after a Taft-Hartley Act injunction had been served on the union. The dock workers obeyed the letter of the law and no more. The theory of the act is that, if a strike is postponed or interrupted for 80 days, tempers will cool and agreement is likely to be reached. Instead, tempers have flared anew; union spokesmen assert they have been insulted; and the vote of union members on the employers' last offer, as required by the act, produced a 14-to-1 rejection.

The President invoked Taft-Hartley after the strike had been in progress only 9 days in November. If the renewed immobilization of shipping should produce another national emergency, presumably the President could seek another 80-day injunction. But that might bring open defiance or still more bitterness in the employee-union bargaining sessions. In short, the emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act have proved utterly inadequate to the handling of this national emergency in shipping.

It is not clear whether the presence in New York of Harry Bridges, czar of west coast longshoremen, who is seeking a common expiration date of dock workers' contracts, had anything to do with the waning hopes for a prompt settlement. Wholly apart from Mr. Bridges' influence, the effect of a strike is usually to harden the demands of both parties. So it would be unrealistic to suppose that continued mediation is all that will be needed. If the paralysis of shipping imperils the national security, Congress may be compelled to intervene. In any event, it should consider overhauling the ineffective emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act so that the national interest may be protected.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT, RELATING TO FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN ACQUISITION OF RUNWAY CLEAR ZONES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the question of air safety has loomed large in recent weeks. We have all been shocked by some of the tragedies which have occurred.

A problem that has been increasingly brought to the fore is that of providing runway clear zones beyond the normal boundaries of our airports. I am introducing a bill today to help with that problem.

This measure would increase from 50 percent to 75 percent the amount of Federal participation in programs to acquire land beyond the normal airport boundaries, where the acquisition is made under orders from the Civil Aeronautics Board. The bill is designed to apply to the costs of acquiring land.

There is precedent for this action in the program for high intensity airport lighting. I ask that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee for early action.

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

The bill (S. 1189) to amend section 10 of the Federal Airport Act of 1946 to provide for increased Federal participation in the acquisition of runway clear

zones, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DEVELOPMENT OF FACILITIES TO TRANSPORT WATER FOR DOMESTIC, MUNICIPAL, INDUSTRIAL, AND OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there are many tragic aspects of the drought situation which is sweeping the great Southwest. But one factor which is frequently overlooked outside that section is the great impact it is having on our cities.

In water-rich sections of the country, we think of drought in terms of farms and ranches. We read stories about land baking under the sun; about cattle dropping from thirst; about landowners forced to leave land which was settled by their grandfathers.

Those stories are all based on fact. They merely neglect to add that in our great cities people are now drinking water that is barely palatable; that they are forced to restrict their use of water; that industry is feeling the pinch of short supplies.

Furthermore, the city shortage is not merely a reflection of drought conditions. It is a direct result of the fabulous growth of our population in the past few decades—a growth that has turned what were once adequate supplies into shortages.

This is a problem that is nationwide. I am introducing a bill today designed to help our cities in this situation. It is similar to a measure which has been introduced in the House by Representative WRIGHT, of Texas.

This measure would authorize the Federal Government to cooperate with State and local authorities in developing water sources for our cities. It would recognize, however, that the primary responsibility would remain on the local level.

The bill would authorize the Government to buy tax or revenue bonds from local authorities issued to finance the construction of transportation facilities for water. No more than $250 million worth of bonds could be purchased in 1 year and no more than $5 million from any one local unit.

The measure provides safeguards to protect against ill-advised ventures. It would apply only to financing which the local unit cannot otherwise obtain.

Mr. President, action now on our part can stave off a developing crisis in our cities. I hope this measure can receive early and favorable consideration.

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

The bill (S. 1190) to authorize purchase of certain bonds issued by States and local units of Government to finance the development by such States and local units of Government of facilities to transport water for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

IMPROVEMENT OF PENTAGON ROAD NETWORK

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to improve the Pentagon road network. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Secretary of Commerce, requesting this proposed legislation, may be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1200) to authorize funds for the improvement by the Secretary of Commerce of the Pentagon road network and that portion of the Henry G. Shirley Memorial Highway in Arlington County, Va., and to provide for the transfer of such highways to the Commonwealth of Virginia, introduced by Mr. CHAVEZ, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The letter presented by Mr. CHAVEZ is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, February 6, 1957.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Submitted herewith is a draft of proposed bill "to authorize funds for the improvement by the Secretary of Commerce of the Pentagon road network and that portion of the Henry G. Shirley Memorial Highway in Arlington County, Va., and to provide for the transfer of such highways to the Commonwealth of Virginia."

During World War II the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Commerce constructed a network of highways in Arlington County, Va., known as the Pentagon Road Network and that portion of the Henry G. Shirley Memorial Highway in Arlington County, Va., with funds made available by the Defense Highway Act of 1941. These highways were constructed upon lands under the jurisdiction of various departments and agencies of the United States Government and lands owned by the Commonwealth of Virginia and Arlington County, Va.

This system of highways has served admirably. Designed for a Pentagon Building occupancy of 35,000 people and a rational increase in traffic, commensurate with the need to conserve materials, manpower, and funds at the time of a national war effort, it has met increasing demands of traffic which after the war were explosive in character. As elsewhere in the United States, the increase in motor-vehicle traffic has exceeded all reasonable expectations; indeed, the increase in the Arlington County area and the traffic across the Potomac River bridges has increased at a more rapid rate than elsewhere as shown by the figures that follow:

Bridge	1940	1954	Percentage increase
Highway Bridge	38,512	101,733	164
Memorial Bridge	32,288	53,910	67
Key Bridge	30,189	46,846	55
Chain Bridge	4,638	14,136	205
Total	105,627	216,625	105

Since their construction these roads have been maintained by the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Commerce at an annual expense of approximately $77,000, with funds provided each year from Defense access funds. It is a continuous drain on the Federal Treasury. Traffic upon these highways has increased to such an extent since their construction that repairs, restorations, changes, and additions are necessary to accommodate present and anticipated traffic with safety and convenience. It is desired at this time to make the necessary additions to meet present and future traffic needs and to place the roads in such shape that the Virginia Department of Highways will be willing to accept title to the lands and the highways and maintain them in the future as part of the State highway system. The Commonwealth of Virginia has expressed a willingness to accept title to said highways and maintain the same after the necessary repairs, restorations, changes, and additions have been made thereto. This willingness is expressed in a resolution of the Virginia Department of Highways passed on March 24, 1955, attached hereto.

It is estimated that the cost of making the necessary repairs, restorations, changes, and additions to the Pentagon road network and that portion of the Henry G. Shirley Memorial Highway located in Arlington County, Va., is $4,950,000. It is estimated that an additional amount not to exceed $200,000 will be needed immediately for survey of the right-of-way of said highways and preparation of plans and specifications for work contemplated by the proposed draft.

The draft of proposed bill, attached, is intended to provide the necessary authorization for appropriations to accomplish the program of repairing, restoring, and making necessary changes and additions to these highways. It is further intended to provide the necessary authorization to expend immediately not to exceed $200,000 from unexpended balances of the appropriation access roads (act of September 7, 1950) for a survey of the right-of-way of said highways and preparation of plans and specifications for work contemplated by the proposed bill.

Information relating to estimated additional man-years of civilian employment, and expenditures for personal and other services, required in connection with the proposed legislation under the act approved July 25, 1956 (70 Stat. 652), is contained in a statement attached hereto.

The Department of Commerce recommends this proposed legislation for the favorable consideration of the Congress.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that it would interpose no objection to the submission of the draft legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce.

Whereas on December 9, 1954, the Bureau of Public Roads submitted to the State highway department a proposal for the State highway department to take over and maintain certain roads, including the controlled access features thereof, which were built as defense access projects by the Bureau of Public Roads in Arlington County, provided that the Bureau do certain resurfacing, widening, and other improvements; and

Whereas on February 9, 1955, the Bureau of Public Roads by letter to the department of highways set forth the roads requested to be taken over and maintained, and the details of the resurfacing, widening, and other improvements agreed to be accomplished on same prior to such taking over and maintenance by the State highway department; and

Whereas on March 8, 1955, the Bureau of Public Roads by letter to the department assured the department that the necessary right of way would be obtained for the grade separation at the intersection of Washington Boulevard and entrance to Fort Myer, Va., in order to permit unconditional compliance with the Bureau of Public Roads' agreement to provide grade separation structure at the aforesaid intersection; and

Whereas on March 17, 1955, the department of highways, by letter to the Bureau of Public Roads, notified said Bureau that the department in light of the assurance in the Bureau's letter of March 8, 1955, that it would obtain the necessary right of way for the grade separation at the intersection of Washington Boulevard and entrance to Fort Myer, Va., considered itself and the Bureau to be in accord and agreement on the items of work to be performed and the roadways requested to be taken over and maintained: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That those roads set forth in the Bureau of Public Roads' letter of February 9, 1955, described as the Pentagon network of roads and the Shirley Highway in Arlington County, including the controlled access features thereof, be taken over and maintained by the department of highways provided and conditioned upon the Bureau of Public Roads' completion of the items of work including resurfacing, widening, and other improvements to the above-described network of roads as set forth in the Bureau's letters of February 9, 1955, and March 8, 1955, and its conveyance to the Commonwealth of the title to the right-of-way of such roads by a metes and bounds description of said right of way, including in such metes and bounds description of the property to be transferred to the Commonwealth of Virginia, the building now occupied by the maintenance forces of the Bureau, together with the adjacent equipment area.

MARCH 24, 1955.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN LEGISLATION, RELATING TO THE PURCHASE OF SILVER

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators BUSH, DOUGLAS, KENNEDY, PASTORE, PURTELL, and SALTONSTALL, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prohibit the mandatory purchases of silver by the Treasury. Under the silver-purchase laws which this bill would repeal, the Treasury must purchase all domestic silver offered to it regardless of the need for such silver. Under these laws the Treasury has accumulated nearly 2 billion ounces of silver.

The bill, if enacted, will bring to an end certain unsound monetary practices. The silver-purchase laws require the Treasury to print and issue paper money to pay for the silver purchased regardless of the need for such paper money. Only a portion of the silver purchased is set aside as backing for these paper dollars, and this silver is arbitrarily valued at $1.29 per ounce. The only real value of such silver is the market value, which is currently around 91½ cents an ounce.

This bill will end the subsidy and support price which is paid to the producers of copper, lead, and zinc regardless of need.

This bill will permit a free and open market for silver instead of the present mandatory purchases of domestic silver by the Treasury which permit control of the silver market by foreign interests.

Hearings were held on a similar bill during the 84th Congress. A complete case was made in favor of the bill. The opposition utterly failed to present a case for the retention of the silver-purchase laws. Not a single producer of silver appeared before the Federal Reserve Subcommittee holding hearings on the bill. In fact, the only witness to appear was the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The opposition in the last Congress relied on delaying tactics to prevent passage of the bill. So I ask the chairman of the committee handling this bill to give the opposition adequate notice of hearings and thereafter to proceed as expeditiously as possible.

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

The bill (S. 1201) to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GREEN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, RELATING TO VENDOR MEDICAL PAYMENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators MCNAMARA, GREEN, BUSH, HUMPHREY, YOUNG, IVES, KENNEDY, DIRKSEN, NEUBERGER, MORSE, COTTON, JAVITS, BRIDGES, JACKSON, MAGNUSON, SALTONSTALL, LANGER and POTTER, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act. These sections refer to the matching of assistance expenditures for medical care, intended "to promote the health of the Nation by assisting States to extend and broaden their provisions for meeting the cost of medical care for persons eligible for public assistance by providing for separate matching of assistance expenditures for medical care."

As I understand the foregoing statement of purpose, the medical care provisions of the act were intended to encourage the States to broaden their medical care programs. This is an objective which has my strongest support. However, the act as amended in the last session had the effect of forcing some States to either curtail their existing medical care programs or to change drastically the methods of operating their assistance programs. I believe that this was not intended for it was not known at the time the Finance Committee adopted the provision that this would be the effect.

I introduced an amendment providing for the same provisions, in a slightly different form, to the social security bill last session, and it passed the Senate, but was lost in conference.

Under a provision of the act adopted in 1950, a State may use matching funds for vendor medical payments—that is, payments to the hospital, doctor, dentist, or nursing home which renders the service, rather than to the individuals who receive the care—within the present $60 limit the Federal Government provides a matching of the funds. Since this provision was adopted, a number of States have established medical payments programs for public assistance recipients which are quite extensive, and in which the payments average more than $6 per month for each person. Presently, to the best of our knowledge, the following States and Territories make medical payments averaging more than $6 per recipient in one or more of the categories for public assistance: Connecticut, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, Washington, and Wisconsin.

Last year's bill separated medical payments from cash payment and limited Federal matching for medical payments to one-half of $6 a month for each adult and one-half of $3 a month for each child. This means that the States and Territories listed above have only one of two alternatives open to them under the act as amended. They can either, first, continue their systems as they now operate them and lose Federal funds on one or more of their medical payments programs, or second, they can limit their medical payments to $6 and increase their case payments, and thus receive the maximum Federal contribution, but at the cost of impairing their existing medical program. Neither alternative is desirable.

After many consultations with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Senate Legislative Counsel, and the staff of the Finance Committee, the amendment to the Social Security Act provided for in the bill I am introducing has been worked out. It would permit any State to receive Federal matching funds for medical payments up to the $6 limit, and would further permit the States to continue using matching funds for cash payments to operate their medical care programs if they chose to do so. In other words, it would combine the old provisions of the law and the new medical care provisions of last year's amendments to the law.

The amendment I am introducing permits a State to receive in Federal matching funds what it could get under the present act if it chose the second alternative, that is, holding its medical payments to $6 and increasing its cash payments so as to maximize the Federal contribution. However, there is some added cost because my amendment allows an averaging of the matchable funds. Another way of putting it is that the amendment permits the States to operate medical payments plans as under the law before it was amended last spring with additional Federal matching of the one-half of $6 a month for each adult recipient.

I believe that it was the intention of the Congress to encourage all States to develop as good a medical care program for the recipients of public assistance as they can. This amendment makes it simpler to achieve that objective.

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

The bill (S. 1209) to amend titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act so as to further assist the States in extending aid for medical care to persons eligible for public assistance under such titles, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

DEFINITION OF APPLICATION OF CLAYTON AND FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACTS TO CERTAIN PRICING PRACTICES

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to define the application of the Clayton and Federal Trade Commission Acts to certain pricing practices. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, may be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1211) to define the application of the Clayton and Federal Trade Commission Acts to certain pricing practices, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Clayton Act (38 Stat. 730; 15 U. S. C. 13), as amended, is further amended by deleting the period at the end of section 2 (b) thereof and adding the following: ": *And provided further*, That in any proceeding involving an alleged violation of this section, it shall be a complete defense to a charge of discrimination in price, or in services or facilities furnished, if the seller shows that his lower price, or his furnishing of greater services or facilities, was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of, or services or facilities of comparable value furnished or offered by, a competitor: *And provided further*, That it shall not be a violation of this act for a seller acting independently, to sell at delivered prices, or to absorb freight to meet in good faith an equally low price of a competitor. Any price or pricing practice permitted by this or the preceding proviso shall not be prohibited under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (38 Stat. 719, as amended, 15 U. S. C. 45): *Provided, however*, That a seller shall not be deemed to have acted in good faith within the meaning of that term as used in this section if he knew or should have known that the competitor's offer or price was unlawful and nothing in this section shall make lawful any contract, combination, or conspiracy in restraint of trade or any act to monopolize, or conspiracy or attempt to monopolize, trade or commerce among the several States."

The letter presented by Mr. CAPEHART is as follows:

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., May 25, 1954.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: In accordance with a request by the President, the Bureau of the Budget has worked with your representative and representatives of the interested Federal agencies in preparing certain suggestions for changes in S. 1377, "to define the application of the Clayton and Federal Trade Commission Acts to certain pricing practices." There is attached a draft bill based on S. 1377, but incorporating the changes agreed upon by you, us, and the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, the Assistant Attorney General in Charge of Antitrust Division, and the representatives of the Secretary of Commerce and the Council of Economic Advisers. An explanation for these changes also is attached.

I am authorized to inform you that enactment of the draft bill would be in accordance with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

ROWLAND HUGHES,
Director.

THREE-HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF CHARLES COUNTY, MD.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on April 13, 1958, Charles County, Md., will celebrate the 300th anniversary of its charter as a county within the colony of Maryland. Charles County citizens are presently making elaborate plans for a celebration to commemorate the county's tercentenary year.

Mr. President, Charles County, Md., has offered much to the history of this nation. Among other eminent persons, it has produced the first President of the United States in Congress Assembled, John Hanson. It was within the confines of Charles County that most of the drama of the flight of John Wilkes Booth occurred. In addition, the public records of Charles County, beginning in 1658, are reputed to be the oldest continuous public records in this country.

When one visits Charles County, he is immediately impressed with the determination of its residents to retain all that has survived over the years which is representative of the history of that area.

Mr. President, today, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to direct the issuance of a postage stamp commemorative of the tercentenary celebration of the founding of Charles County, and I ask that it be appropriately referred.

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

The bill (S. 1216) to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps commemorating the 300th anniversary of the founding of Charles County, Md., introduced by Mr. BEALL (for himself and Mr. BUTLER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ACREAGE-POUNDAGE ALLOTMENTS FOR TOBACCO

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize a system of acreage-poundage allotments for tobacco. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by me before the Farm Credit Conference of the North Carolina Bankers Association on February 11, 1957, relating to the same subject.

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

The bill (S. 1219) to authorize a system of acreage-poundage allotments for tobacco, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The speech presented by Mr. SCOTT is as follows:

SPEECH BY HON. W. KERR SCOTT, OF NORTH CAROLINA, FARM CREDIT CONFERENCE OF THE NORTH CAROLINA BANKERS ASSOCIATION, FEBRUARY 11, 1957

The Farm Credit Conference of the North Carolina Bankers Association is an unusual institution. It has become an annual event that reflects the basic foundation upon which our State's economy rests—that is, the close relationship and interdependence of agriculture and business.

The entire population is indebted to the bankers for the foresight and leadership you have shown in sponsoring this event. It has become a sort of farm and business fair—an exposition—a place where farmers and businessmen get together to discuss mutual problems and share ideas.

Because of the outstanding work the association has done in agriculture with such things as this conference, your short course in modern farming and your judging contest, the North Carolina association is widely recognized as a leader in farmer-banker relationships throughout the Nation.

The fact that the NCBA has won 12 consecutive American Bankers Association agricultural awards is proof of this, and it is a real accomplishment of which all of you should be very proud.

There is another thing about the association that I feel is unique and a credit to you and our State. By and large, you are an association of small bankers, a group of independent businessmen who meet and share common problems.

For this reason you are close to the problems of the State. You work and do business at the grassroots level. You are the thermometer of our economic life.

Because of the nature of your business, I don't have to tell you that money is not as plentiful as it was a year ago—or 2 years ago. All around us, the economic belt is tightening.

Here in North Carolina it is more serious than just moving the belt over a notch or two, because we have certain problems of a special sort that have arisen out of changing conditions.

The general "tight money" situation has been added to some other very serious economic problems we are faced with because of the sharp reduction in farm income in recent years.

As a result of these two powerful forces influencing our overall economy, the bankers are put into a position of extraordinary responsibility.

I am certain that you know the importance of having sufficient funds available to keep the economy fluid, and I am sure you are going to do all you can to have on hand the needed reserves and resources to finance all legitimate farm and business operations at all times.

This is especially important for two reasons.

First, the slump we are now experiencing in the farm economy, is, I am confident, a temporary situation.

Second, we are, and will be for many years to come, basically a State of small farms and small businesses and small industries. In the final analysis, the economic health of our entire State is largely dependent on the condition of our farm economy because a great deal of our business and industrial activity involves the manufacture, processing, and distribution of our native farm products.

As the push-button age of science and machines turns more and more of our attention to industrial development, we cannot afford to make the fatal mistake of taking our farm economy for granted.

Just as a factory must keep up with the pace of automation, so must the farmer keep pace with the changing times in agriculture.

With these thoughts in mind, I would like to talk for a few minutes tonight about an extremely serious problem that is confronting our farmers this very minute.

I am speaking specifically of the tobacco problem. Cotton, grains, poultry, and other commodities also have serious problems, but because I sincerely feel tobacco is facing a problem of emergency nature, I would like to confine my remarks to this one crop.

Since the beginning of the Federal Government's acreage-control and price-support programs, tobacco has enjoyed a unique position.

Unlike most of the other price-support programs, the tobacco program is operated and controlled by the farmers themselves. More so than in any other commodity, the tobacco program has been the farmers' program. We certainly want to keep it that way.

So far, the tobacco program has been the most successful of all the commodity price-support programs because it has always operated without loss to the Government.

In all, its history shows that the tobacco program has been a very successful program in every respect because it has been a sound program. And now, and in the future, we must see to it that it remains sound.

To be sound, the tobacco program must first of all meet the needs of the law of supply and demand.

During the past several years there have been some drastic changes in consumption patterns which in turn have greatly changed the needs of manufacture.

At the same time, our need and desire to increase yields per acre have gotten us into a maddening race. It is a natural result of our efforts to increase yields to make up for reduced acreages, but it is a serious problem.

We have a two-pronged problem. We must not only produce the quantity of tobacco that is needed, but we must also produce the quality of tobacco the market demands.

Increases in yield are fine tributes to the know-how of our farmers, but we must remember that increased yields are of no value at all unless they are accompanied by the production of the types of tobacco that are in demand.

In the past few years, we have sacrificed a great deal of quality in the tobacco we have produced in our efforts to increase the yield.

The time has come when it is suicide not to control quality as well as quantity.

During the past few years we have greatly reduced our tobacco acreage in an effort to bring production in line with demand.

However, we have been losing ground steadily because of the introduction of new higher yielding varieties.

At the same time we have been producing great quantities of tobacco that are simply not wanted in the markets.

So, under the system of acreage controls we now have, we are producing neither the proper types nor amounts of tobacco that are necessary.

This means that if we expect to save the tobacco program as a farmers' program, that we have got to overhaul it to meet the needs of the day. We have got to find a more realistic approach.

I have given this problem a great deal of thought and study, and I think the best answer is a system of acreage and poundage controls. Today we are allotting tobacco in acres, but we always have and always will sell it at the market time by the pound. Until we find a system that will control production in terms of pounds, then we are missing the core of the problem.

A combination system of acreage-poundage controls such as I have in mind would work this way:

Each farmer would be assigned a base acreage allotment and a poundage quota.

To make the program fair, I think it would be wise, in computing the poundage allotments, to use a formula similar to that used in the soil-bank program to determine the average yield per acre. That is, each farmer's poundage allotment would be the highest average per acre yield of 3 of 5 preceding years, with certain limitations.

I think it would be a good idea not to let any individual farmer's per acre poundage quota go higher than 25 percent more than the county's average yield.

And in order to take care of farmers hit by disasters or crop failures, each farmer should be given an average of at least 80 percent of the county average regardless of his production history.

For the purpose of discussion let's say a farmer has base acreage allotment of 4 acres.

Let's say his average yield is 1,500 pounds per acre.

From these 4 acres the farmer would be allowed to market 6,000 pounds of tobacco, which would be his poundage quota.

If the farmer has a bad year and produces only 5,000 pounds, then he would be allowed to produce an additional 1,000 pounds above his allotment the next year. His acreage allotment would be increased by the same proportions as his poundage allotment.

The program would work the same in reverse for those farmers who overproduce in a given year.

If a farmer produces 1,000 pounds more than his poundage allotment, his poundage allotment is reduced by that amount the following year and his acreage allotment reduced in proportion.

To be fair, so long as any farmer stays within his acreage allotment, he should not be required to pay a penalty on his overproduction. However, in fairness to other farmers, he would have to take reductions in both acreage and poundage the next year.

I mention the penalty situation because it is very important to the success of such a program. First of all, if cash penalties were imposed on overproduction, it would encourage farmers to destroy the lower grades of tobacco and sell only the top grades of a crop. This could create serious problems because we need balanced supplies of various grades in the supply pipelines at all times.

It is also important for another reason. By not imposing penalties on overproduction and letting the farmers who do overproduce take poundage and acreage reductions the next year, there would be little chance of marketing cards being bought, sold, and bartered. By tying acreage and poundage allotments directly to the individual farmer's actual production each year a very important enforcement problem would be solved.

There are many other things about such a plan that appeal to me.

First of all, it would be a far more effective way of controlling actual production than under the present system.

It would be a way to avoid many of the problems that are inherent in a plan whereby you allot acres and harvest pounds. If we are going to keep supply in line with demand, then we must adopt an effective system of controlling poundage as well as acreage. That is the nerve center of this whole thing.

Under such a plan, there would be a lot more justice than we now have. Under an acreage-poundage system, everybody would be fed out of the same spoon, so to speak.

The farmers who overproduced would be the ones who would take the acreage reductions.

Under the present system, the farmers who produce anything under the average yield have to pay a double penalty when acreage is reduced, because they have to plant fewer acres to make up for the farmers who overproduce.

Some people may say this is putting a premium on inefficiency, but that is not true.

Increased per acre yield has a point of diminishing returns, and we have very definitely reached that point.

We can increase our per acre yield to almost any level we want, but if we are not producing the kind of tobacco that is in demand, then we are not efficient. And I think all will agree that that is what we have done in recent years.

Another thing that appeals to me about an acreage-poundage program is the fact that it carries with it a built-in system of crop insurance.

I should think that bankers, landlords, merchants, and creditors of all types would have a deep interest in such a program for this reason.

Under such a plan, if weather, disease, or anything else brings about a crop failure, all is not lost. Each and every farmer would have an opportunity to increase his acreage and poundage the next year and recover his losses.

To me, this feature of the program would certainly make it a lot easier for farmers and everybody who does business with them to make long-range plans with far more safety.

I do not want to create the impression that I feel such a plan would solve all the problems of tobacco. There are many others that are also very serious.

But I do feel that such a plan would enable us to come to grips with, and solve, many of our supply and demand problems and many of the problems of quality control.

I mention this to you because unless some far-reaching steps are taken in the very near future, the entire tobacco price-support program will be in very grave danger.

I will appreciate getting any ideas you have on this matter. If you feel the program I have mentioned is not the proper approach, I would certainly like to have your suggestions about solving the problems we have in this very important segment of our farm economy.

I say this because if we try to ride this thing out, if we take the attitude that time will take care of it, then we are in for a great shock and disappointment.

It has been a real pleasure being with you. I would like to add one thing—if you're ever up in Washington on business—or just on a vacation—drop by to see me. It's always good to see folks from home.

AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me relating to the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1220) to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER (Democrat, Tennessee), today introduced an amendment to the Natural Gas Act exempting from regulation unaffiliated producers whose total annual production is deemed too small to have appreciable effect on gas prices.

Senator KEFAUVER said that he was introducing the bill because of inquiries he had made regarding the Federal Power Commis-

sion as a result of its action recently in permitting a 108-percent increase in prices charged by Union Oil & Gas Co., of Louisiana, without first investigating and scheduling a public hearing. This company delivers natural gas to Texas Gas Transmission Co., which in turn serves large portions of west Tennessee and other areas.

"The proposal that I am making could be adopted administratively," Senator KEFAUVER said. "However, the Federal Power Commission has not done so, and as a result develops a bureaucratic tangle which I suspect is used as a cloak for not hearing and investigating the really significant price increases. In other words, a bogged down docket offers an excuse for failing to hear such increases as that permitting the 108-percent increase by Union Oil & Gas, the result of which will be a substantial increase in the retail prices in a large market."

The bill introduced by Senator KEFAUVER covers the sale of natural gas in interstate commerce "at or prior to the conclusion of production or gathering by a person whose total sales of natural gas in interstate commerce individually or in the aggregate with affiliated producers do not exceed during the calendar year 2 billion cubic feet computed at 14.65 pounds per square inch absolute at 60° F. provided such person is neither a natural-gas company by reason of other activities nor affiliated with a natural-gas company."

Senator KEFAUVER said that this would leave about 200 producers subject to the regulation out of almost 5,000 who now have schedules filed with the FPC. The Commission could thereby do a better job of regulation with the same staff, he said.

Senator KEFAUVER said that he is considering mandatory legislation requiring FPC to grant public hearings in all those cases in which there are protests, but he doesn't think that would be possible unless it were preceded by legislation exempting such small producers.

"The basic trouble," he said, "is a lack of zeal in the public interest by the present Commission."

PROPOSED AWARD OF MEDALS OF HONOR TO "DORCHESTER" CHAPLAINS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill cosponsored by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] to authorize the President to award posthumously, in the name of Congress, Medals of Honor to Chaplain George L. Fox, of Cambridge, Vt.; Chaplain Alexander D. Goode, of Washington, D. C.; Chaplain Clark V. Poling, of Schenectady, N. Y., and son of the distinguished Dr. Daniel A. Poling, of my State of New Hampshire; and Chaplain John P. Washington, of Arlington, N. J. These men sacrificed their lives in the sinking of the troop transport, *Dorchester*, in the North Atlantic in 1943.

The United States troop ship *Dorchester* was plowing her way through Arctic seas during the early morning of February 3, 1943, when an enemy torpedo burst in the ship's engine room. Wounded men, shocked by the explosion, fought their way upward through the holds of the disintegrating ship. Oil, which had been sprayed throughout the ship by the blast, made the ladders and catwalks perilous. In their desperate scramble from below, many of the troops left behind their life jackets. There were many men on deck who were waiting to plunge into the water without their life jackets. This would have been apparent suicide, the water being so cold that a man could not hope to survive more than a few minutes. When there were no more life jackets available, the four chaplains removed their own life jackets and gave them to the soldiers who had none. The chaplains knew that, by their actions, they were giving up any chance they might have for survival. They were the last men left on the deck. Their gallant deed will long be remembered as one of the outstanding examples of heroism during the Second World War. The contemplation of this conduct brings to mind the words of Saint John, the Apostle, who said:

> Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends (John 15: 13).

I believe that prompt consideration and passage of the bill would be appreciated.

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

The bill (S. 1225) to authorize the award posthumously of Congressional Medals of Honor to Chaplain George L. Fox, Chaplain Alexander D. Goode, Chaplain Clark V. Poling, and Chaplain John P. Washington, introduced by Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. SYMINGTON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

NATIONAL RADIATION HEALTH INSTITUTE TO PROTECT MANKIND FROM ATOMIC FALLOUT

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 3 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the past few years there has been growing concern and grave discussion of the sinister impact of radiation from nuclear explosions on human health, and particularly on the health and growth of young children and of future generations. Yet, despite an annual budget of $2 billion on all sorts of activities, civilian and military, in the fields of nuclear developments, our Government has lagged in undertaking programs to protect people from the menace of radiation.

There is no doubt of the danger of radiation to mankind. Scientists may differ over the degree of the risk, but as to the existence of the peril doubt has vanished. Long ago, we knew of the tragic and agonizing death of workers who painted radium dials for timepieces—at a time when the physiological effects of radiation were not yet understood. Since man has cracked the atom, each nuclear explosion unlooses cosmic forces which spread mysterious but fatal radiation particles through the world.

The two greatest perils to health which have been identified and widely discussed as consequences of radiation are the danger of cancer and the danger of genetic damage and possible increases in future births of defective human children. Listen to this warning from Dr. William G. Cahan, attending surgeon at the Memorial Center for Cancer and allied diseases, in a letter to the New York Times which the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 9:

> There have been increasing numbers of leukemias developing in the Japanese who had been exposed to the atomic blast in Hiroshima. These have taken from 5 to 10 years to manifest themselves. In all probability, cancers attributable to this radiation will develop as time goes on.
>
> Although the gross contamination to which we have so far been exposed does not, presumably, approach these examples given, there is, in our present state of ignorance, a further ominous unknown.

Mr. President, can we tolerate a "state of ignorance" regarding a hazard so insidious and awful that eminent scientists fear it might induce bone cancer in little children?

Similarly, Mr. Warren Weaver, a vice president of the Rockefeller Foundation and the chairman of the group who wrote on genetics in last year's report on radiation of the National Academy of Sciences, recently testified on the serious genetic risk of radiation before the Disarmament Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations. He estimated that even the limited radioactivity from weapons tests to date will seriously handicap 6,000 live births throughout the world in the coming generation and perhaps 60,000 live births some 50 generations from now, and that a far greater number of future individuals will suffer minor physical handicaps as a result of these spreading genetic injuries. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that excerpts of Mr. Weaver's testimony, from a Washington Post article of January 17, 1957, appear in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 17, 1957]

FALLOUT HELD SURE TO HURT 6,000 BABIES—SCIENTIST TESTIFIES AT SENATE HEARING ON DISARMAMENT

(By Warren Unna)

Radioactive fallout from nuclear weapon testing to date will account for some 6,000 of the 30 million handicapped babies to be born in the coming generation, one of the Nation's top scientists declared yesterday.

Warren Weaver, vice president of the Rockefeller Foundation and chairman of the group of scientists who wrote the genetics section of last June's National Academy of Sciences radiation report, made this estimate in testimony before the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee.

* * * * *

Weaver made it clear that he thought the interests of national security required the continuance of nuclear tests. And he said the relative increased genetic danger from test radiation was small compared with both natural background radiation already existing on the globe and man-made radiation from X-rays.

But Weaver also warned: "There is no radioactive dose which is too small to count from the point of view of genetics". And he characterized as "very unfortunate" an official statement last year that the genetic effects from test radiation were "harmless."

After the hearing, Weaver identified the author of the remark as Atomic Energy Commission Chairman Lewis L. Strauss.

In actual experience, Weaver said the people involved in the 1945 A-bombing of Hiroshima were too few—genetically—to give science any data. But projected from animal and vegetable experiments, Weaver said radioactivity from weapons tests to date:

Will "seriously handicap" 6,000 live births in the coming generation and perhaps 60,000 live births some 50 generations from now.

Will cause "small physical handicaps" in far greater number, "which will accumulate to the point where either fertility or the length of life is reduced, or both."

Weaver said his National Academy of Sciences study, which is still continuing, hasn't gone into the effect of test radioactivity on miscarriages and still births—but he left the impression that it undoubtedly existed.

The Rockefeller Foundation executive agreed with Subcommittee Chairman HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, that it was "inevitable in terms of the history of the human race" that there would be an increase in the current rate of exploding test bombs.

He said there would be double the number of handicapped live births—12,000, if the test rate doubled. And he acknowledged that, with the human tolerance level for radioactivity dropping, and the existing amount of concentration going up, "the gap is narrowing."

Weaver agreed that recent test data would require revision of the National Academy radiation report. But he denied that the AEC had influenced the scientists in their deliberations. He termed "incorrect" and "unfortunate" a story in the Washington Post last October 29 which reported the AEC had succeeded in "softening" the academy's radiation report and that scientists had been asked to sign their names to the report before seeing the final draft.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In view of these hazards with which our epochal discoveries in nuclear science confront us and our descendants for many years, I believe the time has come, Mr. President, when we must undertake some elementary steps toward preparing to live, in health and in safety for the human race, with the byproducts of these awesome discoveries. Therefore, I am introducing today a bill which proposes two such steps. I am honored to be joined in sponsoring the bill by the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], my senior colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. MANSFIELD], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], and the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

The bill (S. 1228) to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish as one of the National Institutes of Health a National Radiation Health Institute, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That title IV of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART E—NATIONAL RADIATION HEALTH INSTITUTE

"Establishment of Institute

"SEC. 441. There is hereby established in the Public Health Service a National Radiation Health Institute (hereafter in this part referred to as the 'Institute').

"Radiation health research and training

"SEC. 442. In carrying out the purposes of section 301 with respect to diseases and conditions resulting from atomic radiation, the Surgeon General, through the Institute and in cooperation with the National Advisory Radiation Health Council (hereafter in this part referred to as the 'Council'), shall—

"(a) conduct, assist, and foster researches, investigations, experiments, and studies relating to the causes, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of diseases and conditions resulting from atomic radiation;

"(b) promote the coordination of research and control programs conducted by the Institute, and similar programs conducted by other agencies, organizations, and individuals;

"(c) make available research facilities of the Service to appropriate public authorities, and to health officials and scientists engaged in special studies related to the purposes of this part;

"(d) make grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other public or private agencies and institutions, and to individuals for such research projects relating to diseases and conditions resulting from atomic radiation as are recommended by the Council, including grants to such agencies and institutions for the construction, acquisition, leasing, equipment, and maintenance of such hospital, clinic, laboratory, and related facilities, and for the care of such patients therein, as are necessary for such research;

"(e) establish an information center on research, prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of diseases and conditions resulting from atomic radiation, and collect and make available, through publications and other appropriate means, information as to, and the practical application of, research and other activities carried on pursuant to this part;

"(f) secure from time to time, and for such periods as he deems advisable, the assistance and advice of persons from the United States or abroad who are experts in the field of atomic radiation, and the diseases and conditions resulting therefrom:

"(g) in accordance with regulations and from funds appropriated or donated for the purpose (1) establish and maintain research fellowships in the Institute and elsewhere with such stipends and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) as he may deem necessary to train research workers and to procure the assistance of the most brilliant and promising research fellows from the United States and abroad, and, in addition, provide for such fellowships through grants, upon recommendations of the Council, to public and other nonprofit institutions; and (2) provide training and instruction and establish and maintain traineeships, in the Institute and elsewhere in matters relating to the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of diseases and conditions resulting from atomic radiation with such stipends and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) for trainees as he may deem necessary, the number of persons receiving such training and instruction, and the number of persons holding such traineeships, to be fixed by the Council, and, in addition, provide for such training, instruction, and traineeship through grants, upon recommendation of the Council, to public and other nonprofit institutions.

"Administration

"SEC. 443. (a) In carrying out the provisions of section 442, all appropriate provisions of section 301 shall be applicable to the authority of the Surgeon General, and grants-in-aid for research and training projects in diseases and conditions resulting from atomic radiation shall be made only after review and recommendation of the Council made pursuant to section 444.

"(b) The Surgeon General shall recommend to the Secretary acceptance of conditional gifts, pursuant to section 501, for study, investigation, or research into the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of diseases or conditions resulting from atomic radiation, or for the acquisition of grounds or for the erection, equipment, or maintenance of premises, buildings, or equipment of the Institute. Donations of $50,000 or over for carrying out the purposes of this part may be acknowledged by the establishment within the Institute of suitable memorials to the donors.

"Functions of the Council

"SEC. 444. The Council is authorized to—

"(a) review research projects or programs submitted to or initiated by it relating to the study of the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of diseases and conditions resulting from atomic radiation, and certify approval to the Surgeon General, for prosecution under section 412, any such projects which it believes show promise of making valuable contributions to human knowledge with respect to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of such diseases and conditions;

"(b) review applications from any university, hospital, laboratory, or other institution or agency, whether public or private, or from individuals, for grants-in-aid for research projects relating to atomic radiation and the diseases and conditions resulting therefrom, and certify to the Surgeon General its approval of grants-in-aid in the cases of such projects which show promise of making valuable contributions to human knowledge with respect to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of diseases and conditions resulting from atomic radiation;

"(c) review applications from any public or other nonprofit institution for grants-in-aid for training, instruction, and traineeships in matters relating to the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of diseases and conditions resulting from atomic radiation, and certify to the Surgeon General its approval of such applications for grants-in-aid as it determines will best carry out the purposes of this act;

"(d) collect information as to studies which are being carried on in the United States or any other country as to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of diseases and conditions resulting from atomic radiation, by correspondence or by personal investigation of such studies, and with the approval of the Surgeon General make available such information through appropriate publications for the benefit of health and welfare agencies and organizations (public and private), physicians, or any other scientists, and for the information of the general public;

"(e) recommend to the Surgeon General for acceptance conditional gifts pursuant to section 501 for carrying out the purposes of this part; and

"(f) advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Surgeon General with respect to carrying out the provisions of this part."

SEC. 2. (a) The first sentence of section 217 (a) of the Public Health Service Act is

amended by inserting after "National Advisory Heart Council," the following: "National Advisory Atomic Health Council,".

(b) The second sentence of section 217 (a) of that act is amended (1) by inserting after "National Advisory Heart Council" the following: "National Advisory Radiation Health Council," and by inserting after "heart diseases," the following: "atomic radiation diseases and conditions,".

(c) Subsections (d) and (h) of section 301 of that act are each amended by inserting after "National Advisory Heart Council," the following: "or, with respect to atomic radiation diseases and conditions, recommended by the National Advisory Radiation Health Council,".

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is directed to establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Office of Radiation Health Control, which shall—

(a) collect from the National Radiation Health Institute and from other sources, and disseminate to the public, information on the manner and extent to which present and future human health, well-being, and living conditions may be affected by radiation;

(b) with such scientific assistance as may be available from the National Radiation Health Institute, formulate a program for making available to each person in the United States a voluntary simple and efficient means of keeping a permanent record of measurable amounts of radiation to which he is exposed during his lifetime;

(c) in accordance with this program, prepare a form of permanent personal radiation exposure record and instructions for its use; and

(d) provide for the wide dissemination of personal radiation exposure record forms, and of instructions for their use, with priority to children and to persons likely to have closer than normal proximity to sources of radiation, through appropriate channels such as Federal, State, and local agencies, medical practitioners (particularly pediatricians) and dentists, hospitals (particularly maternity departments), schools, the armed services, industrial establishments and labor organizations, and radiologists, and operators of any equipment using or creating radiation.

Mr. NEUBERGER. First, this bill would create a National Radiation Health Institute, alongside the other famous National Institutes of Health which are doing so much toward pushing back the frontiers of medicine in half-a-dozen critical areas of human health. As in the case of the other Institutes, the proposed National Radiation Health Institute would have extensive functions of research and study in all phases of the impact of nuclear radiation on human health and well-being—through experiments by its own personnel, scholarships and fellowships, and stimulation and coordination of similar research studies elsewhere. The National Radiation Health Institute would become a central source of the most complete and advanced information and education in this vital new field of medical science.

Secondly, my bill would initiate a program which has immediate importance for every person who would participate in it, and which could also aid greatly in future research on the impact of radiation. This is a program of developing and disseminating a permanent personal record form on which any person can, voluntarily, maintain a lifetime record of exposures to measurable amounts of radiation.

VOLUNTARY RADIATION RECORDS WOULD PROTECT AGAINST OVEREXPOSURE

Such a lifetime record will be of particular value to young children and to those who will be born in the future. Consequently, it should be of primary concern for the Office of Radiation Health Control, which section 3 of my bill would establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to disseminate an uncomplicated and easily usable permanent exposure record form through children's doctors and hospital maternity wards and schools, with simple instructions for entries by dentists and X-ray technicians and others whenever the individual is knowingly subjected to radiation. Another group who will increasingly need a reliable means of keeping a permanent record of radiation exposure will be scientists themselves, industrial workers, and other who are more likely than the average to come into repeated proximity to nuclear radiation.

This section of my bill, Mr. President, would enact a recommendation of last year's report by the National Academy of Sciences, published under the title "The Biological Effects of Atomic Radiation." A section of that study recommended that, because of the ever-increasing quantity of atomic particles in the air, "the medical use of X-rays should be reduced as much as is consistent with medical necessity."

But how would doctors or anybody else know the exact amount of X-ray exposure to which a man, woman or child had been subjected? And so the report of the National Academy of Sciences proposed:

One, records should be kept for every individual, showing his total accumulated lifetime exposure to radiation.

Two, the average exposure of the population's reproductive cells to radiation above the natural background should be limited to 10 roentgens from conception to age 30.

Three, individual persons should not receive a total accumulated dose to the reproductive cells of more than 50 roentgens additional up to age 40. About half of all United States children are born to parents under 30, nine-tenths to parents under 40.

It has amazed me, Mr. President, that the Government and Congress have never acted on this urgent recommendation by the distinguished staff of the National Academy of Sciences that records be developed to permit any individual to keep track of his total dosage of radiation, from the cradle right on through the rest of his or her life. When we consider that too large a dose of radiation could mean the impairment of reproductive processes or even death, the failure to act seems incredible. Is this not one area where any error should be always on the side of safety?

COMPANION BILL SPONSORED BY OREGON REPRESENTATIVE

Last autumn I discussed this crucial problem with Oregon's brilliant new Member of Congress from the Fourth District, CHARLES O. PORTER, as he and I drove together for many hundreds of miles during the campaign. We listened at night on the car radio to warnings about radiation voiced by leading scientists and by such eminent political figures as Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, the Democratic nominee for President; and by other such distinguished leaders concerned with our public policies in the nuclear field as the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], then chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and both Senators from the State of Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER and Mr. GORE].

CHARLES PORTER and I resolved that, if we ever had the opportunity to work together in the Congress, we would make a joint effort to seek the establishment of Government programs designed to protect people from the dreadful menace of radiation. The result is the bill which I have introduced today, and a companion bill which Mr. PORTER is introducing in the House of Representatives. We believe that the establishment of a greatly expanded, central research program, through a national radiation health institute, and a personal radiation-record plan, are the minimum steps which should be taken now. These programs could well be coordinated, without undesirable duplication, with other work now being done or planned at places such as the Medical Research Center at Brookhaven National Laboratory, at Oak Ridge and Argonne National Laboratory and academic centers such as the University of Rochester. We know that radiation can be a tool of medicine as well as a destructive force, and that much progress has been made in its constructive use.

PERILS MAGNIFIED IN HANDLING OF ATOMIC MATERIALS AND WASTE

Another area which will need much additional study before we can fully utilize the constructive potentials of atomic energy is safety in the handling and disposal of atomic materials and waste products.

Mr. President, I have visited on a number of occasions the great Hanford atomic works along the upper Columbia River in the Pacific Northwest, where plutonium-235 for the atomic and hydrogen bombs is produced. This process causes a great amount of waste material. Disposal of this material is one of the most hazardous and difficult tasks confronting the skilled operators of the Hanford works. For example, it must be buried permanently in huge tunnels hundreds of feet beneath the upland desert and encased in enormous tubes of concrete and lead. An article in the January 1957 issue of the magazine Railway Progress, entitled "Hottest Freight on Earth," by Edward A. Herron, describes the delicate and painstaking precautions which must be taken to protect from radiation the men operating the trains dispatched to carry this atomic waste material to its deep and remote burying places.

This merely serves to demonstrate to us the grim peril lurking in the slightest contact with materials which give off radiation. I grant that few in their daily lives share the danger involved in operating what Mr. Herron has described in Railway Progress as "the hottest freight

on earth." Yet, still, Dr. Cahan in his letter to the New York Times has told how a wild muskrat near the atomic plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., was found to be cancer ridden, presumably because some radioactive material had sifted into the river along which the animal lived. The muskrat had bone cancer, reported Dr. Cahan, evidently from eating plants at the water's edge. Earlier the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] submitted this letter for printing in the RECORD.

RADIOACTIVE STRONTIUM MAY ENTER FOOD AND FIBERS

Mr. President, we have had repeated warnings from eminent scientists about the danger from such radioactive substances as strontium 90, a calciumlike material which, when it enters into living organisms, has a tendency to be permanently absorbed into the bone structure. These warnings cannot be disregarded. Nor do we solve the problems of living with the new era of nuclear technology simply by developing and setting off so-called clean H-bombs with assurances that these will not spread a deadly fallout all over the globe. We need to look beyond only the short-range future of bomb tests. We need an agency, outside of those whose essential concern is for atomic developments themselves, which will be responsible primarily for the consequences of these developments for human health and for the safety of life in a world in which we will be increasingly surrounded by radiation.

Mr. President, our field of knowledge in this perilous realm is not nearly wide enough. Note this paragraph in last year's report by the National Academy of Sciences:

> At present the contamination is negligible. But the maximum tolerable level is not known. There is not nearly enough information about the long-term biological effects on man or animals from eating radiation-contaminated foods. Research in this area is urgently needed.

This would be a vital project for the new Institute which my bill proposes. What, Mr. President, could be more urgent to us all? Particles of strontium 90, the deadly substance resulting from nuclear fission, steadily come to earth and enter into vegetables, and into grass and plants eaten by grazing animals, among them dairy herds. People drink the milk given by these cows, particularly children, for milk is a major part of a healthy child's nutrition.

Surely we cannot leave to chance and to fragmentary bits of research and investigation, done in far-separated laboratories, the collection of every possible bit of knowledge about the impact of radiation upon the future sources of the food we and our children will eat. A government which can invest $40 billion in weapons of war can invest a tiny fragment of this, perhaps as relatively little as $15 million, in the establishment and operation of a National Radiation Health Institute to tell us what we now do not know, in the words of the scientists of the National Academy of Sciences, "about the long-term biological effects on man or animals from eating radiation-contaminated food." And the same applies to the other unknown effects of radiation and their prevention or treatment.

The time to begin is now—before the danger becomes so critical that we will have to start sudden and wasteful "crash" programs without adequate preparation, without sufficient numbers of trained and experienced specialists. Let us, for once, be foresighted in this life-and-death matter, and prepare immediately for protecting the people's health in the atomic era.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD part II of the report of the National Academy of Sciences entitled "The Biological Effects of Atomic Radiation," which is a brief digest of the findings and recommendations of this report; the article by Edward A. Herron, from Railway Progress of January 1957 entitled "Hottest Freight on Earth"; and an article from the Washington Post of February 8, 1957, which reports the findings of three Columbia University scientists that "today man has absorbed only a fraction of the maximum amount of strontium 90 his body can safely stand from radioactive fallout, but that the average is higher for children and is rising for all age groups."

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

PART II. BRIEF DIGEST OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is generally agreed that, in the peacetime development of atomic energy, man has been lucky. He has been dealing with an enormous new force whose potential effects he has only dimly understood. Thus far, except for some tragic accidents affecting small numbers of people, the biological damage from peacetime activities (including the testing of atomic weapons) has been essentially negligible. Furthermore, it appears that radiation problems, if they are met intelligently and vigilantly, need not stand in the way of the large-scale development of atomic energy. The continuing need for intelligence and vigilance cannot be too strongly emphasized, however.

The problems of radiation fall naturally into two main classes: (1) The effects on human beings; (2) the various ways in which radiation can reach human beings through the environment.

EFFECTS ON HUMANS

The inheritance mechanism is by far the most sensitive to radiation of any biological system.

Any radiation which reaches the reproductive cells causes mutations (changes in the material governing heredity) that are passed on to succeeding generations.

Human gene mutations which produce observable effects are believed to be universally harmful.

Everyone is subjected to the natural background radiation which causes an unavoidable quantity of so-called spontaneous mutations. Anything that adds radiation to this naturally occurring background rate causes further mutations, and is genetically harmful.

There is no minimum amount of radiation which must be exceeded before mutations occur. Any amount, however small, that reaches the reproductive cells can cause a correspondingly small number of mutations. The more radiation, the more mutations.

The harm is cumulative. The genetic damage done by radiation builds up as the radiation is received, and depends on the total accumulated gonad dose received by people from their own conception to the conception of their last child.

So far as individuals are concerned, not all mutant genes or combinations of mutant genes are equally harmful. A few may cause very serious handicaps, many others may produce much smaller harm, or even no apparent damage.

But from the point of view of the total and eventual damage to the entire population, every mutation causes roughly the same amount of harm. This is because mutant genes can only disappear when the inheritance line in which they are carried dies out. In cases of severe and obvious damage this may happen in the first generation; in other cases it may require hundreds of generations.

Thus, for the general population, and in the long run, a little radiation to a lot of people is as harmful as a lot of radiation to a few, since the total number of mutant genes can be the same in the two cases.

It is difficult to arrive at a figure showing how much genetic harm radiation can do. One measure is the amount of radiation, above the natural background, which would produce as many mutations again as occur spontaneously. It is estimated that this amount is 30 to 80 roentgens.

(The roentgen is a unit of radiation. To give an idea of its value, the average dental X-ray delivers five roentgens to the patient's jaw, but only five-thousandths of a roentgen of stray radiation to more remote parts of the body such as the gonads.)

It is also estimated that a dose of 10 roentgens to every person in the United States would cause something on the order of 5 million mutant genes which would then be a part of the population's inheritance pool. This figure is subject to considerable uncertainty.

At present the United States population is exposed to radiation from (a) the natural background, (b) medical and dental X-rays, (c) fallout from atomic weapons testing. The 30-year dose to the gonads received by the average person from each of these sources is estimated as follows:

(a) Background, about 4.3 roentgens.

(b) X-rays an fluoroscopy, about 3 roentgens.

(c) Weapons test, if continued at the rate of the past 5 years would give a probable 30-year dose of about 0.1 roentgen. This figure may be off by a factor of 5; i. e., the possible range is from 0.02 to 0.5 roentgen. If tests were conducted at the rate of the 2 most active years (1953 and 1955) the 30-year dose would be about twice as great as that just stated.

If the exposure of the general population to radiation is limited to levels which the genetics committee believes reasonable (see recommendations at the end of this part), there should be practically no pathological effects in the persons receiving the radiation.

Larger exposures (say 100 roentgens and up) of the whole body or a large part of it are generally harmful when received in a single dose. (Much higher doses may, however be safely and usefully delivered to limited portions of the body under the controlled conditions of medical treatment.) Very little is now known about how to treat the pathological effects of radiation or how to protect the body against them in the first place. Much research is needed in these fields.

One of the effects is a shortening of life. This seems to involve some generalized action. Irradiated individuals may age faster than normally even if they do not develop specific radiation-induced diseases like leukemia. It has not been shown that exposures small enough to be genetically tolerable have this effect. Furthermore, the permissible exposure levels that have been established for persons working with radiation appear to be within the limits of safety.

However, it is not yet known what minimum dose, if any, would be necessary to produce a statistically noticeable reduction of life span when very large numbers of people are concerned.

ENVIRONMENT AND FOOD SUPPLY

Radiation in the general environment has not yet become a serious problem. In a few decades, however, radioactive waste products from atomic powerplants will represent an enormous potential source of contamination. How much of this radioactivity will actually reach the population depends on how successfully it can be kept out of the great network—ocean and air currents, food and water supplies—which connect man to his surroundings.

At present test explosions of atomic weapons are the only significant source of radiation in the general environment, above the natural background.

Meteorologists have found no evidence that atomic explosions have changed the weather or climate. Nor do they believe that continued weapons tests, at the same rate and in the same areas as in the past, would have such an effect.

Radiation from explosions passes into the atmosphere and much of it eventually returns to the ground as fallout.

Fallout divides into three classes: (1) close-in—material that comes down within a few hundred miles of the explosion and within 10 to 20 hours, (2) intermediate—material that descends in a few weeks after the explosion, (3) delayed—material that remains in the air for months or years.

Close-in fallout from test explosions affects only restricted, uninhabited regions.

Intermediate fallout would descend very slowly if it were pulled down only by gravity. It is mostly washed out of the air by rain and snow. It spreads over large parts of the earth, but its effect over a small area may be accentuated if there is heavy precipitation while the radioactive cloud is overhead.

Delayed fallout is stored for long periods in the stratosphere. Meteorologists know very little about the interchange of air between the stratosphere and lower layers, so they cannot predict exactly how long the material will stay up, or where it is likely to descend.

At this point the oceans are not receiving any significant quantities of radioactive material. But eventually they will undoubtedly be used as a repository for some of the radioactive waste products of atomic powerplants.

Before this can safely begin on a large scale, much research is needed to determine the mixing rates between various parts of the seas. Materials deposited in some of the deep parts of the ocean may remain there 100 years or more, so that most of their radioactivity would be gone before they reach surface water. On the other hand, material dumped into coastal and other surface waters would directly affect marine life and, within a few years, would contaminate all parts of the world because of the relatively rapid circulation of surface layers.

Radioactive tracers can be used to chart ocean and air currents and to study the interrelationships of marine animals. Many important experiments in these fields will be possible only within the next 10 or 20 years. Increasing radioactive contamination of the sea and atmosphere will make it impossible after that to detect the tracers against the heightened background.

Radiation from fallout inevitably contaminates man's food supply. Radioactive elements in the soil are taken up and concentrated by plants. The plants may be eaten by humans, or by animals which in turn serve as human food.

At present the contamination is negligible. But the maximum tolerable level is not known. There is not nearly enough information about the long-term biological effects on man or animals from eating radiation-contaminated food. Research in this area is urgently needed.

Probably the most important potential food contamination is strontium 90—a radioactive element that concentrates in bone tissue. Already, detectable although biologically insignificant traces of it have turned up in milk supplies thousands of miles from the site of atomic explosions.

Food from the oceans is also subject to radioactive contamination. Marine plants and animals extract and concentrate various radioactive elements that get into seawater. The concentration is cumulative, increasing as it proceeds up the chain from microscopic plankton to edible fish.

Properly used, radiation can enhance man's food supply rather than damage it. Radiation techniques have already opened important new fields in agricultural research and will undoubtedly become increasingly valuable. No drastic change in agricultural production appears imminent, however.

Tracer studies will help us understand basic metabolic processes in plants and animals. They will also be applied to practical problems such as the use of fertilizers.

Mutation rates in plants are being artificially speed up with radiation in the hope of producing new and superior strains. Thus far, only a few new economic varieties have been found, but the method is promising. The use of radiation to sterilize packaged food may have dramatic impact on food technology by reducing the need for refrigeration and extending the shelf-life of many products.

Holding radiation to a tolerable worldwide level will require adequate methods for disposing of, or, rather, for containing radioactive wastes from power reactors.

Some of these wastes will remain dangerously radioactive for centuries.

Research has indicated some apparently feasible systems for controlled disposal, but none is yet at the point of economic operating reality.

The major problem in routine disposal is what to do with the wastes resulting from the processing of reactor fuel. The wastes from normal operations of reactors themselves can be more easily handled.

A second major problem is to anticipate the accidents that will inevitably occur and to set up safety standards which will insure that they do not become catastrophes.

Considered in this light, it appears feasible to use nuclear reactors in central station power plants and in naval vessels.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of these findings the study committees have made a number of recommendations. Those of the genetics committee apply most directly to all of us. They are:

(I) Records should be kept for every individual, showing his total accumulated lifetime exposure to radiation.

(II) The medical use of X-rays should be reduced as much as is consistent with medical necessity.

(III) The average exposure of the population's reproductive cells to radiation above the natural background should be limited to 10 roentgens from conception to age 30.

(IV) The 10-roentgen limit should be reconsidered periodically with a view to keeping the reproductive cell exposure at the lowest practicable level.

(V) Individual persons should not receive a total accumulated dose to the reproductive cells of more than 50 roentgens up to age 30 years, and not more than 50 roentgens additional up to age 40. (About half of all United States children are born to parents under 30, nine-tenths to parents under 40.)

Other recommendations of general interest are:

(VI) Techniques for monitoring worldwide fall-out should be further improved.

(VII) Measurements of the storage of radiation in the stratosphere should be continued and extended.

(VIII) A national agency should control and keep records of all dumping of radioactive material in the ocean.

(IX) An international body should set up safe standards for the marine and air disposal of radioactive materials as soon as possible, based on current knowledge.

(X) Research in marine disposal should be carried out on a cooperative international basis.

(XI) Until advances in reactor technology substantially reduce potential hazards buildings that house reactors located near populated areas should be sealed against the release of radioactive materials in the event of accident.

(XII) Research should be continued and accelerated, particularly in the fields of:

Fundamental genetics, mammalian genetics, human and population genetics.

Pathological effects of radiation.

Mixing between various parts of the atmosphere.

Mixing between various parts of the oceans.

The role of plants and animals, both on land and in the oceans, in concentrating radioactive materials.

The tolerable levels of radioactivity in human and animal food.

Geophysical and geochemical aspects of the ultimate disposal of radioactive wastes.

Selection of biologically suitable sites for various atomic facilities.

Safety devices for the control of accidental power surges in reactors.

[From Railway Progress of January 1957]

HOTTEST FREIGHT ON EARTH—HOW WOULD YOU FEEL WITH THE INSIDES OF AN A-BOMB RIDING IN THE BOXCAR NEXT DOOR?

(By Edward A. Herron)

At 6 o'clock on a calm, sunlit morning, Conductor Bill Cantwell takes a last, approving glance at his white-painted, shingle-sided home, ducks under a stilled elm tree by the sidewalk, and starts off for the roundhouse. The early morning hour, the brilliance of the sun, and the complete absence of wind all fit into a pattern. It forms a background for the fact that this morning Cantwell's train will carry the hottest freight on earth.

Every foot of ground in the 7 miles he drives to meet his train is owned by the people of the United States. Every home that he passes is owned, not by the people who live within, but, again, by the people of the United States. Invisibly, the Great Seal of the United States is stamped on the grocery stores, the drugstores, the taxi stands, and the theaters. It's part of the lampposts and molded into the fireplugs.

The treee-lined town of Richland, marooned on a high desert plateau in the State of Washington, is owned by 169 million Americans and cared for by 1 of the most unusual landlords in the United States.

The General Electric Co., agent for the people, maintains the sewerage system, the water system, the police and fire departments. It stocks the libraries and hires the teachers for the 5 schools for the town of 27,000 which only 12 hurried years ago was a tiny village of 250 persons surrounded by sagebrush and sand. Among other activities, it operates a railroad, and each week General Electric hands to Conductor Bill Cantwell a paycheck for shepherding the most dangerous material ever manufactured by man. Only a breath of wind away from Richland, behind a barricade wire and a barrier of secrecy, is another General Electric project, the Atomic Energy Commission's Hanford plant. The product of the billion-dollar plant and its 9,000 employees is plutonium, the ingredient of the atomic bomb. One of

the byproducts of the mammoth plant hidden in the desert is the skill to be applied in the peacetime use of the atom. A waste product of the atomic process is a deadly radioactive residue which must be disposed of safely and without hesitation.

While the rest of industry talks about the coming of the atomic age, the 150-mile railroad within the barricades of Hanford is already deep into it.

Down the black-top highway from Richland, and not quite to the barricade where armed guards maintain a 24-hour vigil, is a vast maintenance shop where trucks, company buses, official passenger automobiles and assorted mobile equipment share space with a fleet of diesel locomotives. The shop is exceptionally new and exceptionally clean, and, unlike any other railroad maintenance shop in the country, it is liberally sprinkled with the purple shamrock insignia marked: Radiation zone.

Here Conductor Cantwell meets Engineer Bill Dye and Trainman A. H. Cox, and receives with them his orders for the day: burial detail.

In the tire industry, when a mold becomes faulty, the tiremakers call in a repairman, or telephone a scrap dealer to come pick it up. Up in Hanford, when a piece of highly radioactive equipment becomes faulty, they bury it.

A special work permit is issued to the train crew, and a radiation monitor is assigned to accompany them on the mission. A little kit resembling an auxiliary lunch bucket is handed out, each kit containing two pen-sized dosimeters for spotting gamma radiation, and a film badge which responds weirdly to invisible rays. A card is prepared for each man on which will be entered a running total of the radiation to which each crewman is exposed. It's the job of the accompanying monitor to keep tabs on exposure, to tell a man, if need be, "You're burned out—no more radiation for the rest of the week."

Getting dressed for the burial detail is a ritual. Full length coveralls are pulled on, a surgeon's skull cap, then a white hood which is tucked under the coveralls. White canvas shoe covers are donned, followed by heavy rubbers. Finally the trainmen pull on surgeon's gloves, topping them off with canvas gloves whose edges are bound with masking tape. If the job is extremely hot, assault masks are included, and the man-from-Mars look is complete.

The 3 crewmen and the radiation monitor then shuffle out to the 1,500 horsepower diesel that is waiting on the track adjoining the maintenance shop. They climb aboard and the locomotive inches ahead. Just as they leave the shadow of the maintenance building, a Northern Pacific steamer, last of the fleet operating out of the nearby Pasco yards, brings in a line of cars. An Atomic Energy Commission yard switcher moves forward to take over the outside freight.

The crew aboard the diesel is cleared through security at the barricade, picks up a string of 10 empty flats, and rolls smoothly over the desert to the tall stacks silhouetted against the horizon. The stacks mark the chemical separations plant where plutonium is separated from irradiated uranium fuel elements.

From the outside, as the odd train advances, the building looks as innocent as a soap factory. Inside is the most advanced manufacturing equipment ever devised by man, some of it dangerously contaminated with radioactive materials.

Engineer Dye takes the diesel onto a spur that leads directly to one of the grim buildings. With Cantwell directing the operation, he pushes his empties toward the windowless building. Waiting for them is a burial box mounted on a flatcar. Dye has 10 cars between him and the box. Cox and Cantwell necessarily are closer when they make the coupling. When they shuffle back to the locomotive, the radiation monitor runs his counter over them in a precautionary check.

Before the arrival of the train, the wornout and contaminated objects had been dropped into the box, inside of which was a 12-inch layer of sawdust to soak up any moisture dripping from the wornout equipment. Steel clamps had snapped shut when the lid was dropped in place on the sponge-rubber gasket surrounding the lip of the box. The precautions were all necessary in order to prevent any stray gust of wind from lifting radioactive dust from the box and scattering it over the desert.

Dye keeps the "funeral train" at a 10-mile-per-hour pace on the run to the burial ground, far out in the desert wastes of the 640-square-mile Hanford project. He brings the train to a gliding stop beside a huge hole dug in the desert. A long cable, threaded through loops along the spacer cars, is peeled loose and attached to a tractor 500 feet away. At a signal from Cantwell, the box is skidded down from the flatcar down a ramp, and into the hole.

The radiation monitor is alert, measuring constantly for radiation. Low clouds, dust, or vapor particles cause skyshine, a radiation that travels mysteriously from the contaminated box, up to the dust barrier, then downward to the crewmen. A signalman, standing high on a crane boom, directs the burial. Bulldozers push earth over the crated equipment. The locomotive and the train crew move away.

The flatcar on which the box has been secured is placed out on a desert siding. Sometimes a vigorous steam cleaning is sufficient for decontaminating a car. In severe cases, weeks or months, even years, may go by before a car is safe for use again.

The locomotive is checked for radiation by monitors who swarm over the husky EMD. On each job the diesels pick up contamination in some degree and are treated accordingly. Back in the maintenance shop the crew is carefully checked. After disposing of the white duck coveralls, boots, gloves, and hoods, they step upon a "hand-and-foot" counter which reveals any vestiges of radiation. When a radiation card shows that a trainman is "burned out," he is removed from all contact with "hot material" until a designated time period is ended.

Burial of extremely heavy equipment, too unwieldly to be boxed, is handled in a more bizarre fashion. When a giant concentrator must be disposed of, it is lashed securely on a flatcar, and Cantwell and his crew go in after it. A tunnel, 500 feet long, has been dug beneath the desert within the Hanford area. A spur leads back into the tunnel, where Dye rolls the flatcar, with its somber load. Cox uncouples the car, and the train pulls out into the sunshine. When the EMD and the white-shrouded crew are safely outside, a huge water-filled concrete barrier drops down, sealing off forever the flatcar and its burden.

The tunnel can swallow 12 flatcars. When it is filled, the spur will be shifted to a new cavern.

Seniority does not prevail at Hanford. The 31 employees of the line, including 8 conductors, 11 switchmen, and 8 engineers, are divided into 8 crews working on rotating assignments. The men who handle fiercely radioactive material 1 day may be pushing a string of lumber cars the next. The major portion of their workday is similar to that of railroad men working the yards outside Los Angeles or around Chicago. But the exciting portions of their work are blazing new trails in industrial America.

In the very near future nuclear fuel will be shipped all over the world. Today it is being shipped daily by rail from one spot to the other within the Hanford works. Plutonium and unfissioned uranium are taken from Hanford's atomic reactors in cylinders. The much-publicized elements are encased in lead-lined casks which in turn are eased into water-filled "wells" mounted on the specially built railroad cars Trainman Cox waves into position. The water in the wells helps absorb the heat generated by the intensely radioactive slugs. Dye hauls the weird freight over to the separation plants, miles away, where the uranium and plutonium are separated. The uranium is recovered and reused; the plutonium is shipped to other Atomic Energy Commission installations. The highly radioactive fission products, now in waste solution, are safely stored.

Today some of those fission products have turned out to have great value in medicine, in industry and agriculture, and the railroads soon will be moving them.

Despite the nature of the work performed on the line, there has never been an injury as a result of radiation in an operation that continues 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

In the more normal railroad operations around Hanford 30,000 cars a year move in and out of the barricades, mostly from the Union Pacific, the Northern Pacific, and the Milwaukee. Four 1,000-horsepower Alco diesels, three 500-horsepower General Electric yard switchers, and one 1,500-horsepower EMD keep the cars moving about the 150 miles of rail within the barricade.

Living in a small town so close to a source of radiation is remarkably calm, country-like. Constant monitoring of stack emission is maintained. Once in a great while an extra-heavy puff coming from one of the reactor stacks will send white-coated monitor crews scurrying about Richland, checking the radiation fallout. But with the tremendous safety factors devised with 12 years of experience, living in Richland is just as safe as living in any other suburban community within the United States.

But there's no denying that railroading is different, no denying that the rules are being rewritten up in Hanford as Cantwell, Cox, and Dye ease radioactive slugs about the desert. The experience gained at the atomic-energy plant will soon be appearing in the operating manuals of railroads in every section of the country as they get ready to do their share in moving the hottest freight on earth.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 8, 1957]

MAN FAR SHORT OF ABSORPTION LIMIT OF STRONTIUM 90, SCIENTISTS REPORT, BUT PERIL MAY INCREASE FIFTYFOLD BY 1970

NEW YORK, February 7.—Three scientists said today man has absorbed only a fraction of the maximum amount of strontium 90 his body can safely stand from radioactive fallout, but that the average is higher for children and is rising for all age groups.

The scientists said such fallout produces "hazards to the human race." They said "the development of bone cancer" is an internal hazard.

The scientists, J. Laurence Kulp, Walter R. Eckelmann, and Arthur R. Schulert, of Columbia University, published their findings in the February 8 issue of Science.

However, they said at a news conference, "there is no evidence of anyone being in danger at the present time."

They added that the average man probably could stand fallout from explosions of 1,000 megatons a year. The Atomic Energy Commission has said nuclear explosions have contributed an average of 3 megatons a year during 1955 and 1956.

The scientists said the "tolerable level of external gamma radiation for genetic effects is not well defined." But they determined that by the fall of 1955, man had assimilated a worldwide average of about 0.12 micro-microcurie of strontium 90 from nuclear explosion fallout.

The average is about one-ten-thousandth of the accepted maximum permissible con-

centration, the scientists said, but will rise to 1 to 2 micro-microcuries by 1970. If tests continue at their present rate, the scientists estimated, the average man will have assimilated 4 to 8 micro-microcuries, or about one-two-hundredth of the maximum amount, by 1970.

A micro-microcurie is one-millionth of one-millionth of a curie, a measure of radioactive emanation from 1 gram of radium.

SMALL FORESTRY LOANS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 3 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Mississippi may proceed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which might be called the small-forest credit bill. I shall briefly explain its need and what it will accomplish if enacted.

The commercial forest land of the Nation comprises 489 million acres. It is surprising to note how much of this land is owned by farmers, housewives, professional and retired persons, and other private individuals not associated with any forest industry. Small forests of less than 100 acres each, both farm and nonfarm, for example, comprise roughly a third of all commercial forest land in private ownership. If woodlands ranging in size from 100 to 500 acres are added, the total forms 61 percent of our privately owned commercial forest area. Looking at it in another way, it has been estimated that about 1 out of 10 American families owns a small forest. These small forests could and should provide a very substantial portion of the total raw-material needs of our forest industries.

On the other hand, it is on these same small private forest-land holdings where the most difficult problems in American forestry are found. It is here that the poorest forest-management practices are applied, and the smallest percentage of potential growth and value are obtained. Although encouraging progress in forest management has been made on forest tracts in public and industry ownership, advances on the smaller private holdings are still disappointingly slow. It is on such lands, accordingly, that both the need for improvement and the potentialities for betterment are greatest.

Public cooperative programs on the part of Federal and State agencies and also industrial and other assistance programs are already helping the owners of small forest tracts in a number of ways. My firsthand observations, however, clearly indicate that further assistance is urgently needed. Too frequently the small forest landowner has to sell his timber while it is still immature and of small value. Too often his trees are prematurely cut in order to obtain immediate cash in order to pay medical, educational, and other pressing family bills. In many cases, he does not have and cannot obtain the money needed to finance timber stand improvement and other forestry measures which would yield substantial returns in increased value of subsequent cuts.

Certain credit is now available, but this is limited and falls far short of meeting the need. National bank loans secured by forest land and timber, authorized within the past few years, are limited to 2-year terms except when special provisions permit a maximum 10-year period. Federal land bank timber loans, available in certain areas, are limited to properties having a substantial amount of merchantable timber or a good growth of young timber approaching merchantable size. Soil and water conservation loans by the Secretary of Agriculture are available only to finance farm land improvement. I understand forest loans by certain of the life insurance companies have been increasing, but these have been limited for the most part to larger industrial borrowers. My bill would supplement credit sources now available by providing loans designed specifically for small owners.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to owners of not more than 500 acres of forest land or land suitable for forest production, and for either of two purposes. The first, for the acquisition, planting, improvement, protection, and management of forests. Secondly, for the payment of expenses or for the refinancing of indebtedness, providing such expenses or indebtedness would otherwise interfere with sustained yield forest management practices.

The bill provides that loans shall be secured by a mortgage on forest land or lands suitable for forests, including permanent improvements and growing timber thereon, and are at no time to exceed 80 percent of the fair market value of the property. Loans are to be repaid over a period of from 5 to 50 years in annual or periodic installment of not more than 5 years. In the case of forest properties expected to increase in value during the development period without producing income that might be used to amortize the loan, permission may be granted for repayment to be deferred up to a maximum of 35 years. Interest rates under the bill are not to exceed 3 percent.

A major feature of the bill requires the borrower to adhere to such standards of forestry and woods practice and to maintain such forest protection measures as are deemed necessary by the Secretary of Agriculture. In this connection the Secretary is to establish standard procedure for approving forest management plans submitted by borrowers, and for inspections to insure such practices and plans are being followed.

Further, the bill permits the Secretary of Agriculture to reduce the borrower's obligation up to 50 percent of the loan in the event of partial or total destruction of the timber by a cause beyond the control of the borrower and not resulting from any act or negligence on his part. In reducing the loan under such circumstances, the Secretary would give due recognition to any recovery available to the borrower from insurance or other sources.

Mr. President, our forests are our basic resource for major industrial expansion. Their improvement and development are essential to keep pace with growing demands. At present, southern forests supply about 9 billion board-feet annually of softwood timber, and this is expected to remain fairly constant to 1975. Demand for hardwood timber will probably increase from the 4.7 billion board-feet in 1952 to 5.3 billion board-feet in 1975.

Southern forests produced 14.4 million cords of pulpwood in 1952 and 18 million cords in 1955. Projected demand by 1975 is expected to be about 26.5 million cords. Thus, we have a great potential for expanding uses for forestry products. We must do everything possible to assist our landowners to increase their production of quality timber.

Well-managed and well-stocked timberlands are a sound investment and provide a good source of income and employment. Considering both woods and mill operations together, it is estimated by the United States Forest Service that for every 80 acres of well-stocked timberland, 1 man will be afforded full-time employment. On this basis, 8,000 acres of timber would provide 100 new jobs. The Forest Service further estimates that 100 new workers could make the following changes in a community: 296 more jobs; $590,000 more personal income per annum; $270,000 more bank deposits; and $360,000 more retail sales per annum. Thus it is not hard to visualize the real opportunities we have with our forests and the importance of bringing them up to full production.

Enactment of such a loan program for small forest landowners, supplementing assistance already available in existing programs, would, in my opinion, be a significant contribution to the development of our Nation's forests. In addition, there would be provided increased yields and increased income for our small owners. These provisions would be a major step forward in the solution of this very important nationwide problem.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I believe that one of the major benefits which would come from such a program, if properly carried out, would be to enable our small landowners to continue as landowners. Forestry property is fast passing out of the hands of the so-called smaller holders and into the hands of the larger holders. In the southeastern and south central and southwestern parts of our country, as well as in many other areas, a proper loan of the kind authorized by the bill would go a long way toward enabling the small landowner to continue to hold his land. It would constitute another bulwark to insure the continuance of a sound America. It would provide the small landowner with a means of holding his land, and also leasing it on long-term leases to the companies and operators of the woods products manufacturing plants, giving them a supply of materials to work with, affording the landowners an income, while at the same time enabling them to continue to own their land.

The leasing of acres on a long-term basis by large wood-products operators is a new plan which is taking hold rapidly. It is one of the best and one of the soundest plans of which I know. It keeps the land in the hands of small owners, it

provides industry with raw material, and it provides a long-term financing plan whereby the small owner can continue to hold on to his land.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, out of order, I may introduce the bill, and that it may be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 1229) to provide a loan program to promote the development of forestry on small tracts of forest lands and lands suitable for forest production, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. STENNIS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to obtain the substantial public benefits resulting from the development of good forest management and the application of sustained yield forest practices on small tracts of forest lands and other small tracts of lands suitable for forest production, and thereby conserve the forests, provide for the continuous production of forest products, and promote soil and water conservation, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to provide for a system of forest credit to owners of small tracts of forest land and lands suitable for forest production.

SEC. 2.(a) In order to effectuate the policy of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized and empowered to make direct or insured loans to owners of no more than 500 acres of forest land or lands suitable for forest production, upon such terms and conditions not inconsistent with the provisions of this act as he may prescribe, for any of the following purposes, provided owners cannot obtain such credit from private lending agencies:

1. To provide for the conservation, acquisition, planting, improvement, protection, management, and operation of forests;

2. To provide for the payment of expenses or for the refinancing of any indebtedness, whether or not such expenses or indebtedness are incurred for forestry purposes which may interfere with carrying on sustained-yield forest management.

(b) Loans under this section shall be based upon the fair market value of the property and shall be limited to a principal obligation of not more than 80 percent of such value.

(c) All such loans shall be secured by a first mortgage (which term shall be construed to include deeds of trust and other security instruments acceptable to the Secretary) on forest lands or lands suitable for forests, permanent improvements thereon, and growing timber. Every such mortgage shall contain an agreement providing for the repayment of the loans on an amortization plan by means of annual or periodic installments, which installment periods shall not exceed 5 years, sufficient to cover (1) interest on the loan at the rate in effect at the time the loan is made, which rate may be fixed by the Secretary from time to time, but which shall not exceed — percent; and (2) such amounts for application on the principal as will extinguish the debt within an agreed period, not less than 5 nor more than 50 years.

(d) To the extent that the annual or periodic payments provided in subsection (c) of this section represent amortization payments on the principal of the mortgage debt, they may be deferred at the time the loan is made for any period up to a maximum of 35 years in the case of mortgaged properties on which timber is to be grown under the management practices required by the Secretary pursuant to this act and which, during this period of development, should increase in value without producing income that might be used to amortize the loan. Payments shall be made thereafter annually or periodically at not longer than 5-year intervals.

(e) In addition to the authority granted in subsection (d) for deferment of payments, the Secretary may, when in his judgment conditions justify it, extend the payment of the whole or any part of the principal and defer the payment of the whole or any part of the interest which may be due or unpaid under the terms of any mortgage given pursuant to this section, and may accept payment thereof within 5 years from the date of such extension.

(f) If a loan is granted for such development, and the prospective increase in value of the property by such development is taken into consideration in determining the amounts to be loaned, no part of the portion of the loan based upon such prospective increase shall be paid out by the Secretary until through such development the total value of the property has been so increased that the total amount paid out will remain within the limits set up in subsection (b) of this section.

(g) Every borrower who shall be granted a loan shall agree in the mortgage executed by him that if the whole or any portion of the loan shall be expended for purposes other than those specified in the application therefor, or if the borrower shall be in default at any time in respect to any covenant or condition of the mortgage, or any other covenant or condition, the whole of said loan shall, at the option of the Secretary, become due and payable.

(h) The Secretary shall require as a prerequisite for the approval of any loan or extension thereof, agreement by the borrower to adhere to such standards of forestry and woods practices and to maintain such forest protection measures as the Secretary deems satisfactory. The Secretary shall establish such standards for borrowers and a procedure for approving plans submitted by, or formulated for, borrowers or prospective borrowers for the management of their forest properties, and for making inspections to ascertain if such practices and plans are being followed.

(i) Every mortgage shall provide that in the event of the borrower assigning, selling, or otherwise transferring the forest land or any interest therein, or in the event of an involuntary transfer or sale, the successor or successors-in-interest shall agree to adhere to the standards of forestry and woods practices provided for in subsection (h) of this section and shall agree to comply with all of the obligations and conditions of the mortgage and upon failure of any such successor-in-interest to so agree, the Secretary may declare the amount unpaid on the loan immediately due and payable.

(j) In the event of the partial or total destruction of the timber on a tract subject to a loan under this section by any cause beyond the control of the borrower and not resulting from any act or negligence on his part, the Secretary may reduce the borrower's obligation not to exceed 50 percent of loan, giving due recognition to any recovery for such destruction that may be available to the borrower from insurance or other sources.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make loans to the Secretary of Agriculture upon the request and approval of the Secretary of Agriculture in such amounts as the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time determine to be necessary for making loans authorized in section 2 of this act. For the purpose of making loans pursuant to this section the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that act are hereby extended to include such loans to the Secretary of Agriculture. Moneys received by the Secretary as payments by borrowers of principal and interest on loans made pursuant to section 2 of this act, and all moneys received from the resale of any property purchased or acquired by the Secretary under subsection (a) of section 4 of this act, shall be available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the repayment of loans made to him by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to this section. Repayments to the Secretary of the Treasury on such loans shall be treated as a public-debt transaction of the United States.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this act the Secretary may—

(a) Bid for and purchase at any foreclosure or other sale, or otherwise acquire property pledged or mortgaged or conveyed to secure any loan or other indebtedness owing to the Secretary under this act; accept title to any property so purchased or acquired; operate or lease such property for such period as may be deemed necessary to protect the investment therein; and sell or otherwise dispose of such property.

(b) Perform such acts and prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem proper to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the administration of this act.

URBAN PLANNING FELLOWSHIPS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to provide fellowships in public or private nonprofit institutions of higher education for the graduate training of qualified persons in urban planning and related fields.

This fellowship program is urgently needed as an integral part of the urban renewal program authorized under the National Housing Act. All major cities, and hundreds of smaller towns, counties, and State agencies are currently engaged in active city planning and housing programs. In all of these programs, there is an increasing need for highly skilled professional and technical personnel. It is estimated that from 300 to 400 new positions are being created each year in local government agencies alone. In every year since 1946, there have been several hundred vacant positions in cities throughout the country. In Baltimore, for example, the mayor's urban renewal study board reported 16 unfilled positions in the city planning staff, and recommended a doubling of the number of positions in order to permit the city to develop an adequate urban renewal program.

Despite this unprecedented demand, the public and private institutions of higher learning that offer graduate training in this field have been unable to expand rapidly enough to meet the needs of local communities. Twenty-

one institutions offer graduate degrees in city planning; 10 of these were established during the postwar period. Last year, the total number of graduates of these courses was only about 150.

The shortage of graduate students is clearly not a result of career opportunities, nor is it a result of low salaries. Many local governments offer higher salaries for well-trained people than do Federal or private agencies. The shortage stems in part from the relative newness of the profession, and in part from the lack of fellowship assistance to finance needy students.

My proposal would authorize a 3-year program at a cost of $500,000 a year, which would permit the training of an additional 200 students a year. This would provide for an average award of between $2,000 and $2,500, which is typical of fellowship programs in the fields of public health, physics, chemistry, and other fields supported by the Federal Government. The program would be administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which has facilities presently being used for graduate training of foreign students coming to the United States for study under various programs of technical assistance. Fellowships would be awarded on a merit basis to individual students who would be free to elect the school of their choice.

Last year, the Senate included a provision in its general housing bill (S. 3855, sec. 603) which would have provided for a program similar to the one I am proposing today. This program failed of enactment in the closing days of the session last year, despite the fact that it did not appear to be a controversial part of the bill. The Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, although he did not support the specific provision in last year's bill, testified to the urgent need for action to alleviate the acute shortage of trained personnel which is now a major impediment to housing, urban renewal, and many other programs of urban development.

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

The bill (S. 1230) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide urban planning fellowships, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AVIATION EDUCATION AND TRAINING FOR CADET MEMBERS OF CIVIL AIR PATROL

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to encourage aviation education and training for cadet members of the Civil Air Patrol. A companion bill, H. R. 3232, has been introduced in the House of Representatives. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD excerpts from a letter which explain the purpose of the proposed legislation, which I have received from Col. Daniel F. Boone, secretary of the National Legislative Committee of the Civil Air Patrol.

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

The bill (S. 1233) to encourage aviation education and training for cadet members of the Civil Air Patrol, introduced by Mr. PURTELL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The excerpts presented by Mr. PURTELL are as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this legislation is to authorize the appropriation of public funds to assist the Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of the objectives set forth in section 2 (b) of the act of July 1, 1946, chapter 527 (36 U. S. C. 202 (b)), to provide aviation education and training for its cadet members.

Aviation has become a dynamic force for the welfare of the Nation which, though increasingly felt, is but partially understood by many people. Aviation's expanding role in the life and security, both of the Nation and of each individual, makes it essential that (a) a better understanding of aviation and its potential be developed among the general public, and (b) an adequate supply of personnel be assured to meet the ever-increasing demands created by aviation development. The President of the United States on May 26, 1954, approved the following statement of policy: "It is the United States policy to capture and hold the interest of the youth of America in aeronautics and the aeronautical sciences through a dynamic national program to stimulate active participation in all aspects of aviation."

The Civil Air Patrol is a nonprofit organization primarily dependent upon the volunteer services of its members. The financial support for its youth training program is derived from an annual $3 per capita senior membership dues, an occasional small donation, and limited local fund raising activities; yet, it is the leading organization attempting to further a national civil air program by active conduct of aviation training for our youth on a nationwide basis.

The present Civil Air Patrol cadet program occupies a unique position in the instruction of the youth of the Nation. The resultant indoctrination points out the need for, and appreciation of, adequate air power and air preparedness. It offers, in addition, basic training for young men and women in performing the increasingly technical and specialized work peculiar to military, commercial and private flying and their related industries. The course of study and training for CAP cadets emphasizes and demonstrates that a solid foundation in mathematics and science subjects is essential to a successful career in aviation. This organization also encourages and fosters civil aviation in local communities throughout the United States and its Territories. Through these activities, CAP offers an incentive and stimulus for youth to further develop and improve our national status by their entering into and acquiring proficiency in the aeronautical and scientific skills.

The United States is the only Nation in the free world which alone has the potential national resources—industrial and technological capability and national income—necessary to insure that the aeronautical and scientific achievements of the Soviet bloc never become superior to those of the United States and its allies. Our friends and allies are depending upon the strength, support and leadership of the United States for their own freedom.

To insure that this leadership is maintained, there must be a continuing and increasing flow of youth into aeronautical, technical and scientific training. The shortage of engineers, scientists and technicians in the United States is reflected in the help wanted advertisements of thousands of newspapers and magazines.

The number of our secondary schools offering complete basic and advanced courses in mathematics and science has declined.

College graduations in engineering and scientific fields have also declined. Education and training in the scientific and technical fields is now, and has been for many years, available to all who desired it, but experience has shown that the number motivated into taking this training was insufficient to produce enough technically trained men to meet our requirements.

A strong influence must be exerted on our youth to cause them to desire technical training. The program of youth training Civil Air Patrol is striving to conduct, with its limited resources, is potentially capable of arousing and stimulating extensive youth interest in aviation and allied scientific and engineering fields.

Two factors are limiting the scope of Civil Air Patrol's training and motivation program at the present time. First, the attractiveness of the present program, without flight training, has been insufficient to induce the maximum desirable number of youth to participate in the program. Second, the cost of an adequate and appropriate program is beyond CAP's capability to support without the aid provided for in this bill.

The Civil Air Patrol, an active nationwide organization, has in actual operation a program for the indoctrination of youth in aviation activities. This program emphasizes the need for technical and scientific training in aviation and related fields. The national benefits to be derived from the CAP cadet program are directly proportional to the scope of the training available and the number of youth induced to join and remain in the program until their training is completed.

Federal financial support will enable CAP to expand its present youth program to include flight instruction and additional technical training. The resulting increased attractiveness of the training program should greatly increase the number of highly motivated cadets entering into further training and employment in the aeronautical and related technical and scientific fields.

As you will remember, Gen. Carl A. Spaatz, former Chief, USAF, testified extensively in behalf of the compensation bill that became a public law last year. He is vitally interested in this proposed legislation to assist Civil Air Patrol's youth training program. Your consideration at your earliest possible convenience is respectfully requested.

DESIGNATION OF FEBRUARY 16 OF EACH YEAR AS LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to designate, by proclamation, February 16 of each year as Lithuanian Independence Day. I am joined in sponsorship of the joint resolution by my distinguished colleague from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter I have received from the Connecticut Luthuanian Catholics, an organization representing Lithuanian church groups in my State, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

Mr. President, on Saturday, February 16, will occur the 39th anniversary of

the founding of the Republic of Lithuania, a nation now enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

In the light of recent events in Eastern Europe, the fate of Lithuania takes on a new significance. Last fall, the people of the free world were horrified by the brutal suppression of the Hungarian people by the Soviet Union. It came as a grim reminder to the free peoples of Soviet brutality, and it taught the free world a new lesson, just as the destruction of Lithuanian independence in 1940 has long been a tragic lesson in Soviet treachery.

In the long and honorable history of Lithuania there have been many chapters which tell of courageous resistance to oppression, and of fighting for freedom. I am confident that that spirit still lives in the Lithuanian people, and I know that their aspirations for freedom have the full sympathy of the people of America.

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

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 55) authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating February 16 of each year as Lithuanian Independence Day, introduced by Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. PURTELL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter presented by Mr. BUSH is as follows:

CONNECTICUT LITHUANIAN CATHOLICS,
February 4, 1957.

The Honorable PRESCOTT BUSH,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The 39th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day will be celebrated on February 16, 1957. In commemoration of this the Connecticut Lithuanian Catholics respectfully request the Senator to submit a formal resolution for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD recognizing this observance and that same be released for the press and radio news bureaus.

On this day the Lithuanian people throughout the world pay tribute to the memory of a free Lithuania and offer their prayers for its citizens who have undergone violent brutality in their efforts to retain their dignity as a people and a democratic nation.

The spirit of freedom remains alive in Lithuania, and we Americans of Lithuanian descent continue the battle for the freedom of our homeland so that one day its people may again regain the liberty which is their rightful heritage and enjoy the happiness they once had as a free and independent nation.

We extend our sincere appreciation for your assistance in this regard.

Respectfully,

REV. FRANCIS J. PRANCKUS,
Spiritual Adviser.

WM. V. TARAGOUSH,
President.

ANNE W. GECEVICH,
Secretary.

CONTINUED USE OF HORSE-DRAWN CAISSON FOR MILITARY FUNERALS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize the continued use of the horse-drawn caisson in military funerals at Arlington National Cemetery.

The joint resolution provides for retention of the horse-drawn caisson in military funerals at Arlington Cemetery. I suppose it is true that a motorized hearse could be obtained for less than is required for the horse-drawn caisson. However, the use of horses is such a time-honored tradition, having been continued for more than 100 years, that I believe it should be continued in tribute to our honored dead.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 56) to authorize the continued use of the horse-drawn caisson in military funerals at Arlington National Cemetery, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF FEBRUARY 3 AS CHAPLAINS' DAY

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, last month both Houses of Congress agreed to a resolution to set aside a special day this year to honor the four Army chaplains who gave their lives when the U. S. S. *Dorchester* was sunk by enemy action off the coast of Greenland on February 3, 1943.

The day designated for the commemoration was the 14th anniversary of the great tragedy—Sunday, February 3.

Since the sacrifice made by those four chaplains, who were of different religious faiths, has become another great symbol of the strength we can find in the recognition of the brotherhood of man, I feel that the entire Nation should set aside a Chaplains' Day each year to commemorate their heroism.

I, therefore, submit a resolution to designate the first Sunday of each February as a special day of observance to honor the chaplains who went down with the *Dorchester*, and I ask that a copy of my resolution be printed in the RECORD immediately after my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that a resolution which has already been adopted by the delegates at the 1956 Grand Aerie convention of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, as well as by Cumberland Aerie, No. 245, Fraternal Order of Eagles, be printed following the measure I am introducing.

I am indebted to Ira M. Boyer, Herman L. Myers, and George J. Mengele for their kindness in letting me know of the highly commendable action taken by the members of their groups. Mr. Boyer is worthy president and Mr. Myers is secretary of the Cumberland Aerie, and Mr. Mengele is a member of the legislative committee, State Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles.

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

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 57) authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating the first Sunday of February of each year as Chaplains' Day, introduced by Mr. BEALL, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The resolution presented by Mr. BEALL is as follows:

Whereas on February 3, 1943, the U. S. S. *Dorchester* was sunk in the North Atlantic, during World War II, with the loss of more than 600 Americans, including 4 chaplains of 3 great religious faiths; George L. Fox, Protestant; John P. Washington, Catholic; Alexander L. Goode, Jewish rabbi; and Clark V. Poling, Protestant minister; and

Whereas these four chaplains gave up their lives that others might, live, going down together on the deck of the U. S. S. *Dorchester*, to give to the world for all time a dramatic example of human brotherhood, courage, and selflessness, and an inspiring demonstration of interfaith unity and understanding; and

Whereas in order that the meaning and significance of their heroic deed may be perpetuated each year, memorializing not only the supreme sacrifice of the four chaplains, but the supreme sacrifice of all chaplains who gave up their lives for others, inspiring all Americans by their example of faith and courage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the Congress of the United States to set aside the first Sunday in February each year, as Chaplains' Day, and that the day be devoted to the dedicated memory of the four chaplains of the U. S. S. *Dorchester* and all chaplains who gave their lives for our country.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION, RELATING TO APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to appropriations. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an explanation, prepared by me, of the joint resolution.

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

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 58) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to appropriations, introduced by Mr. BYRD (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The explanation presented by Mr. BYRD is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Federal expenditures for domestic-civilian programs have been increased more than 45 percent since fiscal year 1954. The need for vetoing some of these programs is obvious.

I am hopeful that the Congress will veto some of the domestic-civilian expenditures proposed by the President in the budget for fiscal year 1958, beginning next July 1.

In order that the President may have an opportunity to veto increased spending added by Congress, Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, and I today are introducing a resolution for a constitutional amendment giving the President the power of item veto.

The spending record since fiscal year 1954, including the President's new budget estimates for the coming fiscal year, follows:

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal years				
	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958
Domestic-civilian:					
Veterans services and benefits	4.3	4.5	4.8	4.9	5.0
Labor and welfare	2.5	2.6	2.8	3.0	3.5
Agriculture	2.6	4.4	4.9	4.7	5.0
National resources	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.4	1.5
Commerce and housing	.8	1.5	2.0	2.3	1.7
General Government	1.2	1.2	1.6	1.9	1.5
Interest	6.5	6.4	6.8	7.3	7.4
Contingencies	----	----	----	.2	.4
Budget total, domestic-civilian	19.3	21.8	24.1	25.6	[1]26.0
Transferred to so-called trust accounts:					
Highways	----	----	----	1.2	1.8
FNMA	----	----	.1	.3	.7
Total, domestic-civilian, including highways and FNMA	19.3	21.8	24.2	27.1	28.5
National security:					
Military functions	40.3	35.5	35.8	36.0	38.0
Stockpiling and DPA	1.0	.9	.6	.4	.4
Atomic energy	1.9	1.9	1.7	1.9	2.3
Total, national defense	43.2	38.3	38.0	38.4	40.7
Foreign aid:					
Military	3.6	2.3	2.6	2.6	2.6
Economic	1.5	2.0	1.6	2.1	2.1
Total, foreign aid	5.1	4.3	4.2	4.7	4.7
International affairs	.2	.2	.2	.3	.4
Budget grand total [2]	67.8	64.6	66.5	68.9	71.8

[1] This figure would be $0.7 billion higher if the budget request for increased postal rates should not be enacted.
[2] Grand totals exclude highway trust fund expenditures for fiscal years 1957 and 1958 and FNMA trust fund expenditures for fiscal years 1956, 1957, and 1958. (Figures rounded; may not add to totals.)

With this sort of Federal spending in view, I sincerely hope a constitutional amendment allowing the President to exercise item veto may be submitted to the States for their ratification.

Forty State governors now have item veto authority. From my own experience I know the authority can be used effectively and constructively.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957—NOTICE OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following notices in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 4249) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

Page 8, after line 6, insert:

"CHAPTER V—PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

"DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL

"Construction, general

"That portion of title III of the act of July 2, 1956 (Public Law 641, 84th Cong., 70 Stat. 474, 480), that pertains to the purchase of lands and improvements in the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District in lieu of protecting said Buford-Trenton Irrigation District in connection with development, construction, and operation of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River, is amended to read as follows:

" 'That in lieu of protecting the East Bottom of Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, the sum of $1,621,791 of the funds herein or hereafter appropriated for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River shall be available for the purchase of lands and improvements in and contiguous to the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, exclusive of tracts Nos. H. H. 3170 and H. H. 3168, and not to exceed $2 million shall be available to the Corps of Engineers for protection of the intake structure of the pumping plant in Zero Bottom and for the construction of bank protection to prevent erosion in the Missouri River adjacent to the Buford-Trenton irrigation project. The substitution of land acquisition for protection shall be made and the Secretary of the Army shall acquire such land and improvements if all of the landowners, except Lester G. Larson, the heirs of Louis Morin, Jr., and the heirs of A. Desjarlais, on or before June 30, 1957, have offered to sell their property on the terms agreeable to said landowners, and within the amount provided for such land acquisition: *Provided*, That the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, is authorized to acquire by condemnation proceedings, in the appropriate United States district court, tract 208C of the Buford-Trenton project, Williams County, N. Dak., according to the recorded plat thereof which tract is owned by Lester G. Larson, the public domain allotment of A. Desjarlais, now deceased, described as Government lots 5 and 8 in section 19 and Government lot 1 in section 30, township 153 north of range 102 west of the fifth principal meridian, North Dakota, and the public domain allotment of Louis Morin, Jr., now deceased, described as the west half southwest quarter, section 16, and the north half southeast quarter, section 17, township 153 north, range 102 west, fifth principal meridan, North Dakota, in connection with the construction and operation of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir: *Provided further*, That in the event land acquisition is undertaken in lieu of protection of the East Bottom, that in recognition of the increased per acre annual operation and maintenance cost of the remaining lands in the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, the construction charge obligation assignable to the remaining lands of said district pursuant to the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 119), as amended, and the proposed contract between the United States and Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, approved as to form February 23, 1955, shall be nonreimbursable, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to enter into a contract with the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District to transfer operation and maintenance responsibility for project works constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation for the benefit of the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District to such district.' "

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 4249) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

Page 7, line 23, after "1958" insert ": *Provided*, That the limitation in section 2 (a) of the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbian-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956, on the acceptance of offers for delivery of ores under said Act in any one calendar month, shall not apply to offers made between December 1, 1956, and the end of the month preceding the date of enactment of this Act, and the quantity of such offers which may be accepted shall be on a cumulative basis."

Mr. HAYDEN also submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 4249, making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notices.)

Mr. POTTER submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 4249) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 6, after line 10, insert a new chapter (with consequent renumbering of succeeding chapters), as follows:

"CHAPTER III.—AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

"CONSTRUCTION OF MEMORIALS AND CEMETERIES

"To the extent that the Commission may find necessary or desirable, the appropriation granted under this head in the General Government Matters Appropriation Act, 1957, shall be available for the purposes of the act of April 2, 1956 (70 Stat. 84)."

Mr. POTTER also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 4249, making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

ENFORCEMENT OF STATE STATUTES PRESCRIBING CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] may be added as cosponsors to the bill (S. 654) to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities, introduced by me on behalf of myself and other Senators on January 17, 1957.

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

TRAINING OF NATIONAL GUARD—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], a very distinguished military commander, and formerly the head of the Pennsylvania National Guard, may be added to the names of the sponsors of Senate bill 1017, previously introduced by me. The bill would authorize two

training periods for the National Guard to accomplish the 6 months' training program.

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

ADDITIONAL SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE — ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] may be added as a cosponsor on the bill (S. 1138) to permit coverage under social security of service performed by an individual in the employ of his son, daughter, or spouse, and service performed by a child under the age of 21 in the employ of his father or mother, the next time the bill is printed.

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

PROPOSED NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 11, 1957,

The names of Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. MAGNUSON were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1176) to establish on public lands of the United States a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, to provide for the protection and administration of the areas within this System by existing Federal agencies and for the gathering and dissemination of information to increase the knowledge and appreciation of wilderness for its appropriate use and enjoyment by the people, to establish a National Wilderness Preservation Council, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. MORSE, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. CLARK) on February 11, 1957.

SELF-DETERMINATION FOR PEOPLE OF CYPRUS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of my colleagues the junior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] may be added as cosponsors to the resolution (S. Res. 81) favoring self-determination for the people of Cyprus, submitted by me on January 30, 1957.

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

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER (S. DOC. NO. 26)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 28, 1956, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of report on the lower Mississippi River—area enclosed by White River backwater levee system, Arkansas, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, adopted September 23, 1949. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustration, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

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

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

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

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Address entitled "The United States and the United Nations," delivered by him at Georgetown University, Washington, D. C., on February 11, 1957.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Lincoln Day address entitled "Republicanism As I See It," delivered by him in California on February 11, 1957.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

Address delivered by Senator TALMADGE before joint session of Georgia General Assembly, on February 11, 1957.

By Mr. WILEY:

Statement prepared by him, entitled "Milwaukee Celebrates National Crime Prevention Week," together with two articles from the Milwaukee Journal of February 10, 1957, dealing with the celebration of National Crime Prevention Week in Milwaukee.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

Lincoln's Birthday address delivered by the Secretary of Agriculture at Pierre, S. Dak.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Program and transcript of proceedings at fifth annual dedicatory prayer breakfast held at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on February 7, 1957.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATION BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

D. Malcolm Anderson, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the western district of Pennsylvania for a term of 4 years, vice John W. McIlvaine, resigned.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Friday, February 22, 1957, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate received today a list of 103 nominations covering appointments of Foreign Service officers of various classes. The list appears elsewhere in the Senate proceedings of today.

Notice is given that these nominations will be eligible for consideration by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

THE NEW FEDERAL BANKING CODE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Commerce Clearing House, Inc., in its Federal Banking Law Reports has published a pamphlet entitled "New Federal Banking Code Explained." It is an explanatory analysis of the committee print bill entitled the "Financial Institutions Act of 1957," now pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The publication is an excellent, well organized document, and will be of great assistance to the committee in its consideration of the bill introduced by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from the publication, entitled "Highlights of the New Code." I believe the information contained in this portion will be helpful to the Senate.

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

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE NEW CODE

1. First legislative steps begin

Banking and financial interests throughout the country are currently engaged in a careful study of a 253-page proposal to amend and revise the Federal laws governing banks, savings and loan associations, and credit unions.

The document in question is the Committee Print of a measure now under consideration by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. It was submitted to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee by a subcommittee early in January. Full public hearings are scheduled to begin January 28, 1957. All persons desiring to appear and testify at the hearings should notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, chief clerk, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, 303 Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D. C., telephone National 8-3120, extension 865, before the close of business on Monday, January 21, 1957. After the hearings conclude, a bill will be introduced in Congress.

2. The code and its purpose

Seven basic financial statutes are amended and revised in the proposed code which is entitled the "Financial Institutions Act of 1957." The statutes included in full text are the National Bank Act, the Federal Reserve Act, the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, the Federal Savings and Loan Association Act, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation Act, and the Federal Credit Union Act. Suggestions are incorporated from the Federal agencies concerned, various financial groups, a 27-man advisory committee, and many individuals.

The proposals are designed to make the Federal financial laws more workable and understandable by eliminating obsolete provisions, to add new authority where needed so that financial institutions may more effectively meet the present day needs of the communities in which they do business, and to realine supervisory authority along more logical lines. The many changes and new provisions in this measure are comparable

in impact and importance to the wholesale revision of the Federal tax structure in the 1954 Internal Revenue Code.

This book presents a detailed explanation of this proposed legislation to acquaint those interested with the scope and content of these sweeping changes. Copies of the Committee Print are available from the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.

NATIONAL BANK ACT

3. Consumer installment, dairy cattle, and frozen food paper

Today's record volume of consumer installment paper has increased correspondingly the needs of sellers and dealers for an expanding market for their paper. National banks are authorized to acquire such paper from one dealer or seller in amounts up to 25 percent of their capital and surplus if such paper carries the full recourse endorsement or unconditional guaranty of the seller or dealer (par. 135).

An obstacle to the convenient financing of the sale of dairy cattle is removed by an express authority for a national bank to acquire obligations of dealers in dairy cattle arising out of the sale of dairy cattle, in an amount not exceeding 25 percent of the bank's capital and surplus in the case of any one dealer. This paper must also carry the full recourse endorsement of unconditional guaranty of the seller as in the case of consumer installment paper (par. 135).

Frozen-food loans are also included within the 25-percent limit applicable to loans to one borrower. Recent developments by frozen-food processors in freezing and storing foods has made unrealistic the present restriction that the security for loans against marketable staples must be nonperishable. The new loan authority requires that refrigerated foods must be insured and that these loans may not run for more than 6 months (par. 135).

4. Financing industrial and commercial construction

To facilitate the financing of new plant and commercial construction, national banks are given authority to make 18-month loans where there is a binding agreement by a financially responsible lender to advance the full amount of the bank's loan upon the completion of the buildings. The total of such loans, including residential and farm construction loans, may not exceed 100 percent of the capital and surplus. These construction loans are classed as ordinary commercial loans rather than as real-estate loans (par. 137).

5. Financing public building construction

Financing aid in the construction of public buildings by the General Services Administration and the Post Office Department is given through a new authority for national banks to make loans for such construction on the security of purchase agreements. These loans are placed outside the limits established for real-estate loans (par. 137).

6. Leasehold loans

Unrealistic provisions in the existing law restricting leasehold loans by national banks to leases having a renewable term of 99 years or more or a term of 50 years beyond the loan's inception date have been replaced by the more lenient requirement that all leasehold loans must involve a lease running at least 10 years beyond the maturity date of the loan (par. 137).

7. Working capital loans

Loans to supply needed working capital for established manufacturing and industrial concerns may be made without regard to the limits set for real-estate loans, even though the national bank holds a mortgage on the real estate as an added precaution. As long as the bank looks primarily to the operations of the borrower for repayment, rather than to the mortgage security, the working capital loan will be considered as an ordinary commercial loan (par. 137).

8. Total limits for real-estate loans

The total amount which a national bank may lend on real estate is liberalized by adding to the present two alternatives for computing this maximum a limitation based upon demand deposits. Thus, the proposed National Bank Act would fix the total at (1) the amount of capital and surplus, (2) 60 percent of the time and savings deposits, or (3) 20 percent of the demand deposits, whichever is the greatest. The new basis of demand deposits is intended to aid national banks in communities where competition for savings deposits is such that they have difficulty in acquiring such deposits in amounts sufficient to enable them to meet the normal demand of their customers for real-estate financing. The present criteria of capital and surplus and 60 percent of time and savings deposits is considered unnecessarily restrictive in the case of banks having a relatively low proportion of time and savings deposits (par. 137).

9. Investments in bank buildings

Higher investments by national banks in their premises are permitted by substituting for the present maximum of 100 percent of the bank's capital the limitation that such investments may not exceed 100 percent of the bank's capital or 50 percent of its capital and surplus, whichever is greater. Under the present act, a bank with a large surplus in relation to its capital suffers in contrast to a bank of the same general size maintaining a large capital in relation to its surplus (par. 144).

10. Purchases of bank stocks

The absorption by a national bank of another bank is made easier by new authority for the national bank to acquire the stock of such other bank for a period of not more than 90 days as a step in the takeover process. The present statutory prohibition against a bank's purchasing corporate stocks is absolute and banks have been deprived of this convenient means of effecting otherwise unobjectionable absorptions (par. 133).

11. Total bank indebtedness

The debt limit of a national bank is increased to 100 percent of its capital and surplus. The present limit of 100 percent of capital less losses on debts unnecessarily restricts banks in borrowing from other banks in the normal course of correspondent banking and in connection with the maintenance of required Federal Reserve balances (par. 138).

12. Stock option plans for employees

National banks are given authority to compete more effectively in today's labor market under a new authority to issue stock options to their employees or to employees of their subsidiaries, and to issue and sell shares of their capital stock without first offering them for sale to the stockholders. There is no present statutory authority by which national banks are permitted to establish stock option programs which are generally recognized as a major solution to the problem of developing and maintaining high-grade personnel in business and industry (par. 132).

13. Preferred stock, note, and debenture issues

Greater access to the capital market for needed bank funds is afforded by express authority to issue preferred stock of one or more classes, capital notes, and debentures. Under the present law national banks may issue preferred stock only in the event of an emergency and they have no authority to issue capital notes or debentures. This restriction, which compels reliance on common capital, is considered unreasonable in view of the fact that other types of securities issues may offer a better and more feasible means of acquiring additional capital (pars. 121, 122).

14. Reports to the Comptroller

A new approach to reporting by national banks takes advantage of the development in recent years in sampling techniques. Furthermore, the proposed law recognizes the fact that there is no need for all banks to report the same information, regardless of size. Accordingly, the Comptroller is authorized to require reports of condition and dividends on a sample basis or from a selected list of national banks without requiring such reports from all banks. He is also permitted to prescribe different forms of such reports and make different requirements as to their publication for different banks according to their location, size, or other reasonable classification. The time within which reports must be submitted to the Comptroller after a call has been issued has been increased from 5 to 10 days, and a burdensome requirement of attestation of national bank reports by 3 directors has been omitted (par. 153).

15. Large stock transactions to be reported

Any single transaction involving the purchase or sale of 10 percent of a national bank's stock will have to be reported immediately to the Comptroller by the president or cashier. This is similar to the present requirement under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, calling for reports to the Securities and Exchange Commission of transactions in securities registered on national securities exchanges by beneficial owners who are defined as owners of 10 percent or more of the corporation's securities (par. 124).

16. Insurance agency and real estate brokerage powers

If State law authorizes State banks to act as insurance agents or real estate brokers, national banks are given co-extensive authority, and the present limitations, restricting a national bank's exercise of these activities to towns having a population of not more than 5,000 are inapplicable in such States. Furthermore, if a national bank has been lawfully acting as agent or broker in a town with a population of not more than 5,000, the authority to so act is not terminated if the population subsequently expands beyond 5,000 (par. 146).

17. Ban on State licensing

No State may examine or license national banks in the exercise of authority given them by Federal law. This prohibition extends to all political subdivisions of the State. The prohibition is directed at legislation in various States requiring national banks to be licensed in order to qualify as licensed lenders (par. 152).

18. Gifts to schools and community projects

Power to participate more actively in community affairs is given. Charitable gifts to nonprofit educational institutions and civic improvement organizations are new categories named as beneficiaries of national bank contributions (par. 132).

19. Branches after merger

A national bank which continues after a merger or consolidation may keep the branches which it operated prior to such reorganization without obtaining new approval by the Comptroller. This is designed to eliminate unnecessary paperwork both by banks and the Comptroller (par. 140).

20. School savings plans

Participation in school thrift or savings plans by national banks is authorized by the proposed act. Acceptance of school children's savings by a bank employee at the school, if located in the bank's trade area and within the State, is not to be considered branch banking (par. 140).

21. Cumulative voting

Mandatory cumulative voting for directors is ended. However, if stockholders so provide in their articles of association, this

method of concentrating voting power is still permitted. This is intended to promote a higher degree of unity in the directorate and in the official staffs of national banks (par. 127).

Election days sometimes fall on legal holidays. A new authority to meet on the next day simplifies the mechanics of holding the election (par. 127).

FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

22. Federal Reserve bank directors

Both the term of office and the requirements as to a director's residence have been changed. All three classes (Classes A, B, and C) of directors are restricted to serving for two consecutive terms and there can be no third term until a three-year period has elapsed. A chairman of the board is permitted to serve three consecutive terms (par. 217).

There is no limitation under existing law as to where Class A or Class B directors, who are elected by the member banks in the Federal Reserve district, and Class C directors, who are appointed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, are presently required to have been a resident of the district for two years. The new Code requires all three classes of directors to be residents of the district or reside within a 50-mile radius of the Federal Reserve Bank on the board of which they are serving. Each director must terminate his directorship when he ceases to meet these residence requirements (par. 217).

23. Reporting requirements

As in the case of national banks, reporting requirements are simplified for state member banks. The Board of Governors may prescribe different forms for reports of condition and earnings and dividends for various groups of State member banks, such as reserve city banks and country banks, or large and small banks. Reports may be required on a sample basis rather than from every bank on every call, and the publication of reports may be waived (par. 223).

24. Reports of large stock transactions

Immediately following any single transaction involving the purchase or sale of 10 percent or more of the bank's outstanding shares, the president or cashier must report such transaction to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (par. 223).

25. Purchases of bank stock

State member banks are given authority coextensive with the new permission given to national banks to acquire stock in another bank for a period of not more than 90 days as a step in the absorption of such other bank (par. 223).

26. Investments in bank buildings

Increased investments by State member banks in their premises is authorized. Amounts up to 100 percent of their capital or 50 percent of their capital and surplus, whichever is greater, are permitted (par. 223).

27. Loans to bank officers

A more realistic ceiling of $5,000 is placed on loans which a member bank may make to an individual executive officer. The present maximum is $2,500. A further change is a liberalizing of the reporting requirements for officers' indebtedness to their banks (par. 228).

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE ACT

28. Management of FDIC

The form of organization of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is changed by the establishment of the position of Administrator to replace the board of directors. This abolishes the present Board of 3, consisting of 2 appointed by the President, and the Comptroller, ex officio. To serve in an advisory capacity to the Administrator is an Advisory Board consisting of the Comptroller, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board or his designee, and 1 of the State bank supervisors (pars. 302, 306, 307, 342).

29. Bank mergers

The act provides for the approval of all bank mergers involving insured banks (heretofore only mergers which reduced capital required FDIC approval) by the Comptroller if the resulting bank is a national bank, by the Board of Governors if the resulting bank is a State member bank, or by the FDIC if the resulting institution is a nonmember insured bank (par. 323).

30. Payment of interest

The language of the Federal Reserve Act prohibiting the payment of interest on demand deposits has been incorporated in the act. There is a conflict in ruling between the Board of Governors for member banks and the FDIC for nonmember insured banks on whether the absorption of exchange is the payment of interest on demand deposits and hence prohibited by law. This resolves the conflict and establishes a uniform interpretation in accord with the present ruling of the Board of Governors which prohibits the absorption of exchange as constituting the unlawful payment of interest on demand deposits (par. 326).

31. Shareholders' list

The president and cashier of every insured bank must keep at all times a full and correct list of the names and residences of all the shareholders in the bank, and the number of shares held by each, in the office where its business is transacted. In addition, the Administrator must be notified immediately of any single transaction involving the purchase or sale of 10 percent or more of the outstanding shares of the bank (par. 327).

32. Termination of insured status

Provisions on the termination of insurance of insured banks for unsafe and unsound practices have been strengthened. A change in the wording of the statute enables the Corporation to terminate insured status if an unsafe practice is "engaged in" as compared with being "continued" (par. 329).

33. Payment to depositors of closed insured bank

In all cases where an insured bank is closed without adequate provision being made for the payment of its depositors, the Corporation has immediate authority to discharge its insurance obligation, and, upon payment, the Corporation is subrogated to the rights of such depositors to the extent of the payment. This new provision strengthens the position of the Corporation when this situation arises (par. 330).

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK ACT

34. Management policy standards

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board is given express authority to set up standards of sound management and home financing policies, nonconformance with which may deprive a nonmember of the right to obtain advances from a Federal home loan bank or result in the loss of membership in a Federal home loan bank (par. 407).

35. Advertising by uninsured members

No uninsured member of a Federal home loan bank may lawfully advertise, off the premises on which is situated its main office or any branch office, that it is a member of a Federal home loan bank or is otherwise associated with the Federal Home Loan Bank System, unless such advertising is expressly authorized by regulations of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board (par. 404).

FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION ACT

36. Interest rates

Interest rate limitations on Federal savings and loan associations are revised to clarify the extent to which interest rates and charges by Federal savings and loan associations are, on the one hand, governed by State or local law, or are, on the other hand, governed by Federal law and regulations of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. Rates are limited to such rates as are allowed by applicable law to other lenders, or such other or higher rates or charges as are allowed by applicable law to any class of other similar local mutual thrift and home-financing institutions, or as are allowed by regulations of the Board (par. 504).

37. Branches

Branches of Federal savings and loan associations located outside of the State in which the home office is located are prohibited. However, branches in operation when the code becomes effective may be retained (par. 506).

38. Dealings with officers and employees

A ceiling of $15,000 is placed on the amount which an association may lend to an executive officer for home mortgage purposes. No Federal savings and loan association is permitted to pay a greater rate of return to directors, officers, employees, or attorneys than is paid to other holders of similar accounts (par. 507).

FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION ACT

39. Scope of amendments

Among the more important changes proposed in the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation Act are those relating to mergers or consolidations of insured associations, the payment of insurance premiums after a merger or consolidation, and the regulation of holding companies controlling savings and loan associations.

New provisions require the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation's approval of mergers or consolidations of insured associations which supply needed authority lacking in the present law. The Corporation is given broader authority to reject applications for insurance as in the case of institutions whose home-financing policies are considered unsound (par. 604). The double payment of premiums would be eliminated in situations where, following a merger of savings and loan associations, the surviving institution's new premum year begins shortly after it has paid the premium due (par. 605). Holding companies in the savings and loan industry are restricted by new provisions which make it unlawful for such company to control more than one insured institution or to acquire more than 10 percent of the stock with power to vote of more than one insured institution. Willful violations of these provisions could result in a fine of $10,000 (par. 609).

FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT

40. Scope of amendments

Among the more important changes in the Federal Credit Union Act are those relating to annual audits, salaries, and loan limits. Annual audits by independent individuals or firms are required of all Federal credit unions with assets of $50,000 or more. Smaller credit unions will be subject to annual audits made by the Bureau of Federal credit unions. Another new provision allows compensation for the treasurer only, instead of for such officers as may be entitled to compensation under the credit unions' bylaws. Specific authority is given to the Director of the Bureau to impose maximum loan limits by regulation. This supersedes the present limit of 10 percent of the credit union's capital and surplus. The unsecured loan limit is raised from $400 to $500 (par. 701).

IMPORTANCE OF GREATER MULTILATERAL TRADE—IMPORTATION OF WATCHES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I believe it is generally recognized that one of the basic elements in establishing a true and lasting peace is the encouragement of greater multilateral trade among the free nations. Many significant and encouraging developments in this direction have recently been taking place in Europe—particularly, the acceptance of the so-called common market. In view of this trend, it is most distressing to find that, despite President Eisenhower's general statements in support of expanded international trade, the Republican administration has frequently taken specific actions which greatly hamper efforts by foreign countries to sell their products within the United States.

Perhaps the best reflection of the wide divergence between America's promises and its performance under the present administration is seen in the watch-importing industry. In addition to invoking a 50-percent increase in duties in 1954, the administration has engaged in a series of actions and threats of actions aimed at curtailing the importation of Swiss watch movements into this country. Only 2 weeks ago, we witnessed the latest of these harassments when the Treasury Department drastically revised a long-standing customs regulation on watch adjustments which will have the effect of increasing duties and placing considerable hardship on watch importers and their foreign suppliers.

One excuse which the administration has employed in an attempt to justify some of these actions has been a claim that the domestic watch manufacturing industry is essential to national security. As many Members of the Senate will remember, the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, of which I am a member, conducted an exhaustive study last session concerning the impact of so-called defense essentiality claims on our foreign-trade policy. The subcommittee, which used the experience of the watch industry as a case study, issued a report which I believe is worthy of the thoughtful attention of Members of the Senate.

One of the most important conclusions of the subcommittee was that:

> Protection of the watch industry by trade restrictions in the name of defense is unwarranted because first, it will not be effective in preserving the domestic industry, and second, it represents an undue burden on other industries, as well as consumers. The burden on other industries and on the trade of the free world will detract from national security.

The Office of Defense Mobilization is now reexamining its earlier conclusion that the domestic watch manufacturers are essential and should be preserved through Government intervention—a position which, strangely enough, was accepted by the administration in 1954 in the face of a directly contrary conclusion reached by the Defense Department. In connection with this current reexamination, I have seen two reports in the press which I believe will be of interest to the Members of the Senate.

The first is an excellent editorial carried in the Toledo Blade, on January 19, 1957. It contains the timely warning that:

> The "defense" gimmick is a tempting device for all manner of thwarted protectionists. President Eisenhower, who has been somewhat fickle in support of the liberal trade policy he advocates, will have to be on guard to prevent its use to "stop the clocks" of other competitors than the Swiss.

The second article which I should like to recommend is a very enlightening study entitled "Does Protectionism Really Protect Us," written by Douglas Cater in the Reporter magazine for January 10, 1957. It underscores the peculiar logic that led to the earlier ODM finding that the watch industry is essential to national security, and emphasizes the vital importance of using great care in the present ODM proceedings if we are to avoid establishing an unfortunate precedent which may undermine our foreign economic policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the Toledo Blade editorial and Mr. Cater's article printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

[From the Toledo Blade of January 19, 1957]

STOPPING THE SWISS CLOCK

Less than 3 years after President Eisenhower granted a 50-percent increase in the tariff on jeweled watches the domestic watch industry is back crying for still more protection from the ingenious Swiss. Once again the contention is that this is necessary to preserve United States horological skills in the interests of national security.

Even granting that some type of preferential treatment is essential to maintain watchmaking skills in this country—a highly debatable point—the question remains whether tariffs or import quotas are a proper mechanism to achieve this.

The plain truth is that the Swiss excel in the manufacture of timepieces and only the most punitive restrictions can prevent them from competing successfully on the American market.

They not only reduced the impact of the 1954 increase in the duty on jeweled watches by shipping in watches to which jewels were added here, but they made inroads in the field of inexpensive nonjeweled watches dominated by American manufacturers. Now not only American makers of jeweled watches but also pin-lever watch and clock makers have joined in the cry for further protection.

But isn't the Swiss competitive spirit and enterprise just what the United States is always extolling? Aren't we always stressing the need for friendly nations to be allowed to earn their way on the world market by exercising their special skills?

If the American watchmaking industry can't compete with the Swiss and has to be supported by artificial means in the name of defense, then wouldn't it be preferable to use some other form of subsidy besides tariff or quotas? Certainly the use of the latter device in this connection is not only an injury to a small and admirably industrious nation but is damaging to the whole reciprocal trade structure under which we sell to other nations as well as buy from them.

The Swiss watch case seems to suggest a need to re-examine the whole relationship of the new concept of "defense essentiality" as it has been connected with tariffs and quotas. In a recent article in Reporter magazine, Douglas Cater points out that a number of other industries besides the watchmakers are attempting to use national security to justify increased protectionism.

The Office of Defense Mobilization is considering the pleas of cordage and twine as well as watch manufacturers. The request list includes thermometers, wool felt, and wooden boats. Mr. Cater notes—and we hope he was merely being ironic—that reports have clothes-pins and dehydrated garlic waiting in the wings.

The defense gimmick is a tempting device for all manner of thwarted protectionists. President Eisenhower, who has been somewhat fickle in support of the liberal trade policy he advocates, will have to be on guard to prevent its use to "stop the clocks" of other competitors than the Swiss.

DOES PROTECTIONISM REALLY PROTECT US?

(By Douglass Cater)

President Eisenhower, having not long ago braved the protectionist wrath of the groundfish-fillet producers by overriding the Tariff Commission's recommendation for higher levies on foreign competition, may shortly be challenged to an even more soul-searching test of his trade policy. The groundfish fillet, it turned out, was fortuitously intertwined with our network of mutual security—more particularly our recently jeopardized forces on little Iceland. But Swiss watches, quite the opposite of helping our defenses, some insist, currently threaten to undermine them. Eisenhower's Director of Defense Mobilization, Arthur S. Flemming, has scheduled hearings for January 7 to investigate the matter.

A strange overlay of strategic doctrine envelopes the arguments of the opposing sides. To listen to the four domestic jeweled-watch manufacturers, who initiated the complaint, their own economic self-interest is scarcely a part of the case. Paul Mickey, a Washington attorney who is vice president of the American Watch Manufacturers Association, claims that should the Government decide the American industry is not essential to security, it will be a matter of great simplicity and greater profits to import Swiss movements and to shift plants to other fields of precision engineering. In opposition, the voluminous literature of the watch importers lays grave stress on America's real security requirements in fighting the proposed quota on the Swiss. Both sides have developed elaborate treatises on the nature of future wars.

For a few independent souls who have tried to make head or tail of these competing strategies, there is a serious question whether the hurdle called "defense essentiality" recently added to our trade-policy procedures hasn't been set up in the wrong part of the playing field. It threatens to trip up our whole reciprocal trade program. Already the Office of Defense Mobilization (ODM), a comparatively recent addition to the Executive Office of the President meant to deal in long-range planning, has become a busier center than the venerable Tariff Commission for American businesses clamoring for very immediate protection. Only now the businessmen and their lawyers are speaking in terms of "maintenance of the mobilization base," "minimum defense requirements," "pools of essential skills," etc.

The watch controversy provides an illuminating case study of this confusion. The Swiss, traditional craftsmen of jeweled lever watches, have held a major share of the market in America since 1936, when the 2 nations negotiated a reciprocal trade agreement. At the other end of the quality scale, American pinlever watch and clock manufacturers have dominated the inexpensive-watch field.

The innumerable Swiss watch-part and movement manufacturers are banded into an interlocking system of trade organizations

that their American competitors condemn as a cartel. Cartel or not, the system has not prevented the Swiss from competing among themselves as well as with American producers in the United States market. The Swiss have led in technological innovations, first developing the shockproof watch, the self-winder, the chronograph, and the various gadgetry wrist watches that have found eager customers in this country. Along with the American importing and asesmbling concerns, they have pioneered in adapting watch-sales techniques to our radically changed postwar market. Well before their American competition, they engaged in mass advertising campaigns. They removed the wrist watch from the exclusive sanctum of the jewelry shop and sold it in department, drug, and even discount stores.

With some justice, the Swiss can claim that they worked to create the volume market for jeweled wrist watches in America while their domestic competitors lagged behind. The American manufacturers, holding onto a steadily declining share of a steadily expanding market, claim that cheap Swiss labor is threatening the livelihood of approximately 4,000 watch workers, many of the highly skilled. The Swiss reply that it is not their labor, the highest paid in Europe, that is the cause but rather un-American lack of enterprise. They claim American trade barriers will threaten an industry which accounts for nearly half of their dollar sales and which is essential to their country's very existence.

WALTHAM STARTS IT OFF

Pressure for a political solution to this economic problem began to build in Washington in 1949, when the Waltham Watch Co., a century-old institution, went on the rocks after what impartial observers agreed was a half century of bad management and had to be taken over by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Elgin and Hamilton soon joined in sounding the alarm along with Bulova, an importing company that has established a sizable domestic plant in the United States.

The Truman administration responded to the extent of inserting an escape clause in the Swiss trade agreement, but in 1952 Truman emphatically rejected a Tariff Commission recommendation for a 50-percent boost in watch duties, declaring this "would be striking a heavy blow at our whole effort to increase international trade and permit friendly nations to earn their own dollars and pay their way in the world."

Two years later, President Eisenhower authorized the boost. His ODM, said the President, had found as a result of an interdepartmental study that the preservation of the unique skills of the watch industry was essential to the national security. It is not certain that Mr. Eisenhower realized that he was establishing a precedent. In the following year, Congress hardened that concept into law by tacking to the Trade Agreements Act a new section a great deal more loosely phrased than the traditional escape-clause and peril-point provisions. Section 7 simply specifies that "whenever the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization has reason to believe that any article is being imported * * * in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security, he shall so advise the President. * * *" The President, if convinced by an investigation, "shall take such action as he deems necessary to adjust the imports of such article to a level that will not threaten to impair the national security." The dark shadow of quotas loomed over our international trade policy.

Skeptics, both at home and abroad, were inclined to suspect the legitimacy of this new security program, pointing to all-too-obvious signs of political wheeling and dealing. There had been the economic recession during the winter of 1953–54 with a resulting protectionist clamor from powerful Republican warriors on Capitol Hill. The administration was engaged in battling through 1-year extensions of the Trade Agreements Act and waiting rather desperately for the Randall Commission report to provide a rationale for something more. Mr. Eisenhower, who feels a deep, if not particularly truculent, devotion to liberal trade, had already rejected four escape-clause recommendations served up to him by the Tariff Commission. There was a mounting feeling that a sop to the protectionists was in order.

Watches had a particular urgency that year. In Massachusetts, home of Waltham, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican whip and chairman of the Armed Services Committee, was facing a tough battle for reelection. In Illinois, home of Elgin, the Republicans were throwing everything into the fight to lick Democratic Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, an outspoken administration critic on economic matters. In Pennsylvania, home of Hamilton, the Republican machine was in trouble.

On June 30, 1954, the same day ODM Director Flemming sent his report to the President, the Armed Services Subcommittee staged a hearing at which a long succession of Members of Congress from the affected States made it clear that jeweled watches were essential to their political security. Only ex-Senator Millard Tydings, a former Armed Services Committee chairman who is counsel for the watch importers' association, spoke in dissent.

CROSSED SIGNALS IN DEFENSE

But the most intriguing byplay occurred within the executive branch. In preparation for the ODM report, the Department of Defense undertook a study based on what Assistant Secretary C. S. Thomas described as "a most thorough examination by technical experts" and "careful consideration by cognizant officals of the Department." Teams were sent to inspect the four jeweled watch companies as well as other precision-engineering factories. The conclusion, astonishingly, was that "the needs of the Department of Defense for industrial capacity clearly reveal that no special nor preferential treatment for the [jeweled watch] industry is necessary."

This conclusion was kept tightly classified until nearly a year later, when Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, who had been tipped off, demanded that Thomas's report be released. To an irate brace of Republican Senators, Defense Secretary Wilson apologized lamely that it had meant to imply that the entire horological industry, including pin-lever watches and clocks, was essential to the mobilization base. He regretted the wrong inference that had been drawn. A careful reading of the report fails to reveal one word to support Wilson's explanation.

The ODM report to the President failed to mention the conclusion reached by this Defense Department study, but drew heavily on one from the Commerce Department based in the main on nonmilitary needs during the Second World War. It scaled down the Commerce Department recommendation from 3 to 2 million watches as a minimum annual production for the domestic industry.

PUBLICITY WAR

Eisenhower's decision to raise the duties on watches in 1954 provoked a decidedly hostile response, both at home and abroad. A nationwide survey of editorial opinion, financed by the importers, showed that 79 percent of the United States daily newspapers that commented on the watch decision were opposed to it. The CIO took a vigorous stand against it. From Geneva, Michael L. Hoffman, New York Times correspondent, wrote, "With one blow, the President proved to the satisfaction of everyone in Europe who cares about such things, that all that the Socialist, Communist, neutralist, and homegrown anti-Americans say about United States trade policy is right, and that everything Mr. Eisenhower, the Randall Commission, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and every United States ambassador in Europe says is wrong."

The watch decision also signaled the start of unrestricted guerrilla warfare between the watchmakers. Both sides possess a clear understanding of the vital nexus that exists between Madison Avenue, the Washington law firm, and the politician. Neither is lacking in legal or advertising talent.

The American watch companies wheeled up their big gun in the person of General of the Army Omar N. Bradley, now chairman of the board of the Bulova research and development laboratories. "May I Speak Up?" Bradley spoke up in full-page newspaper advertisements, arguing forcefully that it was essential "solely for reasons of defense to preserve a hard core of watchmaking skills in this country." The Bradley ad also indicated that further steps were necessary to protect domestic watchmakers.

The watchmakers of Switzerland in turn undertook to drum on the raw pocketbook nerve in a series of newspaper advertisements all over the country. "Tote That Bale * * * to Switzerland!" was the appeal in the Houston Post, pointing out that the Swiss, a $150 million yearly cash customer of the United States, "buy thousands upon thousands of bales of good American cotton." "Business is Business in Detroit, Michigan, or Bienne, Switzerland" ran an ad in the Journal of Commerce, concluding direly that "The same tariff burden that could deny a Swiss watch to the man in Detroit can very well strip American equipment from the plant in Bienne."

The President's tariff decision was only the first of a series of governmental actions which convinced the Swiss that they were in for rough sailing. Three months later, the Justice Department filed an antitrust suit against the Swiss manufacturing associations and the American importers. (It alleges, ironically, that Swiss combination and conspiracy has the effect of maintaining the price of Swiss watches in the United States at arbitrary and noncompetitive levels.) In March 1955 the Treasury Department tried to institute a ban against up-jeweling, the practice of adding jewels after arrival in the United States to avoid the prohibitive tariff on above-17-jewel movements. Failing that, it urged legislation in Congress to affix a processing tax on such movements.

Treasury officials, also began to explore ways of applying the costly adjustment duty on unadjusted Swiss watches because new assembly processes have made the latter just as accurate. In December 1955 the Justice Department instituted a second suit involving the Swiss watchmaking-machinery industry.

Finally, that same month, the United States jeweled watch industry came back to ODM asking further protection on the grounds of defense essentiality. They were joined this time by the pin-lever watch and clock makers.

The unhappy fact was that not only had the fifty percent tariff boost not noticeably helped the sale of domestic jeweled watches but it was apparently helping play hob with the pin levers. The total market for high-jeweled watches has fallen off appreciably. At the same time there has been a fantastic boom in Swiss nonjeweled watches, which approach in accuracy, if not long life, the more expensive variety. Slim and highly attractive in design, they are cutting deeply into the sales of their bulky American counterparts. The cheap pocket watch, formerly a major part of American production, now appears to be a vanishing breed.

WHAT THE INDUSTRIALISTS SAID

So it is that the American pin-lever clock and watchmakers will be standing alongside the jeweled watch representatives during the ODM hearing this month, bearing the testimonial from Secretary Wilson that they too are essential to the Nation's security. The jeweled watchmakers' petition claims they must be allowed to produce approximately 3.6 million watches annually, if ODM's objective for maintenance of the industry in a healthy and vigorous condition . . . is to be achieved.

But other factors have entered the picture. For one thing, part of the agony of the pin-lever group arises from the growing imports of West German clocks. And West Germany, unlike neutral Switzerland, is a vital and fairly fragile member of the western defense alliance.

Also, there have been promptings to reexamine the basic concept of defense essentiality. Last January, a group of American industrialists called on ODM Director Flemming and made some telling arguments. C. H. Percy, president of Bell & Howell, said that he could have sought tariff protection against German cameras produced with much lower-paid skilled labor than the Swiss. Instead, his company perfected automation processes that have kept its optics division in business. John S. Coleman, president of the Burroughs Corporation, told how electronic testing enabled his company to achieve the fine tolerances necessary for the Norden bombsight faster and more effectively than with human skills. He also claimed that with very little difficulty a top-grade toolmaker from his plant could make the most delicate equipment used in the watch industry; the group of American industrialists agreed that tool- and die-makers, the absolutely essential skills, are interchangeable among industries. Thomas Reid, of the Ford Motor Co., a former assistant Director for Manpower in ODM, added that quite a segment of the industrial world shared the feeling that the tariff was not the proper means to protect critical skills.

This reexamination went even further last June when the Bolling Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress undertook a case study of the watch industry. William L. Batt, former Vice Chairman of the War Production Board during the Second World War and former president of the S. K. F. Industries, argued that putting a fence around segments of American industry tends to weaken rather than strengthen national security: "I consider that the important thing to develop and preserve in American industry today is versatility. * * * It is for that reason that I look with grave concern on a proposal that freezes 4,000, or whatever number it may be, men in an industry * * *." There was testimony that the watch of the not distant future may be a radically different, possibly electronic timepiece, requiring other types of skills.

The subcommittee concluded unanimously that "Protection of the watch industry by trade restrictions in the name of defense is unwarranted because, first, it will not be effective in preserving the domestic industry, and, second, it represents an undue burden on other industries as well as consumers." In a separate appendix, Senator RALPH FLANDERS, Republican, of Vermont, sorrowfully castigated the American watch industry for lack of enterprise over the past half century, but concluded that it was essential to defense as a nursery for microprecision skills. He did not specify how it was to be preserved.

VOLUNTARY QUOTAS

There have been straws in the wind that the Eisenhower administration believes it has hit upon a new, painless approach to its tough trade problems. Last September, in a speech to the Northern Textile Association, Sherman Adams, the assistant to the President, pointed pridefully to the voluntary quotas which the Japanese had agreed to impose on their cotton-textile exports to the United States. "I should like to suggest that in broader aspect this arrangement is * * * prophetic of Federal action most certainly to ensue in similar exigencies," said Adams, with clearer intent than syntax. Secretary of Commerce Weeks hinted at the same thing more recently when he lectured an importers' convention on the advantages of moderation.

But trade experts are quick to point out that quotas, whether voluntary or involuntary, have the same detrimental effect on competition. In addition, the voluntary quota, negotiated as a result of American threats, obliges the foreign government to interfere in private enterprise in a way we have righteously sought to discourage. In the case of the Swiss, it would result in the farcical spectacle of the United States Government conspiring with the same cartel that it has brought antitrust action against.

There is a faint hope among some observers that the President may undertake a really new approach. They hope he will remove defense essentiality from the area of trade policy and put it where it belongs—in the Defense budget. The 1954 ODM report on watches indicated that a subsidy to the watchmakers, if carefully applied, would not inhibit competition the way trade barriers do.

This would also mean that manufacurers would be obliged to get acceptance, not just acquiescence, from the politicians before they could win special benefits. It would mean that the cost of maintaining defense-essential industries would get regular review rather than be forever buried in the tariff structure. It would mean that a noisy few could not do lasting damage to our foreign trade—estimated to be worth $29 billion for 1956—and our even more precious system of alliances.

Alternatively, an ever-lengthening procession of security cases can be expected to line up outside the White House. Cordage and twine are already being given solemn consideration by ODM. Behind watches on the request list come analytical balances, fluorspar, thermometers, wool felt, and wooden boats. There are reports that clothespins and dehydrated garlic are waiting in the wings.

THIRTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, Saturday of this week will mark the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Americans of Lithuanian descent and those of Lithuanian lineage throughout the free world will mark the day with appropriate prayers and ceremonies.

In Lithuania itself, the valiant people of that great land, yoked by Communist brutality, will hold no public observances. Rather, there will be private devotions in the heart of each citizen as he prayerfully rededicates himself to the day when Lithuania will once more take her place in honor and dignity among the free nations of the world.

Mr. President, Lithuania—the first victim of Soviet aggression—remains unconquered and unpossessed. Her spirit, gleaming with a desire for freedom, shines through the somber blackness of the Iron Curtain.

The unceasing heroism of her people has heretofore brought her back from periods of subjugation and misery. The deep religious devotion of her sons and daughters has enabled them to withstand the fiendish tyranny of the Soviet oppressors.

In Lithuania we are witnessing the glorious spectacle of freedom being kept alive in the hearts of men and women in the face of overwhelming odds.

We in America, and all of us in the free world, must help to sustain these people in their period of trial and oppression. We must continue to assure them of our deep and continuing conviction that they will be restored to their rightful place in the world as free men and women.

The Lithuanians hold a place of honor in the hearts and minds of free men everywhere. They, who have fought so valiantly for freedom in their homeland and in behalf of freedom all over the world, are an inspiration and an example of the heroic cast of men and women whose sacrifices in its behalf have dignified liberty as one of God's most precious gifts to mankind.

I am most happy, Mr. President, to join with my distinguished colleague from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] in introducing a joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim February 16 of each year as Lithuanian Independence Day.

Mr. President, let us note this anniversary of Lithuanian independence with renewed determination to pursue our efforts in behalf of the enslaved peoples of the world toward the day when the curtain of slavery shall be lifted and the sunlight of freedom shall shine undimmed throughout the world.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a country which is dedicated to freedom should always pause to observe the great anniversaries of freedom. One of those will take place this Saturday—the day on which Lithuania won its independence.

It is tragic that the 39th anniversary of this great occasion should take place when Lithuania is ground under the iron heel of a tyrant. For the Lithuanian people, freedom was all too brief.

But a people who have tasted the blessings of liberty cannot be held forever in slavery. They will know that the hearts of freemen everywhere are with them, and that the day will come again when they will rid themselves of their oppressor.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, February 16 marks the 39th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania. It is a privilege to join my fellow Americans of Lithuanian descent in observing this historic occasion.

There is no Lithuania today because the colossus of Soviet communism has gobbled it up, along with many other nations where the heartfelt desire of the people is for liberty and national independence.

But so long as the spirit of freedom lives in the Lithuanian homeland and is fed by sympathy and support from America, Lithuania lives. We have seen in the past year how indomitable the spirit of freedom is. From that spirit, combined with the prayers and assistance of the people of the free world, will come inevitably the restoration of the Republic of Lithuania to the commonwealth of free nations.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, Saturday, February 16, marks the anniversary of

the short-lived independence of Lithuania from her Russian oppressors. Thirty-nine years ago today, her freedom was established and she emerged as a free and independent nation with great hopes for a new future.

Lithuania, the largest and most thickly populated of the three Baltic States, first gained her freedom from Russian domination in modern times during the First World War. On February 16, 1918, at Vilnius, the Lithuanian Taryba or National Council, proclaimed the restoration of an independent Lithuania. However, it was not until July 12, 1920, that relations with Soviet Russia were regulated by the Treaty of Moscow.

In 1939 Lithuania was again overrun by Russo-German aggression. The Germans first seized the port of Memel and then assigned the whole country to the Russian sphere of influence. For the second time in history, Lithuania was transformed into a Russo-German battleground.

Lithuania revolted again in 1941, and after a few days of freedom was overrun by and held firmly in the grip of the German forces. The fast-moving Russian offensive in 1944 dislodged the Germans and with the accompaniment of a reign of terror, reestablished Russian authority. Since then, Russia has confirmed the forcible incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

We all experienced the great surge of hope that accompanied the uprisings in Poland and Hungary, and felt that perhaps they would emerge free again. One can imagine the feelings of the Lithuanians that perhaps their day, too, had come again.

There can be no doubt that the recent rumors of unrest from the Lithuanian underground are true. These people, who have been uprooted from their homeland and resettled where their captors chose to settle them, yearn for their country to be reestablished; they yearn to practice freely the religion of their choice; and they yearn to live in freedom.

How long they must bear being illegally occupied by the Soviet dictators, who have attempted to rob them of their human dignity and to reduce them to the status of a people without a name or a language, we do not know. But let us all join together in fervent hope and prayer that the people of this gallant country may soon join the family of free nations to live again in the light of freedom and independence.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] was called from the city today. He asked me to have placed in the RECORD a statement he has prepared concerning the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

I join with the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota in expressing the sincere hope that a new day of freedom for the gallant people of Lithuania is not far in the future.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement prepared by the junior Senator from Minnesota be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

February 16 marks the 39th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. After more than a century of Russian domination, the Lithuanian people broke the yoke of Soviet tyranny and became an independent nation, enjoying the freedom and happiness of an independent republic.

For 22 years thereafter, the democratic government of Lithuania prospered and made great strides as a nation to advance and improve the economic and social welfare of its citizens. As an honored member of the family of free nations, Lithuania faithfully fulfilled all of her obligations.

On June 15, 1940, the Soviet Government snuffed out the freedom of the little Baltic State, enslaved its people and destroyed every vestige of their independence. Lithuania was incorporated in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and since that day, her people have endured untold hardships at the hands of the aggressor. The Soviet Union has made every effort to obliterate the national sentiment of the Lithuanian people. Today there is no independence day in Lithuania, no national anthem, no flag.

Yet her spirit persists, and today all freedom-loving people join in the Lithuanians' hope of the eventual realization of their aspiration to resume their existence as an independent republic. The free world will never accept the Soviet annexation of Lithuania, and we share the spirit of freedom that exists within them, and the hope that the day of liberation is not far distant.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on Saturday, February 16, the freedom-loving peoples of the world will pause to pay tribute to the great country of Lithuania. The occasion is the 39th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

To really appreciate what the Lithuanians have gone through, it is fitting at this time to give a brief résumé of the history of Lithuania since its independence in 1918.

Lithuania was an exemplary nation and a respected member of the family of free nations, honorably fulfilling all her obligations.

In 1922 she installed the first Land Reform Act in all Europe. This was one of the most important events in her history, as three-fourths of her population was engaged in agricultural pursuits. It was this Land Reform Act which counteracted the influence of Communist propaganda.

Lithuania did not concern herself only with the physical aspects of progress, but in 1930 introduced compulsory education, with the result that the illiteracy of the people was reduced from 64 percent to 15 percent and the number of pupils in grammar schools rose from 45,000 to nearly 300,000.

Lithuania's rapidly developing cooperatives raised the standards of commerce, agriculture, and industry—thus transforming Lithuania from a self-subsisting nation to one of a commercial type.

Her state opera, ballet, and theater were a mecca for internationally famous conductors and artists, and contributed immeasurably to the culture of this ancient nation.

But then in 1940 the Soviet steamroller moved into Lithuania on its road to world domination. As we speak here today there is in Lithuania a rigid censorship which prevents the rest of the world from learning of the deportations enforced by the Russians under the guise of volunteer work elsewhere. There has been a systematic effort by the Soviet Union to merge Lithuania organically into the Soviet system and to exterminate the hostile native anti-Soviet element by killing members of resistant groups.

But this proud country has not yielded; she still fights on; and Americans of Lithuanian extraction will bow their heads in prayer on Sunday, February 16, and ask the Almighty to free their mother country from the chains and shackles which bind her. Here in our great country there are more than 1 million Lithuanian-Americans and it is truly fitting that these people should observe an anniversary which is denied them in their home country.

To my friends in Rhode Island of Lithuanian extraction and to their brothers throughout the freedom-loving world, I say, "Keep the torch of freedom burning in your hearts. Never let it die out, for your faith in the future is the instrument which keeps alive the hope that beats in the breasts of your countrymen."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement I have prepared on the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS ON LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

In commemorating the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian national independence there is new hope in the hearts and minds of free men everywhere that the Lithuanian people will soon be free and independent again. There are several basic reasons for this new hope which are worthy of mention in connection with todays' commemoration.

A number of years have passed since Lithuania and the other captive nations behind the Iron Curtain lost their freedom and national independence. With the passing of these years there has been a tendency in some quarters to feel that the Communist police state methods were so severe and tight that it would be impossible for the people behind the Iron Curtain to do anything effective to regain their freedom. This has been compounded by a myth which has been built up that the Red army was invincible and it's naked power was felt everywhere throughout the Communist empire. As a result there had developed a feeling of frustration and even despair among some people. This added to the ever present danger that our policymakers would fall victim to the temptation that there was nothing we could do but accept a situation of "status quo" with the Russians.

The Polish and Hungarian patriots have shaken the free world out of its lethargy and have put to rest the notion that there is any degree of finalty in the situation as it exists today behind the Iron Curtain. These brave people have, by their raw courage, placed upon the conscience of all mankind an obligation that there can be no rest for anyone until tyranny and despotism and dictatorships have passed from the affairs of men. Freedom's cause has been lifted up by these historic events and it must never

again be allowed to slip or to be misread by men who know not the power of the will of men who want to be free.

The Hungarian freedom revolution has destroyed the twin myths that the Communist police state makes revolution impossible and that the Red army is invincible. The Hungarian patriots destroyed the police state of communism and held in their hand for a period of 4 days that freedom and independence for which they were prepared to die. They put the Red army to rout—chased them out of their beloved Budapest and drove them to cover and retreat all over Hungary. All these things they did without one bit of help from the free world. These are the things they did with practically their bare hands—it was a great victory won by students, workers, intellectuals; by children in their early teens and old folks in the twilight of life. It was an unforgettable demonstration of what a whole nation can do when its people are determined that they will no longer be slaves.

The patriots of Poznan served warning on the masters in the Kremlin that the days of Communist terror and national degradation in Poland, too, are short numbered. The Russians have made a supreme effort to calm down the Poles and have made all sorts of promises through their agent, Gomulka. But the people of Poland will choose their own course, and there is no turning them back by any power on earth.

In Lithuania the same forces for freedom are at work today. Sooner or later they will make their bid for freedom. I cannot tell you when this will occur or under what circumstances, but I have not the slightest doubt that Lithuania's destiny is with freedom and not with the slavery of the Russians. The whole history of the Lithuanian people gives testimony to this fact; the very character of the people makes certain this will happen as surely as day follows night.

Let us all hope that we will not be called upon for many more years to commemorate Lithuanian national independence day with an alien power in control of that brave little nation. Let us all work harder for the day when Lithuania will once again hold its position among the free, sovereign, and independent nations of the earth.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, as February 16 will be the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, I join with all Americans in commemorating, with their fellow citizens of Lithuanian descent, this great event. This day is a symbol of the love of freedom which is so strong in the Lithuanian people—a freedom which was cruelly taken away from them by the Russians after they had enjoyed it for so short a time. We are happy to have so many fine citizens of Lithuanian descent in this country of liberty, and we share their earnest hopes for a return to freedom of the country of their origin. I know that our Government, guided by high principles of human dignity, will continue its efforts to bring release to the captive peoples of the world. I know I speak for all Americans when I say that we pray the time is not too far off when we can welcome Lithuania back to her rightful place of honor among the free nations of the world.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the leaders of the Communist world are becoming more and more acutely aware that the yearning for freedom, independence, and self-determination is universal and indestructible. Wherever it has once flourished, there will it retain its vitality; nihilistic barbarism becomes powerless to expunge it from the hearts of freedom-loving peoples. On February 16, 1 million Lithuanians in America, along with Americans of Lithuanian descent, joined by their friends everywhere, will celebrate the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, in a demonstration once again of the devotion of the human spirit for liberty.

Russian imperialism overwhelmed this gallant people in June 1940, bringing to an abrupt termination 22 rich and progressive years of development as a free nation. The United States, however, continued to recognize the independence of the Lithuanian nation because our Government and its citizens know full well that the present status of Lithuania was brought about by brutal aggression and without the consent of its people.

The strong common bond among lovers of freedom is an earnest fount of our sympathy and friendship with the courageous Lithuanians. We in America are proud to unite with them in this celebration and the proclamation of this anniversary, and we look forward with hope to the day when they will once again proudly enjoy their ancient rights and freedoms.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the bravery and spirit of the Lithuanian people in the face of great adversity is a source of admiration to all of us.

I am greatly pleased that Rev. Joseph Valantiejus, pastor of St. Joseph's Lithuanian Roman Catholic Church in Waterbury, Conn., is with us today and has given the invocation at the opening of the session of the Senate.

The 39th anniversary of the founding of the independent Republic of Lithuania will be observed on Saturday, February 16, 1957, and I know that Americans everywhere will be proud of join in this observance.

For much of the past two centuries, the people of Lithuania have suffered under the rule of an oppressor—first the Russian czars, later the Germans, and now, since 1939, of the Soviets. During their 21 years of independence, the Lithuanians showed themselves worthy of self-government. Their Republic was progressive, and it achieved much in raising the standards of living of its citizens.

Under Soviet Russia, the people of that small country have endured much, but no brutality has been sufficient to stamp out their burning desire to regain their lost freedom. A strong underground of loyal Lithuanians is helping to keep alive the flame.

Miss Claire M. Grigaitis of the Knights of Lithuania of Massachusetts has written me a letter in which she says:

> We Americans of Lithuanian descent retain an indomitable determination to continue the battle for the freedom of our homeland so that one day the land of Lithuania will, in the fullness of God's time, regain the freedom which is its rightful heritage, and enjoy the happiness they once knew as a free and independent nation.

We in the United States, who believe in the right of all peoples to self-determination, are hopeful that the day will soon come when Lithuania will once again proudly achieve the liberty and independence to which she is so eminently entitled.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, Saturday, February 16, marks the 39th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. This anniversary serves once again to focus our attention on the fact that since 1940, Lithuania has not enjoyed the rights and privileges of a free nation.

Rigid Soviet censorship and the passage of time tend to conceal the extent to which the Commuists have desecrated Lithuania. But the awful tyranny which bears down on this brave Baltic people is the same heel of totalitarianism which butchered the freedom-loving people of Hungary last fall. How hypocritical can the men in the Kremlin be? How dare they talk of colonialism when the Baltic States and Eastern Europe are but the pawns of their ruthless empire? Have they no feelings of compassion—they who exploit their captive lands and peoples with the vengeance of Tartar hordes?

May we in America never forget that the Lithuanian people were once free. We know that the spirit of liberty smoulders still in the hearts of these valiant people behind the Iron Curtain. We look forward to the day when Lithuania will once again be free and independent and will resume her position among the free nations of the world—a position she enjoyed from 1918 to 1940.

It is a privilege to join with the 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent in paying tribute to the people of Lithuania on the occasion of the 39th anniversary of their country's independence.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues in what they have said on the occasion of the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. The rape of Lithuania may prove to be one of the events which will undo Soviet Russia, because it demonstrates not only Communist colonialism, but brutal Communist colonialism.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding Lithuanian Independence Day.

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

LITHUANIA—IN COMMEMORATION OF FEBRUARY 16, 1918, LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

We are commemorating today the declaration of February 16, 1918, Lithuanian Independence Day. This date signifies the achievement of national independence for which the Lithuanians had so long been striving. The bitter years spent opposing the increasing encroachments of Russia had not dimmed Lithuanian hopes for freedom. And with the 1918 proclamation of independence the long-sought goal was finally realized. We are, therefore, indeed proud to add our voice to the steadily growing numbers who want to see the end of Lithuanian oppression and national humiliation.

The February 16, 1918, declaration by a Lithuanian nationalist group for independence was the culmination of three centuries of struggling for the re-unification of Lithuania. The dozen or more independent principalities which were finally united in the 13th century were buffeted about by outside forces over the centuries with the machinations and increasing pressures of Muscovy,

the principal ones with which to reckon. The Lithuanian drive for independence, however, was too strong to be repressed forever, and after World War I, Lithuania's dream for a free and independent Lithuania came true. Unfortunately the hopes engendered by this period of independence were short-lived, for in 1940 Soviet Russia again crushed Lithuania into submission. Since Lithuania was incorporated within the U. S. S. R. more than 500,000 Lithuanians have become victims of Soviet genocide with estimated thousands going into exile each month. These obvious difficulties have constantly plagued the Russian Communists within Lithuania, so that the complete sovietization of Lithuania has proved impossible. And the Soviet Union has admitted the repeated setbacks within Lithuania.

On the other hand, the American people have been constant in their open acknowledgment of the right of Lithuania to independence and to their steadfast belief that the principles which govern relations between nations must be the rule of justice, of reason, and of law. We repeat again, as we have so often done in the past, that the United States does not and will not condone the abuse of a nation's spirit or the perpetuation of injustice. We, therefore, fervently pray for the restoration of Lithuanian freedom and political independence.

DULUTH-SUPERIOR PORT

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles concerning the Duluth-Superior port which appear in the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce publication Greater Minneapolis for February 1957.

These articles point up the importance of this port on Lake Superior in terms of present tonnage. However, the articles also portray the potential growth of this shipping center as the work on the St. Lawrence Seaway and the connecting channels progresses.

I have always championed the St. Lawrence Seaway and the connecting channels legislation. I have given my all-out support for the full use and development of the Duluth-Superior Harbor.

There is now taking place in Duluth much planning designed to expand the facilities of this port. Representatives of industry, labor, civic groups, city officials are all drafting plans for the expansion of the port.

The full development of the Duluth-Superior port will have a great impact on the growth and expansion of the entire Midwest. The completion of facilities will mark a new era of progress and advancement in our Nation's economic and social history. I commend the reading of these articles to all of my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

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

BRIGHT FUTURE: DULUTH'S SHIP IS COMING IN

Bustling, brawny Duluth, with a full century of rich and colorful history behind it, has good reason to look forward. Poised at the westernmost finger of the Great Lakes, it is today eagerly scanning the eastern horizon of Lake Superior—for Duluth's ship is coming in.

Duluth's ship is no figment; already the world's second busiest port, it stands to see a great spurt in foreign shipping once the St. Lawrence Seaway project is completed in 1959. And while Duluth busily prepares to provide the facilities for handling giant ocean-going freighters, the rest of the one-time landlocked upper Midwest is enjoying the foretaste of becoming a primary area of deep-water commerce.

In truth, the good that will accrue to the upper Midwest's some 8 million residents from the 7 seas is something that has stirred businessmen, industrialists, and shippers throughout the area. Robert T. Smith, executive director of the Duluth Port Authority, foresees a tremendous expansion in exporting and importing—if expanded port facilities can be provided.

The port authority is now conducting a comprehensive survey of all business establishments in its sphere of influence—roughly the upper Midwest—to determine the potential of commerce funneling through the twin ports of Duluth-Superior.

Smith says the potential export volume of manufactured and processed goods that exists today in the upper Midwest is around 350,000 tons annually. Significantly, much of the industrial development that can generate this volume lies in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area. These exports, of course, do not include such shipments as grain and other bulk commodities such as soybean oil or linseed oil, which are exported in great quantities.

Similarly, the import potential of the twin ports is equally bright. Here again, the outlook depends on the harbor and ship-handling facilities that can be provided. But Smith points out that Duluth could become a great importing center for such items as fertilizer, sugar, coffee, and manufactured equipment. Coffee, incidentally, would be a natural import commodity for Duluth, Smith says, because the city's air-conditioned climate would permit prolonged storage.

Smith believes that the 600,000-square-mile area of the port authority's theater of operations—which includes Minnesota, North and South Dakota, and parts of Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas, Wisconsin, and upper Michigan—offers tremendous possibilities for world commerce. The area lends itself to industrial development because of great reserves of natural resources, such as iron and taconite, forest products, oil, lignite. Most valuable, too, are the area's tremendous reservoirs of fresh water, which is vital to industry.

The shipping potential for Duluth is unlimited, says Smith, but some years will elapse until the full impact of the seaway will be realized. But he points out that by sea, Duluth is only 783 miles further from Liverpool than is New York—and the cost per ton-mile for shipping by lake is about fifteen one-hundredths of a cent, the lowest cost system of bulk transportation in the world. So sooner or later, Duluth and the upper Midwest will take advantage of this deep-water commerce.

The seaway's coming means that Duluth-Superior Harbor itself must be refurbished to accommodate deep-draft ocean vessels. The harbor already has 17 miles of dredged channels, 25 feet deep at the ore docks and 21 feet at the grain elevators. Army engineers are contemplating increasing these depths commensurate with the 27-foot channel of the seaway itself.

As for port facilities, the port authority has plans for a mammoth public terminal wharf which will be the most modern on the lakes. Governor Orville Freeman, incidentally, has asked the Minnesota Legislature for $500,000 per year for the next 2 years to study and plan the development of the port of Duluth.

The new public terminal would be built in three stages, says Smith. The first stage will cost some $10 million and will accommodate three great ocean vessels or half a dozen lake boats. This facility, which may cost $40 million by the time it's completed, will be financed with revenue bonds. When finished, it will handle 11 of the largest type vessels engaged in foreign commerce.

Meanwhile, Duluth is not forgetting the iron legs on which it stands. Down through the years the Duluth-Superior twin ports have grown through the great shipments of iron ore. An annual average of some 51 million short tons of this red gold passes through Duluth on its way to steel mills to the east.

Although the supply of rich ore of the giant Mesabi and two smaller ranges, Vermilion and Cuyuna, is waning, the burgeoning processing and shipment of taconite has opened a new Minnesota frontier. Second to iron ore on the twin port's manifest is coal, followed by grain. While the twin ports are now the third largest grain center in the Nation, it is expected that the seaway's coming will force enlargement of the present grain-storage capacity of 56 million bushels to about 100 million bushels.

Actually, the Duluth-Superior Harbor is one of the finest natural harbors in the world. With nearly 50 miles of shoreline within the harbor lines and 75 miles altogether, including outer bays, it has plenty of room. It has plenty of bulk-freight docks, 7 iron-ore docks, 21 coal docks, 23 grain elevators on the waterfront, 4 automobile docks, and ample facilities for handling salt, stone, cement, scrap iron, and a host of other commodities.

With the improvements now in the planning stage, the harbor should readily adapt itself to the stepped-up tempo of shipments that will come with the St. Lawrence Seaway. Here's what John S. Coleman, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States predicts for Duluth alone:

"I honestly expect the population of Duluth will double in a relatively short time after the completion of the seaway."

Likewise optimistic is Geography Professor Harold M. Mayer, of the University of Chicago:

"With greatly augmented opportunities for industrial development opened up by the seaway in the major port cities as well as others in the Midwest—not only on the lakes but also in the interior—there will be a greatly enlarged demand for labor.

"Not only will thousands of people be engaged in direct operation of the port and shipping services, but additional thousands will be required in associated services. These include banking, ship chandlering, shipbuilding and repair, marine insurance, and many other activities.

"Many more thousands will be needed by industries attracted by the advantages of lower cost transportation and expanding markets, local and in distant areas, directly and indirectly attributable to the seaway."

So, as Duluth prepares for yet another domestic shipping season, it also is laying the plans which, come 1959, will mark its entry in major league foreign commerce. Port Director Smith entertains no doubts about the twin ports' future.

"If we provide good facilities," he says confidently, "commerce will flow."

WHAT TO EXPECT FROM THE SEAWAY

(By N. R. Danielian, president, Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association)

The mighty Midwest has a date with destiny coming up in 1959. That is the year that the St. Lawrence Seaway, a controversial issue for generations, will be open for large ocean vessels—up to 7,500-ton "general cargo carriers and 25,000-ton carriers of iron ore. This means that only 2 years from now America's fourth seacoast opens for business.

What can the the Midwest expect from this new waterway? Too many people think of the seaway as a sudden piece of magic which will overnight create a new industrial

revolution in the areas it touches. This, of course, is too visionary.

The seaway presents an opportunity to utilize large ships with greater cargo-carrying capacity over a water route which already is in existence. It is merely the tool, which if properly used, can create the setting for favorable changes in the Midwestern economy.

Interest has built up slowly, due to the long period of uncertainty as to whether there would be a seaway at all. But the seaway now finds its ranks of supporters greatly expanded. The New York Journal of Commerce quotes an anonymous Cleveland banker as saying that his bank had inquiries of all types on the seaway.

Said the banker:

"When you see all the correspondence and the activity at many local levels, you can't brush off the seaway. There are too many interests involved—railroad customers, truck-line customers, and manufacturing customers—are impressed at the way the seaway has been taken up by nearly everyone."

This broad interest must result in basic changes which will affect everyone in the seaway area.

As an example of just how significant the change will be, Steel magazine has predicted that in the next 15 years the major part of an anticipated 50-percent expansion in the steel industry will be centered in the Great Lakes area.

The two factors which lead Steel to this prediction are the availability of water for industrial cooling, and the availability of water for transportation. Expansion of the steel industry in the Midwest will mean more men in industry, more dollars in payrolls, and more customers for every item manufactured in the Great Lakes area.

This growth will engender new industries and enterprises which will broaden the economic base of the Midwest.

There are direct effects which also will be important. For the first time, manufacturers in the Midwest can ship their products overseas in quantity without braving the tangle of loading, unloading, shipment transshipment, and all the other costly complications which are necessary now with the long rail haul to the east coast ports serving as outlets to the world markets.

With the seaway, shipments made in lake ports can be loaded and not touched again until the ship arrives at its overseas destination. This will permit savings in time, money and losses due to damaged goods.

All of these things are possible, and indeed probable, when the summer of 1959 rolls around and the seaway opens. But there are several knotty problems still to be solved before the seaway can take its place as a major mover of world commerce.

An equitable system of rates and tolls must be established to pay the costs of constructing and operating the seaway, and at the same time encourage its use; demurrage and rail rate questions must be resolved for the Great Lakes ports; the ports themselves must be deepened and improved to handle adequately the increased trade, and an active program of trade promotion must be started to create the cargoes which will move along the seaway.

Progress and the earnest efforts of many past years are giving us the St. Lawrence Seaway. How effective it will be in aiding in the creation of a Golden Age of prosperity depends on the efforts of midwestern people.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the people of the State of Montana, who themselves are in the great American pioneer tradition, long have been stanch supporters of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. One of the most recent expressions of their feelings in this momentous matter is set forth in an editorial published in the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of February 6, 1957. The Great Falls Tribune is one of the foremost newspapers of the American Northwest.

Because of its pertinency to two measures now pending before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this very timely editorial be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

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

ALASKANS BATTLE INACTION

The Alaskan Statehood Committee has issued a statement asking American people to come to the support of their statehood drive. They have had this to a considerable extent for a good many years. In the Rocky Mountain area of which Montana is a part, such support has been widely expressed in the press. In Montana, our legislative assembly has more than once passed memorials asking Congress to grant Alaskan statehood.

Informed Washington observers report chances brighter for approval of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii in this session of Congress than in previous sessions. It cannot be overlooked, however, that such predictions have been heard at the beginning of each Congress for quite a number of years.

When Senators-elect Ernest Gruening and William Egan and Representative-elect Ralph Rivers were introduced in the Senate a few weeks ago they received a rousing ovation. Supporters of their statehood clause had read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD many editorials and articles favoring statehood for Alaska. This editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal should give some of those Congressmen who have engineered stalling tactics some cause for thought:

"A hardy group of Alaskans are in Washington, lobbying for statehood, and we wish them luck. They are not ordinary lobbyists. On the contrary, they are two regularly elected senators and a representative, legally qualified to take their seats in Congerss the moment Alaska is admitted to the Union.

"The Alaskans, like the Hawaiians, have been used for political footballs much too long. They qualify for statehood; they want statehood; they should have statehood.

"But we wonder if perhaps the Alaskans haven't been knocking too long on the wrong door. The Territory is some distance from the United States. It is cheek by jowl to Canada, though, and the ties between Canada and Alaska have been growing every day. We have an idea that the Canadians would be more than happy to have our valuable, strategically vital northern outpost under the Maple Leaf.

"Washington couldn't very well delay the Alaskans the right to a referendum on whether or not they would like to become a part of Canada, with the full rights and privileges of Canadian citizenship. But we have an idea that there would be a lot of startled looks and quick second thoughts in Congress if the Alaskans were to ask for one. If the door in Washington refuses to open this year, perhaps the Alaskans should try knocking on another one."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, as the Great Falls Tribune editorial points out, statehood for Alaska and Hawaii is long overdue. The first Alaska statehood bill was introduced in Congress more than 40 years ago. The issue has been actively debated in successive Congresses for the past 8 years.

This year, for the first time as President, Mr. Eisenhower gave support, in his budget message, to statehood for Alaska as well as to Hawaii. On the first day for presenting bills in this Congress, I introduced measures to admit both Territories to statehood. I was joined by more than 20 distinguished Senators from both sides of the aisle as cosponsors. Appropriately, the symbolic numbers S. 49 and S. 50 were assigned to these historic measures.

The committee immediately submitted these bills to the executive agencies concerned with requests for reports and an expression of views.

Despite President Eisenhower's statement in support of statehood for both Territories, and despite the fact that the provisions of both bills are thoroughly familiar to the administration, the executive agencies concerned have not yet furnished the committee with reports on them.

I take this opportunity, Mr. President, to call upon the administration to put into practice what President Eisenhower has preached, so to speak, and to comply forthwith with the committee's request for reports on the statehood bills, so that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may proceed to act on these bills in a bipartisan manner and with knowledge of the administration's views.

FOURTH ANNUAL BLOOD DONORS' PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the blood bank, under the auspices of the American Red Cross, the Senate Ladies, and the Senate Secretaries Association, will be open for donations of blood in the Senate Office Building tomorrow. I ask unanimous consent that an announcement on the subject be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

Tomorrow Members of the Senate and their staffs will be given an opportunity to participate in the fourth annual blood donors' program conducted by the American Red Cross under sponsorship of the Senate Ladies and the Senate Secretaries Association.

The purpose of this program is to maintain a blood bank for the benefit of all Senate employees and members of their families. Those who can or will donate a pint of their blood for this purpose will find arrangements made for them in rooms 154 and 155 of the Senate Office Building between the hours of 10 a. m. and 4 p. m. tomorrow.

The importance and significance of this program, Mr. President, is illustrated by the fact that one of our colleagues, the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota, Senator LANGER, is now in the Bethesda Medical Center and has received four blood transfusions in recent days. When the fact of his need for blood was publicized there was received at the hospital a telegram from a tribe of Indians in California offering to provide it.

That was a tribute to our colleague and an indication of the regard in which he is held by some of the groups of Americans he has served during his tenure in the Senate, but I am sure that neither in this case nor in any other where one of our associates or a related family member is in need will there

be a shortage of blood because of the failure of our group to take care of its own.

The opportunity for participation has been simplified by bringing the Red Cross facilities to our own building. I am sure I need say no more.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION GROUP

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, next Tuesday the United States members of the Interparliamentary Union group will meet in the Senate Appropriations Committee room F-39, in the Capitol, to elect officers. I ask unanimous consent that my announcement, as well as two statements on the subject, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

The meeting of the Interparliamentary Union in London in August of this year will be of major significance to the American group because at that time the Soviet Union and its satellite countries will renew their efforts in behalf of the admission of Red China as a member of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Interparliamentary Union is one of the oldest peace organizations in the world, dating back to 1899, with 49 nations holding membership, the United States being one of the charter members.

On next Tuesday, February 19, the United States members of the Interparliamentary Union group will meet at 9:30 a. m., in the Senate Appropriations Committee room F-39 in the Capitol for the purpose of electing officers for the ensuing year.

In order that the memory of Senate Members may be refreshed concerning the history of the Interparliamentary Union, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a brief history of the union prepared in the fall of 1953 by the Library of Congress and a list of the capitals of the world in which conferences had been held from 1889 through 1953, to which I have added Vienna, Helsinki, and Bangkok for the 3 years following 1953 and London, where the meeting will be held in September of the current year.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION, 42D CONFERENCE, OCTOBER 9–14, 1953, UNITED STATES CAPITOL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

BRIEF HISTORY OF THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

(Compiled by the Library of Congress)

Origin and purposes

The Interparliamentary Union is an association of the members and ex-members of the legislatures of the world. Its stated primary purpose is the peaceful settlement of disputes among nations—the promotion of conciliation and arbitration. With this purpose it has combined the furthering of better relations generally, through the study of international law, international organization, the reduction of armaments, economic problems, intellectual relations, social questions, and, particularly, the evolution of the representative system of government.

The formal history of the Interparliamentary Union, originally called the "Interparliamentary Union for International Arbitration," dates from 1889, although the international efforts of its founders started in the 2 preceding years. To Wiliam Randal Cremer, of England, tribute has been paid by the organization through the sixty-odd years of its expanding existence for his initiative and effort, from which the Union evolved. In 1887, he crossed the Atlantic as the head of a delegation representing 234 members of the House of Commons in an attempt to secure an Anglo-American arbitration treaty. Though this plan failed, the principle of arbitration was lauded the following year on the floor of the French Parliament by Frederick Passy.

The collaboration of Cremer and Passy ensued; and, following a preliminary meeting of British and French parliamentarians, they successfully launched in 1889 the first of the conferences of the Interparliamentary Union, held annually ever since, except during World Wars I and II. At the conference held in Paris, in June 1889, 9 countries were represented by some 96 legislators, including 1 delegate from the United States. By 1939, 51 countries had become members of the Union, which is made up of national groups. All Members of the Congress of the United States are automatically members of the American group. Representatives are chosen by the group for the annual conferences.

Conferences

Although the Union has permanent headquarters (now at Geneva), the annual meetings are held in different cities, usually at the capital of one of the affiliated countries. The last conference was the 41st, at Berne, in 1952; the 40th, at Istanbul, was in 1951. The next meeting is scheduled for October 1953, in Washington, D. C., for which Congress has apropriated the sum of $150,000.

An interparliamentary council, composed of two delegates from each affiliated parliament, meets annually to plan the conference, its agenda and arrangements, and the nominations to be made. This council is not to be confused with the Inter-Parliamentary Bureau, the central office of the Union (Geneva), which is composed of paid officers headed by the Secretary General.

Funds

Funds for the organization began with voluntary contributions by one or two governments. Today national groups contribute according to an agreed scale based on membership. A small amount of revenue comes from interest on investments and the sale of publications.

Publications

The proceedings of the annual conferences of the Interparliamentary Union appear in both English and French, in a publication known as the Compte Rendu, which has been issued since 1896. The latest was published in January 1953, and covers the 1952 Bern Conference.

Many of the interparliamentary groups issue publications of their own, but not at regular intervals. A Handbook of the American Group appeared in 1914, and yearly accounts appeared from 1918 onward in the Advocate of Peace (Washington), later renamed World Affairs Annual American group meetings since 1934 have been recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Besides the annual publication of the Union, there is the official organ, the Inter-Parliamentary Bulletin, normally published eight times a year, in both English and French. Another regular publication of the Union is the Constitutional and Parliamentary Information quarterly, which contains the texts of legislative and constitutional documents, sometimes in full, sometimes condensed, with translations into English and French.

Special publications suffer for lack of funds but have appeared occasionally. Among the most important are a 50th anniversary volume giving the history of the Union from 1889 to 1939, and two collections of the resolutions of the conferences and decisions.

Resolutions

Although sometimes criticized as visionary, the Inter-Parliamentary Union has, from its incipience, earned a reputation for its foresight and the influence of its resolutions upon international thought. From this union came the first proposal for a world court. Five years or more before the first Hague convention of 1899 the suggestion had been made by this organization. To it, therefore, may be credited the precursors of the present-day International Court of Justice. The Inter-Parliamentary Union was spoken of as early as 1904 as "the originator of the general congresses of nations, and intellectual parent, a point now admitted, of the Hague conference.[1]

Before World War I, the Union had passed resolutions which recommended the development of machinery for international cooperation on a lasting basis. One of these favored the creation of a permanent body for The Hague conferences.

The League of Nations system followed various recommendations of the Union. The League's lack of an international police force was not for want of such a recommendation. The Inter-Parliamentary Union passed a resolution proposing such a force in 1931.

Resolutions concerning disarmament, the designation of an aggressor, military and economic sanctions, and various others relating to international security were among those made in the 1930's.

Recommendations dealing with colonialism, with specific economic and social problems with aerial warfare, and with miscellaneous matters, have been more recent, yet in advance of those treated in an almost identical fashion by more formal international organs in later years.

It is sometimes difficult to determine whether resolutions of the Union preceded, followed, or were simultaneous with those of other organizations, but their effect could scarcely fail to carry weight. In pursuit of the basic concept of promoting international peace and in recognition of the fact that the chances for it depend on an informed and responsible public opinion in all countries, resolutions of the Union have dealt with an ever-widening field of international affairs. As legislators, the members of the Union are both the representatives of the people and their opinion, and the medium of reaching them and influencing it. As such their influence has reached incalculable proportions during several generations.

Affiliation with United Nations

The Inter-Parliamentary Union is affiliated with the United Nations as a class A organization with representation on the Economic and Social Council, with the right to originate proposals and to advocate them on the floor of the ECOSOC meetings during the year. Organizations in category A are those which have a basic interest in most of the activities of the Council and are closely linked with the economic or social life of the areas which they represent.

Previous conferences of the Interparliamentary Union

No.	Date	Place	Presidents
1	1889	Paris	Messrs. Whiting, Jules Simon, Philip Stanhope.
2	1890	London	Lord Herschell, Mr. Philip Stanhope.
3	1891	Rome	Mr. Biancheri.
4	1892	Bern	Mr. Gobat.
5	1894	The Hague	Mr. Rahusen.
6	1895	Brussels	Baron Descamps.
7	1896	Budapest	Mr. von Szilagyi.
8	1897	Brussels	Mr. Beernaert.
9	1899	Christiana	Messrs. John Lund and Horst.
10	1900	Paris	Messrs. Fallieres and Beernaert.
11	1903	Vienna	Baron von Plener.

[1] Quoted from the Washington Star of September 24, 1904; in Among the World's Peacemakers by Hayne Davis (New York), (1908), p. 66.

Previous conferences of the Interparliamentary Union—Continued

No.	Date	Place	Presidents
12	1904	St. Louis	Mr. Bartholdt.
13	1905	Brussels	Mr. Beernaert.
14	1906	London	Lord Weardale.
15	1908	Berlin	Prinz zu Schönaich-Carolath.
16	1910	Brussels	Mr. Beernaert.
17	1912	Geneva	Mr. Gobat.
18	1913	The Hague	Mr. Tydeman.
19	1921	Stockholm	Baron Adelswärd.
20	1922	Vienna	Mr. Mataja.
21	1923	Copenhagen	Mr. Moltesen.
22	1924	Bern-Geneva	Mr. de Meuron.
23	1925	Washington-Ottawa.	Messrs. William McKinley and Belcourt.
24	1927	Paris	Mr. Paul Doumer.
25	1928	Berlin	Mr. Walther Schücking.
26	1930	London	H. G. the Duke of Sutherland.
27	1931	Bucharest	Mr. Pompéiu
28	1932	Geneva	Count Carton de Wiart
29	1933	Madrid	Mr. Besteiro
30	1934	Istanbul	Hasan Bey.
31	1935	Brussels	Count Carton de Wiart.
32	1936	Budapest	Baron Láng.
33	1937	Paris	Mr. Mario Woustan.
34	1938	The Hague	Mr. Bongaerts.
35	1939	Oslo	Mr. Ivar Lykke.
36	1947	Cairo	H. E. M. H. Haekal Pasha.
37	1948	Rome	Mr. Carlo Sforza.
38	1949	Stockholm	Mr. Georq Andrén.
39	1950	Dublin	Mr. Frank Fahy.
40	1951	Istanbul	Mr. C. Baban.
41	1952	Bern	Mr. Ayron de Denarclens.
42	1953	Washington	Hon. Homer Ferguson.
43	1954	Vienna	Mr. Barthold Stürgkh.
44	1955	Helsinki	Mr. Lennart Heljas.
45	1956	Bankok	General Phra Prachonpachanuk.
46	1957	London	

A SPECIFIC EXAMPLE OF THE DIFFICULT TARIFF PROBLEM: THE CASE OF JAPANESE PLYWOOD

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have frequently indicated on the Senate floor that the tariff problem is still one of the most difficult facing our Nation.

On the one hand, as I have pointed out, very often—most recently, just a few days ago—America is interested in worldwide economic health. We want to encourage the two-way flow of goods and services. We are anxious to assure an increasing market overseas for American manufacturers and other products.

On the other hand, we face, very frankly, the hard fact that already, here in our own country, in certain specific industries, hardships are definitely being experienced because of exceedingly low-priced foreign competitive products.

How to fulfill all of our responsibilities; how to satisfy our worldwide interests, while at the same time protecting our natural domestic interest—this poses the problem. It cannot be solved by an off-the-cuff judgment.

The facts must be secured in each instance. The American market is, of course, the greatest in the world. Naturally, first chance in the American market belongs to the American producer.

I wish to call attention now to one particular situation which illustrates the problem.

I feel that all men of good will, including those who do desire economic health overseas, but who also want economic health at home, will want to study it.

Between 1935 and 1941, Japanese plywood exports to this country averaged approximately 1½ million feet a year. Today Japanese plywood imports have reached a total of 650 million feet, and the Japanese have captured 45 percent of the market. Other exporting countries, which are entitled to consideration, are not receiving it. Meanwhile, our own plywood factories are closing, and American labor is being rendered idle.

I have before me a statement furnished to me by Walter W. Smith, one of the American plywood manufacturers. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, at this point, as a part of my remarks.

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

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Congress, friends, and associates in the nationwide plywood industry, I represent Linwood, Inc., of Gillett, Wis., one of the smaller plants in our industry.

The purpose of our presence here today is in line with the fact that ever since the advent of man, self-preservation has been the first law of nature, and providing for the health and welfare of our loved ones is uppermost in our hearts and minds as we follow our daily vacations.

You men of the Congress, having human tendencies, have enjoyed an opportunity to realize how much an increase in one's earning capacity adds to the peace of mind, well being and sense of security of yourself and loved ones. By comparison, we in the plywood industry can look forward to no security or increase in the future of our business or financial returns from the labor of our hands.

What is causing the forboding and precarious future outlook in our hardwood-plywood industry? Our Government has tried to fashion a system of import tariffs on plywood, the purpose of which, we hope we are right in assuming, is an effort to extend to all peoples throughout the world an equal opportunity to do export business with this country. The hope in so doing is that it may stimulate world trade, wage increases, and higher standards of living in the participating foreign countries.

You may be interested to know just how successfully such equality of opportunity to trade with this Nation is working out in the plywood industry. A summary of reports on imports of plywood during the years 1955–56 indicates that Japan has monopolized 74 percent of all such imports, leaving 26 percent for 28 other friendly exporting foreign nations. Among exporters to this country are Canada, Finland, the Philippines, Denmark, Sweden, West Germany, and other friendly nations, each of which has higher standards of living and wage scales than has Japan and consequently a higher cost of production.

Does Japan have any inherent right over other foreign countries to monopolize our import-plywood markets as she is doing?

From 1935 to 1941, inclusive, Japanese plywood exports to this country averaged approximately 1.5 million feet per year. Prior to 1934 she had little or no plywood production. During the year 1956 Japanese plywood imports reached the total of 650 million feet and no end in sight.

After World War II Japan's economic and industrial life was stimulated by a combination of circumstances including technical and financial assistance to plywood manufacturers and other most-favored-nations treatment by our Government. The quality and productive ability of Japanese labor is known throughout the world as is also their low-wage scale and long hours of work. Those two factors together makes it possible for Japan to underprice all other foreign nations in their endeavor to sell plywood in our country. The same inequality of production costs hampers our efforts to sell our own plywood in, what we hope, is still our own country.

Japan is presently enjoying three-quarters of the plywood imports into this country and a total of approximately 45 percent of all hardwood plywood consumed in the United States while at the same time domestic plywood plants are suffering financial difficulties all over this country. Is there anything in this situation which assures greater national security in time of war?

Japan has usurped this volume of plywood sales not alone to the loss and damage of all other foreign plywood producers but also to the loss and damage of labor in all phases of domestic plywood production.

It is reported that some Japanese plywood is delivered in this country at prices lower than on sales made in Japan.

We are all aware that you men in Congress are facing a multitude of problems and yet we feel sure you are concerned over the welfare of tens of thousands of tax-paying workers in all phases of the far-flung plywood industry. May we ask that after a full study of the facts involved you take steps to establish import plywood quotas on all foreign plywood imports and a realistic antidumping act by congressional action to safeguard the inherent rights of the people of your States and Nation.

We pray that this will be done.

WALTER W. SMITH,
President and General Manager, Linwood Inc., Gillett, Wis.

An incomplete listing of Wisconsin's plywood and veneer users and the plants which supply a part of their needs: 28 veneer and plywood plants, 28 boat builders, 33 door manufacturers, 8 casket manufacturers, 113 furniture manufacturers, 14 brush manufacturers, 15 hotel and restaurant furniture manufacturers, 103 mill and woodwork manufacturers, 18 veneer cheese box manufacturers, 66 wooden cabinet manufacturers.

FLOOD DISASTER IN WEST VIRGINIA, KENTUCKY, AND VIRGINIA

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I have just returned from a visit to that portion of my State which, along with parts of neighboring Kentucky and Virginia, suffered a terrible flood disaster on January 29 and 30. I was appalled at the extent of the damage to communities in southern West Virginia, in the Tug River and Guyandotte River valleys, and along tributaries of those streams. The extent of the damage to homes, businesses, highways, and public institutions, while not fully determined, will run into the millions of dollars. The hardships and suffering this disaster imposed upon thousands of people in the flood-stricken regions is almost beyond comprehension. One must see for himself the havoc wrought to understand fully the extent of this recent disaster.

Let me say here, Mr. President, that I have only the highest of praise for the quick response made by Government agencies to alleviate the distress resulting from this tragedy of nature. The people in the affected areas, their local units of government, representatives of Federal agencies near the scene, and humanitarian organizations labored day and night to care for more than 1,000 persons left homeless in my State. It soon became evident, however, that the local people could not alone cope with this disaster. It became necessary for the Federal Government to provide assistance and the speed with which the various agencies acted is deserving of the highest praise.

I was first informed of the scope of the disaster when I received a telegram from Mayor Ira Cooper, of Matewan, on January 30. He informed me that more than 80 percent of the homes in the town of Matewan were under water, and that the situation was more than the local people could cope with. He appealed to me to do what I could to obtain assistance from the Federal Government. I talked by telephone with other municipal officials in the towns affected and sensed the need for immediate action on the part of Federal agencies. Such action was forthcoming speedily and efficiently. In fact, when I talked with officials of the Federal Civilian Defense Administration here in Washington on January 30, I was informed that they were already moving in to help alleviate the distress. The American Red Cross was already sending in supplies. The Second Army began moving in a contingent of soldiers to help in rescue work and to restore public services. The National Guard had already responded in a most helpful way.

I immediately communicated with Gov. Cecil H. Underwood of West Virginia, on the gravity of the situation. He already had sent representatives into the affected areas. On request the President declared a six-county region of southern West Virginia a major disaster area, and directed the full force of the Federal agencies to go to the aid of the stricken people. A civil defense force was sent into the area at once to survey the extent of the damage and to assist local officials in rehabilitation work. Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, chairman of the American Red Cross, visited the stricken area personally and supervised the extensive aid rendered by that great humanitarian organization. I have at hand a letter from General Gruenther on that phase of the flood relief, and at this point, I ask unanimous consent to have his letter printed in the RECORD.

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

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS,
Washington, D. C., February 4, 1957.

MY DEAR SENATOR REVERCOMB: I have just completed a survey of the areas in Kentucky, Virginia, and West Virginia which were devastated by the recent flash floods. A flight over the affected area and personal visits to some of the hardest hit communities gave me a chance to see the heavy damage and understand the extent of the Red Cross job in helping these people to get back on their feet. The total effect of the disaster is much greater than had been indicated by earlier reports. Over 19,000 families and small businesses have been affected with hundreds of homes totally destroyed or badly damaged. Reports received to date reveal that in West Virginia 3,377 families have been affected. Heaviest damage occurred in the counties of Mingo and Logan.

Since I have only recently assumed the responsibilities as president of the American Red Cross, I was greatly interested to obtain firsthand information about Red Cross relief activities within the affected areas. It was truly gratifying to learn that hundreds of volunteers quickly mobilized to provide food, shelter, and clothing for the victims. During the peak emergency, the Red Cross sheltered and fed over 10,000 persons.

I was much impressed with the leadership and cooperation between the Red Cross, civil defense, State, and municipal officials. The work of the Armed Forces has also been outstanding. During the course of my survey, I was able to talk personally with a number of small-business men and families who suffered losses as a result of the floods. There was no spirit of defeatism and I am proud to report the people of your State are showing true courage and are exercising maximum initiative in overcoming the effects of this catastrophe.

The Red Cross is now confronted with the long-term job of assisting families and small businesses to recover from the effects of the flood. A staff of over 200 experienced disaster workers from all parts of the country are being assigned to assist local Red Cross chapters to carry out this phase of our program. Estimates are necessarily incomplete, but there is every indication now that the Red Cross will expend over $3 million.

Let me assure you that we shall stay on the job until all who need Red Cross assistance have been helped.

Sincerely,

ALFRED M. GRUENTHER.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, the Small Business Administration also responded forthwith to the need and established a special office at Williamson to process quickly applications for flood-disaster loans. Other Federal agencies were already on the scene to offer aid and counsel to local authorities. With all of this assistance, together with the great effort put forth by the people themselves, the effects of the disaster were alleviated to a great extent. The Salvation Army moved quickly into the area with clothing and other help. Citizens of nearby communities and industrial companies delivered food and usable water for those persons in need. My heartfelt praise goes out to all those who responded so willingly and so generously.

It is now imperative, I feel, that everything possible be done to prevent such catastrophes in the future. And, after seeing first-hand the terrific damage caused in my State, I am convinced that we must explore every possibility of flood control along those streams which periodically overflow their banks. For that reason, I have requested the Army Corps of Engineers to complete as quickly as possible an up-to-date survey of the Tug River and Guyandotte River Basins and their tributaries in southern West Virginina, and all streams in this major disaster area, to determine to what extent flood-control projects may prevent further catastrophy in that part of my State. Col. H. J. Skidmore, of the Huntington, W. Va., Army Corps of Engineers, who for a time was with me on a tour of the flood area, has assured me that a complete report will be made by his office as quickly as possible.

I am pleased to note that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has also presented immediate and long-range recommendations for future flood protection along the Big Sandy River, which recomendations, if carried out, will help prevent further flood damage to one area in my State. His recommendations deserve the most careful consideration and early action.

FIFTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF SINKING OF THE BATTLESHIP "MAINE"

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, 59 years ago tomorrow night, February 15, 1898, the battleship *Maine* was mysteriously blown up at her mooring in Habana Harbor. Without warning, at 9:40 o'clock a double explosion rent the great vessel in two. As a result, 260 American officers and men were killed or drowned.

The events of that terrible night in Cuba fused American public opinion behind the cause of the Cuban patriots who long had had our Nation's sympathy. With "Remember the *Maine*" as their battle cry, American forces on land and sea avenged the sinking of that great ship. The battle cry was the echo of another fateful day in American history—the day at the Alamo, and it was to be echoed again decades later, at Pearl Harbor.

Today, the significance of the destruction of the *Maine* remains as a warning to all who would launch an unprovoked attack against the United States. May the loss of the battleship *Maine* remind us Americans, too, of our responsibilities as a world power, and of the necessity in these troubled times of maintaining our watchful strength—a strength which is undeniably the greatest deterrent to aggression today.

It is a privilege for me, as a citizen of the State of Maine, to pay tribute today to the memory of the battleship *Maine* and to the 260 American men who lost their lives in her sinking.

NINETY-EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF ADMISSION OF OREGON TO THE UNION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, today marks the 98th anniversary of the entrance into the Union of the State I have the honor, in part, to represent. On February 14, 1859, the act admitting Oregon was officially approved by President James Buchanan. Since that eventful moment, Oregon has made important contributions to the national welfare, to national prosperity, and to national defense.

Oregon has been blessed by a generous Creator with vast resources of soil, timber, water, wildlife, fisheries, and scenic grandeur. Oregon also has a population consisting of imaginative, vigorous people who look constantly to new frontiers of faith and vision. Oregon is an enlightened State. It has a high degree of literacy, and a splendid system of schools and colleges, both publicly and privately supported.

Oregon has given to the Nation such innovations in democratic government as the initiative and referendum. It was the first State to provide for direct election of United States Senators, thus helping to broaden the base of American democracy. This, in many respects, has been our State's most permanent contribution to political vitality in the United States. Oregon also led the way in fixing maximum-hour and minimum-wage standards for women and children in industry. The constitutionality of such protective laws first was upheld by the United States Supreme Court in the historic case of Muller against Oregon.

My wife and I have traveled over the entire trail of Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, where those first of all westbound Americans carried our flag from

St. Louis to the mouth of the mighty Columbia River, which today is recognized as the North American waterway with the greatest potential for hydroelectric-power production. No one could look upon Oregon's majestic uplands and seacoast from that historic trail and not feel a sense of pride and contentment in being a resident of so favored a domain.

Mr. President, I wish to add that I am paying this brief tribute to our wonderful State on its 98th birthday in behalf of both the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and myself. He is in the West, where he is addressing the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco and the western regional meeting of the Democratic Party. He has advised that he desires to join in heralding to the Senate the anniversary date of Oregon's membership in the Federal Union of States known as the United States of America.

On this birthday anniversary of the great State of Oregon it is appropriate to call to the attention of the Senate the historical role which Oregon has played in the opening of the West. The first structure to be built by Americans along the Pacific slope was erected some 151 years ago on Oregon soil. This was the famous Fort Clatsop, which housed the intrepid explorers of the Lewis and Clark Expedition during 1805 and 1806, when they waited out the winter at the western terminus of their cross-country trek, near the mouth of the Columbia River.

During the last session of Congress, there was enacted legislation to study the Fort Clatsop site as the location for a new national monument. I was pleased to introduce the bill, which eventually led to commencement by the National Park Service of surveys of the Fort Clatsop area. It is my hope that it will some day become the newest addition to our system of historic shrines, so that suitable recognition can be given to Oregon as the location of the first settlement by the Americans whose discoveries paved the way for the great western migration which followed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks an article, which I wrote for the New York Times of November 25, 1956, detailing some of the background of Fort Clatsop and its erection by the Lewis and Clark expedition.

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

MONUMENT ON THE PACIFIC: HISTORIC FORT IN OREGON MAY SOON BECOME NATIONAL SHRINE

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mr. NEUBERGER, junior United States Senator from Oregon, is author of the bill authorizing a national monument at Fort Clatsop.)

ASTORIA, OREG.—The oldest of all American settlements on the Pacific coast soon may become the country's newest national monument. Under the terms of legislation passed by the 84th Congress, the National Park Service is presently studying the possibilities of creating a national shrine at rebuilt Fort Clatsop, near the picturesque mouth of the vast Columbia River. This was where Meriwether Lewis and William Clark spent the bleak winter of 1805-06, after they had carried the flag of the United States from St. Louis to the shores of the Pacific Ocean.

Fort Clatsop has an eminent rank in history. It was the first American military post anywhere west of St. Louis. It was the first habitation by Americans along the Pacific seaboard. It was the first edifice to house white persons in the Pacific Northwest. It was where American conquest of the West began.

Last year, as part of the sesquicentennial observance of the arrival of Lewis and Clark at tidewater, Fort Clatsop was totally reconstructed on the exact site of the original post. The drawings and sketches of Lieutenant Clark, found in the expedition's journals, were followed faithfully. The famous fort is 50 by 50 feet in dimensions, with three rooms along one wall and 4 along the other. A military parade ground occupies the center square, for the men of Lewis and Clark were enlisted in the United States Army.

COMMUNIST PROJECT

Reconstruction of Fort Clatsop was a community project. The Oregon Historical Society had strained a limited budget to obtain the site. The Crown-Zellerbach Corp. provided all the logs for the stockade and buildings. The logs were cut to the exact proportions of those described in Lieutenant Clark's 150-year-old plans. Even the flagpole was made the precise height of that from which flew the original Stars and Stripes to wave within sight of the Pacific Ocean.

In recreating Fort Clatsop, difficulty was encountered in finding men with experience at constructing a log fort. The most skilled cabinetmakers and woodworkers did not have this type of skill. Two Finnish immigrants, recently arrived in the United States, at last were discovered. They had just the talents needed.

These men, at daily carpenter's wages, undertook the major construction job. Thomas Vaughan, director of the Oregon State Historical Society, considers them actually responsible for the success of the project. Thus did two newcomers to America rebuild the oldest buildings which ever housed Americans west of St. Louis.

As a national monument, Fort Clatsop will possess many fascinating features. During the summer months of 1956, even with the most minimum sort of custodial care, more than 10,000 visitors trekked to the fort. The stockade commands a panorama of the sloughs, inlet, and bays which surround the wide mouth of the Northwest's greatest river. Lofty trees of Douglas-fir form a natural fortress beyond the man-built bulwarks. On clear days, stately freighters and sleek passenger liners can be seen standing out to sea, ready to breast the Columbia's rolling bar.

STREAM NAMED FOR EXPLORERS

Fittingly, a near-by smaller stream is named the Lewis and Clark River. It meanders off into the wooded hills. In the distance bulks the 3,266-foot summit of Saddle Mountain, one of the highest peaks in the gentle coast range. Lewis and Clark themselves referred to this spectacular landmark in their journals, but never bestowed its nomenclature. Elk and deer inhabit the forests, and are tracked down during Oregon's hunting seasons. Indeed, the abundant supply of game induced the explorers to settle at the site of Fort Clatsop in 1805, rather than across the river in what today is the State of Washington.

The location of firepits, barbecue pits, log remains, and other remnants has left no doubt that the rebuilt structure is on the ground occupied by the original Fort Clatsop, which Capt. Meriwether Lewis named for the Clatsop Tribe of coastal Indians. Both the Oregon Historical Society and the National Park Service have taken great care to locate the site accurately.

At least $50,000 has been invested in the site and in the reconstruction of the celebrated fort. With the establishment of a national monument, Thomas Vaughn of the Historical Society believes that it will become one of the principal tourist attractions of the north Pacific seacoast.

Visitors who glimpse the reconstructed fort also will have an opportunity to savor of some of the finest boating, hiking, fishing, and surf bathing anywhere in the West.

The spacious Clatsop beaches stretch southward for many miles from the mouth of the Columbia River. These beaches, of sand as white as glacial snow, are frequently guarded by towering headlands and lofty capes. The surf is foamingly picturesque, although often too chilly for all except the most Spartan swimmers. Back and forth across the Columbia's bar prowls the Engineer Corps dredge *Essayons*, largest in the world, deepening the river entrance to 48 feet. This has long been a goal of mariners and pilots. Peacock Spit, near the Columbia's mouth, has claimed more vessels than any other shoal off the north Pacific coast.

Astoria, a few miles from Fort Clatsop, is the principal salmon-fishing community in the Northwest. During the late summer, hordes of Chinook salmon return to the Columbia from the sea, where they may roam as far as the Kamchatka. These fish must ascend to the river's remote headwaters. There it is their destiny to spawn and then to die. They run a gantlet of sports fishermen and commercial gill netters en route.

The Chinooks frequently weigh up to 50 or 60 pounds. Although Lewis and Clark wearied of this diet, they are among the tastiest of fish. Tourists catching a river giant like to have their salmon canned at a custom cannery, with the proud fisherman's own name on the fancy labels.

TRANSPORTATION

No railroad passenger trains serve Astoria, but there is frequent service by Greyhound buses and West Coast Airlines. The highways are excellent. U. S. 101 threads along the seacoast, hugging cliffs and looping headlands, State Route 26 twists across the Coast Range via the Wolf Creek drainage basin. The distance from Portland is 98 miles. Route 26 goes through Seaside, Oregon's most popular beach resort, which is approximately 18 miles from the site of reconstructed Fort Clatsop. Lewis and Clark strolled along the generous beaches and distilled salt from sea water at Seaside to cure their elk steaks and roasts.

When they were in Oregon long ago, some of the argonauts of Lewis and Clark climbed a great cape back of Seaside now known as Tillamook Head. In the lonely solitude of that vast scene, they were relieved to get back to the snug coziness of their stockade of logs at Fort Clatsop. The rebuilt version of that first of all American homes in the West is being studied today by the National Park Service for establishment as a national shrine. Fort Clatsop, after all, symbolizes America's beginning as a nation which stretches from sea to shining sea.

RECORD OF THE MAINE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, as all my distinguished colleagues know, there is at the present time a growing furor over the training of the National Guard. While the central core of the controversy is the active-duty training requirement to be imposed on men enlisting in the Guard, certain statements made in the heat of the argument have cast unwarranted discredit on the record of the National Guard. I happen to be one who firmly believes that the National Guard

has long been one of our first lines of defenses, and has served with credit whenever called. In order that the record may be complete, I request unanimous consent that a brief history of the Maine National Guard, of which it was my privilege to serve as commander in chief during my term as Governor of Maine, be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

A HISTORICAL OUTLINE OF DUTY PERFORMED BY THE MAINE ARMY AND AIR NATIONAL GUARD IN FEDERAL AND STATE STATUS

The history of the Maine National Guard subsequent to World War I is the history of the National Guard of the several States, Territories, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia. Reorganization of the National Guard to meet additional requirements in the event of Federal and State emergency and in accordance with training directive promulgated by the then War Department placed the Maine National Guard in a highly effective status when at the direction of the President, it was called for active duty in connection with World War II in two increments.

The 240th Coast Artillery (Harbor Defense) Regiment was ordered into active military service on September 16, 1940. The regiment assumed its tactical position in the harbor defense of Portland and together with many recruits trained to fulfill its wartime mission of harbor defense. After training replacements and furnishing many officers and men for the activation of the antiaircraft artillery which were being formed to counter the airpower of the enemy, the regiment was broken up on October 7, 1944, leaving only Battery E, 185th Coast Artillery Battalion (formerly Headquarters and Headquarters Battalion, 240th) to carry on the lineage and to man the 16-inch harbor guns at Peaks Island, Maine.

The 152d Field Artillery Regiment was inducted into active Federal service on February 24, 1941 together with the 103d Infantry Regiment as a part of the 43d Infantry Division. The 43d Division was comprised of men from Maine, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Connecticut and was known as the Winged Victory Division. At the time that the 152d FA Regiment went into service the infantry division was triangularized and the Maine battalion was redesignated as the 203d FA Regiment, later to be redesignated as the 203d FA Battalion. The battalion went through training at Camp Shelby, Miss., and later to Fort Bragg, N. C. From Fort Bragg, the unit moved to Camp Shanks in California and subsequently to the New York Port of Embarkation. After a period of maneuvers in England they landed at Omaha Beach on the 23d of June 1944. The battalion was attached to the 30th Infantry Division and participated in the destruction of St. Lo. They participated in the breakout from the Seine bridgehead and followed the campaign across northern France, Belgium, and Holland. The battalion made the dash to the Elbe River and fired in support of the assult on Magdeburg. During its long months of combat, the 203d fired more than 68,000 rounds in hurling 3,200 tons of steel and flame at the enemy. In 318 days of combat, 1 officer, and 8 men were killed, while 2 officers and 50 men were wounded. The battalion's observation planes flew 450 combat missions, and the outfit moved 60 times in covering 1,450 miles from the beach to the last firing position. A proud record it was, and the driving force which made it possible was the spirit behind the numbers of the 203d.

The history of Maine's 103d Infantry paralleled the history of the 43d Infantry Division through training in the United States to tour of duty in New Zealand when it appeared likely that the Japanese might invade that country. It was shipped to New Caledonia for a brief stay and early in 1943 participated in the Guadalcanal campaign. Early in 1943 following this they participated in the Guadalcanal campaign. Early in 1943 following this they participated in the invasion of the Russell Islands, and in late June of 1943 with elements of the Navy and Marines assaulted New Georgia landing on Rendovia Island. The publication "Fighting Division" published by the Infantry Journal has the following to say with regard to this National Guard Division of which Maine units were a part:

"For 35 days of what many authorities believe to be the dirtiest, roughest campaign of the early war in the Pacific, the 43d fought for Munda Airport. As yet inexperienced in the ways of jungle fighting, the 43d was opposed by some of the crack elements of the Imperial Japanese Army. All the tricks of the jungle which eventually became old stuff to our troops were strange to the men of the 43d in the fight for Munda. They had to learn the hard and bloody way, and they did. On August 5 the 43d broke the Japanese resistance and seized its prime objective—the vital Munda airstrip."

From Munda, the division fought in Guinea at Aitape and had a share in the bloody battle of the Driniumor River. Following this campaign, they drew the assignment to invade the island of Luzon with the mission to take the left flank and secure the hill masses and road network to block off strong Japanese forces in the mountains at Baguio. The division bore the brunt of the fighting in this area. Later the division moved to the east of Manila and helped to clear the Japanese from the hills near the city and free the Ipo Dam which was the main water supply for the city of Manila. The 43d Division left Manila and arrived at Yokohama and were later located about 45 miles from Tokyo at a large Japanese air training field. The 103d Infantry returned to the United States from Japan with the 43d Division, it being the first division to return to the United States from the Pacific theater as a complete division.

The Maine Guard reorganized following World War II and at the outbreak of the Korean incident was ready to take its place as a first line defense unit should the need arise.

On July 28, 1950, the 703d AAA Battalion, and the attached 354 Signal Radar maintenance unit, were ordered to active duty effective August 15, 1950, at which time they were relieved of assignment to First Army and assigned to Third Army at Camp Gordon, Ga. At the end of the training period, the battalion was sent to Fort Hancock, N. J., where it remained in the AAA Defense (Antiaircraft) of New York City until its relief from service on April 14, 1952. In this connection, it is of interest to note that the battalion was levied for many of its officers and men who saw service in other organizations in Korea.

Also inducted on February 1, 1951, was the 101st Fighter Wing, Maine National Guard, who after a short period of time at Dow Air Force Base was sent to Grenier Field in New Hampshire where many remained.

The 104th Aircraft Control and Warning Squadron located in South Portland, Maine, was ordered to active duty on September 1, 1951 to serve for a period of 24 months. The unit comprised of 16 officers and 156 airmen at the time of induction was assigned to Continental Air Command. The unit reported to Camp Edwards, Mass.; here it became part of an aircraft and warning control group and in February of 1952 was merged with the 102d Aircraft and Warning Squadron. In April of that year, the squadron was alerted and moved to Camp Kilmer, N. J., and embarked for Tripoli, Libya, and north Africa where it set up equipment in connection with its assigned mission. The unit was released to State control on November 1, 1952, after having served with distinction.

At no time in the history of the Maine National Guard has the training effort of either the Army or the Air side been found wanting by the active Army or Air Force. In connection with its State mission, the Air National Guard has been called out by its Governor in connection with textile strikes, floods, and forest fires. The action of the units under State control has reflected great credit upon the men and their commanders. The quality of Maine National Guard units, both Army and Air, has been tested from time to time by State and Federal emergencies and the status of training of these units is evaluated annually by the active Army and Air Force headquarters having training jurisdiction. Reports covering the training for these units for fiscal year 1957 rated Maine units as highly satisfactory.

THE FARMER AND THE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, a friend of mine showed me a little soliloquy entitled "The Man and the Mule," which he said he received from a farmer who voted Republican in 1956. An accompanying letter, he said, explained that it was sent because of Secretary of Agriculture Benson's recent order reducing farm price supports, and the writer's complete disillusionment as to the sincerity of administration farm promises. The soliloquy is relatively short, and I believe all Senators will appreciate its humor, if not its point, so I shall read it:

THE MAN AND THE MULE

Over the hill trailed a man behind a mule pulling a plow.

Said the man to the mule: "Bill, you are just a mule, the son of a jackass. I am a man, made in the image of God; yet we work hitched up together year after year, and I wonder if you work for me or I work for you. Verily, I think it is a partnership between a mule and a fool, for surely I work as hard as you, if not harder.

Soon we will be preparing for a corn crop. When the crop is harvested, I give one-third to the land owner as rent, one-third goes to you, and the rest is mine. You consume all your portion except the cobs, while I divide mine with seven children, six hens, two ducks, and a banker, after a small portion goes to my wife. If we both need shoes, Bill, you get yours. You are getting the best of me; and I ask you, is it fair for a mule, the son of a jackass, to swindle a man—lord of creation—out of his subsistence?

You never work without me; but often when I work, you look over the pasture fence and he-haw at me. All the fall and winter the whole family works to earn money for taxes, buy a new set of harness for you, and pay the mortgage on you. And what do you care about the mortgage? Not a thing, you ornery cuss. I even have to worry about the mortgage on your tough, ungrateful hide. And about the only time I am your better is on election day, when I can vote and you can't. After the election is over, though, I realize that I was fully as big a jackass as your papa.

Mr. President, while I deeply regret that the farmer who sent me that little story—and a few million other citizens—did not see through the great deceptions of 1956 before November 6, 1956, I feel

that the indictment is too harsh, and unjust.

Last year the American people were harangued by experts at deception, and in agriculture they were harangued by such experts in the most sanctimonious terms.

From early 1956 until after election, farmers were told that the sun was finally rising for agriculture. On January 16, 1956, Secretary Benson told the convention of the National Council of Farmers Cooperatives:

> A new buoyancy in the market place—a new hope—a new vigor and zest—can be anticipated * * * surely it should be reflected promptly in prices and incomes.

In the immediately ensuing months, the administration started boosting farm price supports a little, instead of keeping up their relentless reductions.

President Eisenhower, in vetoing the farm bill, raised supports for wheat from a previously announced level of $1.81 per bushel to $2. Corn was raised from $1.40 to $1.50. Butter support was raised 2.4 cents per pound. Manufacturing milk supports were raised a little. The oil crops—soybeans, flaxseed, and cottonseed—all got a little boost.

Having thus shifted away from its constant downward pressure on farm prices, the administration proclaimed that the salvation of farmers was at hand.

Secretary Benson declared at Idaho Falls, Idaho, on August 17, 1956, that—

> Farm prices and the parity ratio have not only stopped falling—they are definitely climbing.

The Republican Party platform, adopted August 21, 1956, said:

> We are gratified by the improvement this year in farm prices and income as a result of our policies.

Two days later President Eisenhower echoed the platform, by declaring:

> Recent improvement in farm prices indicates that we are on the right track.

And then Secretary Ezra Benson, on the stump, reechoed Mr. Eisenhower in telling the feed and grain dealers on September 11, 1956:

> We are on the right track. The downward slide in prices has been checked. Yes; we are on the right track, and we are going to stay on it.

The farm voters of the Nation were led to believe that the administration had seen the error of its ways; that the ruthless and relentless downward pressure on farm prices was over; and that recovery and salvation could be anticipated.

Secretary Benson rejected with a display of self-righteousness the charge that the slight raising of the administration's low price supports was a political move. In his most righteous manner, he declared that no amount of improper pressure could cause him to deviate one iota from the course he deemed best for farmers.

It was in this sort of a situation that American farmers went to the polls in November 1956, and cast their ballots—some of them still, unfortunately, believing that the Republican oppression of agriculture was over, and that the higher price supports represented a new, right track toward farm recovery.

"Yes," said Secretary Benson, "we are on the right track and we are going to stay on it."

Mr. President, for a long time I was reluctant to believe that Secretary Benson would engage in deliberate misrepresentation. After all, he was not a party to President Eisenhower's golden promises to the farmers in 1952. He was not in the Eisenhower entourage when they were made. He was appointed Secretary of Agriculture after the election, and apparently he did not feel himself bound by the campaign talk of 90 percent and 100 percent of parity for farmers. He might have rationalized that he did not make the promises of 1952, and therefore had no obligation to keep them.

But Secretary Benson cannot today escape the responsibility for leading farmers to believe that in 1956 the administration was on a new right track, and for adding that we are going to stay on it, and then for turning back at his first opportunity, in 1957, on the old track, the course of relentlessly driving farm prices further and further down.

It was completely clear to those of us who followed the administration farm policy closely for 4 years that the 1956 price-support increases were pure, unadulterated politics, regardless of Secretary Benson's proclamation of righteousness. But I can understand how many farm people, busy with their own work and their own problems, were misled.

The important fact which confronts Congress today is that the squeeze on farmers has been renewed; and that unless this Congress adopts positive, mandatory new farm policies, the administration is going to continue to make farmers economic goats and to drive agriculture into bankruptcy.

So long as farmers continue to want to pay their bills, their taxes, interest, and family living expenses, and to make both ends meet, lower prices are going to mean increased production. And virtually all farmers want to make both ends meet.

The only way the Benson theory that lower prices mean lower production can ever be made to work is to reduce agriculture to such bankruptcy that the farmers are driven from the land.

Repeated reductions in farm price supports between February 1953, when Mr. Benson started hacking at feed prices, and 1956, resulted in the biggest farm production in history. The index of production last year stood at 113 percent of the 1947–49 average. The largest previous production was in 1952, when it was 107 percent of the 1947–49 average.

The administration assured livestock producers that they would benefit from low feed costs. The result in 1956 was livestock production 123 percent of 1947–49, and all-time record, with low, disastrous prices.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table showing administration actions in reducing farm price supports, starting with Mr. Benson's first move against feed price levels in February 1953.

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

THE FARM SLIDE

February 1953: Reduced cottonseed meal from ceiling ($80 per ton) to $75 per ton for Commodity Credit Corporation holdings.

March 4, 1953: Announced no price supports on hay and pasture seeds.

March 1953: Reduced CCC cottonseed meal price from $75 to $70 per short ton.

April 20, 1953: Reduced CCC cottonseed meal price from $70 to $57 per ton. (Memphis market broke $10 per ton from April 15 to April 21 on news of this reduction).

May 22, 1953: Reported sale of 527,000 tons of cottonseed meal at the new lowered price levels.

October 14, 1953: Reduced tung nut oil support from $63.38 to $54.96.

October 20, 1953: Reduced barley supports from $1.24 to $1.15 per bushel; reduced supports on oats from 80 cents to 75 cents per bushel; reduced grain sorghum supports from $2.43 to $2.28 a hundredweight; reduced supports on cottonseed from $54.20 to $54 a ton.

January 22, 1954: Reduced soybean supports from $2.56 to $2.22 a bushel.

February 14, 1954: Reduced supports on butter from 67 cents to 56 cents a pound; on manufacturing milk from $3.74 to $3.14 a hundredweight.

March 4, 1954: Reduced supports on dry edible beans from $7.79 to $7.24 a hundredweight.

April 9, 1954: Reduced flaxseed supports from $3.79 to $3.14 a bushel.

September 15, 1954: Cut wheat supports from $2.24 to $2.08 a bushel.

December 13, 1954: Reduced supports on grain sorghum from $2.28 a hundredweight to $1.78 a hundredweight; reduced oats supports from 75 to 65 cents a bushel; cut barley supports from $1.15 to 94 cents a bushel; reduced supports on rye from $1.43 to $1.18 a bushel; reduced soybean supports from $2.22 to $2.04 a bushel; reduced supports on cottonseed from $54 to $46 a ton.

March 24, 1955: Cut supports on corn from $1.62 to $1.58 a bushel.

April 8, 1955: Reduced supports on dry edible beans from $7.24 to $6.36 a bushel.

May 13, 1955: Cut rice supports from $4.92 to $4.66 a bag.

June 10, 1955: Reduced wheat supports from $2.08 to $1.81 a bushel.

October 11, 1955: Cut supports on tung nuts from $54.96 to $51.06 a ton.

December 30, 1955: Rice supports cut from $4.66 to $4.03 a bag.

February 1956: Corn supports reduced from $1.58 to $1.40 a bushel; cotton, cut from 31.7 to 29.3 cents a pound.

February 1956: Supports on peanuts reduced from 13.6 to 13.2 cents a pound.

March 1, 1956: Supports on dry edible beans reduced from $6.36 to $6.31 a bushel; supports on honey reduced from 11.4 cents a pound to 9.7 cents a pound.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the table does not include a considerable number of technical, indirect ways, Secretary Benson and his staff have found to chisel down farm prices.

One such example was the changing of parity for manufacturing milk. Secretary Benson discovered that he had discretionary authority to change the base period on which manufacturing milk parity was calculated. He found that he could thus lower parity, and thereby could lower price supports. So he adopted a new base period for manufacturing milk.

My friends from the wheat-producing States tell me that the Department has recently discovered two ways to reduce farm returns from wheat. Western durum wheat handlers discovered that they could save about 10 cents a bushel by exporting wheat from the west coast during the winter months, and by paying the farmers some of that saving. This was so alarming the Department of Agriculture hastily suspended export subsidies on durum until it could put in a lower, differential subsidy on wheat exported from west-coast ports.

Also, I am advised, the Department is preparing to revise the standards under which wheat is graded. This will be on the pretext of improving quality, but the only actual result will be to reduce farm returns.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table of the slide in price supports from 1953 through 1955—the slide which preceded our record production of 1956.

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

The sliding scale has slid, supports from 1953 through 1955

Commodity and unit	1953		1954		1955		Change [2]	
	Average support price	Support level, percent	Average support price	Support level, percent	Average support price	Support level, percent	Support price level	In percent, level
Butterfat ... pounds	.673	90	.562	75	.562	76.0	−.111	−14
Milk, manufacturing ... hundredweight	3.74	90	3.15	75	3.15	80.0	−.59	−10
Barley ... bushels	1.24	85	1.15	85	.94	70.0	−.30	−15
Oats ... do	.80	85	.75	85	.61	70.0	−.19	−15
Rye ... do	1.43	85	1.43	85	1.18	70.0	−.25	−15
Sorghums for grain ... hundredweight	2.43	85	2.28	85	1.78	70.0	−.65	−15
Flaxseed ... bushels	3.79	80	3.14	70	2.91	65.0	−.88	−10
Soybeans ... do	2.56	90	2.22	80	2.04	70.0	−.52	−20
Beans, dry edible ... hundredweight	7.79	87	7.24	80	6.36	70.0	−1.43	−17
Cottonseed ... ton	54.20	75	54.00	75	46.34	65.0	−7.86	−1
Mohair ... pounds	.607	80	.643	83	.70	91.0	+1.43	+8
Honey ... do	.105	70	1.02	70	.099	70.0	−.006	----------
Tung nuts ... ton	63.38	65	54.96	60	51.06	60.0	−12.32	−5
Wheat [1] ... bushels	2.21	91	2.24	90	2.08	82.5	−.13	−6
Corn ... do	1.60	90	1.62	90	1.58	87.0	−.02	−3
Cotton, upland ... pounds	.3080	90	.3158	90	.3170	90.0	+.009	----------
Peanuts ... do	.119	90	.122	90	.122	90.0	+.003	----------
Rice ... hundredweight	4.84	91	4.92	91	4.66	86.0	−.22	−5
Tobacco, flue cured ... pounds	.479	92	.479	90	.483	91.0	−.004	----------
Tobacco, fire cured ... do	.35	----------	.348	----------	.346	----------	+.004	----------
Burley ... do	.466	91	.464	91	.462	91.0	−.004	----------
Wool ... do	.531	90	.532	90	.62	106.0	+.089	+16

[1] Minimum support for 1956 is $1.81 equal to 76 percent of parity. Support level in 1953 exceeded 90 percent of parity due to "forward pricing provision," also reflected elsewhere in the table.

[2] Apparent inconsistencies in case and percentage level are due to transition from old to new parity.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Secretary Benson's reduction of price supports, as announced last weekend, should make it crystal clear to everyone that the administration is not on any new track; but that in February 1957 it is again on the track on which it started traveling in February 1953—a course of relentless oppression of the farmers, of continued reduction of their price supports, and of continued squeezing from them of food at lower prices, to offset rampant inflation in other segments of the economy.

The action taken last weekend was indeed a shock to the farmers. All this week I have received frantic telephone calls from cottongrowers in Tennessee. They say this will be a heavy blow to them; and it certainly will.

The cut in the supports on flaxseed and cottonseed dropped them from 70 percent to 65 percent; and on cotton, from 84 to 77 percent.

This new price level means $5.40 less per bale of cotton, and $2 less per ton of cottonseed. On last year's total cotton crop, such a cut means a total loss to the cotton farmers of between $89 million and $90 million.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, the Democrats cannot alone prevent the Government from pursuing this course. President Eisenhower has demonstrated that he will use his veto power to kill any proposed legislation which would halt and reverse this slide.

Our only real hope is that the countless members of Mr. Eisenhower's and Mr. Benson's own party here in Congress, who know that disaster lies ahead for agriculture unless the course is changed, will defy the administration lash, and will join in writing mandatory farm legislation restoring at least 90-percent price supports.

Farm-program costs have doubled and trebled under Eisenhower and Benson. Production has soared. The situation has worsened year after year. And now we are back on the same old road to agricultural ruin.

Democrats are virtually unanimously prepared to reenact strong price-support legislation. But we must have substantial assistance from our colleagues across the aisle. Only they can supply the majority necessary to override the inevitable veto which will be affixed to such legislation at the White House or at some quail farm or vacation resort.

With the administration's position again clear, the responsibility for continuing or changing the course is the responsibility of the Republican Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives. They alone can "veto" a veto. I am sure there is nothing the farmers of America would like to hear more than the news that a caucus of Republicans in Congress had determined to end the Benson fiasco and to join the Democratic majority in enacting legislation, a veto notwithstanding, to save the farmers and the economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article on the meaning of the farm vote in the last election. The article was published in the U. S. News & World Report of February 1, 1957.

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

WHAT HIT THE REPUBLICANS IN MIDWEST—HERE'S THE WAY THEY SEE IT

Was there really a farm revolt in 1956? Did farmers in large numbers turn away from the Republican Party? Does the loss of ground by Republicans in congressional and governorship races west of the Mississippi in 1956 mean that a Democratic sweep is in the making for 1958 and 1960?

These questions, arising at the White House in the wake of the 1956 election, now are drawing answers from the Republican National Committee. Careful studies of the voting in farm precincts of the Middle West have been made by the committee's fieldmen.

The committee report, now in the hands of White House officials, pulls no punches in its appraisal of the seriousness of the shift in farm votes, so far as the Republican Party is concerned. The ballots cast by the farmers in 1956 are to have much to do with shaping administration farm policies in the months ahead.

LOCAL UPRISINGS

"While there was no national farm revolt, there certainly were some violent local uprisings," a farm expert of the Republican National Committee informed a White House official.

The reports from the field were peppered with criticism of the administration's farm policies since 1952. They were sharply critical, in several cases, of Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture. And the election figures, collected at the precinct level, detailed the story of Republican losses.

A fieldman for the National Committee in Iowa said Secretary Benson should resign. Another, in North Dakota, wrote: "If the Department of Agriculture is not cleaned up the entire Midwest will go solid Democrat in 1958." In Minnesota, a third fieldman

said Republican losses there were due to "failure to convince farmers of our sympathy for them and their problems."

WHITE HOUSE STARTED IT

The study was prompted by an inquiry from a White House official. He asked the national committee research staff: "Was there a farm revolt?"

After a preliminary study, the national committee replied that the farm vote held up pretty well east of the Mississippi River, that President Eisenhower seemed actually to have received more farm votes in the South than he did in 1952. But the committee reported:

"In some parts of the Midwest and Great Plains States, especially where the economic problems of farmers were compounded by drought, there was a sharp drop-off from the 1952 farm vote for President Eisenhower. Here, the decline in rural support for Republican candidates for the Senate and House was even more pronounced."

West of the Mississippi, the report said, there was a definite fall off in Republican strength among farmers in virtually every State. It said the drop was substantial in the wheat and cattle country, but also was large in Iowa and Minnesota, where agriculture is widely diversified.

Analyzing the results of congressional races in the Middle and Far West, the committee found the greatest losses in areas where farm incomes had been slipping. It was here that Democrats had aimed their heaviest punches of the 1956 campaign.

In States west of the Mississippi, Republicans lost 10 House seats in 1956, although they managed to hold these areas for Mr. Eisenhower. Close results in two other House races in this region were contested.

The national committee found that, in every case except 1 among the House races, Republican candidates had won by good margins in 1952, won by smaller margins in 1954, and lost to Democrats in 1956. They started from a high level of votes in 1952, with healthy winning margins and moved steadily downhill during the period of the Republican administration. The one exception was in Nevada, where candidates and conditions differed from those in the other races.

UNREST ON FARMS

A close look at the voting convinced committee experts that, while the farm problem may not have been the decisive factor in all of these losses, it was important. They concluded that at least three of the losses could be traced with some certainty to farm unrest and drought conditions. The report added:

"While farm unrest may not have been the most prominent issue in certain of these 12 contests, the fact remains that, had the farm vote stayed as Republican as it was in 1952, our candidates would have won in spite of other problems. Had the farm vote held at the 1952 level, we would not only have retained these House seats west of the Mississippi but we would actually have picked up several in such States as Missouri, Wisconsin, and Minnesota."

The report pointed out that virtually all of the Republican Members of the House and Senate west of the Mississippi who were elected won by reduced margins. Often, even in areas that have been stanchly Republican in the past, the margin of victory was only a few hundred or few thousand votes.

BASIS FOR WORRY

"The Members of Congress involved are understandably concerned over 1958," the report said.

Pursuing the matter, national committee officials began to dig more deeply into the question. Fieldmen of the committee in 9 States of the Middle West were asked to pick 4 rural precincts in each of their home counties and make detailed studies of the voting in 1952 and 1956.

The precincts studied were at least 85 percent rural. The study brought together comparative figures on presidential, senatorial, House, and governorship races. Fieldmen were asked to note the changes in vote totals compared with 1952, the types of population in the precincts, the condition of crops, and the reasons for vote changes. The overall results of this study are depicted in the charts on pages 60 and 61.

Almost without exception, the study showed a decline in Republican votes. Similarly, in all of the areas a great many voters stayed at home. In very few cases did the total vote come up to what it had been in 1952, and rarely did Democratic candidates pick up as many votes as Republican candidates lost.

In brief, the study showed:

Wisconsin precincts are in an area where crops were good. This area is peopled largely by persons of Scandinavian descent. The fieldman noted a trend to Democrats in every precinct. Mr. Eisenhower carried all 4 precincts in 1952, lost 2 of them in 1956. Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, a Republican, carried all 4 precincts in his 1956 race for reelection.

In the House races, the farmers of these precincts shifted sharply. In 1952, a Republican candidate for the House carried all 4 precincts. But, in 1956, Representative LESTER R. JOHNSON, a Democrat, trying for reelection to the seat he had won in 1954, got a majority in all four of these precincts. He was reelected.

The fieldman said the local organization of Republicans was ineffective and there was strong opposition from the farmers union.

Colorado precincts studied are in an area that had felt drought for 5 of the last 6 years. One precinct holds many Mexican laborers. This precinct turned Democratic in all contests. It had given Mr. Eisenhower and Adlai E. Stevenson a tie in 1952, and had voted Republican in other contests, by narrow margins.

Mr. Eisenhower carried 3 of the 4 precincts in 1956. The Republican candidate for governor won two. At the same time, the Democratic candidate for Senate got 3 of the 4 precincts. The Democratic candidate for Representative won 2 of the 4 and tied in a third. Overall, the congressional district in which the precincts are located reelected Representative J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, a Republican.

The fieldman said the Republican decline was caused by drought, general farm unrest, an unpopular wheat program, and Secretary of Agriculture Benson.

Iowa precincts included also are in drought country. Crops were poor. The population of the precincts is 80 percent of German and Luxembourg descent, 60 percent Catholic.

All of the precincts showed a Democratic trend. Mr. Eisenhower had carried the four precincts in 1952. He lost one in 1956. The Republican candidate for the Senate lost 2 of the 4. The Republican candidate for governor lost 3 of the 4; the Republican candidate had lost two in 1952. CHARLES B. HOEVEN, the Republican candidate for Representative, carried all four precincts. He had no opposition in the district in 1952.

The Republican fieldman said the losses were due to drought, general farm unrest and the unpopularity of the Republican governor. In the statewide voting, Iowa elected a Democratic governor.

North Dakota precincts surveyed are in an area where crops were fair to poor. The population is largely of German and Scandinavian descent.

A Democratic trend showed in all precincts. Mr. Eisenhower got all 4 in 1952, lost 1 in 1956. The Republican candidate for the Senate won all four in 1956. Democratic candidates for the House and for Governor carried 2 of the 4. North Dakota kept its Republican House delegation, and Republicans held virtually a solid grip on State offices. But they were shaken.

The fieldman, urging that the Agricultural Department be "cleaned up," said declines in Republican votes in the area were due to wheat-acreage controls, poor crops, low prices for barley, Farmers Union activity.

South Dakota precincts in the study are in an area of poor crops.

A swing to Democrats was noted in all precincts. Mr. Eisenhower had carried the four in 1952. He carried 1, tied in 1, lost 2 in 1956. The Republican candidate for the Senate lost two of the precincts. The Republican candidate for Representative lost one. The Republican candidate for Governor carried all four. This district elected a Republican House Member.

Here, the Republican fieldman said the losses were due to drought, disparity in "soil bank" payments, Farmers Union activity and general farm dissatisfaction.

Kansas precincts showed their biggest shift in the governor's race. Two of the four precincts swung back of the Democratic candidate for governor. The 4 precincts are in an area that has suffered from drought for 4 years. Mr. Eisenhower held all 4 precincts as he did in 1952. In the House race, all four precincts also remained Republican.

Nevertheless, the fieldman noted an overall trend to Democrats. He said it was due to drought and a lack of organized Republican effort.

Missouri losses were attributed by the fieldman to the drought, to poor organization, and to failure to sell the Republican farm program.

The overall trend in the four precincts was Democratic. Mr. Eisenhower carried 3 of the 4 in 1952, 2 of the 4 in 1956. Democratic candidates for Senate, House, and governor also carried 2 of the 4. The State elected Democrats for Senate and governor, gave its electoral vote to Mr. Stevenson, and this district elected a Democratic Representative.

Minnesota studies were made in an area of good crops. Population is largely of Bohemian or Norwegian descent.

Democrats gained all along the line. Mr. Eisenhower carried all 4 precincts in 1952, lost one in 1956. This same precinct voted for Democrats for Representative and for governor. The district elected a Republican Representative.

The Republican fieldman reported opposition by the Farmers Union and a lack of good Republican organization.

In Ohio, the principal shifts showed up in the races for Senator and governor. Crops were good. The county in which the studies were made has many part-time farmers who work in industrial plants. Mr. Eisenhower and the Republican candidate for Representative—who also was reelected—held all 4 precincts, as they had in 1952. Their margins were a little lower.

In 1952, the Democratic candidate for the United States Senate lost all 4 of these precincts. But, in 1956, FRANK J. LAUSCHE, a Democrat, carried 3 of the 4 in his successful race for the Senate.

STRAIGHT-TICKET VOTERS

In the main, experts of the national committee reported that most of the farmers voted straight tickets. Unlike other voters who, in many cases, voted for Mr. Eisenhower for President and for Democrats for other offices, the report said, farmers showed few signs of such switches.

Notable exceptions were in the senatorial race in Ohio, in the governorship races in Kansas and Iowa. In these races, Eisenhower

voters leaped across the line to vote for Democrats—Mr. Lausche, George Docking, and Herschel C. Loveless. Mr. Docking and Mr. Loveless became the first Democrats to move into the governors' mansions of their States since New Deal days.

Of the States west of the Mississippi, Mr. Eisenhower ran a little better in 1956 than in 1952 in 7 States: Oklahoma, Arkansas, Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, and Louisiana. His gains ranged up to 9.7 percentage points. He lost ground, however, in 15 States west of the Mississippi. These losses ranged up to 12.9 percentage points in South Dakota.

THE FINDINGS

In checking over the studies, White House officials are finding these things:

Republican candidates have been losing ground steadily in the farming regions since 1952. The trend is reflected both in congressional losses and in smaller pluralities for Mr. Eisenhower.

The losses were heavier in areas affected by drought, but they were not confined to these areas. They reached into every farm area and affected almost every contest.

This is a point that is going to stand at the forefront of all decisions affecting farm politics in the months ahead. The Republican National Committee is acutely aware of the situation. Republican Congressmen from the farm States are emphasizing the point to the President. All of them are troubled about what will happen in 1958 if the trend is not checked.

A REPUBLICAN SPOT CHECK ON THE 1956 FARM VOTE

In each of the counties listed below, the Republican National Committee selected four typical farm precincts for a comparison of the 1952 and 1956 votes. The results:

WISCONSIN: IN DUNN COUNTY, DAIRY AND CORN AREA

For President

	Republican	*Democrat*
1952	1,070	546
1956	830	710

Republican loss: 240 votes.
Democratic gain: 164 votes.

For Representative

	Republican	*Democrat*
1952	1,033	502
1956	666	832

Republican loss: 367 votes.
Democratic gain: 330 votes.

COLORADO: IN SAGUACHE COUNTY, POTATO AND CATTLE AREA

For President

	Republican	*Democrat*
1952	826	506
1956	710	608

Republican loss: 116 votes.
Democratic gain: 102 votes.

For Representative

	Republican	*Democrat*
1952	829	517
1956	604	741

Republican loss: 225 votes.
Democratic gain: 224 votes.

NORTH DAKOTA: IN BOWMAN COUNTY, GRAIN AND CATTLE AREA

For President

	Republican	*Democrat*
1952	490	166
1956	293	256

Republican loss: 197 votes.
Democratic gain: 90 votes.

For Representative

	Republican	*Democrat*
1952	423	157
1956	252	218

Republican loss: 171 votes.
Democratic gain: 61 votes.

IOWA: IN PLYMOUTH COUNTY, CATTLE AND HOG AREA

For President

	Republican	*Democrat*
1952	1,463	657
1956	1,190	780

Republican loss: 273 votes.
Democratic gain: 123 votes.

For Governor [1]

	Republican	*Democrat*
1952	1,119	934
1956	825	1,037

Republican loss: 294 votes.
Democratic gain: 103 votes.

[1] No contest for Representative in 1 year.

Source: Republican National Committee.

SOUTH DAKOTA: IN LYMAN COUNTY, WHEAT AND CATTLE AREA

For President

	Republican	*Democrat*
1952	117	30
1956	64	57

Republican loss: 53 votes.
Democratic gain: 27 votes.

For Representative

	Republican	*Democrat*
1952	115	25
1956	75	47

Republican loss: 40 votes.
Democratic gain: 22 votes.

KANSAS: IN CHASE COUNTY, HAY AND CATTLE AREA

For President

	Republican	*Democrat*
1952	520	128
1956	437	139

Republican loss: 83 votes.
Democratic gain: 11 votes.

For Representative

	Republican	*Democrat*
1952	432	197
1956	405	173

Republican loss: 27 votes.
Democratic gain: 24 votes.

MISSOURI: IN HOLT COUNTY, CORN, HOG, AND CATTLE AREA

For President

	Republican	*Democrat*
1952	1,237	731
1956	1,006	806

Republican loss: 231 votes.
Democratic gain: 75 votes.

For Representative

	Republican	*Democrat*
1952	1,185	662
1956	957	835

Republican loss: 228 votes.
Democratic gain: 173 votes.

MINNESOTA: IN RICE COUNTY, HOG, CORN, AND DAIRY AREA

For President

	Republican	*Democrat*
1952	809	391
1956	596	502

Republican loss: 213 votes.
Democratic gain: 111 votes.

For Representative

	Republican	*Democrat*
1952	914	289
1956	674	498

Republican loss: 240 votes.
Democratic gain: 209 votes.

OHIO: IN LICKING COUNTY, CORN, HOG, CATTLE AND DAIRY AREA

For President

	Republican	*Democrat*
1952	798	363
1956	761	384

Republican loss: 37 votes.
Democratic gain: 21 votes.

For Representative

	Republican	*Democrat*
1952	831	289
1956	723	383

Republican loss: 108 votes.
Democratic gain: 94 votes.

PROPOSED SANCTIONS AGAINST ISRAEL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to speak relative to what occurred in this Chamber when, led by the minority leader, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], there was a great protest against our Government's backing sanctions against Israel. There now have been second thoughts on sanctions, constructive thoughts, dealing with the danger to national survival which confronts Israel and has confronted her since hostilities began on October 29, 1956. The key appears to be United Nations actions in reference to its ability to maintain the peace, and United States willingness to implement them, both inside and outside the United Nations.

A hopeful proposal is pending relating to the Gulf of Aqaba and the security of transit through the international waters, one of the two great issues raised in the debate on sanctions against Israel. We have a right to hope that there will be a solution along the lines proposed with respect to the Gulf of Aqaba. We also have a right to hope that our Government will not be swayed by threats from present efforts to get a solution, but will look at the alternatives of breaches of the peace, chaos, and more Communist interference in the tinderbox that is the Middle East.

We also have hope that our Government, along the lines of the moral principles to be applied with respect to the Gulf of Aqaba, may also present a suggested solution to the problem involving the Gaza strip.

I think the debate on Monday last at least made an important contribution toward putting our feet, at long last, on the constructive road to the establishment of international peace in this very troubled area.

A BALANCED BUDGET

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two editorials from newspapers in South Carolina. The first, which is entitled "Senator BRIDGES Offers a Solution," was published in the Charleston Evening Post on February 4, 1957. The second, which is entitled "Legion Head Challenge To Speak Up Fearlessly Against Increasing Government Control," was published in the Edgefield Advertiser on February 6, 1957.

I wish also to comment briefly on the proposal made by the Senator from New

Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] for a constitutional amendment to require the President and the Congress to balance the budget each year. That is the subject of the editorial in the Charleston Evening Post. I want to make it clear that the editorial approves the idea of a balanced budget.

In my opinion, millions of Americans all over the country also approve—and not only approve, but greatly desire and seek—a balanced budget as a required method of operating the Federal Government. I know that the proposed budget this year is said to be within the revenue anticipated, but there have been too many years in which spending far exceeded revenues.

The public debt totals $275,906,294,-121.74. Even if we maintain a balanced budget, we should also make greater efforts to reduce the public debt at a faster rate.

At the present rate, it will take generations to pay off the debt, even if no additional indebtedness is incurred, and none can foretell what emergencies may arise.

The Federal Government would do well to follow the example of some of the States with reference to the handling of revenues and appropriations. I shall not attempt to go into the details at this time, but the facts show that the States are in much better financial condition than the Federal Government.

However, I call to the attention of the Senate the provisions for a balanced budget in my own State of South Carolina.

Article 10. section 2 of the State constitution provides that—

> The General Assembly shall provide for an annual tax sufficient to defray the estimated expenses of the State for each year, and whenever it shall happen that the ordinary expenses of the State for any year shall exceed the income of the State for such year the General Assembly shall provide for levying a tax for the ensuing year sufficient, with other sources of income, to pay the deficiency of the preceding year together with the estimated expenses for the ensuing year.

That means, first, that the General Assembly is obligated to secure estimates from the financial officers of the State to insure that appropriations for any year do not exceed anticipated revenue. Second, it means, that if an error is made in estimating revenue for one year, it is the obligation of the General Assembly to provide for the deficiency to be paid off during the succeeding year.

As Governor of South Carolina from 1947 to 1951, I required the financial officers of the State to give me a statement when the single-package appropriations bill was sent to me for my signature, certifying that the bill was in balance.

I recommend this procedure as highly satisfactory. It keeps the State of South Carolina in excellent financial condition It would do the same for the Federal Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from South Carolina?

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

[From the Charleston (S. C.) Evening Post of February 4, 1957]

SENATOR BRIDGES OFFERS A SOLUTION

We approve the purpose of Senator BRIDGES' proposed constitutional amendment, even though we doubt the likelihood of its passage or even its effectiveness.

His proposal is that the President be required to submit a balanced budget each year.

It provides also that Congress may not throw it out of balance; that it may not increase spending without a corresponding boost in taxes.

Senator BRIDGES told his colleagues he had "never sponsored a resolution which I thought had more potential as far as the future welfare of this Nation is concerned."

The provisions could be suspended in war or other grave national emergency by a three-fourths vote of Congress.

We're afraid it wouldn't be difficult for the spenders to drum up an emergency. We have experts in that art.

A similar proposal at the preceding Congress made no headway, and that is likely to be the fate of Senator BRIDGES' resolution.

Yet no budget that won't be balanced by revenue should be proposed or adopted; and taxes adequate to finance all Government expenses should be imposed. Deficit financing should be rejected as inflationary and unsound.

But it is not simply a problem of balanced budgets. The basic problem is that of keeping budgets within bounds. Bloated budgets, such as those of recent years, are bad for the country even when balanced. They siphon off too much of the Nation's substance. They necessitate taxes that have inflationary effects by leading to wage demands and higher prices of goods and services. No constitutional amendment can cope with that situation. Only an aroused public opinion, implemented at the polls, will ever turn the trick.

[From the Edgefield (S. C.) Advertiser of February 6, 1957]

LEGION HEAD CHALLENGE TO SPEAK UP FEARLESSLY AGAINST INCREASING GOVERNMENT CONTROL

National American Legion Comdr. Dan Daniel has written one of the most impressive summaries of the Americanism versus communism issue we have yet read. It appears in the American Legion Magazine and its title is "Why Trade Our American Birthright for a Mess?"

"Our own system of government and economics is not much older than the Communist Manifesto. Our Constitution, granting man the right to be his own master and the master of the politicians who run the Government, is less than two centuries old. * * *

"What has happened to the downtrodden people who have been forced to live under communism? * * * terror * * * the firing squad * * * to compel acquiescence * * * mass arrests and deportations * * * execution without trial * * * fear and desperation. * * * The socialist system provides no curbs upon the absolute power of the socialist bureaucracy. * * *

"England's socialism," says Daniel, "is not the violent kind but it too meant spreading poverty."

In conclusion he writes:

"We stand in the shadow of those who pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to bring forth on this continent a new nation dedicated to the proposition that citizens shall control and dictate to the Government, not a government dictating to the citizens. We would be less than honorable if we failed to speak up fearlessly against the continued and increasing Government control of our rights.

"We would be traitors indeed if we now deserted the tenets of the Founding Fathers which have brought us so successfully into our great American heritage."

The accent which was placed on "letting the Government do it," back in the thirties, created exactly what the best citizens, in Edgefield, in Greenwood, in Saluda, and throughout South Carolina and the whole United States, said it would create.

The words of warning of very wise folk are noted with a surprising degree of similarity to the conditions which prevail a generation later.

They warned of mounting Government debt.

At the present time 83 percent of the entire income-tax load in America is borne by people with yearly incomes below $6,000.

As for repayment of Government debt, at the present rate of retirement it could not be paid off in 50 years.

Then there was the sage counsel against government paternalism itself which would encourage dependence.

The results are seen in the crime rate, the feverish buildup of organizational and union power for a sort of security, and the ever-growing demands upon government for more and more bureaucratic services.

This week came a strange sound from Washington, a cry almost as with uplifted hands, to the effect that the people will have to stop demanding more services if the Federal budget is ever to be cut and if government is to be a limited government.

Finally, one of the most far-seeing admonitions back in the thirties was that when government spends lavishly and accumulates new powers it attracts to it and to public life ambitious individuals who have a lust for such powers, and the tendency will be toward the elevation of sharpsters, political grafters, power-hungry racketeers who know and care little about constitutional government, patriotic citizenship, and love of country.

The exact pattern of change which was clearly counseled against by those in every community who were the wise and the good and the patriotic and the unselfish and the industrious and those devotees to the constructive upbuilding of free institutions has surely and gradually come about.

Still there is widespread complacency, and still running with full tide is the habit of going along for all one can get out of it.

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

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from South Carolina on his remarks, and comment that the junior Senator from Arizona should like to join in full support of the Bridges-Byrd amendment.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if he realizes two facts. Does the Senator know that the United States today has a greater national debt than the combined debts of all of the other countries in the world?

Mr. THURMOND. That is my understanding. Our debt is larger than that of all of the other nations of the world put together.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the Senator realize also that every baby born today has a $1,675 first mortgage hanging around his neck?

Mr. THURMOND. I have not calculated the exact amount, but I should say it is at least that much.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to have the floor in my own

right after the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] addresses the Senate; if the Senator from South Carolina will yield to me for a moment on this particular subject, I desire to thank him for his statement and to say I know how the very courageous Senator from South Carolina stands on this matter, and we all appreciate it.

I wish to say very sincerely that, after my service of 21 years in the Senate, it seems to me, as it seems to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who has cosponsored this proposal, and who has been in the Senate longer than I have, the only practical way we shall be able to obtain any assurance of a balanced budget over a period of time is by a constitutional method such as is proposed.

While there may be flaws in the proposal to have a constitutional amendment such as we suggest, it is the most practical approach and I think it is at least a partial answer to the long-range problem. I feel that if the Congress will pass the joint resolution, it can be ratified by the States in the course of the next 2 or 3 years, because there is a growing feeling in favor of such a move.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have the names of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] added to the list of cosponsors of the joint resolution.

In case the names of the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is not on it, I also ask unanimous consent that his name be added to it, as well as the name of my distinguished colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PROTESTS AGAINST PROPOSED VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES BY MARSHAL TITO

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have received and continue to receive a large volume of mail from residents of New Hampshire, as well as from citizens throughout the Nation, protesting the proposed visit to this country of Marshal Tito.

The latest communication which I have received on this subject comes from one of New England's outstanding newspapers, the Manchester Union Leader, which is published in Manchester, N. H. This newspaper has taken a courageous and straightforward position in opposition to a visit by Tito on the grounds that such an occurrence would be an insult to the moral principles and intelligence of all thinking Americans.

Recently the Manchester Union Leader conducted a poll among its readers, whereby opportunity was given for individuals to register their written objection to this proposal. As a result of the poll, I have just had delivered to me something over 2,000 signed protests, representing a substantial cross section of New Hampshire's reading public.

Mr. President, one of the hallmarks of the freedoms which we enjoy in this country is the privilege of each American to be well read and accurately informed. By the same token, it is the responsibility of news media to see that the American public is not only well informed, but that each individual has opportunity to express his or her views on issues of grave international importance. The Manchester Union Leader meets this test, and this most recent poll is indicative of the constructive public service to which it is dedicated.

I think my views with regard to any proposed visit by Tito are well known and it is hardly necessary for me to repeat them at length. I may say, however, that I am not convinced of the necessity for inviting the dictator of Yugoslavia to be our official guest in Washington.

I should like to make it clear that I do not rule out the value of discussing common problems with persons with whom I do not agree. In many cases, it is conceivable that a basis for agreement can be reached, and I certainly am prepared to listen to any reasonable suggestion which might contribute to the cause of peace and the avoidance of American bloodshed.

In Tito's case, however, it does not appear to me that a useful purpose would be served by any high-level talks he might have with President Eisenhower in the event he should visit this country. We have had experience enough with Tito's thinking and policies. He has a long and bloody record of broken promises and duplicity. It is a record which demonstrates lack of good faith and lack of principle. I have no evidence that he has changed for the better, and I have serious doubt that it would be possible to arrive at an understanding with Tito, which would be worth more than the paper upon which it was written.

Tito has consistently played both ends against the middle. First, he gravitates toward us and the rest of the free world, and then back towards the Communists, whichever suits best his needs and ambitions of the moment. Insofar as I can determine, therefore, the only value which might accrue from such a visit, would accrue to Tito and not to us. Bearing in mind that any head of a foreign state must be accorded full diplomatic honors when he visits this country, it seems to me that the only purpose which Tito's visit would serve would be to enhance his personal prestige and give impetus to his personal lust for power. I believe further that such a visit might do irreparable harm. I wonder, for exemple, what detrimental effect there would be on the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain who look to us as the leader among free nations. It might well appear to them that murder, banditry, and double dealing bring richer rewards than the exhausting struggle for freedom in which so many millions of human beings are engaged.

I have opposed the extension of economic and military aid to Yugoslavia, and I shall continue to express my opposition to the proposition of buying Tito's good will. I would be less than honest with my convictions if I did not oppose his visit to this country.

Mr. President, I commend the Manchester Union Leader for the public service it has performed in communicating to me the opinion of so many of its readers, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial which prompted this response be inserted in the body of the RECORD immediately after the close of my remarks.

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

VOTE AGAINST TITO VISIT

As our readers are aware, a plan is being formulated in Washington to desecrate American soil by inviting the depraved Communist dictator of Yugoslavia, Marshal Tito, to visit our shores. All thinking citizens will rebel against this insult to their moral principles and to their intelligence.

Several prominent American patriots, among whom are Senator Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire; Senator William F. Knowland, of California; United States Representative John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts; "Dan" Daniel, national commander of the American Legion; and Cooper T. Holt, commander in chief of the VFW, are vigorously protesting this deliberate insult to the American people. Unfortunately, their voices are few, and they need your support.

Your name and address signed below and mailed to the Union Leader office in Manchester will signify your opposition to this planned crime against humanity. Your vote against Tito will be forwarded to Senator BRIDGES for appropriate action.

I herewith protest Tito's visit to the United States, as agreed to by Secretary of State Dulles with President Eisenhower's obvious approval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

NEED TO RESUSCITATE THE GOLD MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last month we celebrated the anniversary of the discovery of gold in California, an event which altered the course of history on this continent.

At a location on the American River some 30 miles east of what now is Sacramento, the capital of my State, James Marshall was engaged on January 24, 1848, in the construction of a sawmill for the fabulous John Sutter when the glint of gold in the millrace excited his attention and very soon the attention of all the world. Within 2 years, 100,000 people had gone by wagon, by ship, on horseback, and on foot in search of fortune in the Golden West. They went from the eastern seaboard and the Mississippi Valley, and from other lands all around the globe. California, a part of the territory which now constitutes the southwestern portion of our Nation and which had been possessed by the United States as a result of our war with Mexico, became a full-fledged component of this Union almost literally overnight. By reason of the spectacular population increment incident to the gold rush, we were catapulted into statehood, under an act of Congress approved on September 9, 1850, without going through the usual probationary period as a Territory.

I hope I may be pardoned if I recall in passing that many of the communities of the gold rush—such as San Fran-

cisco, Marysville, Sacramento, Hangtown, Auburn—were depicted lithographically by my great uncle, Christian Kuchel, who with his brother, my grandfather, were early residents of San Francisco after coming to the United States from their native Germany in search of American freedom and opportunity.

During the three decades following Marshall's discovery, gold was produced in hundreds of millions of dollars annually, and the economy of California was a mining economy. Gold mining continued as an important industry until the year 1942. Its demise can be pinpointed at October 8 of that year, the date the War Production Board issued Order L-208, suspending nonessential mining operations.

Meantime, by a Presidential order promulgated under the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, the price of newly mined gold had been fixed at $35 a fine ounce. This was an increase of 69 percent in the value of gold which had been maintained throughout the previous 100 years.

During the past 23 years, despite multiple increases in the price of every other commodity and every service in the American economy, the $35 price for gold has been inflexibly enforced, creating a condition under which it has been impossible to reopen the gold mines of my State and of our Nation. Such production of gold as there is today is only a byproduct of the production of copper, lead, zinc, and other metals.

The manifest purpose of Order L-208 was to divert manpower from the mining of gold to the mining of metals critically needed for conducting our war against the Axis Powers. Its accomplishments in this regard were negligible. Gold miners, deprived of their usual means of livelihood, did not leave their homes for jobs several hundred miles away.

I think I can say that that is particularly true in the Mother Lode area of California, the State which I have the honor, in part, to represent. The gold miners, deprived of their usual means of livelihood, dispossessed of their historic line of work, found employment in nearby sawmills, or in the shipyards and other installations where high weekly earnings were available. The gold-mining industry, nevertheless, was effectively throttled.

It did not recover when the wartime restrictions on manpower and materials were lifted, because it could sell its product only at the price fixed during the depression. At 1957 costs, the mines obviously cannot operate at a profit, and are closed down, with very few exceptions.

The effect of this has been pronounced upon the economy of communities whose dependence on gold mining was great. In some cases it has been quite devastating. Lumbering, recreation, and other activities suited to the terrain where gold usually is found have provided substitute sources of income for a number, but by and large the towns of California along our famous Mother Lode have not shared in the growth and prosperity which has been the happy lot of most American communities in recent years. I believe this is true also of mining towns in Arizona, Montana, Nevada, Utah, Idaho, Colorado, and other Western States where gold is one of the natural resources.

This local economic impact in itself is unfortunate. It is a problem in which our Government may most properly interest itself. Resumption of gold mining would create many thousands of jobs both in the mines and indirectly throughout the land. Beyond that, I am convinced the time has come for Congress to examine most completely the effect upon our economic structure which may have been occasioned by stopping, or nearly stopping, the production of new gold.

As to the former, I am delighted that the distinguished chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has introduced two bills with this, as well as the immediate ills of the gold-mining industry, clearly in view. I allude, of course, to Senate bill 325, "to permit the free marketing of newly mined gold," and to Senate Joint Resolution 16, "to establish a joint committee to investigate the gold-mining industry."

It seems reasonable that many American gold mines would resume operations if the free marketing of newly mined gold were permitted again. I should like to express the hope that Senate bill 325 will receive hearings very soon, and I very much hope, also, prompt consideration thereafter by the Senate. It is proposed legislation which appeals to me on the basis of its practicability. Industry, the professions, and the arts have some need of a supply of gold. Their domestic source now is the United States Treasury. The metal is sold at the established monetary value, $35 an ounce, whereas the world price ranged last year from $38.50 at Brussells to $52.40 at Bombay. What our own frozen price structure actually amounts to is a subsidy for industrial users at the expense of the producers of gold; albeit most of the present production, as I have pointed out, is a byproduct of copper and other mines. The annual consumption of gold by industry—$100 million—represents more than double the annual gold production of the United States.

Early action upon Senate Joint Resolution 16, introduced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], likewise is highly desirable, for the measures complement one another. Certainly they constitute a sincere effort to deal with a problem which has been neglected altogether too long.

It would appear that in due time the proposed National Monetary and Financial Commission provided for in Senate bill 599, introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and other Members of this body, would desire to include in its studies a consideration of our monetary gold situation, both as to the stocks owned by the United States and the production and supply of the metal.

I might observe parenthetically that in my conversations with the senior Senator from Indiana, he told me that, in his judgment, the verbiage embodied in his resolution was sufficiently liberal in scope to include such an investigation.

The gold holdings of our Government are somewhat less than $22 billion, with approximately $12,500 million in the Fort Knox vaults and the rest in the Philadelphia, San Francisco, and Denver mints and the New York Assay Office. It is common knowledge that short-term banking liabilities of the Federal Government to foreigners amount to nearly $14 billion, payable in United States gold on demand. Foreign holders of dollars have an additional claim on our gold reserve of approximately $3 billion if they choose to convert their dollars. I, for one, should like to be advised without too much delay as to what the consequences to our economy would be if these obligations had to be liquidated. The bill of the Senator from Indiana, therefore, has more than an ordinary interest for the gold-mining industry of my State.

I am frank to say that I have a primary interest in seeing justice done to a segment of the economy of California which was an innocent casualty of the Second World War. In retrospect, we know that the War Production Board order of October 8, 1942, was a mistake. But ought the injustice to be continued and compounded by denying to the producers of gold the opportunity to sell their metal to industrial users? Is it right to deny them the right to trade in the world market? Is the price for monetary gold established in 1934 realistic today? Is it logical or necessary to continue the United States Treasury as the sole domestic merchant of industrial gold?

These are questions which I hope and believe the Congress of the United States will endeavor to answer fully at its present session. I am prepared to assist in every way I can.

STUDY OF MATTERS RELATING TO THE ELECTION, SUCCESSION, AND DUTIES OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2), to create a joint congressional committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President.

AWARD OF SILVER QUILL TO SENATOR BYRD

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD excerpts from the proceedings of the state of the Nation dinner of National Business Publications, Inc., at Hotel Statler, in Washington, D. C., on January 26, at which Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON presented the 1956 Silver Quill award of NBP—the highest tribute of the business press—to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] for distinguished services to business

and industry, through untiring devotion to sound fiscal policies for the government and for unswerving support of tax measures that have helped make possible the best of free enterprise benefits for the American people

This annual Washington dinner features a question-and-answer period in which captains of industry, Cabinet officers, and other Government leaders gage the state of the Nation by discussing the prospects in their respective areas of the economy.

The award conferred on the senior Senator from Virginia is a very high one, and all of us are proud of this tribute to our colleague.

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

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY MASTER OF CEREMONIES N. M'K. KNEISLY, PRESIDENT, THE IRVING-CLOUD PUBLISHING CO., AND CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, INC.

Permit me, please, just a few words about NBP and its purpose.

National Business Publications is an association of publishers of 203 technical, professional, industrial, scientific, merchandising, and marketing magazines.

Business Publications perform a unique service to the economy. They facilitate the exchange of business education and industrial know-how. They stimulate our enterprise. They power the progress of our technology.

Business magazines are designed to serve the needs of the specialist who must keep abreast of newest developments in his highly specialized field.

The history of business publishing parallels the growth of business and industry in America.

The result is that there are today fields of vital activity never dreamed of only a few years ago that are served by technical periodicals specializing in electronics, antibiotics, supersonics, atomics, and the like, keeping technically trained men and women in touch with quick-changing know-how in such areas as virus vaccines, merchandising and marketing, automation and nuclear propulsion.

Among NBP's principles of practice, which are found on the back cover of your program, there is one that pledges active allegiance to the American system of free competition. And therein lies our real reason for being here tonight.

Sound business decisions are essential to the continued prosperity of our enlightened economy.

Business magazines are dedicated to the enduring service of providing the knowledge that is necessary for those sound decisions.

That is why we seek each year to present our silver-quill award to that person who has best demonstrated those things for which we stand and in which we serve.

The silver quill of NBP, like the organization that awards it, is synonymous with consecrated service to business and industry and to the Government that guarantees our freedom of enterprise.

As in past years, it is our hope that this state of the Nation dinner may serve as a fair-weather forecast of things to come. These leaders from Government and industry have graciously consented to briefly answer one specific question that is related to our future welfare. All have agreed to operate under a tight 3-minute rule.

Now, then, Mr. Speaker, will you please come to this lectern and set the stage and the clock for us by answering the first question?

STATE OF THE NATION; QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture

Question: Mr. Secretary Benson, as always, we are indeed happy to have you at our Silver Quill head table and we will appreciate your authoritative views on the general outlook for agriculture.

Answer: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker, Senator Byrd, members and friends of NBP. Our objective is a prosperous, expanding and free agriculture. We are moving toward that objective. The farm outlook for 1957 is for an improvement over 1956, and 1956 showed an improvement over 1955. We are not out of the woods, but agricutlure is sound and we are embarked upon programs which promise to help keep it so, and improve the opportunity for farmers to further increase their income in the months ahead.

During the months ahead we will come closer to what will make for real prosperity in agriculture, and that is a balance between production and use of farm products, instead of the endless creation of new price-depressing surpluses for Government storage. Achievement of balance is being brought about, first, by intensified liquidation of surpluses—largely through increased exports and expansion of use at home—and, second, by better management of our productive capacity—through the operation of the soil bank.

That we were on the road from the postwar lows in agriculture became visible in 1956. Net income of farm operators moved upward last year by 5 percent. The only other such rise since the peak of 1947 came in 1951—another war year. We are looking forward to still further progress in this peacetime year, 1957. We estimate that there will be another increase of 5 percent in farmers' net income this year.

Along with an expanded surplus disposal program, with diversion of some of our productive land into the soil bank, there will be a continuance of supports along the sounder lines provided by the Farm Act of 1954 as modified last year. The flexibility of this program gives farmers the freedom to adjust their operations to the changing needs of an expanding, dynamic economy.

In brief, then, here's the outlook for agriculture—farm income is rising, surpluses are declining, the storage problem has passed its peak, domestic consumption is increasing, markets are expanding at home and abroad. We are moving forward in the direction of great freedom for the American farmer. Yes, we are headed in the right direction. The outlook is encouraging.

Alfred E. Perlman, President, New York Central System

Question: In your opinion, what does the transportation industry need to keep healthy now and to do its share in the event of national emergency?

Answer: The rapid growth of our population, our expanding national economy, and tremendous developments on scientific frontiers, offer an exciting future for the transportation industry.

To meet this challenge, the New York Central has projected a 5-year budget on half a billion dollars for improved plant and equipment. But, while we are converting our plant to radar controlled push-button freight yards—electronic, centralized traffic control—and working with atomically activated locomotive parts—our governmental transportation policies still date back to the 1890's. These outmoded policies were conceived in the days when railroads had a virtual monopoly upon inland transportation, and railroads are, therefore, being regulated as if this monopoly still existed.

The policies used for the newer forms of transportation are based on concepts of fledgling industries—even though they have long since come of age. To illustrate, gasoline taxes put on highway carriers are used to build highways for the benefit of the users. But what happens to the tax on railroad transportation which all of us pay? It goes—not to help the railroads—but into general funds to build waterways for barges, highways for trucks, and airports for airplanes—literally subsidizing our competitors while strangling the railroads.

And the wartime excise tax is still kept on some forms of transporation. It's been taken off since then in the movies. But it only applies to the common carrier, which is the poor man's mode of carriage. It, therefore, drives business away from the common carrier to the tremendous fleets of completely unregulated trucks and barges—which are not required to pay these taxes.

Thus, the railroads are earning less than 4 percent but must pay 5 percent for the money we are borrowing to finance our plant requirements. How long can such regulation be tolerated by fairminded Americans?

Each form of transportation, whether by air, highway, water, or rail, has certain obvious inherent advantages. The President's Cabinet Committee last year asked Congress for legislation which would permit each to exercise its proper economic functions. If—and only if—this is done, can privately financed common carriage take from the shoulders of the Government the burden of financing transportation facilities with public funds—the bills for which rise each year.

The greatest need, therefore, in keeping our transportation industry—and thus the whole economy—vital and healthy, is a reappraisal by Congress of the archaic national transportation policies. Then the taxpaying common carriers of this country, whether by air, highway, water, or rail, may expand and improve in keeping with the dynamic changes in America's scientific and economic frontiers.

Elisha Gray II, president, Whirlpool-Seeger Corp.

Question: Mr. Gray. On one hand, we hear stimulating predictions for 1957 for the appliance industry, due to widespread demand for the new styling and improved efficiency that are being engineered by progressive manufacturers. But, on the other hand, we hear disturbing comments about the industry's inability to show a profit. From your strategic position, can you clarify the situation for us?

Answer: "Stimulating" is a very good adjective to use in describing 1957's outlook for the appliance business, but it is even more appropriate in describing the next decade for this industry.

For an immediate 12-month forecast we believe there will be only a modest increase, probably of 3 to 5 percent, in appliance sales spread about evenly over each half of the year.

I say "only" because this estimate is well below the average annual growth for this industry since the war and it represents only one-half the rate of increase which some of us calculate for each of the next 10 years. As such, 1957 will represent only a pause for breath on the part of the consumers purchasing appliances.

The appliance industry has now become a mature and an important segment of the economy. It ranks third behind home building and automobiles in annual sales of consumer durable goods. Its forward pace which appears to be at a rate of about two times the rate of growth of our total economy is built upon four prime factors:

1. The population growth. Our customers for the next 20 years are already born and have been counted. Today's school classroom shortage is a dramatic measure of the onrushing numbers of tomorrow's customers.

2. The redistribution of wealth has quietly revolutionized the market. In 1940 the av-

erage family in the United States earned only $2,000—hardly a prospect for major appliances. Today, families earn an average of $6,500 and even that figure is rising steadily. That makes almost everyone a customer as far as ability to pay is concerned.

3. The appliance industry has invested huge sums on an ever-increasing scale to engineer and design more attractive products that do much more for the housewife and at a price that excites her appetite to buy. The rate at which new appliances will reach the market will increase greatly each year.

The fourth significant factor is the need and desires for modern appliances. More women than ever are working outside the home. It is astonishing to note from census figures that more women than men have joined the national labor force in the last 5 years. This trend goes hand in hand with strong appliance sales. Modern household appliances—by easing the housewife's burdens—have either permitted her to seek outside employment or have forced her out of the house from sheer boredom with her new-found leisure. I don't know which.

Principally for these reasons, appliance predictions show a strong upward surge for years to come. The line zigzags upward, of course. We predict 1957 will zag slightly and show a sales increase of 3 to 5 percent, which is less than average growth for this industry.

Now, profits? That's a much harder question. However, with the events in our industry of the last few years behind us, I think it is safe to predict that we are now on the threshold of a more stable era—a mature phase, if you please. Heaven knows it's highly competitive and the consumer is getting more than ever for her dollar. But with the enormous volume of business to be done, and the desperate need of capital to finance this growth (capital which can best come from earnings), I think you will see the majority of companies in our industry generating a satisfactory profit next year.

Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army

Question: Mr. Secretary Brucker—Is the Army keeping abreast of the tremendous advances being made in the atomic age?

Answer: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker, Senator BYRD, members of this great organization, ladies and gentlemen: We have made a lot of progress in 1 year. Last year, the question asked of me, as Secretary of the Army, was this: "Is the Army obsolete?" This year, the question is stepped up: "Is the Army keeping abreast?" We have made great progress in 1 year. Thank you very much.

I wish I were as sure of everything as I am that the research and the development and the production of the new atomic weapons and all of the things that go with this new atomic age were coming along and are coming along and that the Army is representing what you expect in the country—I wish I were as sure of everything as I am of that.

As an indispensable member of a great defense team—Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force—no one of them to be lost sight of and, altogether, a great group and ensemble with a great punch—the Army's part is progressing very satisfactorily, because we have gone all the gamut—the whole way—in electronic, radar, nuclear, atomic, and modern weaponry. Such things as the Honest John, the free-swinging rocket, the Nike guided missile and, now, the Nike B, the improvement upon the old, the Corporal ballistic missile that follows the trajectory of a bullet or an old artillery shell, except at great distances, and then the Redstone, a free-wheeling rocket that goes in medium range so many miles I wouldn't want to mention it. Then, in addition to that, the antitank, antiarmor guided missile, the Dart, the Little John, and soon others.

A great arsenal of weaponry and, along with it, a new concept of the battlefield. We have now streamlined our divisions, world around, to what we call the Pentomic Divisions—that's a contraction of two words, pentana and atomic—and it means that, now, instead of the old-fashioned divisions, we have the five-battalion size instead of the three regimental and they are streamlined so that, with the equipment of atomic power, they can proportion and tailor the strike to exactly the proportion of strength that is desired at the particular moment.

In company with the Atomic Energy Commission, we have been very interested in the developing and the furthering of the progress of reducing the package size of the atomic warhead, until it is down to the place where now it can be fired at great distance or a distance depending upon the target to be hit and Army has that capability and can deliver it night or day, rain or shine, fog, weather nothing to the contrary notwithstanding, any distance within the range of this new battlefield of hundreds of miles wide, hundreds of miles deep and reach into the enemy territory and still not become a target because of dispersion and ability to move quickly, to move about that battlefield, seek out its target and then move to the next, tailoring and proportioning the force to the thing that is to be hit.

In addition to that, we are developing a peaceful atomic capability. Over at Fort Belvoir, right near Washington, we have the first Army Package Atomic Power Reactor Station of its kind in the world and it will be open to the public and dedicated in April and, in addition to that, another peaceful use. We have the use of atomic energy for the irradiation of food and now, as a purveyor of food, the Army is able to preserve it for, not days, weeks, months, but for years and that, likewise, will be of great capacity on the battlefield, with troops and sailors and airmen, the world around.

But, all the while, we have got to be ready for something else. We have got to have the dual punch—the left hand, the first on that side's got to be the conventional weapon, the thing that keeps up for the kind of war that may break out that we want to stamp out before it gets to be a general global war. And the other side, the punch that will put it out with an atomic weapon before it gets started too far.

Yes, the Army has come a long distance in its concept of the new and modern and streamlined, but I want to say just this about the gadgets and the weaponry. With all of the weaponry that we can have—the radar, and it is great; the electronics, and it's wonderful; the nuclear and the atomic weapons, and they are magnificent, there never will be a final weapon. There will always be an antimissile missile. Man's ingenuity will always devise it. There is only one ultimate weapon and that's man himself and that's where the Army and the rest of these forces come in. The men of the forces of the defense team are the ultimate weapon and they ultimately will prevail. And the secret weapon, if I can let you in on something, is the great know-how of business and industry—our secret weapon that can lick the world by giving us the arsenal we need.

Charles Thomas, Secretary of the Navy

Question: Mr. Secretary Thomas, you have said that the Navy is in process of shifting from steam to nuclear power; from subsonic to supersonic aircraft; from guns to missiles. In view of the fact that the United States Navy is now the most powerful in the world, to what advantage will these revolutionary innovations be put?

Answer: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice President, and distinguished guests—I should first like to say that the mission of the Navy today, in this nuclear age, is no different than it was at the inception of the Navy 180 years ago—and that mission is to control the seas, in case of war.

The transition that the Navy is making today gives us the power to carry out that mission. To give you an example of this, the use of atomic power will give our ships a range that we have never dreamed of before. In World War II, a ship could never drive its steam propulsion plant for more than 12 consecutive hours at full speed, full power. Atomic-powered ships can literally run for days, for weeks, for months, at full steam, at full power. The only practical limitation will be the endurance of the crews.

Missiles are very rapidly replacing guns in the Navy today. Our new missiles are reaching out farther and farther, with more deadly accuracy, to destroy our targets and I think that the greatest potential weapon to come up, in our arsenal today, is the medium-range ballistic missile that is a 1,500-mile missile that will be launched from a submarine as a launching platform.

We can take a nuclear-powered submarine and, by placing it in certain strategic ocean areas and firing the missile from there, hit virtually any major target in the world. Jet power is giving our new high-performance carrier-based planes the range and speed that they need in this nuclear age. These high-performance, high-speed planes being launched from carriers that will be hundreds of miles at sea can literally hit and destroy any target that might jeopardize our control of the sea.

The Marines are using and developing the most advanced techniques in amphibious warfare, by using helicopters and what they call vertical envelopment that can go on any beach or over any beach and go over it and on it in depth.

I can assure you, ladies and gentlemen, that your Navy—and it is your Navy—as a part of our great defense team, with its new weapons and with its superb military leadership, is ready, willing, and able to carry out any assignment that either the President or the Congress might give it.

R. E. Salvati, president, Island Creek Coal Co.

Question: Mr. Salvati, will you be good enough to give us your views regarding the prospects for the coal industry throughout 1957?

Answer: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Vice President, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure to be here and to say hello to my friends of the coal industry. I would like to say that the American bituminous coal industry may now definitely be classed as a "growth industry." This is something new in the picture. While coal has always been regarded as supplying a basic need—the evergrowing market for energy—it has in the past 15 years seen its competitors increase their share of the energy market while its own share has constantly decreased. The result has been that, except war and post-war season, coal has lost its position, but we in this industry think our losses have run their course. It is my belief, shared by many other coal executives, that from 1954 on the trend is definitely upward and that the growth in demand can become great enough to strain the ability of the coal industry and of the transportation facilities to meet it.

To provide a capacity sufficient to supply this demand and, at the same time, replacing exhausting mines will require billions of dollars of new capital—dollars which will be justified only by reasonable profits return.

Because of mechanization of operations, both underground and above ground, the capital cost of developing new coal mines has risen sharply. The greater quantities of coal consumed by large enterprises have made large output mines more desirable. These two factors combine to make larger corporate organizations necessary and are, therefore, promoting mergers, consolidations,

purchases, and the current trend toward larger scale organizations is both necessary and healthy.

The industry is recognizing the trend toward larger corporate units. In the last 2 years, much has been accomplished in this direction and more will be accomplished in 1957 and the years ahead.

For the year 1957, we can view the coal industry with optimism. Most of the so-called career coal companies see a bright future for the coal industry and are properly planning and working for an increasing share of that future.

The task ahead is not an easy one. No industry can satisfy a growth of demand such as that projected for coal without encountering difficulties and difficult problems. Like any other growth industry, we in coal are faced with the problem of finding the capital with which to finance our business. We of management are naturally striving for increased profits, as a means of providing a large part of the needed capital and we in this industry accept these responsibilities with optimism and confidence.

Donald Quarles, Secretary of the Air Force

Question: Mr. Secretary Quarles, is defense so preoccupied with security against general war that it is failing to meet the dangers of little wars?

Answer: Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, I believe we all agree that our primary security objective is to thwart aggressive exploitation of the Communists' military might. This is a free world objective in which our own military services share the responsibility with the military forces of our friends and allies around the world. It is a two-pronged objective requiring, first, strength around the periphery that will block Communist nibbling tactics and, second, strategic reserve power, primarily air-atomic power, that is ready to retaliate with devastating effect on any overt Communist attack.

We achieve our first objective by maintaining such strength around the periphery as to block Communist tactics of infiltration and subversion, thus forcing any Communist aggressive moves out into the open where they can be recognized as such by the whole world. We achieve our second objective by maintaining such a powerful air-atomic striking force as to convince the Communists that they could not profit by a massive all-out attack.

Because we feel that the potential danger of massive Communist aggression far exceeds all other threats to the security of our country, one might say that our defense is preoccupied with security against general war. We all recognize, however, that there are many different situations that might develop and many different kinds of military force that might be required.

I do not believe that, in making defense against all-out war our prime objective, we are failing to meet the dangers of little wars. First, we should make it clear that there could be many different kinds of little wars, most of which should not involve participation by our military forces, except perhaps as components of a United Nations police force. If we are talking about a little war in which our vital interests are violated and in which we are therefore forced to participate, it is my point of view that we should do so with whatever it takes to make our participation effective, including the use of such of our quality weapons as may be required.

Moreover, I believe that the general knowledge that we are determined to be effective, if we do have to participate, is the best guaranty against such things happening in the first place. Finally, I believe that sufficiency to meet the massive threat tends to be more than sufficient to meet any lesser danger.

I hope I may have left you with the impression that the Air Force is ready to take on any of these tasks.

Walter Williams, Under Secretary of Commerce

Question: Mr. Secretary Williams, we understand that you have just returned from openings of the international trade fairs at Bogota and Bangkok, the latter marking the second anniversary of official participation in trade fairs throughout the world. From your observations, do you feel that our trade-fair program is effective?

Answer: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice President, other upper-deckers, lower-deckers, and paying members of the Grass Root Society, the answer to—I think these should be the ones to applaud; they didn't pay, you did—the answer to your question, Mr. Chairman, is a ringing, well-qualified "Yes."

I hardly need to say to this group of scintillating intellects gathered in this room that we are engaged, at the present time, in a gigantic struggle between the free world and the unfree world. If I were to paraphrase Dale Carnegie, I would say that the objective of America is to win friends and keep them won and to influence people and keep them influenced, in the way we want them to be influenced, by telling them the truth about the free world and America.

That is what we are doing in connection with our international trade fair program. Up until mid-1954, Russia and her communistic satellites had everything her own way in participating in these trade fairs. Then, President Eisenhower, recognizing the potential effectiveness of this instrument in waging the cold war, made available some funds so that we participated for the first time, in December 1954, in Bangkok, Thailand.

Since that time, Congress and the executive branch have joined to make funds available for a continuance of this program. Actually, this year's budget calls for about $3½ million. That may seem like a lot of money and it is, in one sense, but, when you contrast it with the fact that Russia and her satellites are expending an estimated $50 million per year and appearing in twice as many fairs as are we, you get a little idea of the competition that we are confronted with.

There have been 45 fairs in which America has participated in these last 2 years. This year, this summer, for the first time, we are waging an offensive attack, in the sense that we are going behind the Iron Curtain to appear in Poznan, Poland. The answer is "Yes" to the fact that we are having an effective job done by these fairs.

Now, for just a moment, by way of a corollary thought related to these fairs. As your chairman has indicated, I completed recently a 47-day trip around the world, touching upon 4 continents. I suppose that, perhaps, because of tightness of schedule I might label the title of these remarks from here on out as "4 Continents on 2 Shirts," because it became necessary for me to wash my dacron shirts in the washtub very regularly each evening.

I gained many impressions and had very many interesting experiences as you might gather. But there were two impressions that I want to mention here, by way of relating it to the subject matter—namely the international trade fairs. I found, in talking with the ministers of finance, the ministers of economy, the ministers of industry of these different countries that I visited, that there was a particularly poignant problem that confronted them, all the way along the line: How do we keep our foreign exchange reserve account in balance? And that relates itself to these visiting folks from America who go to these different countries and an American is singled out, I suppose, for two reasons. First of all, because he is American and you can spot him blocks away, because he is just a different breed of animal and, secondly, because an American has with him, in his pocket, that magic thing called the American dollar. And that, somehow or other, is sensed very quickly by the natives in these various countries.

Now, all these programs and the dollars that we are spending, both as tourists and as business people and in the different foreign aid and military procurement programs are fine and our international trade fairs are fine. But, there is one little ingredient that we must never overlook and it relates back to what Mr. Brucker said a little while ago when he was talking about the men. Incidentally, my friends, I encountered some stories and I suspect that some of you who have been over there have, too, that, when we have our American citizens go over there, they don't always follow the right kind of pattern of individual behavior.

Now, I don't like to overlook the opportunity to make a sale when I have the chance to make one and I am cognizant of the fact that I am standing here now within the presence of a group of people who write the printed word. Therefore, you have an influence away beyond the ordinary group that might meet in a room of this sort. I would like to invite you to join with me in a project—namely, to see to it if we can arouse the consciences and consciousness of the American citizens, so that, when they go abroad, they will not merely be a member of a group; that they will not merely be a member of a commission; that they will not be a member of an educational group or somebody else, but that they will be an American citizen, recognizing the fact, as individuals, that they are living in a glass cage; that they are under inspection by those people of the foreign countries, every moment of the time that they are visiting those countries, then behave accordingly.

If you of the controllers of the printed word will join me in that project and help arouse the conscience and consciousness of the American citizens, believe you me, then these programs such as the international trade fairs and all the rest of them will not just be more or less formal things, but they will be live, dynamic things and we will all, as individuals, contribute greatly to the winning of this titanic struggle.

T. M. Evans, president, H. K. Porter Co., Inc.

Question: Mr. Evans, in view of the "tight money" situation, do you feel that the very large corporations have unfair advantage over small- and medium-size businesses—and do you feel that the business press of the Nation is doing an adequate job in discussing such matters?

Answer: Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, before answering your question, I would like to clear up the distinction between large and small business. We all know that the largest corporations in this country have as much as $4 to $7 billion in sales and that some earn as much as $2 billion before taxes. I do not think that any of us will argue that these are not large. The confusion here in Washington seems to be in defining exactly what is small business.

A progress report by the President's Cabinet Committee on Small Business, dated August 7, 1956, singled out those corporations earning less than $25,000 a year, before taxes, as being small business. In this economy, I don't think they actually can be considered as businesses—they are more like individuals running stores or gas stations. In my opinion, we should define small business, under our current economy, as those with less than $25 million in sales and earning less than $2,500,000 before taxes.

In considering the tight money situation, we must remember that loaning and investing money under this economy, based on high income taxes, is in the hands of professionals or people handling money for others, since

few if any individuals have surplus funds for investment under the present taxes. When professional investors, with responsibilities to others, have demands from the leading corporations for all or most of the funds they have to invest or loan, naturally there is little, if any, left over for the small- or medium-sized, less well-known concern, either in the form of loans or the form of money to invest in the common stock of such companies. If any money at all is available to loan the smaller companies, it is usually at rates up to 50 percent higher than the largest companies pay; this is natural, but is a distinct disadvantage to such companies.

The smaller company, operating in only one field, has another disadvantage, in that it has depreciation from only that one field, while a larger corporation, operating in many fields, can use the depreciation from one division that may not be growing rapidly to generate cash for a division that is growing.

An additional problem of small business, under the 1954 tax law, is that the increased depreciation rates apply only to new machinery. I think almost everyone will agree that because a small company cannot afford to buy new machinery and, therefore, must buy it secondhand, such small companies should not be penalized in their depreciation rates, compared to the company which was able to buy new machinery.

Since I definitely feel that the largest corporations have a great advantage over the smaller companies, particularly in this period of tight money, I think that the most practical and effective method of overcoming this would be to tax smaller business at lower rates than the very largest corporations, just as we have eased the burden on individuals in the lower income-tax brackets, compared with those in the higher brackets. However, the problem is not a simple one. I am both surprised and disappointed to find that you editors and publishers of business publications, in general, have not taken a stand. You are among those best qualified and in the best position to study and assess the problem and bring it to the attention of your readers in the business world. I hope that, in the future, you will do just that.

REMARKS OF RICHARD M. NIXON, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, IN PRESENTING THE 1956 SILVER QUILL AWARD OF NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, INC., TO SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, Senator BYRD, distinguished guests at the two tiers, and ladies and gentlemen in the audience, I am honored to be with you for the third time at this dinner and I would like to note, before making the presentation, two firsts, with regard to this dinner, that I think all of us will appreciate. This is the first time that I have ever been in this room, as a matter of fact, when I have seen the people who pay $20 for the $2 seats in the back, get a break with regard to the program. I congratulate those responsible for the program who have done this. And this is also the first time, standing up here as I have many times, either as a speaker or in this capacity, that the speaker has the opportunity to see how foolish he looks on television, all around the room.

But, not only is it the first time in those respects for me but this is also a very special occasion, in that I am honored to join with you in presenting this award to our guest of honor this evening. You know as much about him, I am sure, as I do and I can only underline some of the things that have already been mentioned, but which we should remind ourselves of from time to time.

When I think of Senator BYRD, there are so many things that are worth mentioning that it is difficult to select the few that I will mention here. First of all, he is a Virginian and, as a Virginian, he has the courtliness, the grace, and the charm which we have learned to expect from those who are cast in the mold of tradition of great Virginians—men like Washington, Jefferson, and Robert E. Lee.

In the second place, HARRY BYRD is old-fashioned. He is old-fashioned in a number of ways. I refer, first, to the fact that he is old-fashioned with regard to some of his ideas. He is so old-fashioned that he thinks that a government shouldn't spend money until it already has it. I might say that that, with regard to this evening, is the only thing that I find rather incongruous. This is a Silver Quill Award and it is a silver award with a number of ounces—a hundred or so, as I recall—and all that I can say is that I know of no man in America today who is probably further away from the ideas of free silver and further away from the principle of the gold standard than HARRY BYRD. This, for HARRY BYRD, in more ways than one, should be a gold award rather than a silver award this evening.

Then, I refer, also, to our guest of honor this evening in another capacity, with which I am sure you will be familiar—as a man who is a Democrat. I should say, I think, that he is very proud of his party designation, as all of us are of ours, but, in making this presentation to him this evening, I would like to pay to him what I think is even a higher tribute. There are some men in the House and the Senate who have partisan affiliations who will leave a mark long afterward which is greater than their party. There are men who rise above their party, become Congressmen of our districts and States, and Senators of our States and of the Nation. In presenting this award this evening, I can think of no more appropriate thing to say than this—we honor HARRY BYRD as a Senator from Virginia. We honor him as a Senator from the Democratic Party, but, most of all, we honor him as a great Senator, belonging to all America, and in that spirit I make the award this evening.

REMARKS OF SENATOR HARRY FLOOD BYRD, OF VIRGINIA, CHAIRMAN, SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE, IN RECEIVING THE 1956 SILVER QUILL AWARD OF NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, INC., JANUARY 26, 1957, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen, I simply do not know what I have done to deserve it, but I appreciate it more than I can express. I realize the award is not made of gold but I am told that the silver is pure silver and, if an emergency should occur, it should have some value.

I am very grateful to my good friend, DICK NIXON. I can still call him Dick—I don't know what may happen later on. I am very appreciative to him for his very gracious remarks about me, which I will always remember.

I just want to say, first, a word of appreciation to the Nation's business press for the very splendid service that it has rendered. It is alert, vigilant, enterprising, and responsible and, as a publisher myself, I am keenly aware of the responsibilities which rest upon all of us in these turbulent times. The type of information the business press provides is an absolute necessity in practically every field of business endeavor.

I have watched the Washington corps of business-publication correspondents grow in both size and stature. They are doing a magnificent job. I welcome this opportunity to congratulate them, their editors, their publications and their clients on the fine contribution they are making for the dissemination of vital intelligence. As a business man who uses the product, I can testify to the value.

Now I am entering on my 25th year of service in the United States Senate. I have survived the New Deal, I have survived the Fair Deal and we now have the Present Deal. I sometimes think that the Present Deal will finally land in the middle of the New Deal and the Fair Deal. But, in looking back on these 25 years of service, my thoughts turn to the vast changes that have come to us in this period. I doubt if there is any period in the history of the world when so many momentous things have happened, so many changes have occurred, as have in the last 25 years. There is much in the last quarter of a century to be found on the credit side. In this period, we have made unparalleled progress. Our living standards are the highest, and our military powers the greatest, and let me say that it must always be the greatest. Our business techniques and mass production methods are unrivaled in superiority. I pray God we may preserve this progress and strength as a sound base for a vast new and constructive development which our children must carry on if freedom and civilization are to survive.

But let us not deceive ourselves. High prosperity has never been permanent, as all history shows. It has its ups and downs, and for these we must be prepared.

With this in mind, it is well, in this time of prosperity, to stop and take stock and to remember that the time of the greatest success too frequently is the time of the greatest danger. It is so easy in such times to assume responsibilities beyond our capacity to carry them.

Just let me mention some of the liabilities that have arisen in this 25-year period. I would place first the loss of one-half of the purchasing power of the American dollar. Compared to the 1935–39 period, the dollar lost 48 cents of its value up to 1952. In 1953, 1954, and 1955, the value of the dollar was stabilized, but, in 1956, inflation began again, and an additional 2 cents of dollar value was lost. That's equivalent to 4 percent of the value of the 50-cent dollar. We do not have to be expert economists to appreciate what is going on because all you have to do is to go into the store to make your purchases or, if a business man, to buy the things you need.

Now, this new inflation that has started has disastrous possibilities. We cannot continue to cheapen the American dollar. This present day inflation will be most difficult to control, especially because our regular Federal budget expenditures for the coming year are estimated at $72 billion, the largest peacetime budget ever presented to the Congress.

In this 25-year period, the Federal debt has risen from $22 billion to more than $275 billion. It is taking more than 10 percent of every tax dollar to pay interest on this direct Federal debt. In this period, we have collected from the taxpayer and paid in interest the vast sum of $88 billion on this debt. And this we will continue to do for many, many years and perhaps even forever.

For the first 150 years, up to 1932, we were practically on the pay-as-you-go basis. We had our wars, many of them, but after they were over we buckled down and economized and paid the cost of these wars. Those years may be ridiculed by some as the horse and buggy days, but they were days of frugality, thrift, and work. It was that period that laid the basis for the great prosperity that we are enjoying today. It was Andrew Jackson, that great man, who paid off, in total, the public debt, the only President in the history of our country to pay off, in total, the public debt, for which Mr. Jackson expressed great pride.

I have been asked, from time to time, what kind of a Democrat I am. Speaker RAYBURN, my dear friend, has made some inquiry about that, and, in fact, he was just discussing it with me tonight a little. So, I want all the world to know that I am an Andrew Jackson Democrat. In other words, I am a liberal based upon fiscal conservatism.

We of this generation are spending the fat accumulated in those pay-as-you-go days of saving and saving and work. Not only do we have the direct Federal debt of $275 billion, but we have contingent liabilities of another $275 billion. No one knows to what

extent the Federal Government will have to pay on this contingent liability.

We have increased the Federal payroll, within the past 25 years, from 575,000 to 2,500,000 Federal employees, and have increased their pay from less than $1 billion a year to more than $10 billion each year. This is an index of the big Federal Government and the concentration of power in Washington.

I have just received a special report from the staff of the Senate Finance Committee as to the total tax collections for the year 1956. In that year, the gross total tax take—Federal, State, and local—was $99.8 billion, nearly $100 billion, and that was taken out of a national income of $334 billion. This means that 29 cents out of every dollar that we earn goes for the payment of taxes of one kind or another. This is an increase of $10 billion in the collection of all taxes over the year 1955.

I am speaking of all taxes—local, State, and National. When we speak of taxation, we think mainly in terms of Federal taxation because it is consolidated under one government. The fact is, however, that there are 116,000 governmental units in the United States, most of which have taxing powers; there are 3,000 counties, 16,000 cities, 17,000 townships, and 79,000 school and special districts that have this taxing power. And these taxes, the State and local taxes, will go up day by day and it makes no difference to the taxpayer what pocket he pays it out of because he has to pay it in one way or another.

Now, let me ask you, in all seriousness, how long can we continue to tax and tax and spend and spend and, at the same time, continue our progress and preserve our solvency? I think all of us should take this question to heart and consider it. As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I am convinced that the time is overdue for substantial tax reduction. We have still on the books what are known as the Korean war taxes—past 10 years or more ago—that are being continued from year to year. But I could not support any tax reduction unless the expenses of government are reduced to a level which would make tax reduction possible on a sound basis.

I know of no more certain road to financial suicide than to reduce taxes and thereby create deficits and debt.

It is now up to the people themselves. If the pending budget—this great peacetime budget, spending $3 billion more than any other budget in peacetime history—is substantially reduced, a tax reduction may follow.

Now, do the people want a tax reduction? Yes, they do. Then let them communicate with their elected representatives urging them to support reduction of expenditures sufficient to allow reduction of taxes and something, if but little, on the public debt. I am not asking miracles. I am not asking that projects that have been started be wiped off the books—I am asking moderation in public spending; asking at a time when taxes are taking 29 cents out of every dollar you earn. If the people and the Congress should reduce this budget, and Mr. Eisenhower says that he is willing to have reductions, then that is democracy at work. The pending budget admits of no tax reduction, if enacted as it stands.

I agree with the very able Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, who said that expenses should and must be reduced and that a continuance of high spending will bring about a depression that will "make your hair curl." This, of course, assumes that the Federal Government has left you enough hair to curl. Both George and I are a little deficient in this respect.

Now, I agree with the Hoover report that many billions can be saved. Mr. Hoover has given his personal assurance that he thinks that the budget and expenditures can be cut $5½ billion and that applied to last year's budget and not for the budget that is now pending.

If the citizens want to reduce Federal spending to make possible a tax reduction, they must demand it constantly. Their demands must be specific and forceful. Citizens can appear before Congress more often than they do, in order to take an active position against specific spending. Again and again, streams of persons appear before congressional committees requesting additional money. Few indeed are those—and I think that Congressman CANNON, chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House, who is here tonight, will agree with me—few of those appear in Washington to oppose spending money. Citizens must think of Federal spending in terms of the national interest and stop pushing spending programs of local interest and those of the spending lobbies. All of us must sacrifice something in the difficult days ahead. We must stop asking the Federal Government for things we should do for ourselves.

The regular budget just submitted to the Senate provides, as I have said, for $3 billion more of spending than the previous year. It is somewhat paradoxical that the President stated in his message his opposition to inflation, yet the only way that this $3 billion of additional revenue will come to the Treasury is by inflation. It is unsound, in my judgment, to predicate a budget upon an anticipated increase in revenue from existing taxes.

When the effort is made to reduce spending, we are always told that such reduction cannot be made without disastrous results. Now, I just want to mention 2 or 3 of the proposals that have recently been made.

First, is the proposal of the Federal Government to build local schools and to have local health insurance programs. This will open up a pandora box of new spending for the Federal Government to build the public schools or assist in building the public schools and—let us not forget this—that, when these spending schemes start, they begin as a mouse and quickly become an elephant. And that can be proven. Time and time again, we may have started a program for $200 million or $300 million, yet a few years later the demand will be so great on the Federal Government for the money to go back to these localities that it will be greatly increased. As an evidence of that, in 1932 the Federal Government expended $250 million—only $250 million—for so-called grants to the States. Now, the Federal Government is spending over $3½ billion for grants to the States, covering 45 programs. Of course, reduction in expenditures is difficult, if not impossible, if we assume that such activities as building schools and having health insurance and many like functions are proper obligations of the Federal Government.

Now let's take foreign economic aid. The Marshall plan has a 4-year limitation—that's what we voted on when we passed it—and we spent, under the Marshall plan, $15.2 billion. I voted for it in the years just after World War II because, at that time, there was need for this economic aid. But then, after the expiration of the Marshall plan, we continued to spend for foreign aid so that we spent $40 billion more after the Marshall plan and this year the Congress is requested to increase the foreign economic aid and to open up a vast new area for such spending.

Now, if it is necessary to spend economic aid in certain new areas, then certainly there should be reduction in other areas.

It is time for the American people, ladies and gentlemen, to realize that, while we have great potentialities of wealth, there is a limit beyond which we can go. We must realize that creeping paternalism of the Federal Government is just as bad as creeping socialism. The end result is the same—the destruction of the principles of our free government.

There is one principle we should always preserve if we are to go far as a democratic country and that is: "It is the duty of the people to support the Government and not the Government the people."

Today there are actually 37,817,000 citizens receiving direct payments from the Federal Treasury. If we consider the dependents involved, it is possible that half of our population is affected by these regular Federal payments.

The very base of all we have in free government is our fiscal solvency. Without it we cannot preserve our representative democracy. Without it we cannot have military preparedness except under totalitarian methods such as those in Russia. Without the solvency of the American Government, we would enter an age of international darkness. Ours is the only currency in which everybody, everywhere in the world, has confidence. Our free enterprise system is the greatest deterrent in the world today to Russian aggression. It is our first line of defense. Our military forces are merely the tools through which the strength of this system is applied in war. Our competitive enterprise system can only exist, as I have said, under solvent government.

This fine audience needs no definition of the free enterprise system from me. It is the system that, within a relatively short span of 160 some years, has brought us from the impotency of 13 ununited colonies to our present position of world leadership.

This American system has developed individual freedoms under constitutional democracy to the fullest measure ever known to man. It is the system that supplies the incentive to every American to start at the bottom and rise to the top. It has enabled us, with only 6 percent of the world population, to outproduce the rest of the world combined.

It is no exaggeration to say that there is literally nothing on earth more important than the preservation of the fiscal integrity of the Federal Government of the United States and the freedoms upon which our Republic is founded. Let us pledge ourselves that these freedoms shall be preserved so that the future generations of Americans can live as we have in the security of our constitutional democracy.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I thank you with all of my heart for the privilege you have given me to address you tonight and the honor that you have paid me will be cherished as long as I live.

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES F. BYRNES AT THE ANNUAL PEORIA MEETING AND LINCOLN DAY DINNER

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable James F. Byrnes at the annual Peoria meeting and Lincoln Day dinner of the Illinois State Bar Association, in cooperation with the Peoria Bar Association, on February 9, 1957.

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

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES F. BYRNES, AT THE ANNUAL PEORIA MEETING AND LINCOLN DAY DINNER, OF THE ILLINOIS STATE BAR ASSOCIATION IN COOPERATION WITH THE PEORIA BAR ASSOCIATION, FEBRUARY 9, 1957

Long ago thoughtful people of the South realized that Abraham Lincoln was correct in his opposition to slavery.

For the indefensible traffic in human beings many people were responsible. Traders

from Spain and France, as well as from Great Britain, encouraged the African chiefs to sell their people into slavery. Later, New England traders brought thousands of slaves to our shores.

Southerners who bought and worked African slaves shared the guilt of the slave traders. Certainly, I would make no defense of slavery. God never made a man wise enough or good enough to own another human being.

Most southerners now believe that had Lincoln lived, the South would not have been subjected to the oppressions of the reconstruction period which aroused more resentment than the sufferings of the war.

They believe, too, that Lincoln would have appreciated that the heroic fight of Confederate soldiers, the vast majority of whom owned no slaves, was due, not to the desire to perpetuate slavery, but to their belief that under the Constitution of the United States it was the right of each State to regulate its own internal affairs.

They feared that if the right of a State to control its internal affairs in one instance was denied, the Federal Government would soon make further encroachments upon local governments.

The people of the South respect the written Constitution of the United States. Heretofore they have had great respect for the Supreme Court because they have regarded that Court as the defender of the Constitution. They have relied upon the Court for protection against either the Executive or the Congress, acting in violation of the Constitution.

When we speak of the law of the land we refer to the United States Constitution which, according to article 4, "shall be the supreme law of the land."

We regard the Constitution as a statement of principles by which all departments of government are bound, the liberties of the people assured and that it can be altered only in the manner provided in the instrument.

In the early days of the Republic, the people were vigilant in protecting their liberties.

But in time, the people became busy and indifferent. Gradually in the courts there were developed the doctrine of judicial review, but it was founded on the principle that acts of government contrary to the Constitution were void.

All of us will agree, as Chief Justice Marshall stated in the Marbury-Madison case, "The Constitution is either a superior paramount law, unchangeable by ordinary means, or it is on a level with ordinary legislative acts and, like other acts, is alterable when the legislature shall please to alter it."

If the latter be true, a written Constitution is an absurdity. It is equally clear that if the Constitution is the superior paramount law, it cannot be altered whenever the Supreme Court wishes to alter it. That would be an absurdity.

If the Supreme Court can alter the Constitution by its decisions, then five men—a majority of the Court—can make the Court a constitution maker instead of a constitution defender.

Throughout our history, Presidents of the United States from Washington to Franklin D. Roosevelt have warned against the Court attempting to usurp such power.

Time and again the Court itself has declared it had no power to amend the Constitution. Now it is agreed by students of the law that the Court, while still admitting its lack of power to amend, is exercising new powers without the public realizing that the powers are new.

The trend is well illustrated by the school case.

In 1952 a 3-judge court presided over by Hon. John J. Parker, senior judge of the fourth circuit, in a case from Clarendon County, S. C., held that the segregation statutes of South Carolina did not violate the 14th amendment. Lawyers for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People appealed to the Supreme Court.

Some months after the case was first argued, the Court asked for further argument. Because the 14th amendment makes no reference to schools, the Court requested counsel to direct their arguments to the question "What evidence is there that the Congress which submitted and the State legislatures and conventions which ratified the 14th amendment, contemplated or did not contemplate, understood, or did not understand, that it would abolish segregation in public schools."

The attorneys general of all States interested in the issue, were invited to file briefs. Many of them responded. Among other things it was shown that about the time the amendment was submitted Members of the Congress proposed that in the Constitution and in statutes, segregated schools should be prohibited. The proposals were rejected.

The legislative history so conclusively demonstrated that the prohibition of segregated schools was not contemplated either by the framers of the 14th amendment or by the States in ratifying it, that the Supreme Court could not assert otherwise. The most it could declare, in an effort to justify its decision, was that the legislative history was inconclusive.

When the 14th amendment did not mention schools and the Court decided the legislative history was inconclusive, the Court should have declared, as it did only 11 months ago, in March 1956, in the case of *Ullman* v. *U. S.* (350 U. S. 427), that "nothing new can be put into the Constitution except through the amendatory process."

The Court should have upheld the Constitution its members are sworn to uphold. It should have upheld the doctrine of separate but equal facilities which had been sustained by the Supreme Court in eight different cases since 1896.

Instead, the Court declared, "We cannot turn the clock back to 1868 when the amendment was adopted, or to 1896 when *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* was written." Then why did the Court ask counsel to file briefs as to the intent of the Congress in 1868? And why did the Court ask counsel to argue whether the Court was bound by its previous decisions such as *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*?

If the Court could not turn the clock back to consider the intent of the drafters of the 14th amendment in 1868, what chance is there of the Court turning the clock back to 1778 when the Constitution was drafted?

If age so outmodes the eternal truths of the Constitution, what chance would the Ten Commandments have with the present Court?

The doctrine of stare decisis is not sacred but when a case involves an interpretation of the Constitution and that interpretation is sustained by the Court's decisions over a period of 60 years, we should be able to rely upon it as the law.

Plessy v. *Ferguson* was not the only case precedent. There were seven others. When the Court included such great Justices as Taft, Holmes, Brandeis, and Stone, it declared, in *Gong Lum* v. *Rice* (275 U. S. 78), that segregation in public schools had been "many times decided to be within the constitutional power of the State legislatures to settle without interference of the Federal courts under the Federal Constitution."

In another case, Chief Justice Hughes said the question could "no longer be considered an open one."

Relying on the decisions of the Court, while Governor, I urged the issuance of bonds and the levying of a sales tax to build schools under the segregated system. Of the first $75 million we allotted 70 percent to Negro schools, even though Negro students constituted only 39 percent of the total enrollment.

The Supreme Court could not cite a single legal precedent in support of its segregation decision. It cited only the writings of a group of psychologists, several of whom had been declared by the House of Representatives Un-American Activities Committee and by the Department of Justice to be subversive.

A law-abiding citizen may ask, If a decision is not based upon law, is that decision law?

If the Court can disregard the process for amendment of the Constitution and add a prohibition as to segregated schools, why can it not add prohibitions on other subjects, destructive of the rights and liberties of the people?

If the Constitution is whatever the Supreme Court says it is, instead of taking an oath to defend the Constitution, citizens should be required to swear to uphold and defend the decisions of the Supreme Court.

After the Court adopted the school amendment to the Constitution, it had a further hearing to determine how the new 14th amendment should be enforced. Let us look at the 14th amendment itself.

The 5th section of the 14th amendment reads: "The Congress shall have the power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of this article."

In the case of *Fay* v. *The People of the State of New York* (332 U. S. 261) decided 10 years ago, the Supreme Court indicated in the absence of congressional authority, it had no power to enforce the 14th amendment.

That case involved alleged racial discrimination against Negroes serving as jurors. The Court called attention to an act of Congress specifically prohibiting such discrimination, by which it was controlled. Referring to the 5th section of the 14th amendment, the Court said:

"It is not said the judicial power of the General Government shall extend to enforcing the prohibitions and to protecting the rights and immunities guaranteed. It is not said that branch of the Government shall be authorized to declare void any action of a State in violation of the prohibitions. It is the power of Congress which has been enlarged. Congress is authorized to enforce the prohibitions by appropriate legislation."

Clearly, then, when the Court added to the 14th amendment the prohibition against segregation in public schools, that prohibition, like all other prohibitions of the amendment, could be enforced only by congressional legislation.

Instead of legislating to prohibit it, Congress for 75 years specifically appropriated for segregated schools in the District of Columbia.

And in recent years in appropriating for the school-lunch program, Congress, by implication, approved segregated schools by providing that if a State maintained separate schools for races, funds should not be paid unless they were equitably distributed between the segregated schools.

But the Court that was unwilling to leave the amendment of the Constitution to the Congress and the States, as provided in that instrument, likewise was unwilling to leave to the Congress the enforcement of the new 14th amendment.

It substituted the courts for the Congress. That means the power of injunction. The power of injunction is a dangerous power, often abused.

Where Congress, in precise language, applicable to all citizens, would define what constitutes a crime, and the punishment therefor, already it is apparent that the judge-made laws will radically differ in the different jurisdictions.

In July 1955, the Honorable John J. Parker, senior judge of the fourth circuit, speaking for the three-judge court having jurisdiction of the South Carolina segregation case, said that the Supreme Court "has not decided that the States must mix persons of

different races in the schools or must require them to attend schools, or must deprive them of the right of choosing the schools they attend. What is has decided, and all that it has decided, is that a State may not deny to any person, on account of race, the right to attend any school that it maintains. * * * The Constitution, in other words, does not require integration. It merely forbids discrimination."

That court held voluntary segregation possible. However, in Tennessee a United States district judge took a different view. He issued an order on January 4, 1956, which according to him, "requires adoption by school authorities of Anderson County of a program of integration that will expeditiously permit the enrollment of Negroes of high-school grades to the high school of that county."

Later that district judge enjoined certain parties who were named, and all others who may be acting in counsel with them from interfering with what the judge called the integration order or from picketing Clinton High School, either by words or acts or otherwise.

Subsequent events demonstrate the chaos that will result from these judge-made laws. In Clinton, Tenn., troops and tanks were ordered to a school, but disorders continued, in and out of the school. When the soldiers withdrew, the Attorney General of the United States ordered an investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of violations of the court order.

In December a white minister who had no connection with the school, voluntarily accompanied certain colored students to the school. After he left and while passing some citizens on the street in front of the police station, he was struck in the face by a man who claimed the minister shoved him. The minister was not seriously hurt.

By order of the court, the man who struck the minister, along with about 12 other persons including another minister and a woman, who were on the sidewalk where the fight took place, were charged with criminal contempt for violating the injunction order. Released under heavy bond, they were to have a hearing on January 28 but the hearing was postponed.

The people of many States await with interest the result of that hearing. They are anxious to know:

First, whether the district judge instead of enjoining discrimination against individuals, had the power to issue an order requiring the adoption of an integration program.

Second, whether striking a citizen who has no connection with the public schools, at a point some distance from the school building, constitutes an interference with the court's integration order.

Third—heretofore it has been thought that where an act was alleged to violate an order of injunction and at the same time violate the criminal law of the United States, or any State, the defendant was entitled to trial by a jury. The people want to know if this has been repealed by the court.

Fourth—whether the presence of citizens at a place on the street, where an assault and battery is committed upon a person not connected with the school or its students, constitute an interference with the court's integration order, justifying punishment by a judge with or without a jury trial.

The President was quoted as saying in response to a question at a recent press conference, that the problem at Clinton was now in the hands of local courts and local officials. If correctly quoted, the President was misinformed. The citizens have been arrested by order of the United States district judge and the school children have been threatened with the secret police of the United States who were sent to the scene by the United States Attorney General.

The only local official in the picture is the prosecuting attorney of the county who was so thoroughly frightened that he told the assembled children of the school that if they were guilty of misconduct they would be reported to the FBI and "uncalled-for provocations will be dealt with swiftly and harshly."

If school children who engage in a fist fight or other disorderly conduct at school are not to be punished by school authorities, a juvenile court, or other State tribunal, but are to be arrested by the FBI and without trial by jury, are to be sentenced by a United States district judge for violation of an injunction, I fear the consequences in districts where the races are evenly divided.

In the Tennessee school of 804 pupils, only 14 are Negroes. In the school district in South Carolina where there originated the case decided by the Supreme Court, the school population is 2,900 Negroes and 290 white students. There are many such districts in the South and they present a far more serious problem than the situation in Clinton.

In Tennessee a man was sentenced by the district judge to imprisonment for 1 year and a fine of $10,000 for making a speech which the judge regarded as inciting people to violation of the injunction and to acts of violence. That individual was not a citizen of Tennessee or any Southern State.

The facts of the case I do not know. But law-abiding Southerners do not encourage or condone acts of violence. If a white man from a Northern State comes South and does incite white people to violence, he should be regarded with the same disfavor as the professional agitator from the North who comes to incite our colored neighbors to acts of violence. In our midst, we have trouble makers in both races. They need no assistance from other States.

The Southern people know the United States Government has the military power to enforce the orders of its courts. They say, however, that the Supreme Court which ordered this experiment in sociology must enforce it. It cannot expect the States to voluntarily enforce a decision they regard as having no basis in the Constitution or any statute.

When they are criticized by some of the metropolitan press, they recall that only a few decades ago the Constitution was lawfully amended in the manner provided in that instrument and prohibition laws were enacted. Unquestionable, that was the law of the land. Many of the present critics of the South strongly urged the nullification of the prohibition laws. They made it fashionable to carry whiskey flasks and boasted of distilling gin in bathtubs. They did not cease fighting for nullification until the 18th amendment was repealed.

The Supreme Court did not create the people of the United States. The people created the Supreme Court. And the people gave to Congress in article 4 of the Constitution, the specific power to regulate the appellate jurisdiction of that court.

Congress should exercise that power. It should deny to the Supreme Court the power to invalidate the provisions of a State constitution affecting public schools or affecting the security of the State or the United States Government.

In view of the judicial threat to take out of the Constitution, through the injunctive process, the guarantee of trial of all crimes by a jury, Congress by legislation should protect the people against judicial abuse of the power of injunction.

Heretofore when a man has been charged with a felony and has pleaded "not guilty," he has said he would be tried "By God and my country." We must make certain that a man charged with committing a crime, as well as violating a judicial order, is not forced to plead that he will be tried—not by God or his country—but by a United States district judge.

One could not discuss this segregation decision without admitting that entirely apart from the legal phases, there is a fundamental objection by the people of the South to the social experiment of the Supreme Court.

They fear the purpose of many of those advocating integration in schools is to break down social barriers in the period of adolescence and ultimately bring about intermarriage of the races. They are opposed to this and they are determined to resist in every legal way the efforts to mix the races in the schools. This is not petty prejudice. It is a serious problem of race relations.

Pride of race has been responsible for the grouping of people along ethnic lines throughout the world. Race preservation is the explanation of the political unrest and race tension in south Africa.

Pride of race as well as loyalty to religion contributes to the conflict between Jews and Arabs in the Middle East, which today threatens the peace of the world. Jews do not marry Arabs. Several Arab governments will not even allow a Jew to enter those countries.

It was a realization of the wisdom of segregating races that prompted 46 governments, including the United States, to agree in the Geneva Convention of 1929 that "belligerents shall, so far as possible, avoid assemblying in a single camp prisoners of different races or nationalities."

In the United States, pride of race is not confined to the South. Today in 23 States, intermarriage of the races is prohibited by law. The degree of race tension in various States and communities is dependent upon the percentage of Negro population.

In the mountainous areas of the South there are few Negroes and little tension. There are other areas where the races are more evenly divided. There the race problem is acute and is the principal topic of conversation among all classes of people.

Similarly in northern States in the rural areas there is little tension while in the great cities of New York, Detroit, Washington, and Chicago, there is increasing tension.

It is useless for men to argue whether the racial instinct is right or wrong—it exists. It is nothing new.

Thomas Jefferson, the patron saint of the Democratic Party, when he was nearly 80 years of age, said "Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people are to be free; nor is it less certain that the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same government. Nature, habit, opinion, have drawn indelible lines of distinction between them."

Abraham Lincoln, who signed the Emancipation Proclamation, and has been regarded as the patron saint of the Republican Party, said in his joint debate with Douglass, at Charleston, Ill., on September 18, 1958, "I will say then that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races; that I am not, nor ever have been in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say, in addition to this, that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality."

Lincoln further said, "Whether this feeling accords with justice and sound judgment is not the sole question, if indeed it is any part of it. Universal feeling, whether well or ill founded, cannot be safely disregarded." (Vol. 4, Writings of Abraham Lincoln, edited by Arthur Brooks Lapsley.)

The prophesies of these two statesmen, were made a century ago. In the early days, following the war, the people of other sections showed no great interest in educating the

recently freed slaves. The problem of helping him educationally and economically was left to the impoverished peope of the South. They so generously did what they thought was right, now they can boast that since the days of reconstruction the Negro in the South has made greater progress than he has made in any country of the world.

I am proud of their progress in South Carolina. They are in all the professions. Some few are engaged in banking, hundreds in insurance, and real estate. They are engaged in merchandising, farming, and in the skilled trades. They own radio stations. More than 18,000 own their own farms. Others manage farms. Thousands own their homes which are equipped with television and electrical refrigeration.

With a Negro population of approximately 800,000 Negroes, about 140,000 own automobiles.

I am confident the number of automobiles owned by Negroes in South Carolina is greater than the number of automobiles privately owned in Russia with its population of 200 million.

As a result of the educational program which I sponsored while Governor, there is at least one Negro high school in every school district. Because these schools are new, in most instances, they are better than the high schools for white pupils.

In the State we have 7,500 Negro schoolteachers. In New York City with a larger Negro population, less than 5 percent of the regular teachers are Negroes.

For the State of Illinois with a Negro population of approximately 700,000, I do not have the figures, but I am certain the number of Negro teachers is not one-half the 7,500 in South Carolina.

Proud as I am of this progress, I am even prouder that in the last 25 years there has been a vastly improved relation between the races.

Because this is true, the decision of the Supreme Court was a tragedy. It has undone all that men of good will in both races had accomplished in improving race relations. Instead of improving, the situation is worsening. Now we fear for the future.

In the cities, where Negro homes are concentrated, schools were built near their homes. Students are assigned to the schools nearest their homes. If, however, a district judge insists on disregarding State assignment laws and orders the mixing of the races in the schools, I fear the American people will have as serious a problem in the Southeast as we now have in the Mideast.

In several States laws have been enacted providing that "if by order of any court, State or Federal, a student is assigned to a school different from that to which he is assigned by school officials, all appropriations for the school to which that student is assigned and all appropriations for the school from which he comes, shall immediately cease."

Counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People predict the Supreme Court will declare these laws unconstitutional. I do not think so, but in view of the segregation decision, I would not bet on what the Court would do.

However, I predict that if the Court shall declare unconstitutional all State statutes having in its opinion the effect of continuing segregation, then with great regret, many States will discontinue public schools.

In anticipation of this last resort, provisions in State constitutions requiring appropriations for public schools have been repealed by the voters. Private schools will be preferred to integrated schools.

Of one thing I am confident, should the Supreme Court cause the closing of public schools, leaders of the white race in the South will see to it that the innocent Negro children receive an education. They must not be permitted to suffer because of the well-intentioned but misguided efforts of overzealous do-gooders.

In South Carolina a similar law was passed as to recreation parks. There are parks for both races. When a suit was brought by several Negroes to be admitted to a park set aside for white people, the legislature passed a law closing that park. A United States district judge recently held the question of discrimination was moot because the park was closed.

The people do not feel as keenly about integration in parks as in schools. Recreation is desirable, but education is essential. However, law officers believed that with the existing tension, integration in parks where there are cabins for lodging and swimming pools, was dangerous.

Governors of several States have announced they will not follow the Tennessee example and call out the National Guard to escort Negro children to white schools. They take the position, taken by the Governor of Texas, that under the police powers, it is the duty of a Governor to quell disorders, not to cause them.

In its decision, the Supreme Court said that segregation would retard the development of Negro children. It did not comment upon the effect integration would have upon the development of white children. We believe the presence of troops and tanks, and the secret police, at a school will do great psychological harm to children—white and colored. Instead of thinking of mathematical problems, they will think of race problems.

The people of the South are not an alien people. They are loyal Americans. Whatever may have been the differences between the North and South 100 years ago, in the Spanish-American War southerners proved their devotion to the United States. In World War I and again in World War II they demonstrated their patriotism and their courage on the battlefields of the world.

Today they are overwhelmed by this problem of race which was inherited by them more than a century ago. Through the years that cross has borne heavily upon them.

Now they earnestly appeal to you for understanding, as they pray that their burdens may be lessened, if not lifted.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that under the order previously entered, the Senate now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, to Monday, February 18, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 14, 1957:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Walter K. Schwinn, of Connecticut, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

D. Chadwick Braggiotti, of Connecticut, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Vaughn R. DeLong, of Maryland, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 2, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Frederick B. Haskell, Jr., of Maryland.
Lewis M. Lind, of Maryland.
Warren F. Looney, of the District of Columbia.
William L. Uanna, of Massachusetts.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4:

Edward S. Benet, of Texas.
Jesse D. McElroy, Jr., of Georgia.
William B. Snidow, of Virginia.
Robert L. Ware, Jr., of New Jersey.
Vernon B. Zirkle, of Virginia.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Charles M. Gerrity, of Georgia.
Karl F. Mautner, of Pennsylvania.
Neil N. Muhonen, of Virginia.
William H. Rusch, of Virginia.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5 and to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Miss Faith V. Andrus, of California.
Fred A. Durling, of New York.
Clifford J. Glennon, of Utah.
Seymour S. Goodman, of Virginia.
Miss Teresa Offie, of Pennsylvania.
Joseph E. O'Mahony, of New York.
Neil L. Parks, of Maryland.
Edward M. Peach, of Virginia.
Miss Elizabeth Rice, of Florida.
Regulo Rivera, of California.
Mrs. Helen E. Sheehy, of Arkansas.
Fred A. Somerford, of Maryland.
Robert G. Sturgill, of Utah.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Henry Bardach, of New York.
John R. Bietz, of Virginia.
Albert Beryl Hudes, of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 7 to class 6:

James H. Bahti, of Michigan.
Melville E. Blake, Jr., of California.
Byron E. Byron, of California.
Charles W. Henebry, of California.
Wilbur W. Hitchcock, of New Jersey.
Ernest A. Nagy, of Ohio.
Russell A. Price, of California.
Warren E. Slater, of New York.

Miss Alice C. Mahoney, of Arizona, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 6, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

John J. Bentley, of California.
Miss Hulda Christiansen, of California.
Glen H. Fisher, of Indiana.
Miss Edna T. Flach, of Texas.
Archibald Lappin, Jr., of California.
Frederick E. Myers, of Ohio.
Leland A. Pyle, of Virginia.
Martin G. Ryerson, of New York.
Miss Lois M. Unger, of Ohio.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8 vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Alfonso Arenales, of New York.
Miss Joan E. Bennett, of California.

Miss Alix S. Bouldin, of California.
Benjamin N. Brown, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Robert S. Cameron, of California.
Miss Pamela Cheatham, of Pennsylvania.
J. Chapman Chester, of Wisconsin.
George E. Chewning, of Virginia.
William Clark, Jr., of California.
Peter D. Constable, of New York.
John E. Crump, of Kansas.
Curtis C. Cutter, of California.
Robert B. Dollison, of Pennsylvania.
Marvin B. Durning, of Louisiana.
Miss Doris Ann Fetters, of California.
Rudy V. Fimbres, of Arizona.
Robert L. Flanegin, of Illinois.
Miss Dagmar Frahme, of Ohio.
Benson Lee Grayson, of New York.
Miss Elinor Greer, of the District of Columbia.
William H. Hallman, of Texas.
Charles H. Hallock, of Virginia.
Miss Jo Ann Hallquist, of Wisconsin.
William Bruce Harbin, of California.
Thomas J. Henighan, of New York.
Miss Evelyn R. Hessler, of New York.
Marvin J. Hoffenberg, of Maryland.
Martin Jacobs, of New York.
James D. Johnston, of California.
Samuel C. Keiter, of New York.
James E. Kerr, Jr., of Virginia.
John W. Kizler, of Texas.
George B. Lambrakis, of New York.
Henry Ellis Mattox, of Mississippi.
Robert Marden Miller, of California.
F. Pierce Olson, of Minnesota.
John A. Perkins, of California.
Kenneth W. Preston, of New York.
Robert G. Ryan, of New York.
George M. Scanlan, of New York.
C. Richard Spurgin, of Illinois.
Ulrich A. Straus, of Michigan.
George H. Wall, of North Dakota.
Howard L. Worthington, Jr., of Virginia.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Arthur L. Funk, of Florida.
Dwight B. Herrick, of New Jersey.
Henry C. Palm, Jr., of California.
Henry H. Stephen, of New Jersey.
John M. Stuart, of New York.
Miss Geraldine B. Stibbe, of Ohio, a Foreign Service reserve officer, to be a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Robert M. Snyder, of West Virginia.
Vasia C. Gmirkin, of California.
Miss Frances D. Hyland, of California.
Mansfield D. Sprague, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Gordon Gray, resigned.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate February 14, 1957:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mansfield D. Sprague, of Connecticut, an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Carter Lane Burgess. (Received on January 14, 1957.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Peter P. Cinikas, executive director, Lithuanian Daily Draugas, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

O Eternal Father, Lord of the Universe, God of Love and Mercy, we give Thee thanks and praise for the many great gifts Thou hast seen fit to bestow on our land and its people. We thank Thee especially for the material gifts which have made our land strong and powerful, for the deep faith in God which has imbued our people and leaders with the unquenchable love of liberty and for the qualities of mercy and understanding for the downtrodden and the oppressed.

O Eternal Father, bless our President, grant him strength and health, wisdom, prudence, and patience, and above all, shine Thy guiding light upon him as he wrestles with the momentous problems of mankind. Thou knowest his love and thirst for peace. Aid him in his quest to bring the peace of Bethlehem to every corner of the world.

O Heavenly Father, bless this august body of lawmakers, enlighten their minds with wisdom as needed to steer the true course through the tempestuous seas of strife, hatred, and prejudice to the port of peace. Fill their hearts with mercy toward the underprivileged in this country and those who live in want and in the shadow of fear all over the world. Make them ever strong in the struggle against those who seek to rule by force, to enslave nations, and to stamp into dust under the heel of tyranny.

We pray Thee, Father of Heaven and Earth, to keep the Members of this august body ever under Thy protection. Give them the light to see and the power to perform their tasks as they see them and according to Thy holy will. Make them strong in their fight against Thine enemies. Help them extend a generous hand to the nations which know not Thy peace, whose people are held in bonds and chains of slavery. Help them return peace and liberty to the land of Lithuania whose people last possessed it 17 years ago and who today writhe in agony and terror in the merciless grip of a godless oppressor who seeks to bring the entire world under the rule of his clenched fist.

We beseech Thee, O God of Mercy, to shorten the days of darkness and tyranny for these people and all other peoples whose homelands have been oppressed. Grant us the grace to share the blessings of Thy generous bounty with all peoples and nations. Grant our President and this august body the loving heart, nobility of spirit, firmness of purpose to be the hope of the oppressed, to carry the torch of freedom that shines brightly in our land, to all nations.

We humbly implore Thee, Our Father, grant us this blessing on this, the anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, where freedom has been suppressed by brute force. May Thy name, O God, be forever glorified by us, Thy children. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 11, 1957, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McBride, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 394. An act to waive the limitation on the time within which a medal of honor may be awarded to Comdr. Hugh Barr Miller, Jr., United States Navy.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow night, February 15, to file a report on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD reserved all points of order on the bill.

FAILURE OF THE LEASE-PURCHASE PROGRAM

Mr. LANHAM. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the fact which I am sure you noticed in the news this morning that the much-vaunted lease-purchase program had been suspended in the interest of the control of inflation. But that is not the reason it was suspended. As a matter of fact, it was not suspended. It has simply bogged down and ground to a halt.

During the 3 or 4 years since it has been authorized I am informed that only one building has been even started. What is the reason for that? It is the administration's hard-money policy. They have been unable to get anybody to finance these buildings at a return of 4 percent as provided in the law. This is just another effort of the administration to cover up a dismal failure.

Moreover, this hard-money policy has brought practically to a halt the building of homes for veterans. If it is continued, we will be faced with deflation and a recession. After all, the hard-money policy affects only the small homeowner and in no way limits or holds in check the huge corporations and giant industries, who always are able to get funds for their own building and expansion.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means and the subcommittees thereof be authorized to sit during sessions of the House during the 85th Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may sit today while the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SOIL BANK AND PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the primary concept of our democratic form of government is equal treatment under the law. This is our heritage. It is the distinction between a totalitarian state and a democracy.

The architects of our government, the framers of our Constitution never conceived of a way of justice that dispensed its favors on a first-come, first-served basis.

Yet this deplorable travesty on equality under the law is what we see today in the shameful treatment of our farmers, thousands of whom have stood in line to enter their land in the soil bank, which was their right—but only to be turned away.

The Congress passed the soil-bank law last year when it was the only action open to us after the President by use of his veto power thwarted the Congress in the restoration of 90 percent of parity price supports for the basic crops.

But it never was the intention of this Congress that the benefits of this program should be put on a first-come, first-served basis.

This is the work of the Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Ezra Taft Benson. I do not challenge his motives, but I do criticize his judgment. He may have thought that the soil-bank funds were large enough to accommodate all the farmers who wanted to enter their acres into it and maybe he could not foresee what is taking place.

Our newspapers in the South are displaying photographs of hundreds of farmers standing in lines, reaching around city blocks, wanting to exercise what is their right—to place in the soil bank. The news accounts tell of soil-bank funds in the various counties being quickly exhausted, and of thousands of farmers being turned away. We hear that in some counties a very few farmers, perhaps eight or ten or a dozen, got contracts for the total funds allotted for the soil bank, and the rest of the farmers got none.

Mr. Benson may not have foreseen the travesty his "first come" policy would cause but, Mr. Speaker, his mistake now certainly is abundantly and tragically clear to him, and the Secretary, in the name of justice to our farmers, forthwith should scrap that policy and come forward with a program to open the soil bank to every farmer who wants to invest his land in the acreage reserve.

This Congress should insist upon it.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my nature to seek satisfaction or even amusement in an I-told-you-so attitude when somebody blunders. And it is not in that attitude, but rather with a feeling of regret and gloom that I must emphasize what has happened to agriculture in this country since the attack was launched 4 years ago to break down the firm 90 percent of parity supports for the basic crops.

The firm-support program was destroyed in 1954, and we now have the sliding-scale supports—and the so-called soil bank.

Now we must ask: What has happened in these 4 years since the assault was launched on the firm supports for the major crops; how have our farmers fared? Where are we now?

The report of the Commodity Credit Corporation, just published, contains some astounding facts and figures. It shows that the CCC has spent $3 billion in the last 4 years in its price-support operations, which is almost exactly three times the $1,064,000,000 spent in all the previous 20 years of these price-support operations.

It sets forth that where the CCC supports for the basic crops actually showed a profit of $13,011,000 4 years ago, after 20 years of operation, a loss of $1,235,000,000 has occurred in these operations since January 1, 1953.

Mr. Speaker, let us look particularly at cotton. We all know that for almost a century this harvest of southern fields was America's greatest export crop, and it maintained this Nation's financial integrity in the world. So it has been with cotton in the price-support picture. Cotton, by the huge profits realized on its support program, had maintained a profit on the balance sheet of CCC support costs for all the basic crops. At this time a year ago CCC showed a profit of around $267 million on its cotton-support operations for 23 years. Now that profit has vanished, under the bargain sale export program, and the cotton operations now show a loss of $161,850,000.

And what have we gotten for all these expenditures?

Four years ago our total surpluses, in CCC inventories or on loans, totaled only $2,452,000,000. Today the figure is $8,211,000,000.

And, whereas our farmers had enjoyed prices at 100 percent of parity or better for 11 consecutive years, 1941 through 1952, these prices now are down 18 percent to only 82 percent of parity.

It would be well if the whole Nation took a look at what has happened during the time the firm-price system for agriculture was being destroyed. I fought as hard as I could against it, and I now have pending a bill proposing to restore the 90-percent supports for the basic crops.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I call upon the administration in power: First, to undo the injustices in the soil bank and come forward with a program that is fair and just to all our farmers; and, second, to review forthwith the disastrously low price supports set by the Secretary for 1957, and then to give to our farmers a level of prices that will hold some hope that they may shake off the depression that now grips them and that they will share, as our other citizens, in the prosperity of this great Nation.

LAWS RELATING TO CAMPAIGN PRACTICES

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 483, which created a special committee to investigate the election of Members of the House of Representatives, I had the honor to serve as chairman of that special committee which included among its duties the investigation and reporting to the House with respect to—

5. The violations, if any, of the following statutes of the United States:

(a) The Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

(b) The act of August 2, 1939, as amended, relating to pernicious political activities, commonly referred to as the Hatch Act.

(c) The provisions of section 304, chapter 120, Public Law 101, 80th Congress, 1st session, referred to as the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

(d) Any statute or legislative act of the United States, or of the State within which a candidate is seeking nomination of reelection to the House of Representatives, the violation of which Federal or State statute, or statutes, would affect the qualification of a Member of the House of Representatives within the meaning of article I, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States.

6. Such other matters relating to the election of Members of the House of Representatives in 1956, and the campaigns of candidates in connection therewith, as the committee deems to be of public interest, and which in its opinion will aid the House of Representatives in enacting remedial legislation, or in deciding any contests that may be instituted involving the right to a seat in the House of Representatives.

Serving with me were my colleagues, ROBERT E. JONES, RICHARD BOLLING, KENNETH B. KEATING, and PATRICK J. HILLINGS.

I invite the membership of the House to study anew our report No. 2968, which is available. We were in unanimous agreement that at least one complete safe generalization could be made about the testimonies at the public hearing we had last December.

The laws relating to campaign practices, and particularly the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, are in drastic need of sweeping revisions, to be effective in the economy in which today's political campaigns must be conducted. None of the witnesses before the committee were completely satisfied with existing regulations.

Most of the shortcomings of the present laws, and the complaints made about them, are well known to Congress and the public. The difficulty which has prevented the enactment of corrective amendments over the years has been the inability of any majority of the Congress, and of the witnesses who have

repeatedly appeared, year after year, before various committees of both Houses, to agree on all specific measures.

Our committee, in the short period of its existence and with the limited funds available to it, did not presume that it would find solutions to the problems that have been pondered by Congress for so many years, or even to arrive at any definite consensus of its own members as to specifics of corrective legislation.

The first point on which there is no disagreement perceived by us is that the ceilings on campaign expenditures imposed by present law are too low.

Another point of general accord is that the public is entitled to a full disclosure of the expenditures made and contributions received by candidates and political committees, and that present reporting requirements do not provide full disclosure.

There appears to us to be a preponderance of opinion that full disclosure means at least these things:

(a) Extension of financial reporting requirements to include contributions and expenditures of State and local political committees which influence or attempt to influence the outcome of an election for Federal office.

(b) Official publication by the House and Senate, in tabular form, of the total contributions and expenditures shown on all financial statements filed by candidates and committees.

The general agreement that exists among the members of the committee and the witnesses we heard on the above broadly stated principles, does not include agreement on these specific questions:

First. In extending financial reporting requirements to State and local committees which influence or attempt to influence the outcome of Federal elections, should all such committees be included—no matter how small—or should some exemptions be granted? If exemptions are granted, what sizes or types of committees should be exempted?

Second. Should financial reporting requirements be extended to include contributions received and expenditures made by candidates and committees in connection with campaigns for nomination—primaries, nominating conventions and caucuses, and preference primaries?

And, on slightly different but closely related subjects, these additional questions were raised, with, in our view, no consensus reached:

Third. Should the provisions of the Federal Communications Act requiring radio and television stations to grant equal time, at the same price, to all candidates for a particular office, if time is allowed to one, be amended? Should it be repealed altogether—as a spokesman for the industry suggested?

Fourth. Should the Federal Government encourage the broadening of the base of political financial support by allowing a tax deduction, or an outright tax credit, for small contributions to political parties or candidates?

We do not pretend that these limited recommendations begin to cover all the problems existing in this field. But it is certain that all the other problems will come into a clearer focus when Congress and the public have the benefit of full disclosure and full knowledge of all contributions and expenditures made in campaigns for Federal elective office. The present reporting requirements are so fragmentary as to be meaningless.

Today I have introduced a bill, drawn by our committee counsel, Gillis W. Long and Raymond D. Watts. Mr. Long served as counsel for a similar committee in 1952. Both of these men are splendid lawyers and have a thorough understanding of all election laws pertaining to Federal office. I have introduced this bill not as chairman of the special committee. It does not necessarily represent in and of itself any thought which may be in the minds of my valued and respected colleagues on that committee. Neither do the lawyers who have actually prepared the bill, nor I, have any pride in authorship. We do not claim that it is a model fair-elections law. We recognize that there may be found many controversial provisions.

Because of the justified interest of the millions of voters in this country in the proper conduct of elections, I have felt that a start should be made somewhere. The purpose of this bill is to present most of the constructive suggestions which have come from many places and from many people for an improvement in existing law.

Accordingly, I hope that the Speaker will make reference to the proper committee in order that full, thorough, and complete hearings may be conducted in the hope that that which is good in this suggested bill may be retained and that which is not sound may be discarded. Only in this way will the House be permitted to work its will. In that spirit have I painstakingly suggested the language in the bill offered today.

Thorough hearings and full debate in the Committee of the Whole should result in a fair-elections law which will establish confidence in the American people.

REVISION OF FLUE-CURED TOBACCO PROGRAM

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, it was my intention to introduce in the Congress today a resolution directing the Secretary of Agriculture to increase the acreage allotment of flue-cured tobacco 10 percent. Realizing a revision of the entire flue-cured tobacco program is necessary, I have today introduced a bill for that purpose.

This bill, if enacted into law, would do two things:

First, it would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to put into operation farm acreage and poundage allotments for most types of tobacco under certain conditions. For several years we have had a system of farm acreage allotments for most types of tobacco. In the case of flue-cured tobacco, and I believe the same is true for some other types, under the acreage allotment system, the incentive is to produce quantity rather than quality. This has been a major problem in my State for some time and it seems to be the consensus of most tobacco growers that the most effective way to encourage the production of the kind of tobacco that the market wants is the adoption of a system which would provide for poundage quotas along with the acreage allotments.

Second, this bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to call a referendum among flue-cured tobacco growers within 30 days after its enactment if he determines that the anticipated reduction in poundage because of the adoption of the new system of allotments would warrant an increase in flue-cured tobacco acreage.

Estimated production of flue-cured tobacco for 1957 based on average yield for 6 years, 1951 to 1956, inclusive

Yield per acre:	
1951	1,309
1952	1,229
1953	1,245
1954	1,261
1955	1,497
1956	1,609
Total	8,150
Average yield per acre	1,358
Multiplied by allotted acres for 1957	712,600
Total production for 1957	967,711,000
Less (soil bank)	70,000,000
1957 production	897,711,000

Marketing quota for 1957, 1,172 million.
Deficit, 274 million.

Since the Department of Agriculture announced on November 27, 1956, a national quota of 1,172 million pounds, and 712,600 acres for flue-cured tobacco for 1957, several factors have appeared which will undoubtedly materially reduce the total production of flue-cured tobacco in 1957.

On December 18, 1956, Department of Agriculture announced that support prices for three high-yielding varieties of flue-cured tobacco, namely, Coker 139, Coker 140, and Dixie Bright 244, would be reduced 50 percent. In other words, the support price level for the above-named varieties will be 45 percent of parity instead of 90 percent of parity. Coupled with this announcement, meetings were held throughout the flue-cured area to acquaint growers with the fact that the above-named varieties would not carry the 90 percent support prices.

As a consequence of this action by the Department of Agriculture and the publicity given to this action, there has been a drastic reduction in the planting of seed of the high-yielding varieties. Best estimates place the 1956 plantings of these varieties at 55 percent of the total crop, while the estimate for 1957 is not over 5 percent.

The switch from the high-yielding varieties to other varieties will undoubtedly result in a lower yield per acre for 1957. We believe that this factor alone will reduce the poundage at least 10 percent.

Another factor which will result in a lower production for 1957 is the soil bank. It is now estimated that 6 percent of tobacco acreage will be put in the soil bank.

These two factors, added together, will cut production at least 15 percent. If these conclusions are correct, and if growing conditions equal the favorable conditions of 1956, the 1957 production will only be 65 percent of the 1956 production. If weather conditions should be less favorable than those of 1956, the crop would be reduced even more. Another factor that will cut production in 1957 is the disease factor. Many growers who have been planting the resistant varieties, which have been discontinued, will plant nonresistant varieties in 1957. The incidence of black shank, Granville wilt, and nematodes will undoubtedly increase, and will result in a loss of poundage throughout the flue-cured tobacco belt.

The yearly requirements of domestic manufacturers amount to approximately 750 million pounds. The average exports of flue-cured tobacco amount to around 450 million pounds. Therefore, the total requirements for domestic and export trade are about 1,200 million pounds. The yield per acre for the 6 years 1951–56, inclusive, has averaged 1,358 pounds per acre. If we assume that the yield per acre for 1957 will be 1,358 pounds, then the production from 712,600 acres would amount to 968 million pounds. If we deduct from this figure 70 million pounds taken out of production through the soil bank, the total production for 1957 would be approximately 898 million pounds. Therefore, the anticipated production for 1957 will be more than 300 million pounds short of annual disappearance.

If we use the average production per acre for the 5 years 1951–55, inclusive, and multiply this figure by the allotted acres, the production would be 932 million pounds, after deducting 70 million pounds for the soil bank, which means a total production in 1957 of 862 million pounds, or 338 million pounds below normal annual requirements.

Throughout the years, exports of flue-cured tobacco have played an important part in the economy of the areas producing flue-cured tobacco. Over the past 10 years, $1 out of every $3 received by growers from the sale of flue-cured tobacco has come from foreign countries. The production from one acre out of every three is shipped to and consumed in foreign countries.

Another important point to be considered is the fact that during the past 2 years, especially during the past year, manufacturers in many foreign countries have held their purchases to a minimum in order to avoid purchasing leaf from the undesirable varieties. As a result of this development, many of these foreign manufacturers are expecting and hoping to make larger purchases from the 1957 flue-cured crop since they will be assured that the 1957 crop will have but little of the undesirable varieties in it. If these foreign customers, by reason of the anticipated reduction in production, are not able to secure their requirements of United States flue-cured tobacco, they will look to other sources for their requirements. These export markets, once lost, are extremely difficult to regain.

These facts fully justify a 10-percent increase in the acreage of flue-cured tobacco recently allotted for 1957. They represent developments which have taken place, in part, since the marketing quota for 1957 was determined late in 1956.

MILO (GRAIN SORGHUM) SUPPORTS DISASTROUS

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I deplore the sliding-scale price concept, especially as administered by Secretary Benson. His recent announcement that the 1957 grain sorghum crop would be supported at only 70 percent of parity is shocking and regrettable. I contend that the foremost responsibility of the Secretary of Agriculture is to serve the farmers.

A parity support price of 70 percent is absurd for grain sorghum growers. In my own community of Rolla, Kans., I know of seven young GI farmers with families who went broke on their 1955 crop of grain sorghum supported at 70 percent of parity and their crops were good. As the concept of parity itself has been watered down since that time the announced 70 percent of parity for the 1957 crop is ridiculous. It is also unjust to support the grain sorghum price at a figure materially lower than corn price supports. It is impossible in my district to rely on raising a corn crop because of weather conditions. Grain sorghum, however, is acclimated to this area and under irrigation may be counted on to yield substantially year after year. Due to drought conditions nearly 90 percent of the 1957 wheat cropland in my area is in the soil bank and the only chance left for profits from 1957 crops was in the raising of grain sorghum. This opportunity was obliterated by Mr. Benson with his announcement of only 70 percent of parity.

In protest to this announcement the following telegram was sent by myself to the Secretary:

FEBRUARY 12, 1957.

HON. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.:

I view with great alarm and regret your announcement of only 70 percent of parity as the price support for the 1957 milo crop. A great portion of the milo in the United States is produced in the drought area toured by yourself and the President early last month. The further slashing of prices of farm commodities in these areas is not compatible with the emergency assistance asked by the President. Nor do I see any justification for supporting milo prices at a lower rate than corn. In the southwest Kansas section of the drought area milo has offered farmers practically their sole income for the past few years. Lowering the support price from 76 percent of parity to 70 percent of parity will have only one noticeable effect. It will cost the milo growers approximately $15,790,000 in income this year. You have continued to urge lower support prices on the theory that such action will discourage production. This theory has not worked to date. It will not work in this instance. It will not cut production nor the amount of surplus grain sorghums carried by Commodity Credit Corporation. But it will again be an expensive experience for CCC. The new support price will become the market price and will thus drive down the dollar value of milo that is presently in CCC stocks, thus costing the Federal Government millions of dollars. The sliding scale price supports partially explain the nearly $3 billion loss which CCC has experienced in the last 4 years. Your longtime contention that lower crop supports will discourage production has been proved false again and again. Even the 25-cent wheat of the early thirties did not cause the farmers to lay down their tools. Instead they continued to produce more wheat. No individual farmer is going to hold his land out of production voluntarily to force higher prices. I feel very strongly that the sliding-scale-price approach to controlling farm surpluses has failed. The price factor will not control farm output. Because of higher and higher costs of production, milo farmers will certainly go broke on 70 percent of parity. I urge that farmers be given full parity and the chance to once again share in the prosperity of the Nation.

J. FLOYD BREEDING,
Member of Congress, Fifth District of Kansas.

CAREER OPPORTUNITIES FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, there have been two recent newspaper articles on which I would like to comment. They both pertain to remarks of the President concerning Government employees. In one article, which I am including with my remarks, the President is reported as being concerned over the loss of engineers and scientists to private contractors with Government cost-plus contracts.

We, too, in our Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization, have been concerned about this. We have repeatedly pointed out that the Government itself, through exorbitant allowances for recruiting expenses and salaries, is permitting tax money to be used by holders of defense contracts to pirate Government scientists essential to defense work. This is something the President can and should take steps to correct.

In another newspaper article he was reported as saying to a United States Coast Guard and Geodetic Survey meeting that—

People who leave Government employment for higher paying positions "have lost all comprehension of what public service is."

A close look at the record might reveal some reasons why Government employees are leaving the Federal service. There are some things the Republican

administration can do to help hold career employees other than by castigating them.

Every red-blooded American should be looking for legitimate means of advancing himself. Unless the individual advances the Nation will suffer. By and large, advancing means greater return for one's efforts. Those returns can be financial or they can be in the form of recognition. Everyone knows that the regular civil service does not offer a great deal of financial return or recognition. In the main, it offers a chance to serve with reasonable security.

How much recognition has this administration given career employees by appointing them to higher positions in the public service? What opportunities have the Republicans given them to comprehend what public service might be? It is common knowledge that several hundred top-level career employees, many with 15 or 20 years of service, have been turned out to make room for political appointees. Is their comprehension of public service the same today as it was before this happened? Of course not. This has had a very disrupting impact upon career employees.

Mr. President, are you sure in your heart that your advisers "have a comprehension of what public service is" and how a career servant can be devoted to the public service without regard to party or personalities? Perhaps more positive steps on the part of this administration to create career opportunities would eliminate the need for negative steps to prevent the loss of employment.

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 10, 1957]

SCIENTIST "PIRATING" TROUBLES EISENHOWER

(By Joseph Young)

President Eisenhower reportedly has expressed his concern over a congressional committee's finding that private contractors with Government cost-plus contracts are luring away Federal engineers and scientists with offers of higher salaries.

Administration insiders say that at a recent cabinet meeting Mr. Eisenhower told Cabinet members and other agency heads to take steps to control such contracts so that the Government's personnel won't be raided by private contractors.

A House Civil Service Subcommittee headed by Representative DAVIS, Democrat, of Georgia, last month pointed out that private contractors were using Federal funds to deprive the Government of critically needed engineers and scientists and other professional employees by paying them higher salaries.

Mr. Eisenhower is reported to have asked that Government cost-plus contracts be so worded to limit contractors from paying salaries in excess of that paid by the Government.

Federal officials, particularly of the defense and scientific agencies, have expressed concern about the difficult problem of retaining and attracting key engineering and scientific personnel. Yet, the Davis subcommittee pointed out, the Government's own policies on cost-plus contracts is making the situation that much worse.

The President's concern over the situation may have further significance for the entire Federal service. Some administration officials say the White House is apt to look askance at another general Federal pay raise if it feels that this would result in contractors using Government cost-plus funds to pay even higher salaries in raiding Federal personnel.

That is why it is vitally important to all Government personnel as to what the defense and other agencies will do to curb the pirating of key personnel by private contractors.

COMMUNIST PARTY CONVENTION

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington News, February 12, 1957, issue, page 17, carries an editorial entitled "Comrades Spat," and reads as follows:

COMRADES SPAT

Delegates to the convention of the Communist Party in New York are fighting among themselves. The issue is said to be which party line the stooges in this country will follow—Stalin, Khrushchev, or Tito.

The delegates are meeting in secret, natural for their ilk.

There are 350 of them, which means the central conspiracy has tagged them to be the ones who show their faces. These are not the commies who are the most dangerous—they are the front, the gaudy ones, the promoters of confusion.

The real spies and subverters keep out of sight, posing as something they aren't.

The Communist Party, as such, is said to be a little frayed at the cuffs, squabbling internally, short on funds, low on official membership.

But whatever faction comes out on top in that ruckus in New York, the whole caboodle is dedicated to one project—destruction of our way of living. You'll note they agreed on one thing—an impudent telegram to President Eisenhower suggesting he keep his nose out of the Middle East, where the Russians are trying to start a fire.

Wrangles and purges among the comrades suit us fine. They even may be amusing. But there is nothing amusing about the purpose of these intriguers, whatever their inside difference. They are against us and everything we believe in.

This editorial correctly points out the fact that the delegates to the Communist Party convention in New York were the ones who were expendable, and that they were not the most dangerous members of the Communist Party, the party advocating the violent overthrow of our Government. The editorial is, also, correct in taking note of the impudent telegram to President Eisenhower, suggesting he keep his nose out of the Middle East.

I want to supplement the editorial by calling attention to the fact that the same convention, and the same Communists, also telegraphed President Eisenhower demanding that the Supreme Court's decision in the school cases be speedily complied with and, also, that the same convention, and the same Communists, recommended passage of civil rights legislation now pending in Congress. Of course, that same convention, and those same Communists, demanded again that full equality be granted to the Negroes. That is no more than was to be expected, for there is not a shadow of doubt but that the Communist Party in the United States was the leader in the demand for the breakdown of segregation and the amalgamation of the races. The Communist Party's platform of 1928 indisputably proves that these demands were spawned by the Communists and are their babies, and no one can deny that these demands are their offspring.

The amazing thing is that the demands set out in the Communist Party's platform of 1928 have been complied with by Executive, administrative, and judicial decrees. These demands were designed not for the purpose of helping anybody but the Communist Party and for the expressed purpose of creating dissension and strife. The tragedy of the age is that maybe they are going to succeed. Let us shake the Communists off while there is yet time.

INTEREST RATE ON SAVINGS BONDS

Mr. COOPER. 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce to the House that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and I, as chairman of the committee, are today introducing a bill, at the request of the administration and the Treasury Department, to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act, to authorize a change in the maximum interest rate permitted on United States savings bonds.

I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD a copy of a press release issued by the Treasury Department today explaining this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

The Treasury announced today that it has requested the Congress to enact legislation which will permit an increase in the interest rate on new sales of United States savings bonds.

The Treasury's request to the Congress called attention to the important role that the savings-bonds program has played in our national life over the last 22 years, serving to encourage thrift and to place the Government's finances on a sound basis. Today about 40 million persons own more than $41 billion of series E and H savings bonds.

Identical proposed bills were transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives today which would give the Treasury the same flexibility with regard to interest rates on savings bonds that it has on other types of Treasury bonds. Passage of the legislation will permit the Treasury to go forward with plans to offer improved interest-rate terms on all series E and H bonds sold on or after February 1, 1957.

If the proposed legislation is passed, the Treasury plans to increase to 3¼ percent the interest rate on new E-bonds held to maturity, in place of the present 3 percent. The issue price and face value of the new E-bond will be unchanged, but the present 9 years and 8 months maturity will be shortened to 8 years and 11 months. Terms of any extension privileges for the new bonds will be determined later.

Also, redemption values of the new bond for the early years will be increased to provide a substantially higher yield to owners who find it necessary to redeem their bonds before maturity. The return on the new bond, if held 3 years, would be 3 percent, compared with 2¼ percent at present.

However, present owners of bonds will generally find it advantageous to continue holding them. For example, a $100 E-bond has a redemption value of $79.20 when held 2½ years. That bond will earn $20.80 more to reach its full $100 value at first maturity, and this $20.80 is slightly more than 3¼ percent on $79.20 for the remaining period of 7 years 2 months, compounded semiannually.

People holding bonds which have reached maturity and are being retained under the 10-year extension privilege will also find it to their advantage to continue holding them. Such bonds reaching the extension period since May 1952 are already paying a full 3 percent interest compounded semiannually and are redeemable on demand, and bonds of an earlier period show a still greater return.

The Treasury also plans to offer, effective February 1, 1957, a revised 10-year series H bond with yields generally comparable to the new E bond and returning 3¼ percent if held to maturity. The new H bond, like the present bond, would pay interest by check each six months in contrast to the appreciation-type E bond.

On passage of the legislation, all bonds dated February 1957 or thereafter would bear the new terms automatically. Existing stocks of bonds in the hands of the Treasury's more than 20,000 E bond issuing agents would be used until supplies of the new bonds are available. Since the issue date on the bond would determine its terms, no purchaser who received an old form of bond dated February 1957 or thereafter need feel that he should exchange it for a new bond when it is available—although he may if he wishes.

The E and H savings bonds rank among the best investments in the world for the average saver. The man who buys a savings bond has something that other bonds do not offer—complete freedom from market fluctuations. He also has something many other forms of saving do not have—a guaranteed interest rate over a period of years. He has the unusual protection of safety against the physical loss or destruction of his securities; a million separate bonds have been replaced by the Treasury over the years.

Series E bonds have acquired greater attractiveness in recent years because of the country's substantial success incurbing inflation. Government fiscal and monetary policies will continue to be directed toward the twin goals of economic growth and stability in the value of the dollar.

Because of the more attractive features of the new series E and H bonds, the limit on bonds which may be purchased by one individual in any 1 year is being reduced from $20,000 to $10,000 face amount for each series. The Treasury is withdrawing the present investment-type series J and K bonds from sale, effective April 30, 1957. Both of these decisions underline the Treasury's desire to emphasize the savings bond as a security designed for millions of average individual American savers.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I also desire to announce that 1 week from today, on Thursday, February 21, the Committee on Ways and Means will hold a public hearing on this legislation.

COUNCIL BLUFFS REST-HOME FIRE

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, a terrible tragedy took place on February 13 in a rest home situated on a high hill overlooking the historic, beautiful, and progressive city of Council Bluffs, Iowa.

Within the space of a few minutes fire destroyed the entire frame building. Fourteen people are now dead. Many others are in hospitals suffering from agonizing burns.

We cannot aid those who perished. They are with God.

We cannot aid those who are in pain. All that is humanly possible is now being done to help them.

We cannot demand changes in State and local firesafety regulations. That is a matter under the jurisdiction and control of State and local authorities.

We can and we must insist on stern firesafety measures being enforced in all rest homes and other private and State-operated institutions receiving Federal aid.

We can—all Americans can—pray for the victims of the Council Bluffs rest home disaster.

This is my prayer: "Almighty God, accept into Thy love these, Thy servants, who came to Thee in fire. Heal Thou those who still live whose bodies are wracked with the agony of burns. Give unto us who have been entrusted with the stewardship of making the laws of the United States the strength and the wisdom to legislate so that the tragedy at Council Bluffs shall never be repeated. This we ask, in Christ's name. Amen."

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the president of the Interparliamentary Union, the Honorable DANIEL A. REED, of New York, I announce a business meeting of that organization to be held on Tuesday, February 19, in room F-39 in the Capitol, at 9:30 o'clock a. m.

THE ETERNAL LIGHT

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with my colleagues in hailing the forthcoming 39th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence. The unquenchable thirst for freedom exhibited by the Lithuanians, throughout their years of enslavement by the Soviets has been an inspiration, and a confirmation of something the Soviet should have learned long since. Namely, that they can enslave human beings; they can shoot down rebels; they can crush dissenters; but they can never kill an idea. Certainly, they can never extinguish man's hope to be free.

In all man's history, there has never been an idea so viable, so inspiring and so enduring as the idea of freedom and independence. We owe a debt of gratitude to the Lithuanians for reminding us of this, by means of their annual Independence Day observation. They have never in their hearts submitted to the Soviet tyranny, and they never will.

More power to them. The distinguished minority leader of the other body, Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, recently voiced the opinion on one of my television programs that we would see the breakup of international communism in our lieftime. Certainly this is a consummation devoutly to be wished; and if it comes about, it will be chiefly because such people as the Lithuanians kept the light of freedom burning, however secretly, during the long Soviet night, against the inevitable day when it could again flame forth to light the path to the future.

SPOKANE FARM FORUM

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my provilege to attend the Spokane Farm Forum early this week and I want to share as much of that experience as possible with my colleagues. It is my conviction that our farm programs require a long look at this time. I feel that we can no longer endure the controls that present farm legislation impose on our domestic producers. For one thing, our present legislation is holding the umbrella over commerce in agricultural products of the entire world.

As we reduce acreages in accordance with basic legislation first enacted in 1938, we find other countries enlarging their acreages in the same commodities. We also find discrepancies among our own domestic producers which have the effect of transporting wheat acres from Kansas to Indiana and cotton acres from one State to the other—all being done in a legal way.

It is my conviction that our agricultural legislation does require a long look. We need to analyze and consider the effect of our entire pattern of controls. It is also my conviction that they are not controls but roadblocks and frustrations. I am equally convinced that our long look should consider action not to add more shingles to a leaky roof until the rafters collapse but the elimination of controls until, like the chambered nautilus, we at last may find a free agriculture.

It is for this reason that I propose to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the next few days excerpts from talks given at the Spokane farm forum. Farm forums provide a sounding board

that could be of great use to those of us who are responsible for initiating, servicing and correcting any farm legislation that may be upon the Federal statutes. They are held in many parts of the United States. The farm forums at Des Moines and Minneapolis are of long standing. The one I attended at Spokane is younger—the one held this week being their fourth annual farm forum. But it was well-attended and provided a sounding board for at least seven of the Pacific Northwest States. Among the speakers was our own Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, who spoke to the banquet last Monday evening, and I believe it is significant to say that at least 500 people who wanted to hear the Secretary had to be turned away for lack of space. Another speaker at the farm forum was Dr. O. B. Jesness, Chief of the Division of Agricultural Economics at the University of Minnesota. Dr. Jesness is perhaps the dean of all of our agricultural economists in the United States. Mr. Robert C. Liebenow, the youngest president of the Chicago Board of Trade in history, also spoke as did Anthony B. Sparboe, vice president of Pillsbury Mills, and Dr. Bottum, agricultural economist from Purdue University, J. Earl Coke, vice president of the Bank of America, and former head of the Federal Extension Service, Mr. W. B. Camp, a farmer with interests in both South Carolina and California, and many others.

I do hope that my colleagues if they are interested in a reflection of the problems, constructive criticisms and, perhaps, some possible solutions of agriculture's afflictions, will read these insertions as they appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

AMENDING THE SECURITIES ACT TO PROVIDE INVESTORS ADDITIONAL PROTECTION

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to amend subsection (b) of section 3 of the Securities Act of 1933, to provide that responsible officers or other persons shall be liable in damages on account of untrue statements or material omission in statements or documents filed under such subsection as a condition of exemption from the registration provisions of the act.

This bill is identical to H. R. 9319, which I introduced in the 84th Congress. Extensive hearings were held on this legislation by the Commerce and Finance Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The subcommittee and the entire committee reported this bill favorably to the House. The Rules Committee also approved it and scheduled it for debate. However, there was not sufficient time left during the remainder of the 84th Congress to get this bill considered by the House and the Senate. So it was not brought up for debate.

As I explained in a speech on the floor of the House on July 27, 1956—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 13820—a large segment of American investors, principally small investors, are being solicited to invest their savings in securities which are exempted from the registration provisions pursuant to section 3 (b) of the Securities Act. The public offerings pursuant to this exemption have been substantial and amount to approximately $250 million annually. Investors in such securities are admittedly not receiving adequate protection against false and misleading statements made in the selling literature on the basis of which the public is being solicited to invest its savings.

It is for the purpose of providing investors in these exempted securities with additional protection that I introduced H. R. 9319 in the 84th Congress, and am reintroducing it today. This legislation would impose certain liabilities on those who are responsible for making false and misleading statements with respect to the securities being offered. The imposition of such liabilities would result in the exercise of greater care and diligence by those who prepare these statements. It would result in more accurate disclosure of information regarding the securities being offered publicly. My proposal now takes on added significance in view of the fact that a bill has been introduced in the Senate—S. 843—which proposes to raise the exemption from the presently permissible limit of $300,000 to $500,000, in line with the recommendation of the President's Committee on Small Business.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that a prospective investor in securities has a right to adequate and accurate information concerning the securities he is asked to buy. I believe that the Congress owes a duty to the public to see that such investor gets the additional protection provided for in my bill, which he does not now have. It is for these reasons that I shall press for early consideration of my bill.

EQUALIZATION OF RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1957, I introduced H. R. 689, entitled "A bill to clarify paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942—56th United States Statutes at Large, page 368." By the indulgence of the House, it is now my privilege to explain the purpose and import of this bill. It is a short bill, and I shall make my explanation similarly short.

First, let me emphasize that this bill neither expands nor otherwise amends the intent of Congress when it enacted this measure originally in 1942, nor its intent in its reenactment in the Career Compensation Act of 1949. My bill would serve simply to restate the plain intent of the Congress that there shall be no discrimination between regulars and reserves with comparable service. That intent has been both confirmed and denied by conflicting administrative and legal decisions, and as it remains therefore in doubt this bill appears needful to terminate this confusion.

First. Paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942—56th United States Statutes at Large, page 368—is the only portion of the 1942 act which remains in force, and it reads as follows:

> The retired pay of any officer of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act who served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to November 12, 1918, hereafter retired under any provision of law, shall, unless such officer is entitled to retired pay of a higher grade, be 75 percent of his active-duty pay at the time of his retirement.

This provision was reenacted by exception from repeal by section 531 (b) (34) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949—63d United States Statutes at Large, page 302—when it was clearly and almost exclusively applicable to officers of the Reserve components with World War I service.

Second. The Congress has repeatedly said that there shall be no discrimination between regulars and reserves with comparable service. Notwithstanding this long-established policy and the clear, unambiguous words effectuating it, the administrative agencies have persistently applied the 1942 law and its 1949 reenactment only to Regular officers. Evidence is clear and unequivocal, and includes statements of two Senators who served on the committee of the Senate which drafted this measure in 1942, including the chairman of the subcommittee which was charged with it, that it was intended to apply without discrimination to Reserve as well as Regular officers with World War I service.

Third. H. R. 689 reads as follows:

> Paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368) is clarified to read as follows:
>
> "The retired pay of any officer of the Armed Forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, who served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to November 12, 1918, heretofore or hereafter retired with pay under any provision of law, shall, unless such officer is entitled to retired pay of a higher grade, be 75 percent of the active duty pay of his rank and length of service."

Fourth. The only purpose of this bill is to clarify the 1942 law—and its 1949 reenactment—and to confirm the expressed will of Congress. Neither the intent of Congress nor the legal significance of the 1942 and 1949 acts is changed. The words "the Armed Forces of the United States" have been substituted for "the services mentioned in the title of this act" because all of the 1942 act except this paragraph 4 of section 15 has been repealed, and the substitution is the more modern terminology. The words "including the Reserve components thereof" have been added to spell out the intent of Congress in terms which cannot be abro-

gated. The words "heretofore or" have been restored to be consistent with section 513 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949. The words "with pay" have been inserted to insure that only those officers—Regulars and Reserves—who have otherwise qualified for retirement under a general law are within its provisions. The words "at the time of his retirement" have been replaced by "of his rank and length of service" to make certain that all retired officers will get the benefit of increased pay scales enacted after his retirement without the necessity for special legislation.

Fifth. There are about 7,000 Reserve officers, otherwise qualified for retirement, who are entitled to 75 percent special retired pay for World War I service. By actuarial computation, they are dying off at the rate of about one a day, and nearly all will be gone within the next 25 years. The average annual cost as to them will be approximately $6,956,400. This cost was anticipated by Congress when the law was passed in 1942 and reenacted in 1949.

Sixth. The enactment of this bill will be one more step toward equalization between Regulars and Reserves, as so long and frequently and expressly stated to be the will of the Congress.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, or any of its subcommittees, may have permission to sit during general debate in the sessions of the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER — PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF FEBRUARY 18

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, will the gentleman give us the program for next week as far as he has it?

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be very happy to.

Monday: Under suspension of the rules, H. R. 348, a bill to amend the enabling acts of Montana, Washington, and North and South Dakota.

Tuesday: The Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill for 1958.

Wednesday and Thursday: H. R. 4090, the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1957; House Joint Resolution 209, a stopgap relief bill relating to FNMA mortgages; H. R. 1056, the military substandard housing bill.

Friday: George Washington's Farewell Address will be read.

Any further program will be announced as it develops.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, can tell us when the bill to suspend Britain's payment of $82 million on the debt she owes us will be called up.

Mr. McCORMACK. Aside from newspaper comments, this is the first direct information I have had come to my attention that legislation might be necessary. I am sorry I am unable to advise my friend; I have no knowledge as to its status or as to whether legislation is required. I can assure the gentleman that it will not come up next week.

Mr. GROSS. But the gentleman will assure us so that we will have plenty of time before the bill is called up?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman knows that the gentleman from Massachusetts always cooperates with him and all other Members.

Mr. GROSS. I am very much interested in where the money is now and whether we are going to get it.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EMPLOYMENT OF TWO ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 165

Resolved, That, effective February 15, 1957, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation at the basic rate of $2,460 per annum each, for the employment of 2 assistant legislative clerks, 1 for the office of the majority floor leader and 1 for the office of the minority floor leader, respectively.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ISRAEL—A VALUABLE ALLY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, reliable reports of new Soviet shipments of tanks, jet planes, and other armaments to Egypt in violation of the United Nations cease-fire resolution of November 2, are spurring the realization everywhere that the Middle East crisis is getting worse, not better, and that in spite of assurances from the administration, we are rapidly losing control of the situation. Let us not ignore that we are responsible for a major share of the difficulty in which we now find ourselves. We cannot go on making enemies of our friends and appeasing our enemies, and thereby hope to prevent war. Every day brings fresh evidence that the administration will have to do something better than try to muddle through with a policy of bluff, bluster, and blunder.

One victim of that policy is Israel, and Secretary Dulles' threat to give serious consideration to sanctions against Israel is another of those incredible aberrations that have convulsed American foreign policy under his administration. Who can forget the international storms whipped up in the past by his threat of massive retaliation, his boast of carrying America to the brink of war, and his recent slur at the soldiers of Great Britain and France?

Now, the mounting storm of criticism and protest that his reckless, irresponsible statement against Israel has stirred up is a tribute to the American public for its sense of justice and fair play. All across the country voices are rising against the shameful spectacle of the United States bringing economic pressure against little Israel because that struggling democracy has the courage to insist on the right to live in peace and security. We cannot, and we should not, deny Israel the right to demand that Egypt stop making war against its people by raids and blockades.

Indeed, we should be the ones to make that demand on Israel's behalf and to insist that Egypt end the state of belligerency which she claims as justification for her warlike acts against Israel. We should be demanding commitments from Colonel Nasser and insisting that the United Nations Emergency Force remain in full control of Sinai until Egypt agrees to make peace.

We ourselves are responsible for the Middle East crisis because the administration doesn't have the courage to tackle the basic problems of the area. Dulles' brinkmanship is no substitute for genuine statesmanship; and no one-sided, ad hoc, catch-as-catch-can policy that flaunts advertising slogans and diplomatic clichés in place of sound, carefully thought through programs and long-range plans is going to see us through this crisis successfully.

The United Nations is spending many millions to clear up the sabotage that Colonel Nasser did to the Suez Canal, and within the next few weeks the canal will be open to shipping once more. We are turning it over to Colonel Nasser without having obtained any agreement from him to keep the Suez an international waterway, open to the shipping of all nations without discrimination. We picked up this dictator, dusted him off after the thorough defeat he suffered because his war against Israel boomeranged, and put him back in power without asking him for as much as a promise of good behavior.

There is no reason to believe that Colonel Nasser has been chastened by his shattering defeat. On the contrary, there is every indication that he may use this newly restored power to bar British, French, and Israeli ships from the Suez if this serves his political purpose. He has given no commitments to the United Nations nor to our Government that international shipping will go through the Suez Canal as a matter of right rather

than his tolerance. Do we then propose to permit Egypt to take over complete control of the canal when it is opened in the next few weeks? Colonel Nasser has successfully defied the Security Council resolution of September 1, 1951; there is every reason to believe that he will prove more stubborn and recalcitrant in his illegal blockades now.

We have no moral justification for insisting that Israel withdraw from Gaza and Sharm-el-Sheikh unless we first obtain from Colonel Nasser a commitment to end Egypt's belligerency. The United Nations should guarantee Israel against blockades and border raids not only as a matter of simple justice but in fulfillment of its own resolution of November 2, 1956. The numerous incidents that occurred during the years when Egyptian guns commanded the Straits of Tiran and thus blockaded the Gulf of Aqaba demonstrate Colonel Nasser's complete disregard for international law. This was an illegal blockade because the Straits of Tiran is an international waterway which, under international law, should be open to the ships of all nations.

The United Nations Charter to which Egypt adheres calls on members of the United Nations to settle their international disputes by peaceful means. Egypt and the other Arab States, which are also members of the United Nations, stand in open violation of the charter by their acts of belligerency against Israel.

I cannot conceive that there is one law for Israel and another for Egypt in the United Nations, one law for the little and one law for the big. The United Nations has never voted sanctions in all the years of its existence in spite of the fact that its resolutions have been defied by Egypt, by all the Arab States, by the Soviet Union, and by India. Any such action would be a distortion of the aims and principles of the charter and would mark the beginning of the end for the United Nations. Thus not only is it shocking to find our Secretary of State willing even to contemplate sanctions against Israel, it will also be the greatest tragedy of our times if the United States were to lend its great prestige and support to any move for sanctions against a fellow member of the United Nations. The United Nations itself would pay the greatest price.

It is fantastic to find our country in this untenable position, and one can only hope that the administration will extricate itself from this latest extraordinary blunder without destroying the United Nations in the process.

It is time that we stopped being frightened by false stereotypes and propaganda clichés about the Arabs and the Middle East. The illusion of a united, all-powerful Arab world ready to act as one force in a holy war against the outsider has been shattered by the events since October 29. Words like colonialism, imperialism, and Arab nationalism have taken on an unwarranted power to frighten and intimidate. Moreover, we ought to no longer be taken in by population statistics that cannot stand the light of day. This applies especially to our Secretary of State who did not hesitate to wave the figure of 40 million Arabs over the heads of Congress when he was testifying early last year on our failure to aid Israel. How can 2 million Israelis hope to stand against 40 million Arabs, ran the argument in those days. Who has counted these 40 million? No one knows what the Arab population is. Our State Department experts have themselves pointed out that there has not been a census of the Arab people since the time of Julius Caesar.

Another bogyman that is brought out from time to time is the mandate that an estimated 22 million Egyptians are alleged to have given Colonel Nasser. We are warned about his great popular support, but we fail to recognize that Egypt and other Arab governments are run and controlled by small cliques of self-seeking, power-hungry demagogues with no mass support or roots in the people whatsoever. There are no political parties in Arab countries that resemble our own concept of a political party in any manner. We should be dealing with realities, not specters.

Vast sums of money have been paid to Arab countries as royalties for their oil, but almost none of this gets to the poverty-stricken peasant. In Egypt, in Syria, in Saudi Arabia, and in Iraq, the fellaheen live in a grinding poverty that is beyond our ability to describe and our capacity to comprehend. Yet these countries have not hesitated to come to us for additional millions of dollars in aid—American tax dollars which the administration plans to give to these Arab rulers in the form of guns, tanks, and planes.

The agreement which we recently concluded with slaveholding King Saud calls for the shipment of many million dollars of American arms over a period of 5 years and the doubling of Saud's army. No one has told the American public that we would be starting an arms race all over again by such arms shipments, that they would upset the policy of maintaining a rough balance of arms between Israel and the Arab States, and that we would be stirring up fears of Saudi expansionist ambitions among the British-protected states along the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean. We should take note that last year Saudi Arabia collected almost $300 million from American oil companies. And despite a Senate resolution deploring Saud's discrimination against Americans on the basis of their religion, the administration is again yielding to this infamous practice. Freedom of religion. Not for Americans on an American military base in Saudi Arabia. As Americans, we must share this shame.

The policy of arming the Arab rulers which was begun by this administration is one of the major factors in the Middle East crisis and a contributory reason for the state in which we now find ourselves. This policy was responsible for stirring up the rivalry between Iraq and Egypt to a new high pitch and tempted Colonel Nasser to open the gates of the Middle East to the Soviet Union, thus giving the Kremlin the opportunity she had been seeking in vain for more than a century. The extent of Communist penetration of Egypt, the large numbers of so-called technicians, and the vast stores of Soviet-bloc arms that were built up in Egypt shocked the free world when they were exposed by the Israeli sweep across the Sinai.

Today we are witnessing the beginning of another Soviet buildup in Egypt. If we continue to treat Colonel Nasser with kid gloves, we will be derelict in our defense of the free world, and all our fine words about resisting Communist aggression will be exposed as empty bluster. Whether or not Colonel Nasser is a tool in the hands of Communist masters is idle speculation. The plain hard fact is that he was playing the Kremlin's game long before our State Department experts woke up to the fact. For over 2 years Cairo radio and Moscow have been speaking with one voice, carrying on aggressive psychological warfare against Israel and the West. Directed by Nazi exiles who once worked under Goebbels, Cairo radio is the most powerful voice in the Middle East and Africa today, and its 12 transmitters hurl a daily barrage of subversive propaganda in a war of nerves against Great Britain, the United States, France, Israel, Iraq, and Turkey.

By using the modern techniques of subversion and all the devices of propaganda, as well as by sea blockade and by guerrilla warfare, Egypt has been an effective spearhead of Communist aggression in the Middle East. It was Egypt that started the guerrilla attacks against the British forces in the Suez and finally led Britain to withdraw entirely from the canal, a move by which she gave up control of her lifeline to the East and in which the United States played a decisive role. It was Egypt that encouraged the North Africans to rise against France, and it was Egypt under Colonel Nasser which, with Soviet inspiration, engineered the expulsion of Glubb Pasha, the British strong man in Jordan and the founder of its famous Arab Legion. Let us not forget that it was Colonel Nasser who undermined the Jordan Government with American dollars borrowed from Saudi Arabia's oil royalties and set his henchmen in control. And while he hoodwinked our State Department with sweet talk about a social revolution and raising the living standards of his impoverished countrymen, Colonel Nasser opened fire on the American-sponsored Baghdad Pact with deadly effectiveness and set up his own counteralliances along the Arabian southern tier.

At the same time Colonel Nasser stepped up the war that Egypt was waging against Israel. Israeli leaders made concrete offers of peace, including provision for a free port at Haifa, duty-free transit to Jordan and the release of $8,500,000 of Arab funds frozen in Israel banks, but Colonel Nasser responded by developing an extensive spy and sabotage network on Israeli territory. Early in 1955, Israeli army intelligence disclosed that 24 Egyptian agents had been caught in 1954, and that 10 had been killed. Egyptian fedayeen attacks mounted in frequency from bases along the Gaza Strip, and the sea blockades of Suez and Aqaba grew in intensity with consequences that resulted finally in the hostilities of October 29.

Colonel Nasser was finished both politically and militarily as a result of his defeat at the hands of Israel but we

rescued him politically and put him back in power, while the Kremlin is now restoring his military power. We did it deliberately and at the expense of our traditional allies and friends, Great Britain, France and Israel. We did it without conditions despite the fact that we were no longer under any illusions about the kind of person the Egyptian dictator is. And we did nothing when Colonel Nasser took on more and more of the trappings of a Hitler. His persecution of Egyptian Jews, many of whom are stateless even though they are native born, the roundups that follow the Nazi pattern of closing off a part of the city, one block at a time, and then sending troopers on night raids through each house and each apartment picking up innocent victims and shipping them to concentration camps, the expropriations of property and finally the deportations—these are the signs of a tragedy most of us remember too well. Fifty thousand Egyptian Jews watched helplessly when these persecutions began, and so far more than 6,500 Jews have been robbed and deported, some without even a chance to bid their families farewell. The decrees published in the Egyptian press warn those still in Egypt that their days are numbered.

Not only Jews but Christians too are being persecuted in Colonel Nasser's drive to "Egyptianize" his country. In the pattern established by totalitarian dictators, he has followed his drive on the Jews by expropriating the property of all Western business establishments and closing all French and British schools. Great Britain, France, and Israel have all protested to the United Nations against this violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and our Government has expressed its grave concern, but that is all.

There should be no doubt in anyone's mind that we cannot appease Colonel Nasser. We ought to wake up to the fact that we are permitting Egyptian troops and Communist armor to go back to the positions they formerly occupied, where Nasser can start a new round of hostilities. It is still not too late to mend our damaged relations with Britain and France, and help make Israel secure against Communist aggression.

It is time we woke up to the harsh reality that the Middle East would long ago have been lost to communism if Israel had not stood firmly across the Egyptian dictator's path. There is every reason to believe that Syria, Jordan, Saudi Arabia and Iraq would by now have fallen to Colonel Nasser if it had not been for Israel. The economic dislocation that Europe is suffering now is a mild tremor compared to the financial catastrophe and military collapse that would follow if Colonel Nasser controlled Arabian oil as well as the Suez Canal. Our own security would be hanging in the balance.

Israel has been standing between Europe and a Communist-puppet controlled Middle East. Instead of appeasing Colonel Nasser we should be strengthening Israel. Instead of cutting off all economic and technical aid to Israel as we are doing and threatening to support United Nations sanctions against her, we should be working at top speed in full cooperation with Israel to restore peace and stability through direct Arab-Israel negotiations. The full weight of our prestige and power ought to be behind this effort now because only if there is peace between the Arab States and Israel can we concentrate on the job of keeping communism out. With peace there will be freedom of the seas, and a start on such vast projects as the Johnston plan for the development of the Jordan Valley. With peace there will come further programs to resettle the Arab refugees and restore these unfortunate men and women to full, productive lives.

The measure of Israel's strength is the measure of our own strength in the Middle East, and we play directly into Communist hands whenever we reinforce her enemies.

If the assurances that Secretary Dulles is reported to have given Monday to the Ambassador of Israel can be considered more than a face-saving device, then they will be a welcome step in the right direction. A guaranty by the United States that it will insist on free navigation through the Gulf of Aqaba can be meaningful if it is implemented in the United Nations by clear, firm measures leading to the establishment of peace. One such measure which would be imperative to the restoration of the rule of international law is a commitment by Egypt to renounce its state of belligerency against Israel. This must follow if our guaranty of the principle of free international waterways is a firm undertaking. Under those circumstances, we can look forward to the world's strongest democracy marching together with the youngest democracy in the quest for a lasting peace in the Middle East.

Those of us who are at all conscious of the way history is made—and who is there today who has not had this consciousness impressed upon him?—must recognize that a new era has begun in the Middle East and in the history of the world. This is an era filled with pitfalls and dangers of enormous proportions, but it is also a period of great hopes and tremendous potentialities for the good of all mankind. The Middle East can make a worthy contribution to that future if the Arab countries can be brought to work together with Israel and the West in a vast program of regional cooperation, economic progress and the development of human and natural resources. Not by force and threats but upon the determination of our country and its people rests in great part the strength of the United Nations, and upon the effectiveness of the United Nations rests the hope of the world for peace between Israel and her neighbors and between East and West.

THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY introduced a bill on Thursday, February 7, 1957, to extend coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act. This bill covers the subject matter recommended to the Congress by both the President of the United States and by many interested groups. It is a matter of such far-reaching import to the constituents of nearly every Member of Congress that I asked for and have received an explanation of the bill, H. R. 4575, both in summary and in a section-by-section analysis. I trust it will be of service to my colleagues.

EXPLANATION OF BILL TO EXTEND THE COVERAGE OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT, H. R. 4575

The coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act would be extended under the bill to millions of low-paid workers now denied its protection (a) by relaxing certain restrictive definitions now contained in the act; (b) by basing coverage on activity engaged in by the employer rather than on activity engaged in by an individual employee as is now the case under the act; (c) by extending the act's protection to employees wherever an employer is engaged in any "activity affecting commerce"; and (d) by eliminating 8 exemptions now in the act and tightening and clarifying the remaining 7 exemptions.

The bill does not raise the minimum wage nor make any changes in the maximum number of weekly hours of work that are permissible under the Fair Labor Standards Act without payment of overtime compensation, nor does it change methods of computing overtime prescribed in the act.

Proposals to raise the minimum wage from its present level of $1 an hour to $1.25 an hour, and to reduce the maximum workweek from its present level of 40 hours to 37½ hours after 2 years, and to 35 hours after 4 years are contained in separate bills.

A section-by-section explanation and analysis of the Fair Labor Standards Act coverage bill follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1. Title

This section simply sets forth the proposed official title of the proposed bill, namely, "The Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1957."

Section 2. Findings and declaration of policy

This section amends the Findings and Declaration of Policy contained in section 2 of the present Fair Labor Standards Act by making clear that "labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standards of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers" ought to be corrected and as rapidly as practicable eliminated, not only in "industries enaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce," as now provided in the act, but also in "industries engaged in * * * any activity affecting commerce" where some 13,500,000 workers now excluded from the act are employed. The act is to be applied broadly and liberally in such a way as to effectuate the carrying out of its remedial and humanitarian purposes, "subject only to the limitations expressly prescribed in this act," in order to bring as many of these workers as possible within the coverage of the act.

Section 3. Definitions

Subsection (a) of this section amends the definition of the term "produced" contained in section 3 (j) of the present Fair Labor Standards Act to read as it did before the

1949 amendments to the act were enacted. Prior to these amendments "produced" was defined as including, not only production of goods itself, but also "any process or occupation necessary to the production thereof." In 1949 this phrase was amended to read, "any closely related process or occupation directly essential to the production thereof", with the result that workers were excluded from the protection of the act if their work was not in a process "closely related" or in an occupation "directly essential" to production. This restrictive change would be revoked by H. R. 4575, and the original language of section 3 (j) of the act would be restored.

Subsection (b) of section 3 amends the definition of "wage" contained in section 3 (m) of the present Fair Labor Standards Act by adding to it a new, clarifying proviso. Under the present law, the reasonable cost, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, of board, lodging, or other facilities customarily furnished by an employer to his employees is included in the employees' wages for the purpose of determining whether they have been paid in compliance with the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the act. The proposed proviso specifies that the cost of such facilities is not to be taken into account "if the furnishing of such facilities is an incident of and necessary to * * * employment and such facilities are practicably available only from the employer."

Subsection (c) of section 3 adds a number of new definitions to section 3 of the present Fair Labor Standards Act. Each of them must be read in conjunction with changes that the bill proposes to make in other sections of the act.

Paragraph (p) must be read together with the changes proposed to be made in the basic provisions of the act dealing with minimum wages, maximum hours, and child labor. It proposes a new basis of coverage by these provisions. Its effect is to extend the protection of the standards provided for in the act, not only to employees who are "engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce", but also to employees who are employed by an employer who is "engaged in any activity affecting commerce". As defined in this paragraph, "activity affecting commerce" includes "any activity in commerce, necessary to commerce, or competing with any activity in commerce, or where the payment of wages below those prescribed by this act burdens or obstructs or tends to burden or obstruct commerce or the free flow of goods in commerce". This definition is substantially similar to that contained in the National Labor Relations Act, and the effect of its inclusion is to make the basic coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act substantially similar to the coverage of that act.

Paragraphs (q), (r), and (s) define three new terms which are used in the revised exemption applicable to employees employed in agriculture which is proposed in section 8 (a) of the bill (see clause (5), p. 4). Read in this context, these terms are designed to distinguish between the large-scale industrialized types of agricultural enterprises whose employees would be brought within the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act and the small or family operated farms that would continue to be exempt from the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the act. Paragraph (q) defines the term, "hired farm labor" as including the labor of any person employed on a farm, "except the labor of the farmer and his immediate family". Paragraph (r) defines a "farm enterprise" as comprising "all tracts of land, whether contiguous or not, under one management, located in a county and immediately adjacent counties" on which farm operations, as defined in section 3 (f) of the act, are carried on. Paragraph (s) defines the term "man-day" as meaning "any day on which hired farm labor is performed".

The term "American vessel", which is defined in paragraph (t), is used in the revised exemptions applicable to seamen which are proposed in section 8 of the bill (see clause 7, subsection (a), and clause (3), subsection (b), p. 4). As defined in this paragraph, the term includes any vessel defined as a "vessel of the United States" under title 18, United States Code, section 9, or which is "documented or numbered under the laws of the United States". Vessels of the United States, as defined in the code section referred to, are not limited to vessels belonging to the United States, but include vessels belonging to any citizen of the United States or to any corporation created by or under the laws of the United States, or of any State, Territory, District, or possession of the United States.

Section 4. Special industry committees for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands

This section amends section 5 of the present Fair Labor Standards Act to authorize the appointment of special industry committees to recommend the minimum rate or rates of wages to be paid under section 6 of the act to employees in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands who are employed in or about or in connection with any enterprise where their employer is engaged in any activity affecting commerce. Taken together with sections 5 (c) and 7 (a) of the bill, this section applies to the fixing of minimum wage rates in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands the same coverage tests, based on activities of the employer, rather than activities of the employees, as the bill applies to the minimum wage, maximum hours, and child labor provisions of the act (see sections 5 (a), 6 (a), and 8 of the bill). The present tests of coverage, based on whether the employee is "engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce", however, would also be retained.

Section 5. Minimum wages

This section amends section 6, the basic minimum-wage provision, of the present Fair Labor Standards Act in three respects: (1) It extends the coverage of the minimum-wage provisions to employees who are employed by any employer who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce; and (2) it makes wage orders applicable to employees in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands who are employed by any employer who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce.

Subsection (a) provides that the minimum wage prescribed by section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act shall be paid, not only by every employer to each of his employees who is "engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce," but also by every employer who is "engaged in any activity affecting commerce" to each of his employees who is "employed in or about or in connection with any enterprise where his employer is so engaged. It thus adds to the present coverage tests based on each individual employee's activity a new test based on the activity which is being engaged in by his employer. If the employer is engaged in any activity affecting commerce, his employees employed in or about or in connection with any enterprise where he is so engaged will be covered by the minimum wage provisions of the act, regardless of the activity in which the individual employees may be engaged.

Although some 6,700,000 workers are denied the protection of the minimum-wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act at the present time as a result of specific exemptions contained in section 13 (a) of the act, more than twice this number are excluded, because they do not meet the present tests of being "engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce." Even if all exemptions were eliminated from the act, these workers, numbering more than 13,500,000, would still be excluded from the protection of the act unless action is taken to broaden the basic coverage so as to bring them within its protection. In the case of retail workers, for example, elimination of the retail exemptions might bring approximately 1,140,000 of these workers under the act. The status of more than 5,500,000 retail workers who are excluded, because they do not qualify under the tests of basic coverage now contained in the act would not, however, be changed. A change in the basic coverage of the act, along the lines proposed in the bill, is necessary for this purpose.

It has been estimated that the changes in basic coverage and exemptions proposed in the bill will bring within the protection of the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act some 9,652,000 workers who are now denied this protection. The types of employment in which these workers are engaged, and the numbers of employees engaged in each type of employment, are as follows:

Retailing and service (including laundry and cleaning)	3,960,000
Outside salesmen	1,351,000
Agriculture	1,500,000
Construction	1,400,000
Wholesaling	242,000
Hotels and inns	235,000
Agricultural processing	233,000
Finance and insurance and real estate	117,000
Seamen	117,000
Small logging operations	110,000
Mining and manufacturing	101,000
Local transit companies	80,000
Small newspapers	32,000
Seafood processing	26,000
Taxicab companies	20,000
Small telephone exchanges	18,000
Miscellaneous	210,000
Total	9,652,000

Subsection (b) of section 5 amends section 6 (c) of the present Fair Labor Standards Act, which gives effect to minimum wage rates specified in special industry wage orders in the case of employees in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Under the provisions of the bill, these rates are extended to employees "employed in or about or in connection with any enterprise" where their employer is "engaged in any activity affecting commerce." These rates will, of course, continue to apply to each employee who is "engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce."

Section 6. Maximum hours

This section amends section 7, the basic maximum hours provision, of the present Fair Labor Standards Act in three respects: (1) It extends the coverage of the maximum hours provisions to employees who are employed by any employer who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce; (2) it repeals the 14 workweek exemption from the maximum hours provisions which is applicable under the present act to workers employed in industries of a seasonal nature; and (3) it also repeals the exemptions from the maximum hours provisions which are applicable under the present act to employees engaged in various types of processing of farm commodities.

Subsection (a) extends the coverage of the maximum hours provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act to employees who are employed by any employer who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce in exactly the same way in which the minimum-wage provisions would be extended to such employees, as explained in the discussion of section 5 (a) of the bill above.

Subsection (b) strikes out of the Fair Labor Standards Act the provision contained in section 7 (b) (3) thereof, by which em-

ployers are exempted from compliance with the maximum hours provision "for a period or periods of not more than fourteen workweeks in the aggregate in any calendar year in an industry found by the Secretary of Labor to be of a seasonal nature." The only overtime exemptions will be in section 13 (b).

Subsection (c) strikes out of the Fair Labor Standards Act the provisions contained in section 7 (c) thereof, by which employers engaged in certain agricultural processing operations enjoy total or partial exemptions from the act's maximum-hours provisions. As noted above, the only overtime exemptions to be continued under the bill will be in section 13 (b).

Section 7. Wage orders in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands

This section provides that it is the policy of the Fair Labor Standards Act with respect to industries in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands to reach as rapidly as is economically feasible without substantially curtailing employment the minimum wage level specified in section 6 (a) (1) of the act, which is currently $1 an hour, not only in the case of industries engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, but also in the case of industries engaged in any activity affecting commerce. Special industry committees appointed by the Secretary of Labor under section 5 of the act would be authorized to recommend the minimum rate or rates of wages to be paid under section 6 of the act by employers in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands who are engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce or who are engaged in any activity affecting commerce.

Section 8. Child labor provisions

This section extends the coverage of the child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act to employers who are engaged in any activity affecting commerce in substantially the same way in which the minimum wage provisions are extended to the employees of such employers, as explained in the discussion of section 5 (a) of the bill above. It amends section 12 (c) of the act to provide that it shall not only be unlawful for an employer to employ oppressive child labor in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, but it shall also be unlawful for any employer who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce to employ any oppressive child labor in or about or in connection with any enterprise where he is so engaged. Oppressive child labor, for purposes of section 12 of the act, is defined in section 3 (l) of the act.

Section 9. Exemptions

This section amends section 13 of the present Fair Labor Standards Act which contains numerous exemptions from the minimum wage, maximum hours, and child labor provisions of the act.

Subsection (a) strikes out eight of the exemptions from the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act that are now provided for in section 13 (a) of the act. These eight exemptions are the following:

(a) Clause (4), applicable to employees of certain retail establishments processing goods;

(b) Clause (8), applicable to employees of certain weekly, semiweekly, and daily newspapers;

(c) Clause (9), applicable to employees of local transit companies;

(d) Clause (10), applicable to employees engaged in certain agricultural processing operations within the "area of production";

(e) Clause (11), applicable to switchboard operators employed in public telephone exchanges having up to 750 stations;

(f) Clause (12), applicable to employees of taxicab companies;

(g) Clause (13), applicable to employees in retail or service establishments engaged in handling telegraphic messages under an agency or contract arrangement with a telegraph company; and

(h) Clause (15), applicable to employees of small logging operations.

Subsection (a) also renumbers the remaining 7 clauses of section 13 (a) of the present Fair Labor Standards Act that would be retained. Thus renumbered, clauses (1), (2), (3), (5), (6), (7), and (14) would become clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7), respectively.

Finally, subsection (a) amends these clauses as follows:

1. Clause (1) eliminates the present exemption for outside salesmen.

2. Clause (2) eliminates the exemption for employees of chain or large independent retail and service enterprises and for employees of enterprises in the selling and service fields that do an essentially nonretail business, even though they do make some retail sales or perform some retail service functions. The exemption would be limited to employees employed in a retail or service establishment "by an employer having neither more than four such establishments nor more than a total annual dollar volume of sales of goods or services of $500,000." An establishment would be deemed to be a "retail or service establishment," for purposes of this exemption, only if not more than 25 percent of its annual dollar volume of sales of goods or services is for resale or is made to customers who are engaged in a mining, manufacturing, transportation, commercial, or communications business. Under the proposed bill, however, the small corner grocery store, cleaning and pressing establishment, neighborhood drugstore, and the like, would continue to be exempt.

3. Clause (3) revises the exemption applicable to employees of laundering, cleaning, and repairing establishments in a manner substantially similar to that in which the exemption applicable to employees of retail and service establishments is proposed to be revised. Employees of the large industrial and commercial laundries and cleaning establishments would no longer be denied the protection of the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. The small home laundry, however, would continue to be exempt.

4. Clause (4) eliminates the present exemption applicable to fish and seafood processing (fish and seafood canning are already covered by the minimum wage, but exempt from the maximum hours, provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act), but retains the exemption applicable to fishing and gathering of seafood and other aquatic forms of animal or vegetable life.

5. Clause (5) limits the exemption for employees employed in agriculture so as to bring within the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act employees of large, industrialized agricultural enterprises, while leaving the small, farmer-operated farm exempt. The exemption would be limited to employees employed during any calendar quarter by a farm enterprise which used less than 400 man-days of hired farm labor during each of the preceding four quarters other than labor performed by members of the family of a farmer-operated enterprise.

6. Clause (6) continues without change the exemption included in the present law for learners, apprentices, and handicapped workers pursuant to orders issued by the Secretary of Labor under section 14 of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

7. Clause (7) eliminates the exemption for seamen employed on American vessels which is now contained in the law. It also provides that the compensation these employees receive must amount to not less than the minimum hourly rate prescribed in section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act for all hours during which they are actually on duty (not including off-duty hours aboard ship when they render no service). Seamen on other than American vessels continue to be exempt from both the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the act. Under subsection (b), seamen on American vessels are exempt from the maximum hours provisions.

Subsection (b) strike out three of the exemptions from the maximum hours provisions that are now contained in section 13 (b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act. These three exemptions are the following:

(a) Clause (1), applicable to motor-vehicle employees subject to section 204 of the Motor Carrier Act of 1935;

(b) Clause (4), applicable to employees engaged in canning fish, shellfish, or other aquatic forms of animal or vegetable life, or byproducts thereof; and

(c) Clause (5) applicable to outside buyers of poultry, eggs, cream, or milk, in the raw or natural state.

Subsection (b) also renumbers the two remaining clauses of section 13 (b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act that would be retained. Thus renumbered, clauses (2) and (3) would become clauses (1) and (2). A new clause (3) would be added. The new clauses (1), (2), and (3) would provide as follows:

1. Clause (1) exempts from the maximum hours provisions employees of express, sleeping car, refrigerator car, and railroad carrier companies subject to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act;

2. Clause (2) continues to exempt from the maximum hours provisions employees of carriers by air subject to title II of the Railway Labor Act; and

3. Clause (3) exempts from the maximum hours provisions seamen employed on American vessels (see discussion of proposed revised clause (7) of section 13 (a) of the act, above).

Subsection (c) amends the exemptions from the child-labor provisions contained in section 13 (c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Aside from minor language changes, its principal effect is to limit the exemption for children employed in agriculture to those who are employed on small, farmer-operated farms. Such employees may be employed only outside school hours for the school district where they are living while so employed. The exemption for children employed as actors or performers in motion pictures or theatrical productions, or in radio or television productions, which is contained in section 13 (c) of the present act, is continued.

Subsection (d) continues the exemption from the minimum wage, maximum hours, and child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act which is now applicable to employees engaged in the delivery of newspapers to the consumer, but specifies that such delivery to the consumer must be at his residence. An exemption from the child-labor provisions would also be provided for employees otherwise engaged in the delivery of newspapers to consumers, for example, as newsboys, but only if they are more than 16 years of age and are so employed outside of school hours for the school district where they are living while so employed.

The special exemption for American Samoa in section 13 (e) is not affected by the bill.

Section 10. Effective date

This section specifies that the changes in the Fair Labor Standards Act proposed in the bill shall take effect 90 days from the date of the bill's enactment.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may

extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, Lithuanians form one of the oldest ethnic groups in Europe. More than 700 years ago they established an independent state in northeastern Europe, and they had grand and glorious days. Late in the 18th century, however, Lithuania was annexed to Russia. But the liberty-loving and independent-minded Lithuanians were never reconciled to the Czarist regime, and during the First World War when that regime collapsed, they saw their dream come true. On February 16, 1918, they proclaimed their national political independence anew, and set up their own democratic form of government. Soon that government was recognized by other governments, and in due time Lithuania was admitted into the League of Nations. In the course of two decades industrious and patriotic Lithuanians made their homeland a prosperous, progressive, and happy land in which everyone was enjoying full political, economic, and religious freedom.

The turn of world events of the late 1930's were disastrous to the Lithuanians. In 1940 they were cruelly annexed by the Soviet regime. After suffering under it for about a year, their country was overrun by Nazi forces, and for some 2 years it was under German occupation. Early in 1944 the Red army returned once more, again the country was incorporated into the Soviet Union, and again Lithuanians were placed, against their will behind the Soviet Iron Curtain. Since then it has been effectively sealed off from the outside world, and all forms of freedom have been denied to them. Ideas of freedom, liberty, independence, and individual initiative are rigidly proscribed.

We all hope that this will not long be so. God grant that the day is not far off when Lithuania will once again be a free and independent nation.

HOSPITALIZATION INSURANCE FOR OLDER CITIZENS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill designed to assure to many of our older citizens benefits of hospitalization insurance—a type of protection which, in all too many cases, is not now available to elderly people.

More than younger people, those over the age of 65 are prone to illness which requires hospitalization, and this vulnerability increases for each individual with each passing day. Yet it is the practice, under many private health-insurance plans, to discontinue or reduce the hospital benefits available to an insured person after age 60 or 65. At present, fewer than one-third of our people over age 65—and only a sixth of those over 75—have hospitalization insurance of any sort, and not all of this gives anything like adequate coverage. In the rest of the population, more than 2 persons in every 3 now have some form of hospital insurance or more comprehensive health insurance.

The problem of paying hospital bills is particularly serious for our older citizens because their greater need is accompanied by reduced economic means. Their incomes, on the average, are smaller than for the rest of our people. Among our 14 million people 65 years of age or over, only about one-third have money incomes exceeding $1,000 a year, and only about 1 in 5 has as much as $2,000 a year. The 6 million who depend on old-age insurance benefits are receiving, on the average, $105 a month for a retired worker and his wife, or about $64 a month for a retired worker alone. Even those who receive the maximum allowable retirement benefits get only $162.80 a month for a couple, $108.50 for an individual. This level of income cannot cover more than a few days of hospitalization. Few of these couples have any significant additional income, and few have savings to fall back on.

To individuals in such circumstances, sickness and its attendant expense are disastrous—and the financial difficulties and worries which accompany a stay in the hospital often aggravate the difficulties of restoring good health.

Persons over the age of 60 or 65 are generally unable to obtain hospital insurance coverage if they do not have it when they reach that age, and many who do have it earlier find that they are no longer permitted to renew it. Private plans in most instances not only refuse to accept older people as new members; they also commonly drop them as they reach age 60 or 65. Where coverage is offered to older people, it is placed beyond their financial reach or made less helpful because the premium is substantially greater or the permissible benefits are substantially less than for younger people. In this way, by eliminating the more costly risks—and elderly people, unfortunately, are in the category of costly risks—the private plans hold down their premium rates to a reasonable level for the majority of the people. But our older people are either priced out or locked out of this insurance protection at the very time when it is of utmost importance to them.

Private plans offer little tangible hope of meeting this need reasonably soon. And we will wait a long time indeed if we expect help from the administration's old reinsurance proposal—which the insurance groups themselves rejected—or from the limited permission for pooling of risks which the administration has now substituted. These programs are merely hortatory; they hold no promise of providing hospital insurance for the aged people who now lack the means to buy such insurance.

The bill which I have introduced provides a simple and straightforward remedy. It adds a new type of benefit—hospitalization benefits—to the present social security system.

Under this bill, anyone who, upon filing application, would be entitled to receive monthly payments of old-age and survivors' insurance benefits, would also be eligible for up to 60 days of hospitalization in a semi-private room in any calendar year. The cost would be paid from the old-age and survivors' insurance trust fund. The dependents and survivors of insured aged persons, as well as the insured individuals themselves, would be eligible—a total of some 13 million persons who would be given this protection at the outset. The bill provides for appropriate utilization of qualified State agencies and private nonprofit organizations, and it preserves the right of each patient, upon referral by a licensed physician, to make his own choice of a hospital.

The insurance in the bill would include the usual services, drugs, and appliances furnished by a hospital—that is, bed and board and the nursing, laboratory, and ambulance services, use of operating room, staff services, and those other services, drugs, and appliances which are customarily furnished by the hospital to its bed patients. The insurance would not cover any medical or surgical care, except such as is generally furnished by hospitals as an essential part of hospital care. It would not cover hospitalization in any tuberculosis or mental hospital or an institution which furnishes primarily domiciliary or nursing care.

The cost of these benefits, to be paid from the trust fund, has been estimated at about $400 million for the calendar year 1958. This represents an increase of about 7 percent over the present rate of benefit disbursements from the trust fund. It would be equivalent to less than one-fourth of 1 percent of covered payrolls.

My bill proposes to add the hospitalization benefits with no advance over the contribution rates already scheduled. I am confident that this can be done without impairing the financial integrity of the fund. A cost of one-fourth of 1 percent of payrolls is within the generally accepted margin of error of the overall estimates. Even more reassuring is the fact that, even with the benefit improvements that have been added over the years, the status of the fund has steadily improved as a result of rising earnings. Under present schedules of benefits and payroll taxation for old-age and survivors' insurance, the income of the trust fund grows faster in periods of rising income than do the payments or liabilities for benefits. The primary monthly cash benefit is based on monthly earnings in covered employment over the working life of the retiring worker—after dropping out up to 5 years of lowest or no earnings—and is computed at 55 percent of the first $110 plus 20 percent of the next $240. As average earnings rise, a larger part results in benefits computed at the 20-percent rate, rather than at the 55-percent rate.

It will be noted that the bill does not require a person to retire in order to receive hospitalization benefits. Millions of people continue to work beyond

the age of 65, as long as they are able to. They should not be deprived of hospital benefits for themselves and their dependents just because they have chosen not to apply for retirement benefits. For this reason the bill provides that individuals—including their dependents and survivors—shall be eligible for hospital benefits if, upon application therefor, they would be eligible for the cash benefits. This new relief from the financial burdens of hospital bills may, in fact, enable some of our older working people to obtain needed hospital care which they cannot otherwise afford—and thus to defer their retirement even longer. This would be an offsetting financial gain to the trust fund, but, much more important, it would be a tremendous boon to these elderly people and to our society as a whole.

The proposed extension of hospitalization insurance will not only benefit the millions who are eligible for this protection; it will also reduce the costs to hospitals and charitable organizations for handling the cases of elderly people who cannot now afford to pay. There will doubtless be some savings in public-assistance expenditures. And the hospitals will be assured of adequate and prompt payments for services rendered.

In view of all the humanitarian features of this bill, its economic advantages, and its administrative simplicity, I am sure my proposal will commend itself to the Committee on Ways and Means and to the membership of the House. I look forward confidently to its early enactment.

AMENDMENT OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. BURNS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, through the gracious kindness of the able and distinguished Senator from Illinois, the Honorable PAUL H. DOUGLAS, I am privileged today to introduce a bill to amend titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act so as to further assist the States in extending aid for medical care to persons eligible for public assistance under such titles.

Under the provisions of the act adopted in 1950, Hawaii and 13 States must either curtail their existing medical-care programs or drastically change the methods of operating their assistance programs. Neither alternative is desirable. The amendment permits the States to operate medical payment plans as under existing law with additional Federal matching of the one-half of $8 per month for each adult recipient.

The statement of purpose of the sections of the Social Security Act referred to leads to the belief that the medical-care provisions of the act were intended to encourage the States to broaden their medical-care programs. It is not believed that it was the desire of the Congress in adopting the amendment it did at the last session to change this purpose.

BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. J. Res. 202) providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand there are quite a number of resolutions coming from the Committee on House Administration. They have all been reported out unanimously, and there is no opposition to any of them, is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. That is correct, sir.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, be filled by the appointment of John Nicholas Brown, a citizen of Rhode Island, for the statutory term of 6 years, to succeed Everette Lee DeGolyer, deceased.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REAPPOINTMENT OF DR. ARTHUR H. COMPTON

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. J. Res. 23) to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Arthur H. Compton as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, which will occur by the expiration of the term Dr. Arthur H. Compton, of St. Louis, Mo., on September 20, 1956, be filled by the reappointment of the present incumbent for the statutory term of 6 years.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR EXPENSES FOR STUDY AND INVESTIGATION

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 158 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 128 of the 85th Congress, incurred by the Committee on House Administration, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $75,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 1, after "That", insert "effective January 4, 1957."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF HOUSE REPORT

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 62 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed 5,000 additional copies of the report of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives entitled "Price Discrimination, the Robinson-Patman Act, and the Attorney General's National Committee to Study the Antitrust Laws" (H. R. 2966, 84th Cong.), of which 4,000 copies shall be for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the House document room.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF HEARINGS ON NATIONAL HIGHWAY PROGAM

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 82 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held by said committee during the 84th Congress, 2d session, on the national highway program.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "1" and insert "2".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF UNITED STATES DEFENSE POLICIES

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 97 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the document entitled "United States Defense Policies Since World War II" by Charles H. Donnelly, Library of Congress, be printed as a House document.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF HEARINGS ON EXCISE TAXES

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 104 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, 2,500 additional copies of the hearings on excise taxes held by that committee during the 84th Congress, 2d session.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF PUBLIC LAW 880, 84TH CONGRESS

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 120 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 23,400 additional copies of Public Law 880, 84th Congress, the social security amendments of 1956, for the House document room.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACCEPTANCE OF STATUE OF THE LATE CHIEF JUSTICE EDWARD DOUGLASS WHITE

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 6 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed as a Senate document with illustrations and bound, in such style as may be directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, the proceedings in Congress at the unveiling in the rotunda, together with such other matter as the joint committee may deem pertinent thereto, upon the occasion of the acceptance of the statue of Chief Justice Edward Douglass White, presented by the State of Louisiana; and that 3,000 copies be printed, of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of and distribution by the Representatives in Congress from Louisiana; and 1,000 copies shall be for the use of and distribution by the Senators from the State of Louisiana.

SEC. 2. The Joint Committee on Printing is hereby authorized to have the copy prepared for the Public Printer.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARKANSAS-WHITE-RED RIVER BASINS AND WATER RESOURCES OF THE NEW ENGLAND-NEW YORK REGION

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 7 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Public Works the amounts stated of the following reports transmitted by the Secretary of the Army from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on review of report on the Arkansas, White-Red River Basins, Senate Document No. 13, 85th Congress, 3,000 copies, and report on water resources of the New England-New York region, Senate Document No. 14, 85th Congress, 3,000 copies, which reports were authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1950.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LITHUANIAN NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House desiring to do so may extend their remarks on this subject, following the remarks I am about to make.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for 1 hour's time in order that we Members of the House may give appropriate recognition to Lithuanian National Independence Day which is being commemorated in most countries of the free world. Many Members of Congress intend to make a statement with reference to this historic occasion. A number of important events have taken place since last Lithuanian Independence Day was commemorated here in the United States; revolt and revolution behind the iron curtain have been the most significant and encouraging of those events. In Poland that gallant nation gave indications of turning loose its entire pent up fury against the Russians. The will of the people has been temporarily halted by Gomulka, who himself hangs precariously between his masters in the Kremlin and the wrath of the humiliated, but determined Polish people.

All the world knows the story of the Hungarian revolution—of the fight of the entire Hungarian nation to win freedom and national independence from the Russian occupier. Free men everywhere owe a great debt to the Hungarian people for the indelible contribution they have made in exposing the myth of Russion invincibility and Communist superiority. Several months ago when the Hungarian revolution was at its peak, I stated publicly that the Hungarian people had won their revolution because without weapons and with absolutely no support from the free world, they demonstrated how vulnerable the Red army really is and what terrible cowards the Communists really are. All the people behind the Iron Curtain will take added courage and firm determination to throw off the Russian yoke as a consequence of the Hungarian fight for freedom.

Against this background of inspiring events, we cannot at this time overlook the dangers to the cause of human freedom and the independence of nations posed by the ill-conceived notion that there is such a possibility as national communism or independent communism. The silly notion has been foisted upon the free world by the Communist dictator, Tito, and unfortunately it has been picked up and accepted by people in high positions in the United States who ought to know better. Acceptance of these false beliefs are, in my opinion, the primary reasons why the United States of American froze up in the face of the Hungarian revolution and did no more than offer a weak protest to the Kremlin and a few well-meaning speeches in the United Nations. While the big planners in our Government were theorizing on how to bring about regimes based on so-called national communism or independent communism the Hungarian people were fighting and dying for purposes which were exactly opposite to any kind of communism. The Hungarian people fought for their freedom and absolute national independence. This acceptance, I am sorry to say, accounts for the humiliating posture of political paralysis which overtook our Government during the days of the historic Hungarian revolution.

There is a lesson to be learned from this which has great meaning to all people who have worked for and looked forward to the ultimate freedom and independence of Lithuania and all the other nations subjugated behind the Iron Curtain. It is significant that up until now our Department of State has not recognized the illegal takeover and Russian occupation of Lithuania and her sister republics of Latvia and Estonia. Moreover, we have maintained diplomatic relations with the governments in exile of all three Baltic nations. This is all fine, but it also is extremely dan-

gerous when thought of in terms of the trend toward official support of so-called national communism or independent communism.

Suppose the Communist regime in Lithuania should suddenly—and of course, with the approval of the Kremlin, declare itself to be based upon the concept of national communism or independent communism and then seek full diplomatic recognition from the United States. If such declaration were made, our present policymakers would probably be quick to recognize officially such a phony regime, and be even more eager to hand over a big downpayment of the American taxpayers' money.

This is not an impossible situation. The Department of State will very shortly, I am reliably informed, propose that an extensive foreign aid program be offered to the Gomulka Communist regime in Poland. Congress will be told that Gomulka is a "national Communist," that he desires to be "independent" of Russian control, and that it is in our national interest to aid him in his efforts to bring "freedom" to the Polish people. The reality of this possibility is again emphasized by an Associated Press dispatch from Moscow dated February 9 which indicates that one M. A. Gedvilas, a quisling Lithuanian, is being built up by the Russians as one of their new "Khrushchev reformers." This same Gervilas, upon whom the Russians conferred the title of Chairman of the Legislative Proposals Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities, has begun to make strange noises about "the necessity of expanding the rights of the republics in the juridical sphere." This is only the opening gun for Gedvilas, but in my judgment, he will be rapidly built up by the Russians as the champion of "independent communism" in Lithuania. When this occurs, the stage will have been set for the complete sellout of the gallant Lithuanian people. That sellout will be condemning them to the degrading slavery of "national" or "independent communism." Lithuania is deserving of a far better destiny than that which some of our policy planners in the Government have marked out for her. She deserves and must get nothing less than complete freedom and absolute national independence. On this commemoration of Lithuanian National Independence Day it would do all of us well to bear this in mind and to make certain that the just due of a great nation shall be accorded Lithuania.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I want to compliment the gentleman on his taking time today to bring this matter to the attention of the American people. I also want to compliment the gentleman on the very valiant effort he has been making on behalf of the people who today are behind the Iron Curtain. His remarks today on Lithuania are important and timely. I shall present my own views on this subject.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the gentleman from Ohio in paying tribute to the people of Lithuania on this, their Independence Day.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and also to incorporate in my remarks a proclamation issued by the Governor of Indiana setting aside February 16 as the Republic of Lithuania Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, February 16 is an important day for all Lithuanians, and those of Lithuanian descent, to commemorate because this day is an important milestone in Lithuania's long battle for self-government and independence. Lithuania's history goes back beyond the 10th century when the country was divided into a number of separate principalities. In the 13th century, Lithuania became united under the rule of King Mindaugas.

During the intervening centuries, Lithuania has enjoyed independence and self-government only at intervals because of periodical invasions by the Russians and Teutons in their mad rush for conquest and European domination. Lithuania during these long years succeeded in retaining its identity and at times independence as a national power until the 18th century when the nation suffered a major decline. For 120 years during this period, the patriotic and liberty-loving Lithuanian people conducted five major revolts against powerful Russian domination.

World War I presented the hope which eventually resulted in freedom for the Lithuanian people and the establishment of a free and independent Government on February 16, 1918. On that date, Vilna was established as the capital and Lithuania severed all political ties which linked it with neighboring nations. On this date the Constitution of Lithuania was promulgated. No other nation in world history, large or small, demonstrated more ability to progress in self-government than Lithuania in such a short time as it did during the first 20 years of its freedom as an independent nation. Among the outstanding accomplishments of the Lithuanian nation during this period was its program of land reforms. During that time almost 300,000 independent farms were established in this agrarian reformation. Industrial development kept pace along with agricultural progress. By 1939 over 16,000 industrial enterprises were established within the borders of Lithuania. Educational progress was remarkable in the fact that the new Government established and increased school facilities in every area throughout the nation. Transportation facilities were expanded and great steps were made in social and welfare legislation for the benefit and well-being of all the people.

I need not recite the recent history of World War II wherein Lithuania was the victim of attacks and infiltration by both the Nazis and Soviets which eventually resulted in the present Communist domination of Lithuania by the Soviet tyrants and Lithuanian freedom and independence was again shattered.

The historical battle for freedom on the part of the Lithuanian people still continues. During recent years, numerous indications are present which convinces thinking people of the free world that "all is not well" in the Communist orbit where their dictators have enslaved over 600 million people. The highly publicized Soviet economic utopia is rapidly proving to be a failure. This fact has been affected by the uprisings and rebellions in East Germany, Poland, Hungary, and other areas behind the Iron Curtain.

The efforts of Bulganin, Khrushchev, and Tito to visit and sit down with leaders of the free world is but part of the Soviet strategy to mislead and build personal prestige for their faltering governments and the communistic system in general. As a member of two special congressional Communist investigation committees during the 82d and 83d Congresses, we recorded volumes of sworn testimony exposing communistic strategy and deceit which their system uses in an effort to enslave the world.

Dozens of former leaders of the present captive Soviet nations, including Lithuania, testified before our committee warning the leaders of the free world against being taken in by Soviet trickery and deception. Dictator Tito's proposed visit to the United States was part of this Soviet trickery in order to enhance the prestige of Communist leaders throughout the free world. I firmly believe that the congressional petition signed by so many Members of Congress, which Majority Leader McCormack, Congressman McDonough, Congressman Keating, and I caused to be circulated, was the No. 1 reason for Tito's canceling his proposed visit to the United States. The nations of the free world must continue our fight against the cold war of the Communist dictators. We must not retreat or appease. If we continue exposing the truth about the Communists and curtailing the further expansion, communism is destined to failure and collapse. When that day arrives, Lithuanians, as well as other enslaved nations, will again enjoy freedom and independence.

Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 17, in the city of Gary, Ind., the Lithuanian people of the Calumet region will assemble in a large mass meeting commemorating Lithuanian independence of February 16, 1918. The people assembled at this meeting will repledge their efforts to regain Lithuanian independence. I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks a proclamation by Hon. Harold W. Handley, Governor of Indiana, setting aside February 16, 1957, as Republic of Lithuania Day.

PROCLAMATION—REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA DAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1957

To All to Whom These Presents May Come, Greeting:

Whereas the 16th day of February 1957 will mark the 39th anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people whose origin is from the Baltic State of Lithuania; and

Whereas Lithuania lived at peace with her neighbors until the forceful occupation by Russia in 1941, when she was compelled to become a part of the U. S. S. R.; and

Whereas more than 700,000 Lithuanians suffered deportation from their homeland to

Siberia and many tens of thousands of these people were exterminated; and

Whereas, despite untold hardships and brutal occupations, the people of Lithuania have never lost hope of ultimate freedom; and

Whereas the residents of Indiana feel deep sympathy for the gallant people of Lithuania and of other countries, presently enslaved by the Kremlin imperialism: Now, therefore,

I, Harold W. Handley, Governor of the State of Indiana, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1957, as Republic of Lithuania Day throughout the State of Indiana, and commend all interested groups, organizations, and individuals to appropriately observe the occasion, encouraging the Lithuanian people and wishing that they soon attain their goal of freedom and independence which they so ardently desire, and to which they have every right.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Indiana, at the capitol, in the city of Indianapolis, this 25th day of January 1957.

HAROLD W. HANDLEY,
Governor of Indiana.

By the Governor.

[SEAL] FRANK A. LENNING,
Secretary of State.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, communism has been the curse of freedom-loving humanity for four full decades. Its baleful influence and impact have been felt everywhere. And its enslavement of the human being, of both the body and the soul, is known to all. All of us live under the fear that Communist ambition has created, but fortunately some of us are still free to enjoy the elemental human rights. That is not true of the many countries in which peoples have been overpowered by the Soviet steamroller. Lithuania with its bighearted and valiant inhabitants is one of those countries in northeastern Europe.

Lithuanian independence was born after the untiring and persistent struggle of the liberty-loving Lithuanians against the czarist autocracy. When that dreaded regime collapsed, Lithuanians were fully prepared to proclaim their national independence, as they did on February 16, 1918. The independence they thus regained was well-earned and richly deserved. Centuries past when their freedom was in danger, the brave Lithuanians fought against the invading hordes of the east and against the teutonic knights of the southwest. And in all of these struggles they gave a good account of themselves. In 1918 and in subsequent years they were prepared to do the same, but it was not possible for a few million Lithuanians to resist the Red army, at that time the largest army in the world. Lithuanian independence thus became an early casualty of the last war.

Today Lithuanian Independence Day is being celebrated by Americans of Lithuanian origin, even though the Moscow-trained Communist regime of Lithuania does not permit its observance there. I ardently hope that the chains of communism will soon be shattered there, that Lithuania will once more regain its independence, and that Lithuanians will once again celebrate their most cherished holiday, their independence day, in their beloved homeland.

Mr. Speaker, as I view the world today, the fight for liberty is going to be fought in Europe.

The Middle East is important; it is important from a geographical angle, it is important from the angle of its natural resources in the economic life of many nations throughout the world, among whom are the nations in the non-Communist world; but the people of the Middle East with few exceptions have never had any experience in possessing liberty and the rights of the individual which come under the head of liberty. They are inherently in the minds of the people of those countries and potentially there of the Middle East who have never known and enjoyed individual liberty. Some time in the future when advancement is made in the art and science of representative government under established law they will possess liberty, and they will understand and appreciate the significance of liberty. But it is in Europe, in Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and other Communist-subjugated nations that the fight for liberty is going to be waged, the fight which is going to stop and destroy international or atheistic communism. We have seen it during the past number of weeks in the case of the brave people of Hungary.

Millions of persons in other subjugated countries entertain the same strong desire to have liberty under their own government, a government that is noncommunistic in nature. The people of Lithuania are overwhelmingly opposed to communism; the people of other Communist-subjugated countries are overwhelmingly opposed to communism. Even in the Soviet Union itself the great majority of the people which comprise it and are under the domination of the Soviet Union are non-Russians, and millions oppose communism. For example, the people of the Ukraine despise and condemn communism. Little Lithuania has, for hundreds of years, been fighting for its freedom and for its right to possess liberty.

So the battle to stop communism and ultimately defeat it is not going to take place in the Middle East; it is in Europe, it is in the hearts and minds of the men and women who have enjoyed liberty in the past, and who despise communism, who love liberty, who want a government of their own under law and under God; and who, as the great people of Hungary have clearly manifested, are willing to give their lives if necessary to attain their goal and to remove oppressive conditions that become so burdensome that people have to resort to extreme means in order to regain their liberty.

Little Lithuania is one of those countries in which the great majority of the people, probably 98 percent of the people, not only have contempt for communism in any form, but are waiting and praying for the day of their deliverance. They look to America as do the people of other subjugated nations.

What policy has America? Have we a policy in the case of Hungary? Have we a policy in the case of Lithuania if its people revolt against communism tomorrow? Czechoslovakia and other satellite nations when their tomorrow comes? And it is bound to come in their willingness to give up life in order to possess liberty. It is vitally important that our country formulate a policy to bring hope to those people, not only hope but to bring to those people aid and assistance in their struggle for liberty.

Today we pause in this branch of the Congress to pay our respects to the brave people of Lithuania, to join with all of those of Lithuanian origin in America or throughout the world in expressing hope that that brave country will quickly regain its independence, and its people their liberty. But in pausing to pay our respects to these great people, we also pause to pay our respects to the brave people of all other countries in Europe and throughout the world where there are people who desire real liberty under their own law and in accordance with their own culture.

So this is the fight of men and women everywhere who want to be free. They are the Patrick Henrys of today, "Give me liberty or give me death." There are countless millions of Patrick Henrys today in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Poland, Yugoslavia, and in the Soviet Union itself, who are looking to America for the guidance and leadership and the assistance that will enable them to quickly regain the independence of their country and the liberty of their people.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the hope and the desire of my colleagues that Lithuania will gain its independence which it so richly deserves.

I have had some experience in meeting with Lithuanian people in my district. I find that they are very intelligent, capable, liberty loving and conscious of the need for a type of government that will give them an opportunity to express their talents and they are seeking and hoping that the United States will be the nation through which this liberty may be obtained.

It seems to me that we should make a move through the United Nations, as one of the powerful nations of the United Nations, to demand that nations like Lithuania, Estonia, Poland and others have their individual representation in the United Nations rather than to be blanketed under the umbrella of Soviet Union control and domination, that they may be privileged to express their views in the council of the United Nations as an individual nation without that control by Russia over them at all times. Mr. Speaker, today is the 39th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. But there is no celebration in that country today, no observance to mark a day of liberation. There is only the silent prayers of freedom-loving Lithuanians that there may one day be an end to the enslavement of this nation by Soviet Russia.

Following World War I in 1918, the people of Lithuania gained independence after more than 100 years of struggling

against subjugation by the Russian Empire. Lithuania became a republic, and the Lithuanian people rejoiced as their country took its place among the democratic nations of the world.

In 1940, after just 22 brief years of freedom, Lithuania was again seized by Russia, this time to fall under the domination of communism. This was a tragic blow to the cause of freedom in the world, and the liberation of Lithuania is a matter of deep concern not only to the people of Lithuania and those of Lithuanian ancestry, but to all freedom-loving people everywhere.

The people of Lithuania are dedicated to the principle of individual liberty and national independence, and they have maintained their national identity in spite of their long term of enslavement. During their brief existence as an independent nation, Lithuania improved the economic status and physical welfare of Lithuanian citizens and instituted standards of commerce, agriculture, and industry in accordance with democratic principles.

Today on the 39th anniversary of the Republic of Lithuania, all Americans join with the Lithuanian people and those of Lithuanian ancestry in a prayer for the liberation of these gallant people and that Lithuania may be delivered from its captivity to become once again a free and independent nation.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the 39th anniversary of Lithuania's most recent Independence Day, February 16, it is a privilege and a pleasure to speak for that country of indomitable courage, of undying devotion to freedom. In commemorating that day we honor Lithuania, ancient and modern, small in size but great in spirit, undaunted and indestructible at home and abroad. We in the United States have never acceded to the domination of Lithuania by the Soviets.

We have only to look at Lithuania's history for eloquent testimony of the character of her people and the promise of their future. Through centuries of invasion, conflict, revolution, and international migration this nation, known to have existed in prehistoric times, has been distinctive. The ancient Phoenicians found Lithuanians on the shores of the Baltic. Etruscan, Greek, Roman, Arab travelers told of Lithuania, "the gold of the North". Archeologists today have found traces of the Lithuanian people on the site of their homeland throughout the ages.

The melting pot of Europe was never able to mar their identity. Unlike most of the peoples of the world they have retained their separate racial characteristics through centuries of settlement, conquest, occupation, insurrection, expansion, international union, partition, massacre, and dispersion.

These Lithuanians were the people who, embracing Christianity in the 12th century, are said to have suffered martyrdom for their religion more than any other people except the early Christians. Similarly, they have endured conflict for the sake of freedom.

These are the people whose nation, dating from the Middle Ages, has emerged from repeated attacks of powerful enemies. They have typified the cause of liberty; they have championed freedom through the centuries.

These people, who won their latest independence after World War I only to suffer Communist oppression with World War II, have withstood the upheavals of history. They are certain to emerge again in enduring independence and in final freedom.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in this observance of the 39th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. This little nation, whose sons and daughters have contributed so much to the building of America, is, of course, neither independent nor free. But this annual commemoration of her independence gained 39 years ago serves a most useful purpose. It is a reminder of the tragic fate of Lithuania and other small states which were formerly free but which today are fettered by the chains of Communist slavery. But this occasion is far more than a time of tribulation and sorrow over the fate of Lithuania and these countries which are existing in the darkness of the Iron Curtain. Let us make it a time of rededication in the eternal fight for freedom and independence.

This observance here and throughout other lands where people of Lithuanian blood are living today will be heard behind the Iron Curtain. It will demonstrate to the people of the motherland that they are not forgotten, that their struggles are the struggles of the freedom-loving world. It will help to keep bright in their minds and hearts the flames of hope for the day of liberation.

Fortunately for Lithuania and for the free world, the Soviet masters who have made captives of their bodies have never captured the minds and the souls of these freedom-loving people. There is no Lithuanian flag in Lithuania; there is no national anthem there, but these symbols of nationalism and liberty still shine brightly in the hearts of their people.

We have fresh memories in the past year of events in Poznan and in Hungary. These are visible cracks in the Iron Curtain. We know that there are many other unseen cracks. The disintegration of the Communist empire has begun. A government based on the ruthlessness of the police state, upon the whiplash of the slave master, must eventually crumble and die.

This is the hope of Lithuania as we observe the anniversary of her independence today.

LITHUANIA LIVES

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 39th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. It has become the practice of this House to pay tribute to the Lithuanian people whose devotion to freedom and independence has led them to heroic feats to resist Russian tyranny.

The recent heinous events in Hungary brought to light the truth about the Soviet Union's cruel imperialism. The dramatic flight of Hungarian refugees bared to the world the brutal Soviet oppression of Hungarian liberties and gave the lie to the Soviet propaganda that they are the peace-loving defenders of human rights against Western imperialism and colonialism. This February 16, the anniversary of Lithuania's independence, it is particularly fitting that we recall that once-free Lithuania, like Hungary, was the victim of Soviet aggression. It is imperative that we remember that once-free Lithuania, like Hungary, is still enslaved by the Kremlin.

Lithuania had long known the Russian yoke. In 1795 Russia and Prussia partitioned Lithuania, and Russian domination lasted until 1915. During those 120 years Moscow tried to eradicate Lithuanian nationality by banishing the Lithuanian language from the schools, closing the famous university of Vilnius, substituting Russian for Lithuanian law, and even prohibiting the printing of Lithuanian books in Latin characters. Almost every generation rose in revolt against the regime of the invaders, but each was brutally crushed.

On February 18, 1918, while German armies occupied their country, Lithuanian statesmen proclaimed independence. By the Treaty of Moscow of 1920, Soviet Russia recognized the sovereignty and independence of Lithuania. Today it is ironical to read article 1 of that treaty:

> In conformity with the right declared by the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic of all peoples to a free self-determination, including the right of full secession from the state of which they were a part, Russia recognizes without any reserve the sovereignty and independence of the State of Lithuania with all juridical consequences resulting from such recognition, and voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory.
>
> The fact that Lithuania was ever under Russian sovereignty does not place the Lithuanian people and their territory under any obligation to Russia.

Here in a formal treaty, the Soviet Union solemnly proclaimed its high convictions with regard to sovereignty and independence, the same principles that Communist officials mouth again and again at the United Nations and at every opportunity where they have an audience. But what about Communist deeds? Lithuanians, since the reoccupation of their country by the Red army in 1940, can attest to Soviet hypocrisy. The inhuman mass deportations in which parents were separated intentionally from their children, the forced collectivation and suppression of religion, the slave-labor camps, the mass exterminations—these were all part of the Red terror that swept Lithuania.

But the barbaric Communist treatment has been no more successful in crushing the Lithuanian spirit of freedom than were the earlier efforts of Czarist Russia. According to the latest information to come out of Lithuania, the leader of the Lithuanian Communist Party has complained that elements similar to those that raised the flag of rebellion in Hungary are active in Lithuania.

Throughout the Sovet empire there is ferment. The Iron Curtain is not thick enough to muffle the outcries of the captive peoples. We call upon the Soviet

Union to live up to its solemn pledge of freedom to Lithuania, which it has so cynically ignored. Today, on the anniversary of Lithuania's hard-won independence, our prayers go out that the time may not be long distant when Lithuania, as well as the other captive Baltic countries and those of Eastern Europe are restored to their rightful positions as free and independent states.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, once again it is singularly fitting that we pay especial tribute to the enslaved people of Lithuania. Their courage in the face of almost unendurable trials and tribulations has been superb. Their loyalty to the principles of freedom-loving peoples is admirable. Their devotion through suffering is such that we, in peaceful and prosperous countries, have also been given strength and determination to help, in every way possible, all countries behind the Iron Curtain that some day they, too, may know the way of life we find so beautiful, so inspiring, and so human.

Our hearts go out to these brave and valiant people. And may the day they are free be not too far away is the fervent prayer from their American friends as we mark the 39th anniversary of Lithuania's Independence Day in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege for me to join with my colleagues in commemorating the 39th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian Republic.

We in America have come to recognize February 16 as a date with special significance. It is a day to be set aside for tribute to, and prayers for, a people who have refused to bow down before the might of godless transgressors. Although Lithuania has been overrun by the Red hordes since 1940, the torch of liberty continues to burn bright in the hearts of her people.

The strength of this spirit testifies to the fervor and permanence with which they embraced democracy in 1918. And I am confident that spirit will never die.

Although we have reasons for despair that Lithuania is not free today, my friends of Lithuanian descent would be the first to assure me we have no reason to give up hope. They know that the Lithuanian people will not cease in their efforts to gain liberty. Repeatedly, through her history, Lithuania has proven that her people can overcome any temporary occupation. The faith which in 1399 emerged triumphantly over the Tartar invasion and helped save Europe from barbarism is still with her today. It gives the people of Lithuania the spiritual vigor to outlive any ungodly dictatorship.

My home city of Rochester, N. Y., has been singularly blessed with many fine Americans with Lithuanian origins. Their contributions to the community, blending their rich heritage and customs with ours, have been many. They have provided examples of good American citizenship while remaining true to the traditions of their native land.

This Sunday, the Rochester Chapter of the Lithuanian American Council will be holding a rally commemorating the 39th anniversary of the proclamation of Lithuanian Independence. Peter Norkelunas, president and Anthony Sabalis, secretary of this outstanding organization, inform me that Jonas Matulionis, president of the Supreme Committee for the Liberation of Lithuania will deliver the main address. It should be a memorable occasion and I regret I shall not be able to attend.

Mr. Speaker, meetings such as that to be held in Rochester and occasions such as this today, providing us with an opportunity to renew our pledge of dedication to the cause of Lithuanian independence, do much to bolster the spirit of those behind the Iron Curtain. Through mediums such as the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe, these people know they are not forgotten.

Recent unrest behind the Curtain raise the hopes of all of us that a free Lithuania will some day soon be a reality. From my own friendship with my fellow Americans of Lithuanian descent, I know that deep in the heart of every Lithuanian is that dedication to liberty and freedom which never dies. There is no power on earth which can forever enslave a people determined to be free.

Until the light of freedom once more shines on Lithuania, our hearts go out to her brave people. Until that day, no lover of liberty can rest.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

Many of us in Congress have made it a regular practice to note the anniversaries of independence of the countries behind the Iron Curtain enslaved by the tyrannies of communism. Some people may ask what concrete good comes of such periodic tributes on our part. It appears to me that it is our duty and obligation as representatives of a free people to express our abhorrence of those powers which keep other peoples in a state of subjugation and fear. Communist Russia, I am sure, welcomes the day we in the United States cease to raise our voices against the plight of the citizens of Lithuania and other countries dominated by the Communists.

The sparks of freedom still exist in the hearts of these people. This has been evidenced by the recent uprisings in Poland and Hungary. These people look to us as the leader of the free world to provide them with both moral and spiritual support which they need for the perpetuation of their great crusade for freedom. We cannot fail them. That is why this Congress should continually express its strong sentiments against Soviet colonialization until every Iron Curtain country is freed from its terrorists.

The recent history of Lithuania follows the formula of a country broken by the Russian imperialists. After an all too short 22 years of independence from 1918 to 1940, Lithuania was once again "conquered" by Russia, after the banishment of 60,000 Lithuanian citizens from the country, who may have supplied the spirit and the leadership to overthrow the Russian invaders.

The Lithuanian-American Information Center communicated with me recently and I would like to quote parts of that letter as it portrays dramatically the tremendous oppressive force against these people and the spirit they have, which refuses, in the face of adversity, to die:

> As you know, there is no observance of the day (Independence Day) in Lithuania; no national anthem, no flag. It is marked in silence or a silent prayer. That is why nearly one million Lithuanian-Americans in every State in the Union, will commemorate the day, pledging moral and spiritual support to their kin in the homeland enslaved by the Soviets.
>
> Visitors are barred from Lithuania. No one is permitted to leave Lithuania. The recent drive to return to the homeland to inveigle the living witnesses of the horrors of the first Soviet invasion to return back, ended in dismal failure. From the meager news trickling through the Iron Curtain, we know that a resistance movement still exists, that there is an invincible will for freedom and independence.

I am pleased and honored to be among those who speak against the actions of totalitarian Russia in their attempts to communize the earth. This master plan must fail. History has proven to us in the past that the enslavement of people and the denial to them of their culture, their church and their freedom, is doomed so long as the will for those cherished things exist. I am confident such will exists in the heart of every Lithuanian. Because of this unyielding will the battle for the preservation of human dignity and independence is more than half won.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, since the House of Representatives will not be in session on Saturday, February 16, I would like to take this opportunity to join with my colleagues today in paying tribute once again to the courageous people of Lithuania.

After years of Russian domination and oppression, Lithuania proclaimed its independence 39 years ago on February 16, 1918. Unfortunately that independence was very short-lived, and after 22 years of freedom as an independent republic, Lithuania was again seized by Soviet Russia in 1940.

Her people have suffered shameful persecutions and hardships at the hands of the Communists, and yet they still continue to resist this tyranny, and work for the day when they will again be free.

While the people of Lithuania cannot openly celebrate this anniversary, Lithuanians all over the world will acknowledge the day, as we do here in the United States.

We must continue to give reassurances to these people that we still recognize the independence of that country, and deplore the aggressive and predatory actions of the Soviet Union in subjugating Lithuania.

On this anniversary of the declaration of independence by Lithuania, we here in the United States who are so blessed with freedom and liberty, wish to give continued encouragement and support to that brave nation and her gallant people, who have been an inspiration to free men throughout the world. God grant that their liberation is close at hand.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Americans are free to celebrate

with gladness the 39th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania on February 16. But those who have the greatest right and desire to celebrate that day, the people of Lithuania themselves, are denied that right, because their little country is now subject to the tyrannical rule of Soviet oppressors. Americans view this with sadness, and will work and hope for better days for Lithuania.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, today, in commemorating the 39th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, we speak for those whose voices have been silenced, for those once free who are now chained. Yet, we can be sure that the memory of the centuries-long struggle of the Lithuanian people for freedom and justice lives warmly within their hearts and renews their hope for the future. Their courage and determination to regain their liberty will forever stand as a symbol of devotion to the cause of freedom.

Since the 13th century, the Lithuanian nation has enjoyed periods of liberty and self-government but has also been the victim of attack and domination. Yet it maintained its spirit and belief in the dignity of human liberty and ever continued to fight for freedom. The First World War brought a new era for the liberty loving Lithuanian people. On February 16, 1918, their leaders proclaimed the independence of their country and so realized a dream of Lithuanians for over 100 years. During the following 22 years in every respect Lithuania made great progress as a free and independent nation and took her place in the League of Nations. Then in 1940, without justification and in violation of nonaggression pacts with the Baltic States, Soviet forces occupied Lithuania. The world is acutely aware of the sufferings endured by those who have felt the iron heel of Soviet communism.

Despite the tortures and oppressions which the Lithuanian people suffer, we know that the spirit of liberty has not died and that they continue their fight as they have in the past. Man can be prevented from exercising his natural right of freedom; but he cannot be forced to accept and believe in the tyranny imposed on him.

We join with all who commemorate this day—in prayer that the spirit of the Lithuanian people may be strengthened, and in dedication of ourselves once again to the cause of freedom and justice for all people everywhere.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in paying tribute today to the people of the nation of Lithuania on this 39th anniversary of the declaration of their independence.

On February 16, 1918, the small republic of Lithuania regained its freedom and the right to a separate national destiny. After centuries of Russian oppression, Lithuanians at last were able to enjoy their God-given right to self-government and to look forward to a future of continuing fulfillment.

An era followed of peace and economic and industrial progress, until in 1940 the Red Army marched into Lithuania and Lithuania was subjected to a systematized oppression which reached into every phase of the existence of its people. The wholesale deportations to Siberia, a rigidly enforced border control, together with collectivization of agriculture and industry have made in Lithuania the typical pattern of Soviet rule. But in spite of what are surely the most brutal and trying vicissitudes, the people of Lithuania have not lost heart.

We pray that the day may be near at hand when their courage will be rewarded and a liberated Lithuania will be welcomed once more into the community of free nations.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1957, will mark the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. An independence that was won by the great effort and will of freedom-loving people.

Unfortunately this small nation has been brought behind the Iron Curtain and made captive by the evil forces of the Kremlin. But, nevertheless, the spirit of freedom still remains and God willing, Lithuania will once again, take her place among the independent nations of the free world.

Thousands of Lithuanians have perished in the slave camps of Siberia. Thousands have been driven into exile from their native land. Yet the spirit and will for freedom cannot be extinguished.

It is most fitting that all Americans joining with those Americans of Lithuanian descent take time out to send warm greetings to those who, through no fault of their own, are forced to live under the Soviet yoke. Our thoughts and hearts are with them as together we all strive for a better world in which all men will be free.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to pay tribute to the people of Lithuania who are commemorating the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. Unfortunately, there is today no measure of freedom for this proud people who are forced to bear the yoke of Soviet Communist imperialism.

I know that free men everywhere in the world join with their Lithuanian brothers in abhorrence of the manner in which the Soviet Union has crushed not only freedom but life itself in Lithuania. The mass deportations of Lithuanians to Soviet slave labor camps is a transgression of national and individual liberty not easily forgotten. The economic bleeding of the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain in the interest of the Soviet Union will leave a mark which cannot be readily erased.

I join with the Lithuanian people in the fervent hope that their homeland will soon enjoy full freedom from Soviet tyranny.

I wish to include in the RECORD at this time a statement by my good friend, Mr. Leo C. Mazotas, a highly respected leader of the Lithuanian people in the State of Connecticut:

At 3 p. m. on Sunday, February 24, 1957, the Lithuanians of the Greater Hartford area are commemorating the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, which date was actually February 16, 1918. Exercises will be held at the Holy Trinity School Hall at 329 Capitol Avenue, Hartford, Conn.

As history has recorded Lithuania lost its independence again in June of 1940 when Lithuania and its neighbors Latvia and Estonia were occupied by Soviet forces despite all solemn promises to the contrary, despite existing friendship and nonaggression pacts between the Baltic States and Soviet Russia.

Since that time Lithuania and its neighbors have been the victims of Soviet social engineering (planned periodical annihilation of the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia). Literally hundreds of thousands of innocent victims, men, women, and children have been brutally deported into the Soviet Union slave labor camps. It is estimated that since the beginning of the Soviet annihilation program on June 13–14, 1941, the population of Lithuania has been depleted from over 3 million to 1,500,000 to 2,000,000. Her neighbor nations have suffered a like fate. Where in the history of the world can there be found a more vivid example of inhumanity and brutality? Where can there be found a more vivid example and warning of the goal of a totalitarian, avaricious force such as the communism of Soviet Russia was, is and always will be? For other examples and warnings we need only to point to the fate of Poland, Czechoslovakia, China, Manchuria, Northern Korea, Indochina and yes, even more recent, Hungary. How much more convincing does the free world need?

Lithuanians and people of Lithuanian extraction need no further examples of warnings of Soviet communistic intentions. They and their neighbor nationalists know only too well the result of apathy, ignorance, and inaction in the face of the communistic menace. Lithuanians will never cease their unending fight to regain their lost freedom and independence. They will never cease to endeavor to point out to the free world the ever-existing menace of Soviet communism. They will never cease to urge all free peoples to become informed regarding this great threat to world freedom, to realize that the materialistic philosophy of Soviet communism has and always will have only one unwavering goal—world revolution and the ultimate enslavement of all mankind.

Lithuanians will always set aside the period around February 16, their independence day, as the one period during which special emphasis will be made to keep the free peoples of the world ever reminded of the inhuman wrongs perpetrated by the Soviet Union upon Lithuanians and all of the other victims. This, Lithuanians have dedicated themselves to do until Lithuania and the other enslaved nations have been restored to positions of dignity and freedom in the world, and the threat of the scourge of communism has been destroyed.

And so once again, this time in the year 1957, Lithuanians all over are extending their warning to the unwary world and praying that their day of liberation for Lithuania and the others is 1 year closer to realization.

LEO C. MAZOTAS.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the 39th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, the little Baltic Republic which was founded on February 16, 1918, occurs this Saturday. Unfortunately, its independence lasted only some two decades until it was wiped out by Soviet Russia.

Nevertheless, during this brief span of independence, Lithuania was a democratic country in the finest sense of the word, and its people achieved great progress in all fields of human endeavor, such as social, cultural, economic, and political.

Today, the people of Lithuania are a captive nation of Communist Russia. They are subjugated and enslaved under the brutal yoke of communism. Its people have paid a great toll in human suffering. Yet, despite this suffering, they have never given up their fight for freedom and their hopes for national liberation.

The people of Lithuania are sealed off from any contact with the rest of the world. No one can go there, and no one is permitted to leave the country. What little news seeps through the Iron Curtain from Lithuania tells us that the indomitable desire of the Lithuanian people for freedom and independence has not been extinguished—that it still lives on in their minds and in their hearts.

The annual observance of the anniversary of Lithuania's Independence Day is one way of keeping alive this desire for freedom, as well as the spiritual affinity of the Lithuanian people with all other freedom fighters and with all nations enjoying the fruits of freedom. It also serves as moral encouragement to the nearly 1 million people of Lithuanian descent in this country who commemorate this day and renew their pledge of support to their kinsmen in Lithuania.

I am proud to know that Americans of Lithuanian descent have not forgotten their kinsmen abroad. On this occasion of the anniversary of Lithuania's independence, we send our heartfelt greetings. We pray and hope for a better day to come—when the Communist nightmare will meet its ignominious end. We pray that this day will soon come, and the people of Lithuania will know the true meaning of freedom and national independence, and their country will again take its rightful place among the free nations.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1918, was a happy day for Lithuania, for on that historic date, after more than a century of Czarist oppression, she achieved her independence. During the following two decades, this democratic Republic made rapid progress. Lithuania was a proud member of the community of nations.

Unfortunately, World War II marked the end of liberty for Lithuania. A new conqueror, Soviet Russia, engulfed the country and extinguished freedom. Since that time, the people of this captive country have been unable to mark February 16 as a day of celebration. Accordingly, it has become an occasion when the free world, in the name of these silenced people, protests the fraudulent incorporation of this helpless nation into the Soviet Union.

In this country Lithuanian-Americans and all other Americans express this concern for these enslaved Lithuanians by proclaiming that their conscience will never know peace until these subjugated people once again will resume their rightful place among the free nations of the world. Furthermore, we Americans take this opportunity to reassure the captive Lithuanian people that we have never accepted their bondage and that we will never condone any agreement perpetuating that enslavement.

It is also fitting on this 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence that we remind these captive people that we have not forsaken them. In all fairness, we should not encourage false hopes for liberation. But we should assure them that we will constantly work realistically for the truths expressed in the Atlantic Charter, that all peoples have the right to choose the form of government under which they will live.

Our feelings for these oppressed people on this anniversary day are perhaps best expressed by the words of our own Declaration of Independence—that all peoples have the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We are confident that these truths, in the end, will prevail and that freedom and liberty once more will be restored in Lithuania.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to the patriotic and freedom-loving Lithuanians throughout the world, who on February 16, 1957, will observe the 39th anniversary of their national independence.

Perhaps no national holiday is so meaningful and of such great significance as that which marks the beginning of a people as an independent sovereign nation, its independence day. This is true for all nations, but perhaps more so for a nation such as Lithuania which had the misfortune of losing its independence, which has long suffered under alien rulers in the homeland, which then succeeded in regaining its independence, only to lose it again.

More than 700 years ago, Lithuania was a leading power in eastern Europe, but by the beginning of the 19th century it had been absorbed by the Russian Empire and had lost its independence. In 1918, the Lithuanians regained their independence and for two full decades thereafter enjoyed their freedom. They lost it again early in the last war.

Lithuanians in their homeland are not permitted by their Communist masters to celebrate this occasion, at least not outwardly. Fortunately, the Communists cannot see what goes on in the hearts of the people, and I am sure that in their hearts, the people of Lithuania will be joining with their brethren of the free world in commemorating their day. Let us all hope and pray that soon the Lithuanians will once more become the masters of their fate, and in a free Lithuania celebrate independence day.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to call attention to the proclamations issued by the Honorable Goodwin Knight, Governor, State of California, and the Honorable Norris Poulson, mayor, city of Los Angeles, Calif., in commemoration of Lithuanian Independence Day. The proclamations follows:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Sacramento.

Seven hundred and four years ago, Mindaugas united all Lithuanians and declared that country bordered by Latvia, Poland, and the Baltic Sea a Christian Kingdom. Many years later on February 16, 1918, Lithuania was proclaimed an independent Republic by the people, climaxing a long struggle for freedom by a courageous and gallant nation.

Today, tens of thousands of Americans of Lithuanian origin and ancestry live in the Golden State. On February 16 of each year these fine citizens commemorate the freedom of their land of origin with special services and meetings emphasizing their faith in the American way of life and demonstrating their belief in the inalienable rights of people. They look with hope to the day that this country of their ancestry will once again be able to taste the sweetness of freedom.

Therefore, I, Goodwin J. Knight, Governor of California, do hereby urge my fellow citizens to pay tribute to those of Lithuanian lineage; to take part in programs commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day, and to offer a solemn prayer that their day of liberation will soon dawn.

Cordially,

GOODWIN J. KNIGHT,
Governor.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Los Angeles, Calif.

PROCLAMATION

To the Citizens of Los Angeles, Greetings:

Whereas the Republic of Lithuania came into being 39 years ago and it took its rightful place in the family of nations after being denied independence by Czarist Russia for more than a century; and

Whereas as a result of World War II, the Iron Curtain of Communist Russia has descended on Lithuania, establishing a reign of terror in this freedom-loving country; and

Whereas thousands of persons of Lithuanian descent in the Los Angeles area will hold a mass meeting commemorating the independence of their homeland which one day will arise from enslavement and occupation by Soviet forces.

Now, therefore, as mayor of the city of Los Angeles, I do hereby proclaim Saturday, February 16, 1957, as Independence for Lithuania Day, and I direct public attention to the high value that Americans of Lithuanian descent place on the freedom which we all too often take for granted, and I further urge that we join with them in praying for the freedom of their native country.

NORRIS POULSON,
Mayor.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, February 16 is the 39th anniversary of Lithuania's independence—again this year a forbidden holiday in Lithuania still dominated by Soviet Russia. In this country, however, a million Lithuanian-Americans will in all solemnity pledge their moral and spiritual support to their oppressed and suffering compatriots.

America joins with them in their pledge and in their hope and dreams of the coming day that shall see Lithuania once more stand free and independent. That day will come! The despotic totalitarian power now crushing the proud Lithuanian people cannot endure forever. Lithuania shall again take her place among the free nations of the world in the not too far distant future.

On this anniversary of her independence I am happy and proud to join with her people here in our country and with her people in the homeland in a heartfelt pledge to continue all efforts to speed the birth of Lithuania's freedom.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity to join with my colleagues in the commemoration of the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence which will fall on Saturday, February 16.

This valient little nation has historically been the victim of domination by its power neighbors and it was only in

1918 that she was able to declare her independence. Tragically her freedom was short lived and now once again she is in the unhappy situation of being dominated by a totalitarian power.

But although freedom does not prevail in Lithuania today, the spirit of freedom is fully prevalent in the hearts of the people and we can take hope that their determination and courage will eventually gain for them their rightful place in the family of nations.

We here in America who are fortunate enough to enjoy the fruits of democracy are deeply sympathetic with those persons behind the Iron Curtain who are not blessed with a democratic government, and we congratulate them for their courage. We are sure that their struggle will not be in vain.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, February 16, will mark the 39th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. On this occasion nearly one million Lithuanian Americans will in an atmosphere of solemnity commemorate the day, offering spiritual and moral support to their dear ones in the homeland, captives of the Soviet tyrants.

This should represent a day of rejoicing and happiness but unfortunately it is not. For Lithuania, while it courageously set out as an independent nation, is now a Communist slave state.

The brave people of this little nation have survived other oppressions and the information gathered through news seeping through the Iron Curtain indicates that an active resistance movement still exists there. The people have retained their indomitable spirit and despite the ruthless Communist methods to enslave and destroy, the Lithuanians flatly refuse to recognize Communist Russia as their overlord. Their determination not to show allegiance to Moscow exemplifies the sterling character of these extraordinary people.

The people of the United States must continue to send encouragement to the people of Lithuania. We cannot stand aloof and watch as communism tramples upon them. My sincere wish is that the flag of freedom will soon wave again over these courageous people. Their many sacrifices will not be in vain for their determination and invincible spirit will surely lead them to final victory over their cruel aggressors.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Lithuanians who have come to the United States have brought with them an earnest dedication to the principles of freedom. In the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence of February 16, 1918, the people of Lithuania reasserted their adherence to the democratic way of life. For over 20 years, Lithuania remained a free republic of a proud and independent people.

The United States Government still recognizes the independence of Lithuania because it cannot accept the ruthless Soviet annexation of this ancient land against the will of its people. Our continued recognition of Lithuanian independence testifies to our overwhelming belief in the justice of the Lithuanian cause and our determination to let the whole world know our faith in the ultimate restoration of a free nation.

Today, in marking the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, we reaffirm that faith.

To Americans of Lithuanian descent, both those who are now citizens of this country and those who are in the process of achieving citizenship, all Americans extend a cordial hand of fellowship. All of us in some measure share a common pride and gain a common inspiration in the undying free spirit of Lithuania.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to add my voice to the many the world over who will, on February 16, acclaim the spirit of the Lithuanian people on the 39th anniversary of their independence.

I salute again the Lithuanian American Information Center for its continuing efforts to remind the world of the sorrowful plight of Lithuania.

I salute your courageous countrymen who, despite overwhelming obstacles, tenaciously hold to their principles which fostered the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence.

Freemen everywhere will not forget the people of Lithuania in their efforts to regain the right of self-determination. We must continue to support the policy of nonrecognition of the Russian annexation of Lithuania.

Again, congratulations on this memorable day in the history of a free people.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, 1918 was a memorable year for Lithuania, for it was in November of that year that Lithuania became an independent Republic. But it was a compartively short-lived independence, as the Soviet Russian troops occupied and overran that territory in 1940. In true Soviet style, the citizens of Lithuania were ruthlessly persecuted and their freedoms were outlawed. In spite of such tyranny, however, these brave people held on and resisted all attempts to make them forget they were Lithuanians. They were deported, enslaved, imprisoned, and deprived of necessities, yet they continued, and still continue, their fight against their oppressors.

We in this country are aware of their attempts to regain their beloved freedom and hope and pray with them that their independence will soon again be realized. We salute them on this, the 39th anniversary of their declaration of independence.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that the House should pause on this day to join with Lithuanian people and other lovers of freedom throughout the world in celebrating Lithuanian Independence Day.

Although the darkness of oppression now falls upon the historic land of Lithuania, this day forcibly brings to mind the indomitable will of the Lithuanian people to recapture the freedom which has been stolen from them by ruthless Communist dictatorship.

The history of the noble Lithuanian people shows unmistakably that freedom is part of the Lithuanian character, and for that freedom the people of Lithuania will never cease to struggle and to fight and to make every sacrifice.

What has happened in Lithuania in recent years would probably dishearten and discourage less hardy advocates of freedom than the Lithuanian people. But, thank God, though their lot has been difficult, and the path bestrewn with suffering, privation, hunger, and brutality, the people themselves have never faltered in their basic aims to recover control over their own Government and to restore their precious, God-given liberties.

The presence of so many persons of Lithuanian blood, heritage, and background here among us in America furnishes us with special reason to be vitally interested in the problem of Lithuanian liberation, because the Lithuanians here in this country have won the respect, esteem, and regard of all our fellow citizens for their unfailing loyalty throughout the years, in war and peace, to the free principles for which our own great Nation stands.

It is a happy circumstance indeed that America has had the benefit of the admixture of the illustrious Lithuanian heritage which has been a source of great enrichment of our own national life. The Lithuanians in this country have not only shared our opportunities to live in this greatest of all democracies, but they have also assumed their full burden of responsibility for guarding, protecting, and developing the Nation. Lithuanian-Americans are among our foremost citizens in every field, and I am proud indeed to acknowledge and laud the striking example of fine Americanism which they furnish to all our fellow citizens. It is my special privilege to enjoy the friendship of a great many persons of Lithuanian ancestry. In my view the nation that has them for citizens is indeed fortunate, and the people who have them as neighbors all attest to their splendid personal qualities and their unexcelled patriotism and devotion to the truths of freedom.

It is for us as a Nation to continue to exhibit our friendship for the Lithuanian people and the cause of Lithuanian independence which we celebrate today.

By our words here, as well as by our official action, let us provide them with the assurance that this great free Nation will ever be interested in and concerned with the rebirth of their freedom and the restoration of their democratic government, that we pledge ourselves anew to the principles of self-determination and to aid and assist in every way we can in the reestablishment of free institutions in their afflicted country.

Let us make it clear again on this great day to the oppressors of Lithuania that free men and free women everywhere will never cease their efforts until freedom once again is restored to the great Lithuanian nation and the other helpless, defenseless peoples suffering under the cruel, heartless lash of Communist tyranny.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, once again this year as in recent past years, we are privileged to give public recognition to one of the truly valiant little countries who continue their struggle against the forces of communism. To Lithuania on the 39th anniversary of

her independence, I offer my prayerful wishes that she may soon join that commonwealth of free nations.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, today is the 39th anniversary of the day which all Lithuanians remember and revere because it is commemorated as the inauguration of Lithuania's independence.

In spite of cruel Communist oppression the spirit of independence will always be part of the Lithuanian people. Today must serve to remind us of our duty to these oppressed people. We must resolve in concert with other freedom-loving people, that the enslaved people shall be aided to realize their dreams of a return to freedom. With the aid of all free nations—and the free nations must act positively and forcefully in order to maintain their precious freedom—and the underground movement behind the Iron Curtain, the day will come when Lithuania and other Communist-dominated countries will be restored to liberty and freedom.

Lithuania attained its political independence at the close of World War I. For the next 20 years, the country prospered economically and made great strides in social and cultural fields. Twenty short, precious years, and again in 1940 Lithuania was overtaken by a powerful tyrant. We are all too familiar with reports of brutalities and massacres which have been inflicted upon the Lithuanian people during the last 17 years. A large part of Lithuania's population have been deported to slave-labor camps. Nevertheless, in the face of all such tyrannical measures the mass of people are still carrying on their resistance to their oppressors. Twenty short, previous years imbedded in the hearts of all patriotic Lithuanians the spirit of freedom. Tyrants can destroy men and institutions, but they can never destroy the love of liberty.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, February 16, is the 39th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. Though this largest and most populated of the three Baltic states has been deprived, by the Soviet Government, of the place she once took among free nations, I think it proper that we join the nearly 1 million American Lithuanians in commemorating with their brethren this day, the spirit of which has not diminished.

In light of such defiance as burns behind the walls of other Communist satellites, that is, Hungary, I urge that we stand also in recognition of an anti-Communist Lithuania. Even under the blanket of tyranny—first spread out when the Nazis and Soviets carved up the Polish corridor in 1939—Lithuania has not forgotten the value of freedom. Here too, we trust, will occur someday a revival of independence.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, another year has passed and once again we approach the 16th day of February, the day which means so much to the people of Lithuania, the anniversary of the declaration of independence of that country.

Those of us who have friends and neighbors of Lithuanian descent realize how much we are indebted to Lithuania and how greatly the sons and daughters of that country have contributed to the progress of America.

Our hearts go out to those in the Lithuanian homeland, who have suffered so greatly under the domination of the Communist government of Russia.

The recent courageous struggle for freedom against overwhelming odds in Hungary made clear to all the suffering and the tyranny by which people have been confronted in all the captive nations which have been forced against their will behind the Iron Curtain.

All of us appreciate Lithuania's fine contribution to the world as a whole during the period of its independence.

All of us share the sorrow of its people in the termination of that independence by force.

All of us join on this memorable occasion in sympathetic greetings to all those in Lithuania and in the hope for the dawn of a new day in which they may again enjoy freedom as a nation and again contribute to the progress of the free world.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday the 16th of February, the men and women of Lithuania and Lithuanian ancestry will be celebrating the 39th anniversary of that nation's independence. Lithuanians everywhere except in their own homeland, where her people still writhe beneath the iron heel of a Communist dictatorship. And if we in free lands can do no more than offer heartfelt sympathy to this proud but enslaved nation, by so doing we can at the same time serve warning to all oppressors that free men everywhere look with scornful disdain and repugnance on their deeds of tyranny. If they who strive with godless might to put out the bright spark of freedom that still smoulders in the breasts of those they believe have been conquered would only thumb backwards through the pages of history they would read there in glowing letters the indisputable forecast of their ultimate failure. For just as a tiny band of men led by a humble fisherman 2,000 years ago rose up in triumph over mighty Rome and left an imprint on all time to come, so too will tiny Lithuania and the other oppressed nations of the world one day fling off the chains of pagan communism and know again that freedom under God, of which today they only dream.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 16th, the freedom-loving people of Luthuania will celebrate the 39th anniversary of her independence. However, this celebration will not be filled with joy and happiness because Communist treachery still continues to subjugate this nation into a state of slavery.

While observance of this anniversary is not permitted in that country because of Soviet occupation, the one million Lithuanian-Americans in this country will commemorate the day with renewed pledges of moral and spiritual support of their people.

We know of the courage of these people and that their cry for liberty and freedom cannot and will not be extinguished.

We, in America, who enjoy the great liberties and freedoms of a great democracy, extend our warm understanding and encouragement to the Lithuanians in their determined struggle for freedom and independence. We hope that before long these sinister obstacles will be removed and that peace, security and independence will again be enjoyed by Lithuania and its people.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 16, the thousands of Lithuanian-Americans throughout this country will celebrate the observance of the 39th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. I desire to associate myself with the gentleman from Ohio in calling the attention of the House to this occasion.

Like her Baltic neighbors to the north, Estonia and Latvia, Lithuania was one of the first of the captive nations to lose her sovereignty and freedom to Communist tyranny. But even though she was unable to resist the might of the invading Soviet armies, even though she has since then been unable to openly assert the true desire of her brave people for independence, the heroic people of Lithuania have shown in many ways their belief in and adherence to the principle of genuine self-determination. They have displayed to the free world that their spirit has not been crushed and that they, too, still have a passionate conviction that freedom will again be theirs. It is important on this anniversary day to reassure them that the people of the United States share that conviction to the fullest degree.

It is also important to remind the House that the display of courage and patriotism of the Hungarian people which thrilled the world last fall is likewise to be found among all the captive peoples of Communist Europe, including of course, the Lithuanian people. I therefore wish to join my other colleagues in paying tribute to the people of Lithuania on this occasion of their independence and again to repeat to them that the Government and the people of the United States will do everything possible to the effect that that sacred right of man, immortal freedom, will again be theirs and that one day the unconquerable spirit of independence will break down the Iron Curtain and spread throughout what is today the Communist slave empire. Freedom, that precious commodity which is God-given cannot permanently be denied by the works of men, no matter how brutal the forces of repression.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in this House 1 year ago I had the pleasure of commencing the tributes to the people of Lithuania on their day of independence. I also introduced a resolution stating:

> That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should never agree to a perpetuation of the injustice [the annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union] and should morally aid the people of Lithuania in restoring their freedom, human rights, and political independence.

Recently this resolution has become vitally significant, for the Hungarian revolt and its subsequent repercussions throughout all of Eastern Europe and the Baltic have buttressed and substantiated the beliefs, hopes, and deep resolves expressed by all of us at that time. Furthermore, our fervent desire that Soviet colonialism should be exposed

to the world also has been realized with the rebellion of the people of Hungary against the tyrannous rule of Communist Russia. Hungary, one of the Soviet satellites, has demonstrated that the strength of a nation's will to be independent and free can shatter even the steel-like tentacles of the Soviet Communist octopus. This demonstration of courage has made Hungary the symbol of liberty for all the world. It has shown a people may prefer to die free rather than live enslaved. And Lithuania, a so-called "autonomous" republic within the Soviet Union, also has shown this same indomitable will to resist tyranny and oppression. In fact, Lithuania today stands in the vanguard with Hungary in the fight against Soviet oppression, because she is the first Baltic republic publicly to express anti-Communist feelings. In December 1956 the first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party's Central Committee, Antanas Snechkus, admitted to the press that "bourgeois nationalist elements and their various accomplices begin to raise their heads." He also admitted the unrest in Lithuania had been encouraged by the Hungarian revolt. We can make, therefore, no greater gesture to the Lithuanians on this day than to reaffirm our declarations of last February and to continue to press for an end to the grave injustices the people of Lithuania suffer at the hands of Soviet Russia.

Historically, Lithuania has had to cope with the steady encroachments of Russia for centuries. Repeatedly she has tried to roll back Russian incursions, but the power and pressures of Muscovy always proved relentless and implacable. Harsh as has been the treatment meted out by the Russian invaders, however, the Lithuanian desire for freedom and national independence was never crushed. Finally on February 16, 1918, a Lithuanian National Council proclaimed the reestablishment of an independent Lithuania. But this period of independence was short lived for in July 1940 Lithuania was made the 14th republic of the Soviet Union.

During the period of Soviet domination, resistance efforts developed and underground groups began to plague the Communist officials. Exploitation, forced labor, and collectivization were resisted so effectively that Moscow openly admited her dissatisfaction with this inadequate "sovietization" of Lithuania. And the national determination of the Lithuanians to achieve political unity and to regain an independent status is at this moment worrying the Soviet Union. The candid admission this last December by the first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party's Central Committee that the armed revolt in Hungary had encouraged "reaction" and caused "principles of party spirit" to be undermined is a revelatory disclosure of Communist difficulties in Lithuania.

In conclusion, therefore, we Members of Congress can take a great measure of pride from the fact we have gone on record that the United States should "morally aid the people of Lithuania in restoring their freedom, human rights, and political independence."

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 16, Lithuania will be observing—but, unfortunately, not celebrating—the 39th anniversary of her independence. Since the spring of 1940 this brave small country on the Baltic has been a Soviet concentration camp and its people victims of ruthless Soviet domination. Tens of thousands of Lithuanians have been deported to slave labor camps in Siberia. The iron chain of Communist tyranny keeps Lithuania in a state of constant terror and exploitation by the Kremlin masters.

It is fitting and proper that in the Congress of the United States, which represents the hearts and minds of the American people, we express our faith in the rebirth of a free and independent Lithuania. Not only do we join the many Americans of Lithuanian descent, but we join the free peoples all over the globe who remember Lithuania as once a free nation and who pray for her delivery from Kremlin domination and control.

We must continue to give heart to the millions upon millions of enslaved peoples all over the world. They must never lose hope. Their faith in us must never be diminished. More important, however, than our own faith and our support is their own determination that they will be free again. The people of Lithuania have never lost their courage and their determination. With a deep faith in a Divine Creator, they know that liberty and freedom must ultimately triumph over tyranny.

As chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I join with my many colleagues in a tribute to the brave, gallant, and freedom loving Lithuanian people. They will one day, I am certain, regain their freedom and independence and again take their rightful place among free peoples who are striving together to make this a better world.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish once again to pay tribute to the gallant spirit of freedom of the Lithuanian people.

February 16 marks the 39th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

Here in the Congress of the United States we pause in our occupation to commemorate this day. But in Lithuania there is no such celebration. There is only silent prayer.

Therefore, it is only fitting that we who enjoy the blessings of liberty and freedom of speech, pay tribute to these people who know not defeat, to a nation whose pride has been trampled, but whose head is held high.

It is our fervent prayer that one day soon February 16 will be observed as Lithuanian Independence Day not only in the United States, but also across the seas in the little country which knows not surrender.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, throughout the 19th century, for more than a hundred years, some 3 million devout and patriotic Lithuanians worked and prayed for the day of their freedom from Czarist oppression. At last they saw their cherished dream come true in 1918. When the Czarist regime in Russia collapsed, they saw their chance for freedom and proclaimed their national independence on February 16 of that year.

For more than two decades Lithuanians enjoyed their newly won independence. They organized a democratic form of government, rebuilt their war-ravaged country, revived their national institutions, introduced many progressive social and economic legislative measures and in a short time Lithuania became a respected member in the family of nations. Unfortunately, however, the new republic was not to have a long life, and in the ensuing world turmoil of the late thirties its independence was endangered. In the fall of 1939, it was forced into a nonaggression pact with the Soviet Union, and in the summer of 1940 it was incorporated into the Soviet empire.

Since then Lithuanians have not known freedom. During the war the country was under Nazi occupation for 2 years; in 1944 the dreaded Red army returned with its commissars and secret police, and it has been there ever since. Literally hundreds of thousands of innocent victims, men, women, and children, have been brutally deported into the Soviet Union slave-labor camps. Where in the history of the world can there be found a more vivid example of inhumanity? Where can there be found a more vivid example and warning of the goal of a totalitarian, avaricious force such as the communism of Soviet Russia? For other examples and warnings we need only point to the fate of Poland, Czechoslovakia, China, Manchuria, northern Korea, Indochina, and yes, even more recent, Hungary. Is it any wonder that these brave people will never cease to fight and pray that the Soviet yoke which they have carried around their necks, but not in their hearts, might again be broken.

Lithuanians have been cut off from the outside world and the country has been forcibly estranged from the free world. Behind the Iron Curtain, Lithuanians cannot celebrate their independence day, but here, in the heart of the free world they can, and do. In fact, I am looking forward to Sunday, the 17th, when I will be the guest of the Lithuanian-American Council in Waterbury, Conn., participating in exercises commemorating the 39th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my colleagues in the House on this solemn occasion, and I salute the peoples of Lithuania and their Baltic neighbors for their courageous and unconquerable spirit, their inflexible determination to restore their lands to freedom which, one day, will unquestionably be crowned with victory.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, another year has passed since I spoke here on the occasion of the anniversary of Lithuania's independence. It was a year of great historical events and drastic political changes. We have witnessed a bloody uprising in Hungary preceded by a calmer but, perhaps, more effective revolution in Poland.

Unfortunately, this cannot be said about Lithuania, whose 39th anniversary we are celebrating once again. And

what is worse, is the fact that here, as in the case with the other Baltic States we do not deal even with the so-called peoples democracies, but merely with another republic of the Soviet Union. Lithuania, a great country with a great history, great traditions, and a great people is being represented by the "gentlemen" of the Kremlin.

After the "thaw" of Kremlin's tactics that followed the death of Stalin, we watched carefully developments in communist-occupied countries. At first we were amazed by the sudden speech of Khrushchev denouncing his longtime friend, colleague, and disciple—Stalin. To prove his "sincerity" he slightly opened the Soviet border admitting Western tourists, businessmen, and correspondents. Most of them visited Moscow, some went to Leningrad, Stalingrad, and a very few went as far as the Urals. None of them were shown Kolyma, and other places where there are still large concentrations of slave labor camps, with inmates from all Communist-conquered countries but mainly from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. I wonder how many of the visitors have asked permission to go to those latter countries, and see for themselves what Soviet terror has done to them. How many have been inquisitive enough to see the changes that have affected these countries in the past decade, from the day when Moscow made them "Lithuanian Republic of the U. S. S. R." and so forth? A complete blackout has descended on the Soviet-dominated Baltic States and today for us here in the free world it is even difficult to determine how many of the original natives are still in their countries and how many have been deported. This, perhaps, has been the greatest tragedy of these states.

Mr. Speaker, only a quarter of a century ago the great President Wilson, when drafting his 14 points for the newly established League of Nations, did not forget to bring Lithuania with the other neighboring countries into the family of all sovereign states. We did not forget her when the Atlantic Charter was drafted and it's meaning referred just as much to her as to Poland, Estonia or Latvia. I can see no reason why we should forget her today. Time and again on previous occasions have I mentioned her glorious past as an independent and sovereign state and as a great democracy. Lithuania's heroic stand against foreign domination—and there were many of them—has been stressed year in and year out by all the distinguished colleagues of this great democratic body, but, unfortunately, so far in vain.

It seems incredible that the fate of the Baltic States has so far been sealed and the fact that they are mere republics of the U. S. S. R. has been taken for granted. Isn't there anyone in the present administration who has courage enough to ask the Soviet leader, point blank, how long they intend to play their game? Isn't there anyone dealing in an official capacity with the Soviets who will finally ask them whether they are trying to annihilate the peoples of these states just as much as Hitler tried to annihilate the Jews?

Today, on the occasion of the 39th anniversary of Lithuania's independence let us think again before it is too late. Let us keep our honor and the promises given years back, and not long ago, and let us pray that Lithuania and the other Baltic States shall find themselves among the other free nations in a free world.

For though usurpers sway the rule awhile,
Yet heavens are just and time suppresseth wrongs.

—*Shakespeare*, King Henry VI.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, as I have done in the past, I am again joining with my colleagues who will speak for Lithuania in the House today. February 16 marks the 39th Independence Anniversary of this country. Because the date falls on a Saturday of this year, we are paying tribute to courageous Lithuania today.

On February 16, 1918, after more than 120 years of oppression under Czarist Russia, Lithuania proclaimed its independence. Although her freedom lasted for only 21 years, in that short period of time Lithuania prospered under a democratic system of government and became a respected member of the international community.

Tragically, this hard-earned independence was lost during World War II. With the aid of a so-called mutual security pact, imposed under the threat of force, the Soviets incorporated the Lithuanian nation into the Soviet Union. Once again their freedom was obliterated.

The tactics employed by the Reds to subdue this helpless nation profoundly shocked the American people. Furthermore, the Soviets have continued to use terror tactics to keep the Lithuanians under subjugation.

Although still enslaved, today—the 39th Anniversary of their independence—the Lithuanian people have not lost their desire for freedom. Despite the constant threat of persecution and deportation, resistance continues in this brave country. Positive proof that opposition continues is seen in the number of underground newspapers published in Lithuania today.

Furthermore, it has been estimated that in spite of Communist brutality, Lithuania has the smallest Communist Party membership of any of the satellite countries—approximately 0.87 percent of the entire population. Even the Communists in Lithuania admit that resistance continues. Recently, the head of the Red party in Lithuania stated that the Hungarian revolt had once again stirred the nationalists in the country.

The American people have not forgotten Lithuania's constant struggle against oppression. Evidence of our concern was the formation by Congress of the House Baltic Committee to investigate the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union, legislation which received my wholehearted support. Eyewitness testimony given before this committee allowed all the world to see the pattern of Communist aggression in the Baltic countries. This well-documented investigation should be a source of encouragement to these oppressed people by assuring them that we have not condoned their captivity.

This anniversary date gives the American people an opportunity to express this thought once again. We have not become reconciled to their enslavement. Lithuanian independence day also allows freedom-loving Americans a chance to join with Lithuanian-Americans in protesting the inhuman tactics of Soviet aggression as well as transmitting a message of hope for the eventual freedom from their bondage. We are confident that Lithuania's will for freedom will prevail and the Soviet despotism will not perpetuate its rule over a nation that loves God, freedom and liberty.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the proclamation of our former colleague, the Honorable Norris Poulson, mayor of Los Angeles, designating February 16 as Independence for Lithuania Day, strikes a responsive chord in many Members of this Congress.

Since we are in such hearty agreement, I ask unanimous consent to have it reproduced in the RECORD.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Los Angeles, Calif.

PROCLAMATION

To the Citizens of Los Angeles, Greetings:

Whereas the Republic of Lithuania came into being 39 years ago and it took its rightful place in the family of nations after being denied independence by czarist Russia for more than a century; and

Whereas as a result of World War II the Iron Curtain of Communist Russia has descended on Lithuania, establishing a reign of terror in this freedom-loving country; and

Whereas thousands of persons of Lithuanian descent in the Los Angeles area will hold a mass meeting commemorating the independence of their homeland which one day will arise from enslavement and occupation by Soviet forces.

Now, therefore, as mayor of the city of Los Angeles, I do hereby proclaim Saturday, February 16, 1957, as Independence for Lithuania Day, and I direct public attention to the high value that Americans of Lithuanian descent place on the freedom which we all too often take for granted, and I further urge that we join with them in praying for the freedom of their native country.

NORRIS POULSON,
Mayor.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1957, will mark the 39th anniversary of the independence of the heavily oppressed state of Lithuania, whose people are forced to live under Soviet domination.

While the Iron Curtain prohibits anyone from entering or leaving this small, but gallant state, the spirit of independence and the will for freedom knows no barriers. This indomitable spirit never left Lithuania and continues to exist among these valiant people as it has throughout their long history of resistance to tyranny and subjugation.

Having experienced a free form of government in the past, they will not cease in their courageous struggle for liberty.

The people of Lithuania must know that their countrymen throughout the world and we, in the United States particularly, have not forgotten them. In marking this day, we reaffirm our faith in this brave country's devotion to liberty and independence and express the hope

that we may soon again welcome Lithuania as a member of the free world community.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, I am honored to pay tribute to the people of Lithuania. That country, which had stagnated for over 100 years under Czarist Russian imprisonment, underwent a glorious renaissance after it won its freedom in 1918. For 22 years Lithuania occupied an honorable place among the family of nations. By their dedication to democratic principles and their gigantic achievements toward economic and social betterment, the Lithuanian people gave ample demonstration of their capacity for self-rule.

Then came in 1940 the monstrous crime of the Kremlin. The Communists, after agreeing with Hitler on a division of Europe, cynically marched into Lithuania to "protect" its independence. The terrors of the mass deportations, murders, and religious persecutions inflicted upon Lithuania by the Communist tyrants are well known. We know, too, of the heroic resistance of the Lithuanian people to the mailed Communist fist that still clutches the nation by its throat.

On this, the anniversary of Lithuania's independence, we send the greetings of the American people to the captive peoples of Lithuania. We send these words of assurance that they have not been forgotten in their darkest hour. We send our vow to keep up the battle against the Communist conspiracy until the day when Lithuania, and all men, are again free to choose their own destiny. We pray that, with God's help, the day will come speedily.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have the opportunity to participate in the observance of the 39th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuania's independence.

During Lithuania's brief span of independence, she earned the admiration and respect of the family of free nations; she made great progress in the social, cultural, economic, and political fields. When Lithuania became the victim of Communist aggression, it was a tragic blow not only to her people there, but to the many Lithuanian Americans and the friends of Lithuania throughout the world.

There can be no rejoicing in Lithuania today. For that reason, it is highly important that we take recognition of her anniversary of independence and let her know that we are thinking of her people and that we support her in her desire to regain the freedom she has lost. We know that the people of Lithuania have determined that they will one day regain their independence; we admire them for their courage and faith in the cause of freedom. They have our promise of continued moral support and we hope that the enslaved Lithuanians will find some comfort in the fact that they have our great respect and sympathy and that free men everywhere look forward to the day when Lithuania will be free of the burdens of oppression under which she now suffers.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, Lithuanian independence day on February 16 will not be forgotten in Lithuania. But it will only be observed in silence and in silent prayer.

In the United States, on the contrary, the day will be widely commemorated by the nearly 1 million Lithuanian Americans in every State of the Union. On this occasion they will take the opportunity, as they have in the past, to renew their pledge of moral and spiritual support to their enslaved kinsmen.

The spirit of liberty has not died among the Lithuanian people in spite of the long night of their captivity. From the meager bits of news trickling through the Iron Curtain, we know that there is an invincible will for freedom and independence and that a resistance movement does exist. But the believers in freedom struggle against overwhelming odds. A recent report tells the story of tens of thousands of young people in the Baltic countries being deported to distant parts of the Soviet Union for so-called labor service. Most of these will never return to their native soil. Thus the Soviet Government is renewing the worst practices of the Stalinist era in an effort to extinguish the flaming hopes lighted by the Hungarian revolt.

We can but hope and pray that our generation will live to see the dawn of a new day in Eastern and Central Europe where 100 million people long for liberation. But if this day is to dawn, it will dawn as the result of the labors of those who look toward the future. The peoples of captive Europe and their friends in the West must look to the past, yes, for inspiration, for examples of that dauntless courage which is the eternal heritage of free men. But there is danger in too much looking to the past, the danger of languor, of vain regrets, of inacitivity.

And so, in looking to the future, in what direction should the efforts of the friends of Lithuania be joined, in striving for a liberated Lithuania, for a liberated Europe?

In the first place, we should do what lies in our power to share with the captive peoples our continued hope and faith in the eventual liberation. True, the horror of modern weapons has added a new dimension to the ancient battle for freedom. These weapons in the hands of tyrants provide a powerful deterrent to the forces of freedom. But it could never be said in the past, and it cannot be said now, that the sword, however mighty, is mightier than the spirit. In captive Europe the human will, the human mind, the human heart will yet prevail over the brute forces of the despots.

By the very spirit of resistance, fed by hope, the captive peoples can do much to deter further Soviet imperialism and to weaken the Soviet system. For example, although we may be inclined to think that the Hungarian revolution has ended in failure, has it indeed wholly failed? Has it not laid bare to the world the fact that the Soviet despots can never again count on the loyalties and the arms of the peoples of the European satellites? Has not this knowledge offered new opportunities to the West to press for a peaceful return by the Soviet Union to its prewar borders?

In the second place, the concept of the liberation of Eastern and Central Europe must be kept in step with the concept of European unity. European integration has been making rapid strides since the cold war was launched in all its virulent fury. Our hope and faith in an eventual rollback of the Iron Curtain should take into account that the Europe of the future should not follow too closely the pattern of the Europe of the past, whose rivalries and conflicts led to such tragic consequences. The recent somber history of the Baltic States points to the weakness and vulnerability of small sovereign nations in a lawless world. Congress has gone on record in favor of a strong, united Europe. This is an objective that promotes the true interests of all Europeans as well as of the United States. Indeed, the Assembly of Captive European Nations, representing Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania has declared in its statement of aims and principles that—

> Our work * * * is intended to serve the general interest of the free world through the integration of our homelands into a united Europe.

Central to this concept of European unity is the belief in the inalienable rights of the individual, rights which in their fundamental aspects should be beyond the power of government to curtail. This belief is the cement that binds the larger Atlantic community.

May the friends of the subjugated Lithuanian people find ways of helping to keep alive their faith in eventual liberation and of contributing toward the strength of a united Europe which could eventually throw its protective mantel around the captive nations.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, the fight for freedom and independence is a never-ending one and once achieved a nation must be very vigilant and alert to protect its liberty. Our own history reveals this to be the fact because we won our independence through courage and faith in the ultimate justice of things and indeed through great sacrifice. Once achieved, we have continued to make sacrifices in order to protect our sovereign independence.

Such being the case we as a Nation naturally look with great sympathy and a feeling of fraternity to those countries who in this troubled world today have lost their freedom through the domination of some overpowering force. Therefore, it is very fitting for us to pause a moment in our active lives to do honor to a little nation established many years ago, who cherished its freedom but now exists under the domination of a foreign power. It is a privilege to salute the unquenchable desire for freedom which is characteristic of the Lithuanian people and in commemoration of the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence let us offer a fervent prayer that the constricting bonds of domination by others may soon be severed and that once again this great people may enjoy their inheritance in the knowledge of the sympathetic support of our country that stands forth as the champion of personal liberty.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 39th anniversary of the Lithuanian independence. It is a privilege for me at this time to give encouragement and support to the ideals and principles of the hundreds of thousands of American citizens of Lithuanian birth and descent on the occasion of this anniversary, and to pay tribute to the captive people of Lithuania, whose bold spirit has been an inspiration to the whole freedom-loving world. In Rhode Island we have a segment of the population who are of Lithuanian extraction. They have made a most worthy contribution to the civic life of our community. In their diligent work, in their respect for the Constitution and the laws of our community, they are exemplary citizens.

The Lithuanians behind the Iron Curtain look to America as the beacon for ships of freedom throughout the world.

The people of Lithuania through 8 centuries enjoyed liberty and self-government for long intervals. They have also been oppressed for long periods, during which their independence disappeared. They have been the victims of aggressors and have suffered through the centuries from attacks and rule of tyrants.

In 1918 Lithuania, still threatened with foreign pressure, was determined to rid her lands of invaders. The last battle with the Red forces was fought in 1919, and a peace treaty was signed in Moscow. Following this action, Lithuania was soon recognized by other powers, and she began her happy, though short, future as a free democratic republic. Lithuania was admitted to the League of Nations in 1921. The next 20 years saw a period of progress and achievement in Lithuania. Following World War I, Lithuania made up for lost time brought about by the foreign invaders. The Government took the initiative in bringing about land reforms and social legislation. Improvements in transportation and education were pursued with diligence. The advancements made by the new republic would certainly serve as proof that Lithuania was capable of governing its own affairs, and that national sovereignty had been long overdue.

With the outbreak of World War II, Lithuania attempted to remain neutral. However, in October 1939, Soviet Russia forced upon Lithuania a "mutual assistance pact" which provided for the maintenance of a large Russian military garrison in that territory. The following year, in complete violation of their agreement, the Russians rushed in troops and dealt a final blow to the independence of Lithuania. Along with tanks and bayonets the Soviets brought in their elaborate system designed to enslave both body and mind. The NKVD began ruthless persecutions. All religious and cultural organizations were outlawed. Religion was proclaimed "the opium of the people." Portraits of Stalin and Lenin were placed in classrooms. Children were forced to join youth organizations where they were taught to spy on their parents, to abandon religion, and forget "that they were Lithuanians."

As professed lovers of liberty, we cannot, Mr. Speaker, allow this subjugation of a free people to go unnoticed and without some word from the free world. I believe that it is proper for us, on this anniversary of Lithuania's independence, to reaffirm our dedication to the principles which call for liberty and self-determination for all nations.

In expressing our deepest sympathy to the people of Lithuania may we reassure them that our Nation shall not rest until the yoke of oppression is lifted from their weary shoulders.

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, the Lithuanians in America will join together to commemorate the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

We all know the extant circumstances of Lithuania today. Likewise we know that during their independent status, they assumed their place in the family of free nations.

I hope and pray that in the not too distant future the people in Lithuania will again know that their independence is not a dream of the past but a reality of the present.

Those Lithuanians who have come to America and have integrated themselves in the American way of life are a great source of inspiration to their people abroad who are still under Communist domination.

I join all of you in praying that our fellow men in Lithuania will be given renewed faith and courage and hope for a brighter tomorrow.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on this 39th anniversary of the Lithuanian independence, we must again ask ourselves how long can we permit tyranny to dominate the freedom-loving Lithuanian people behind the Iron Curtain.

Can we bask in freedom's light while the shadow of oppression and terror afflicts so many of our friends behind the Iron Curtain?

It is indeed important that this Congress and the American people should consider the plight of the Lithuanian people. Our Government was the very first to recognize the independence of the Lithuanian people. The 3 million Lithuanians behind the Iron Curtain look to America with hope. They may be terrorized, they may be oppressed but they will never succumb to the force of communism.

In Cleveland, we have a large segment of the population who are of Lithuanian extraction. They have made a tremendous contribution to the civic life of our community. In their diligent work and provident thrift, in their respect for the Constitution and the laws of our community, they are exemplary citizens. They have always been proud of their culture and heritage. They have always been concerned with the welfare of their less fortunate relatives and friends who remained in Lithuania.

On Sunday, February 17, over 1,000 Americans of Lithuanian descent will attend a program in the WHK auditorium in Cleveland to commemorate this 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence under the auspices of the American Lithuanian Council in Cleveland. The spirit of Lithuanian independence must be kept alive until it is the privilege of the Lithuanian people as well as the other oppressed people in the world.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in December 1956 the Lithuanian Communist party secretary openly admitted bourgeois deviation from the official Communist line, adding the courageous and downtrodden people of Lithuania to the ever-growing list of dissenting Soviet captive areas. Of course, the Lithuanians had not been submissive under Soviet Communist rule for they had been resisting the sovietization of their country since its inception. There are other reasons, however, for us to commemorate with the Lithuanians the proclamation of their independence, because this late 1956 display of disaffection for the Communists was the first time such an admission had appeared in any of the Baltic Republics. We salute the Lithuanian people for this courageous step.

The struggle for independence had been an unceasing one since their dozen or more principalities were first united in the 13th century. Increasing application of power from the outside led to war and eventual Russian domination over their homeland, but the Lithuanians stubbornly refused to deny themselves their nation's survival. National consciousness persisted over the years, and they strived constantly to fulfill their democratic goals based on their glorious historical past. In 1916 Lithuanian delegates accredited to an international conference put these desires into print:

> * * * the Lithuanian nation with its own traditions, culture, national ideals and its individuality, believe that the only way a nation can survive is to acquire its own rights in all domains of life, and that the nation should direct its own destiny.

With this declaration, the free nation of Lithuania was launched once again on an independent course.

Independence was brief, however, and once again in 1940 the Lithuanians felt the stultifying impact of Russian hordes. And between 1941 and 1948, the fate of Lithuania was one of mass murder and vicious oppression. Hundreds of thousands died at the hands of the Communists. Nevertheless, the Russians had to appeal in early 1956 in a radio broadcast to the anti-Communists to surrender to the authorities, giving testimony that after 15 years of Soviet occupation an anti-Soviet underground existed.

This hope of a year ago is now becoming a reality when less than 2 months ago a Lithuanian Communist had to admit that bourgeois nationalist elements and their various accomplices begin to raise their heads. This so-called bourgeois nationalism, he also admitted, was a result of the recent armed Hungarian revolt. This was tacit admission by the Communists themselves that Lithuania had joined the vanguard for liberty with their valiant Hungarian compatriots. We are proud, therefore, to repeat our fervent wish for the achievement of Lithuanian national goals.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure on this occasion to salute the gallant people of Lithuania and the many United States citizens of Lithuanian origin on the 39th anniversary of

the independence of Lithuania, February 16, 1957.

It is a time which cannot be celebrated in Lithuania itself and when we in America must reaffirm our traditional friendship for the devout and dedicated people of that sorrowful land.

The Lithuanians enjoyed only a brief span of independence before that country again fell prey to Communist aggression. It is up to all of us as free Americans to send them our encouragement to carry on in the cause of liberty.

Our hopes and our prayers go out to them not only today but every day. Lithuanians and the other Baltic peoples must know that they will never be forgotten.

We look forward confidently to that time—we trust in the not too distant future—when they may again be restored to their rightful place in the family of free nations.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, Lithuanian Independence Day is celebrated February 16, which marks the 39th anniversary of the independence of that valiant nation. Behind the Iron Curtain the celebration is forbidden by Soviet aggressors so that the oppressed Lithuanians in that unhappy land observe the event with litanies of prayers beseeching Almighty God to deliver them from the hands of their cruel persecutors.

Mr. Speaker, the pages of history are filled with political systems whose existences are based on oppressing the inherent rights of people and crushing the spirit of other nations. Lithuania, too, has suffered this all-too-familiar fate. Nevertheless, Lithuania has continued to strive for independence and freedom. Her undying passion for democratic principles and her equally undying passion for the convictions and beliefs that make those same democratic principles possible, have nurtured the Lithuanian desire for national survival. This, too, has placed Lithuania in the vanguard with other courageous nations who continue to strive for liberty and independence. We commemorate today, therefore, the proclamation of Lithuanian Independence Day, pausing to show our admiration for this great determination to survive.

The Lithuanians, descendants of an eastern branch of the Indo-European race, were united as early as the 13th century. Their unification was accomplished in spite of devastating wars and unending foreign pressures. The Lithuanian spirit and drive for freedom and national independence, however, could not be broken and finally in 1918 Lithuanian officially proclaimed her independence. This period of independence was short lived for she was forcibly incorporated within the U. S. S. R. in 1940. But the inherent determination of the Lithuanians to regain their status of national independence and their desire to exist as a free nation has not been obliterated. Lithuanians know—as do all of us of the free world—that the existence of tyranny anywhere is a threat to freedom for all nations. We cannot afford this sort of complacency at any time, but particularly not today, when totalitarian ideologies are on the march. We salute, therefore, the valiant nation of Lithuania on this day of her independence anniversary.

Mr. Speaker, America is proud of the Lithuanian immigrants who came to our shores and by their character, industriousness, and loyalty to their adopted land, have made marked contributions to the progress and development of this great Nation.

In my congressional district in Pennsylvania, we have many fine Lithuanian families whose children represent a generation of American citizens of the highest caliber. These young men and women have served their country with honor and distinction in all the wars in which it has engaged, reflecting to a marked degree the love of freedom exemplified by their parents many of whom came here as immigrants seeking the liberty denied them in their native land.

Today the American Nation, in its salute to the freedom-loving people, joins in their prayers that a just and merciful God will hasten the day when they may break the shackles that now consign them to a life of suffering and servitude.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, today we pause to celebrate the 39th anniversary of the proclamation of Lithuanian independence. We all know that Lithuania was conquered by Soviet Russia at the beginning of World War II and has been incorporated into the Soviet Union itself. But some may not realize that the story of the Lithuanian people goes on today. They were crushed by Soviet armed might and exist now under the repressive heel of the Soviet Communist bureaucracy. But the Lithuanian people continue to seek that freedom which they experienced as an independent nation from 1918 until 1940. In this hour we are testifying to their unquenchable thirst for freedom, for that liberty which we are often tempted to take lightly because ours seems so secure. But also in this hour we are calling the attention of the world once again to the Soviet denial of independence to the foreign nations in her control. Soviet Russia practices this repression of the Lithuanian people, but in the next breath pledges her undying devotion to the cause of freedom for oppressed and exploited peoples everywhere. We must not cease to make this hypocrisy clear.

The Lithuanian people have never surrendered themselves to communism. Ever since the end of World War II, they have resisted Communist attempts to Sovietize their country. Great numbers of Lithuanians were deported and there were large-scale movements of Russians into Lithuania. The Soviet Union attempted to collectivize the Lithuanian farms. Any celebration of the Lithuanian Independence Day was forbidden and the flag of free Lithuania could not be displayed. The Soviet authorities admitted last year that the spirit of resistance lived on in spite of this, for they began an unsuccessful drive to lure back the anti-Communist underground still at large in Lithuania. They proclaimed an amnesty for all such fugitives, but the Lithuanians fought on.

At the very end of 1956 when the eyes of the world were focused on the Soviet brutality in Hungary and Poland's attempt to gain freedom from Soviet domination, the seeds of discontent were also blossoming forth in Lithuania. The educated men and women of Lithuania had begun to attack Soviet culture in all its aspects—the arts, the sciences, and, of course, Soviet philosophy. The Soviet Union vowed a campaign against what it called these instances of bourgeoisie ideology. But what is this bourgeoisie ideology Russia wants to kill? It is the claim to freedom from domination by the brute power of a foreign totalitarian state. It is the claim to the right which Christians have affirmed for 2,000 years, the right to know the truth and to act on the belief that the individual man has infinite value, for he is the child of God. The freedom which Soviet Russia gave was only the freedom to live within the mental chains of a foreign-imposed communism.

We who live in America salute the freedom-loving people of Lithuania on this occasion of their independence day. We salute them with knowledge that the world will not be permitted to forget that they live under Soviet domination. We salute them with our renewed devotion to fight the threats to liberty that may arise in our own land. We pray that they may be strengthened to bear the harshness of foreign totalitarian rule and that God, in his infinite mercy, may lighten their burden.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to associate myself with my colleagues in this House who are commemorating the 39th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, which falls on February 16.

It seems to me that we can best and most fittingly observe this anniversary, which is a milestone on the obstacle-strewn roadway of human freedom, not merely by felicitations, in which all of us may join with the greatest sincerity, but more particularly by using this House, this assembly of the elected representatives of a free people, as a sounding board to reach the whole world, and especially the cruel and graceless and godless lords of Communist imperialism, to send out messages of hope and encouragement to the nearly three million people now living in Lithuania who are actually in captivity behind the Iron Curtain.

They cannot leave. If they could, our country gladly would provide asylum for many of them, as we are doing for those who have been able to escape from the Red terror in Hungary. Doubtless many of them would not wish to leave their homeland if they could; but they do yearn for freedom, the freedom which they won when the Czar was overthrown in 1918, the freedom which they lost when in 1940 the armed might of Communist imperialism crushed the resistance of the Lithuanian people, who number in total approximately the same as the population of my own State of Connecticut, and forced them against their will to become a Soviet in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

To emphasize the mockery which Soviet Russia perpetuated, the people of

the Republic of Lithuania have had no opportunity to have a free election, have had no say about their government, which is conducted on direct orders from Moscow. Lithuania has no direct contact with the outside world, except as directed by Soviet Russia.

We all know that, in this era when all over the world new nations are emerging by self-determination to independence and freedom, Soviet Russia is the biggest colonial empire in the world. The Kremlin counts Lithuania as one of its colonies.

But the 10,000 Americans of Lithuanian birth who live in my State, and their tens of thousands of children and grandchildren, and their friends and neighbors by the hundreds of thousands who admire and respect them and the land of their origin, know that Lithuania will not willingly continue to be a colony of any empire.

The fires that light and warm the way to freedom still burn in Lithuania, although their brightness may not today be visible across the seas. Here, today, let us assure our friends in that beautiful country on the Baltic, that we admire their courage, and that we look forward to the day when we may be able to help them to secure again the freedom which they won 39 years ago, and to see them take their place among the United Nations as a free and independent country.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to say that this 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence should again alert all freemen to the price of freedom. Lithuania today portrays a truth we cannot permit to grow dim—the truth that a lack of adequate strength and unity among free nations spells Soviet domination. We cannot view this truth as a Nation apart from immediate threat, for only through mutual vigilance, strength, and unity among all who cherish liberty can independence be attained, maintained, or regained.

It is timely that we recall the Soviet aim. On the eve of the conquest of Lithuania, Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov boldly stated that Lithuania "should begin now to initiate your people into the Soviet system which in the future shall reign everywhere."

It is well that we and other free nations recall the Soviet's tactics—professed friendship, professed guaranties of territorial integrity, the peaceful entry of military units under a so-called mutual-assistance treaty, internal subversion, an incident coupled with demands, and, finally, rigged elections leading to the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

Nor can we forget the consequences—the mass deportation of Lithuanians to the Soviet Arctic, the warping of the thought and culture and economy of Lithuania to the perverted mold of communism, the stifling of religion and the sacrifice of human liberties to the monstrous appetite of Soviet dictation.

On this independence day, Americans join with Lithuanians everywhere in reasserting the inalienable right of all men to be free. We join in recognition of the undying will of a people to throw off their bonds and again to exercise their freedom. The will of a nation to assume its rightful identity still flames, and with the patient and watchful unity of all free peoples, history will again confirm the reality of Lithuanian independence.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, the Republic of Lithuania proclaimed its independence. After hundreds of years under the control of the Russian Czars, Lithuania became a free nation. Unfortunately, the people of Lithuania had only a short period of freedom, for in 1940 the Soviet Union brutally seized this democratic nation. Nevertheless, the social and economic accomplishments of the Republic of Lithuania were many during this period of independence.

We all feel sadness that on the 39th anniversary of their independence the people of Lithuania are not able to join with us in commemorating this momentous event. I know that they are observing this day as best they can with the hope that the Republic of Lithuania will soon be once again free from Russian domination. I am certain that love of liberty is very strong in the hearts of the Lithuanian people.

I want to take this opportunity to reassure the Lithuanian people that they are not forgotten, and that their valiant resistance to oppression, and their love of freedom, are remembered well by the American people. I would like to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the courage of the Lithuanian people and in extending to them our best wishes on this 39th anniversary of the declaration of independence by the Republic of Lithuania.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, the 39th anniversary of Lithuania's independence was observed by Lithuanians the world over last Saturday, February 16, and once again it gives me pleasure to join with my colleagues in honoring that valiant nation. As we commemorate this anniversary, it is fitting that we, and all other freedom-loving people reflect upon the tragic events which brought about the enslavement of this courageous country whose heroic history dates back to the Middle Ages.

On February 16, 1918, after more than 120 years of Russian domination, Lithuania achieved her independence. Her status as an independent nation lasted a brief 22 years, during which time she made great progress in economics and education, and outstanding achievements in commerce, agriculture, and industry. In 1940, Russia violated its treaty commitments, the Red army marched in, and this brave little country again fell under the yoke of Communist oppression. Nevertheless, the spirit of her stalwart people still burns brightly, and their firm stand against their aggressors is a source of inspiration to oppressed people everywhere. Their determination to restore freedom to their country will eventually lead them to victory over their oppressors, and it is my fervent hope that the day is not far distant when Lithuania will regain her rightful place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleagues here on the floor of Congress and pay tribute to a gallant nation and its courageous people.

Lithuania, with great traditions of national sovereignty going far back in time, finally proclaimed its independence on February 16, 1918. This after centuries of subjugation by the Russian regime. Unfortunately, as has been so well developed here today, that independence was short-lived. As a result of a series of military occupations during World War II, the Lithuanian Republic was destroyed and its people once again enslaved. The tragic story of the brutal assault of this noble and courageous nation by Soviet Russia has been repeated many times. In spite of this long history of continuous oppression, the Lithuanian people have managed to preserve their nation and their national heritage. Endowed with an indomitable will and inspired by intense patriotism—patriotism purified in the crucible of oppression—the people of this small Baltic state continue to resist their oppressors now as they have done so many times in the past. They are displaying the same tenacity and vigor that their forefathers did in years gone by.

As I have previously said on this same floor of Congress, the contribution of the Lithuanians in America and their descendants gives us some idea of the national vitality of that country. It is an indication that confidence and faith in Lithuania's future is well placed. The distinctive culture, the deep-rooted traditions, and the rich folklore of the Lithuanian people have greatly enriched our own country. Their contribution has been magnificent, and I am proud that so many of them are citizens of my State of Rhode Island. Today the Lithuanian people are held in the grip of the greatest tyranny of modern times. For these courageous people all the world raises its voice in a common cry of righteous indignation. No one knows just what the future holds in store for Lithuania. Of one fact, however, the Lithuanian people can be very sure—they have the sympathy and good will of all the free world.

For the past several years it has been my custom to speak briefly in the House of Representatives on this occasion of the anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. Each year I have expressed my sincere hope that the next anniversary would find the noble people of Lithuania restored to the family of free nations. And each succeeding year I have been a little more disheartened to realize that little progress has been made.

Now, however, there appears to be an increasing indication that perhaps in the not too distant future our pious hopes may become reality. From rumblings within the Iron Curtain the free world learns that Soviet intervention in the affairs of Eastern European nations has caused a rebirth of the drive for independence. It could be but a question of time before this drive gains the proportions of an all-out crusade, sweeping before it the Russian oppressors and returning valiant Lithuania to its rightful place as an independent nation. May God will it so.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in northeastern Europe some 3 million Lithua-

nians live in an area of only a little more than 20,000 square miles. They are one of the smallest national groups in all Europe, though the important role they have played in European history has no relation to their size as a nation. Through most of the Middle Ages and part of the modern times they have been the upholders and defenders of Western Christian civilization. In the course of their turbulent history they have managed to hold their own and safeguard their freedom, even in adversity. By the beginning of the 19th century, however, the powerful Russian advance overwhelmed them. Their country was then overrun and incorporated into the Russian empire. In 1918 when the Czarist regime collapsed the Lithuanians took advantage of the situation and proclaimed their national independence on February 16 of that year. Unfortunately the independence thus regained lasted only two decades. In 1940 the Lithuanians were annexed to the Soviet Union.

Since then Lithuanians in their beloved homeland have not known freedom. Under the unbending regime there, installed by the heartless men of the Kremlin, they are denied all freedom. They cannot leave the country, and they are sealed off from the free world. We of course know that those brave and patriotic Lithuanians do not have even the freedom to celebrate their independence day. Let us ardently and heartily hope that soon these deserving souls, suffering under Communist tyrants, will regain their freedom once more and celebrate their national holiday, the Lithuanian Independence Day, in their beloved homeland.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, anniversaries often commemorate different kinds of occasions. Sometimes they recall memories of stirring or happy events in the past. The observance of the birthdays of two great Americans makes this month of February especially important to us. Often, however, anniversaries are solemn reminders of the injustices still being countenanced in the world today. Such an anniversary was February 16—the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

For an all-too-brief score of years, Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors, Estonia, Latvia, Finland, and Poland had freedom to develop their own national and democratic way of life. During her period of independence, from 1918 to 1940, Lithuania made remarkable progress in every phase of life, and received the recognition of the other free nations for her cultural, educational, and economic growth.

However, in August of 1939, the Soviet Union concluded an infamous agreement with the Nazis to divide eastern Europe between them—a fate suffered by these peoples on several occasions throughout history. By terms of this most unholy alliance, the Baltic countries, including the eastern half of Poland, fell into the sphere of the Soviet Union. The Russians were not long in extending their influence over these valiant little republics which had asked no more than the right to live their own lives in peace. They were annexed in 1940 by the Russians; then by the Nazi armies from 1941 to 1944, and then reoccupied and ruled by the Soviet forces up to the present day. During these years of agony, the people of these Baltic republics were forced to choose between some desperate alternatives—to flee over the perilous Baltic to the friendly Scandinavian countries or to Germany, knowing that a very uncertain fate awaited them in Hitler's crumbling Reich, or to stay, knowing that death or deportation awaited many of them at the hands of the Soviets. Few people have endured such a cruel ordeal.

The example of Hungary has shown us that the spirit of freedom and independence burns brightly in eastern Europe, masked, perhaps, by a sullen compliance with the Soviet overlords as eloquent as open revolt itself. Over Eastern Europe has descended, in the words of Winston Churchill who was speaking of an earlier era of oppression, "a long night of barbarism, unbroken by even a star of hope" unless we in the United States forever insist and maintain that under no circumstances will we ever be parties to the bargaining away of the right of independence of Lithuania and her sister republics. We must continue to refuse to recognize the occupation of the three Baltic countries.

The people of Lithuanian descent have contributed much to America and the other lands in which they have settled in search of haven and a new life. I join with others in commending them for their steadfast devotion to those principles espoused by the two great Americans whose birthdays we celebrate this month. What Lincoln and Washington stood for are as applicable to Lithuania as to the United States. Liberty is indivisible, and tyranny, wherever it is found, threatens our own liberties. Let us hope that our expressions of tribute to Lithuania on this occasion may once more demonstrate to the entire world our firm desire that other peoples of the world may come to enjoy the blessings of freedom that we have always known.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, as the free world continues to occupy itself with the grave concerns of Soviet aggression it is fitting to consider for a moment the example of Lithuania, where black totalitarian night remains pierced by the love for liberty of a courageous and indomitable people.

February 16 marked the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence—an independence which was extinguished in one of the earliest excesses of the Soviet Union. It was created as a nation in the surge of hope and idealism that followed World War I; during the brief time that Lithuania occupied her rightful place in the family of free nations the cultural, economic, political, and social contributions of its people were outstanding.

Today, as we commemorate this anniversary, there is no longer a Lithuania. Its flag has been destroyed; its national anthem made mute. More than a half-million Lithuanian men, women, and children—one-sixth of the total population—have been deported to Soviet slave-labor camps or have died in prison or massacre.

Visitors are barred from Lithuania; no one is allowed to leave the country. Yet, the little news that we manage to obtain from that land tells us that a resistance movement flourishes there, that the will for freedom remains invincible. The fate of Lithuania should serve to remind us that our hopes for a free world can be fulfilled only if we insist upon freedom for every nation.

Mr. DELLAY. Mr. Speaker, I salute the Americans of Lithuanian descent who are celebrating the 39th anniversary of the adoption of the declaration of independence at Vilnius, as well as the good and brave people of Lithuania, existing under the heel of the oppressor. In spite of persecution and indescribable humiliation, they have had the fortitude and courage to carry on a resistance against their oppressors. It has become a tradition with Lithuanians to fight for liberty and freedom and for the belief in the church of their ancestors. It is indeed commendable that they still hold high the torch of their tradition and look to the day when the march of communism is ended. In view of the splendid record and generous contribution to humanity given by this small country, we earnestly hope for her quick recovery. Until then we must exert ourselves to keep the light of freedom burning brightly until it illuminates the whole world. On that day a new proclamation of liberty will bring joy to the hearts of the people of Lithuania and all other freedom-loving nations of the earth. Again, I salute these valiant people.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, on February 16 Americans of Lithuanian ancestry commemorated the 39th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania. All over the world, Lithuanians gathered to renew their efforts and to encourage one another to continue to work for the independence of their homeland. In Baltimore, the Council of Lithuanian Societies also observed this anniversary with a large rally and dinner, which it was my privilege to attend. On this occasion, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

At the annual banquet, commemorating the 39th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania, sponsored by the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore, Md., held on the 16th day of February 1957, at Lithuanian Hall, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas during the past year Soviet leaders in the Kremlin have had serious disagreements among themselves as to the methods, doctrines, and accomplishments of their former idol, Joseph Stalin; and

"Whereas unrest and uprisings in Russian satellite nations have demonstrated that the yearning for freedom still burns strongly in the hearts of the people of subjugated countries existing behind the Iron Curtain; and

"Whereas in particular the spontaneous October rebellion in Budapest, Hungary, against Kremlin rule certainly indicates that Soviet imperialism is in trouble; and

"Whereas many thousands of Hungarian refugees, leaving behind their martyred companions, escaped from their homeland rather than submit to Soviet tyranny and found haven in the United States of America; and

"Whereas the spirit displayed by the Hungarian people in their fight for freedom from Soviet rule is a shining example to the subjugated people of Lithuania and their Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia; and

"Whereas the Hungarian cause of independence is essentially the same as and synonymous with the Lithuanian cause; and

"Whereas the signs of disintegration of the Soviet regime hold out a new ray of hope to people everywhere to strive unceasingly until liberty and freedom are again achieved: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the leaders of our country be urged to continue to maintain the fight for peace, justice, protection, and freedom for all people; and be it finally

"*Resolved*, That any new immigration laws to be enacted by Congress take into consideration that loyal Lithuanians are just as desirous of finding freedom and refuge in the United States of America as the patriotic Hungarians."

In Lithuania the bright flame of freedom which lighted that nation with such promise and progress has been darkened by the bitter night of communistic tyranny.

Thirty-nine years ago, Lithuania stood forth as an independent, democratic republic with a happy, prosperous people who faced the future with confidence in their destiny.

Today, the bright star of Lithuania's freedom has been clouded over by the violent storms of oppression. We gaze with sadness upon the advancinng tragedy of sacrifice to ruthless Russian imperialism that has enveloped Lithuania.

The world does not know all the terrible details of what has happened and is still happening to Lithuanians behind the dark, impenetrable Iron Curtain. However, we do know that behind that dreadful Iron Curtain, hundreds of thousands of God-fearing Lithuanians have been liquidated, martyred for their patriotism, their religious faith, their steadfast resistance to tyranny.

Hundreds of thousands of good Lithuanians, just as the unfortunate people in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and other satellite nations have been torn from their families and their homes for service as slaves in Siberia. It is slave labor that the Communists are using to equip Russia for further expansion, for further despotism, for further persecution, and perhaps even for war.

Certainly we cannot continue and must not continue to close our eyes to this injustice, to close our ears to the calls for help, to close our hearts to the suffering we know is going on behind the Iron Curtain.

Without losing our honor, we cannot much longer ignore the human tragedy the Iron Curtain conceals. We cannot much longer hold up our heads in self-respect, if we continue to give silent approval to a group of atheistic political leaders who have demonstrated themselves to be devoid of Christian humanity and sense of Christian justice.

The cause of Lithuania and the other small nations is a challenge to the moral conscience of this Nation and the United Nations to establish the great, basic principles of freedom and liberty for all peoples.

To rally the support that we ourselves must have from God-fearing nations of this world, we must openly state that we will work for the liberation of all countries that have been enslaved by the Red Russian imperialism.

There is no other course to follow if Christian peace and freedom is to be retained on this earth. With the help of Almighty God and the persevering sacrifice of all Christian peoples, I belive that all of us will see the dawn of a new era of freedom and peace for Lithuania and the world.

May that day be not far away.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 39 years ago, Lithuania threw off the shackles of czarist brutality and proclaimed her independence. For the following 22 years, every February 16 was joyfully celebrated by the Lithuanian people.

It was natural and proper that these free people proudly observed every independence day. Each year found Lithuanian growing in all the attributes that makes a free nation strong. Through the creative energy of her people Lithuania became a progressive independent democratic republic. With freedom there naturally followed internal consolidation. Industrial establishments grew in number. Socially, great strides were made to insure the health and general welfare of the people. Rapid progress was also made in education. Politically, Lithuania became a respected member of the international community.

However, now, on the 39th anniversary of independence, Lithuania is no longer free. Nevertheless Lithuanians throughout the world still commemorate this glorious day.

Unfortunately, today, the people in this enslaved nation will have to mark it in their hearts. For the past 17 years, Soviet oppression has prevented any open celebration of this day.

Consequently, it rests with the free world to transmit hope and aspiration to them on this occasion. It is especially important that the United States, the leader of the free world, speak for these silenced Lithuanians. It is just that we Americans remind these brave Lithuanians that we have not forgotten their suffering. It is also just that we assure these persecuted people that we will continue to renounce the fraudulent incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union; and continue to demand the right of all people to choose the form of government under which they will live.

The American people will not rest until Lithuania once more is master of her own fate. We will not sit idly by as long as any nation with such an historical record of independence remains enslaved.

The recent events in Hungary perhaps has provided us with an opportunity to aid these oppressed peoples. This revolution is indicative of the unrest that is spreading throughout the Communist-controlled world. Accordingly, it might be the opportune time to negotiate with Russia on the satellite problem.

With this in mind I recently joined with 10 other Democrats in offering President Eisenhower a plan for achieving the peaceful liberation of the satellite countries. This plan would provide a startling point for negotiation with the Soviet Union. Briefly, the plan included the demilitarization of the area between the Rhine and Soviet Russia; international guaranties of constitutional liberties in the liberated nations; and economic aid to promote regional federation and economic integration.

I think it is appropriate on the anniversary of Lithuanian independence that we Americans remind the captive Lithuanian people that we have not become reconciled to their fate. The plan that was submitted to the President is evidence that we are constantly trying to find a solution to the satellite problem. We assure the Lithuanian people that we will continue to work for conditions that will eventually lead to their freedom.

TITO PROTEST PETITION

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, in a joint statement issued by Representative GORDON L. McDONOUGH, Republican, of California, with the cooperation of KENNETH KEATING, Republican, of New York; JOHN McCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts; and RAY MADDEN, Democrat, of Indiana, sponsors and circulators of a petition to the President of the United States protesting an invitation to Marshal Tito as an official guest of this country, they stated:

Since the objective of the petition has been obtained by the refusal of Tito to accept an invitation to visit the United States as an official guest at this time, we do not intend to submit this petition to the President of the United States at this time, and will hold the petition in abeyance until further action initiating such an invitation from the White House or the State Department is taken.

The petition was signed by 168 Members of the House of Representatives, representing 41 States. We will not release the names of the Members signing this petition until it is submitted to the President. The petition is available for signing by any Members of the House who have not already signed.

Inside sources say that actually Dulles had no part in initiating the invitation to Tito. He was in the hospital when that idea was advanced and got underway. When he got back on his feet, he felt he had to go along with what had become an official line. The old Acheson crowd in State, it is said, started the move to invite Tito and has tenaciously held to it. Privately, it is reported that Jacob Beam, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, is the bureaucrat who pushed the matter for the crowd.

ACCOUNTING BY CONGRESS OF COUNTERPART FUND EXPENDITURES

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, today, I have introduced legislation that should be welcomed by every member. It is a simple bill, but its purpose is extensive. That purpose is to require the

committees of Congress in the future to budget and account for the expenditure of counterpart funds.

Mr. Speaker, there isn't a Member of this House who has not been damaged by a recent disclosure that two employees of the other body used thousands of dollars in counterpart funds for a free-spending, free-wheeling tour of Europe. The justifiable discharge of these employees, does not correct the damage done, for in the public mind remains their statement to the effect that they had done "nothing that was not a general practice of Members of Congress."

Until the people of this Nation are permitted to know how counterpart funds are spent by Members of Congress and its committees, this statement will stand uncontradicted by any evidence they will accept.

In introducing this legislation, I do not question the wisdom of using counterpart funds to help finance trips we make under committee auspices to foreign countries. I do not challenge the value of those trips. On the contrary, I am convinced that with few exceptions the work of Congress in its investigative capacity here and abroad, saves the taxpayers thousands of dollars for every dollar spent. Because I believe this, I am confident that full disclosure and budgeting of these funds in the future would convince the public mind once and for all that they are not being misspent.

My bill is simple in purpose and content. It provides merely that the amount of counterpart currency—local currency of a foreign nation—used to defray the expenses of any committee shall be charged against the amounts available to the committee in the respective contingent funds of the House and Senate.

This is only orderly accounting procedure. Under the practice that now prevails, the various committees are allowed a definite budget for travel expenses.

In addition, however, committees have been spending undisclosed amounts of counterpart funds to finance travel abroad. As a result, the Members and the public have no idea of the extent of travel by Members and committees. This is poor budgetary procedure. If a committee can justify a budget of $100,000 per year for travel it should have that budget. If it can use counterpart funds to meet a portion of the cost of this travel, it should do so. But, it should not, as is presently the case, justify an expenditure of $100,000 and then supplement this budget with undisclosed and unregulated amounts of counterpart funds.

I have faith that every Member of Congress would spend counterpart funds wisely and with more confidence in the future if he knew that these funds were subject to the regular scrutiny that other congressional expenditures are. As is presently the case, the entire membership suffers from the impact of rumors that some Members and some committees are abusing this privilege. I have found that rumors grow and that in every case the rumors exaggerate by many times the situation which started them in the first place.

We require the employees of the executive agencies to account for the expenditure of counterpart funds. We should be held to the same accountability. I can think of no situation as indefensible as the one now confronting us—that is, to require by law the justification of expenditures of public funds—counterpart or otherwise—by Government employees, and then exempt ourselves from the duty so imposed.

FIFTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SINKING OF THE BATTLESHIP "MAINE"

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRD). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the 59th anniversary of an event and tragedy that in the development of sequences started the United States of America on the road to her destiny. As the House will not be in session tomorrow, I am taking advantage of this opportunity again to pay respect to the memory of the 266 men who went down with the battleship *Maine* in Habana Harbor on February 15, 1898.

For more than half a century I, with other veterans of the Spanish-American War, annually have paid tribute to the memory of those heroes. When I came to this body there were four Members of the House who had served in the Spanish-American War. Of the four, I alone remain, and this year, as in every year since I have been a Member of this House, I have asked and graciously have been granted by unanimous consent 1 hour to pay tribute to the heroes who died on the battleship *Maine*.

Mr. Speaker, I have in this a purpose. So dramatic and dynamic have been the events that followed one after another in the 20th century that those great, momentous events in the last years of the 19th century, events that were drawing the blueprint of our history, have largely been forgotten. I know that sometime there will come a period when historians will give greater and more understanding scrutiny to the last half decade of the 19th century and the early years of the a-borning 20th century. It was then that in every American's blood was the feel of the destiny for his country that was at the end of the trail that he as a part of his generation was building. It was a feeling, indefinite and undefined, that possessed him and as a magnet drew him into a crusade of patriotism to prepare his country for her rendezvous with destiny.

When we went to war with Spain, Spain still was regarded as one of the four great powers of the world. With an army and a navy composed entirely of volunteers, we engaged the enemy in the waters and on the land in the areas of the Pacific and the Atlantic. Our volunteer forces, soldiers and sailors alike, fought with a brilliancy that never had been equalled in all the history of warfare. So quick, so decisive were the victories that one could have only the sense that guiding those victories was the will of Providence.

It was my fortune to witness the naval engagement on July 3, 1898. The proud ships of Spain came out of Santiago Harbor to do battle. They were good ships, the pride of the Spanish navy, ably and courageously officered and manned. Within almost a matter of minutes they were destroyed one after the other, and I, then a boy of 16, watching that engagement from the heights near Aquadores whereat my regiment of American infantry was stationed, wondered if in that which I was seeing with my human eyes was not indeed part of the pattern of Providence to make of our country the instrumentality for carrying mankind to greater heights.

I am hopeful that when the day comes when historians of later generations seek to recapture the spirit of 1898, the spirit that has carried us to our present position of world responsibility, some researcher going through the files of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by chance may hit upon some of the remarks in the annual observance in this Chamber of the anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine*.

For the Members of this House I have a feeling of very warm affection. It has been entrusted to me by my comrades in the various sessions of the Congress to introduce the bill to increase the very small pension paid to the widows of our Spanish War veterans. Each year the House so graciously, so generously and with such fine spirit has passed this bill, only to have it go to the other body and there fail to meet the understanding that our cause has met in the warmth of the membership of this great body.

I am hopeful this year that the House early will pass the three Spanish War bills; the widows' bill, the bill for the neglected naval veterans and for our Moro veterans and that similar favorable consideration will be given in the other body.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California who fought so valiantly all during the years for the Spanish War veterans.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois. I realize that he speaks from his experience as a witness of the events of that great war that the United States fought, not to acquire additional territory or wealth for the United States, but for the freedom and independence of another nation.

I also join with him in his appeal to the House that the bill before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will come to the floor and be favorably acted upon to increase the pensions to the surviving widows of the Spanish-American War veterans. I have introduced a companion bill and I join him in the hope that the other body will see the light of day as the House has seen it.

This war about which the gentleman has been speaking and in which we spent our manpower and wealth in order to win, was different from any other war that has ever been fought. Here was a great nation, the United States, fighting to obtain independence from Spain for two other nations, the Philippines and

Cuba, which independence since has been given to them—and which has become the nucleus on which we can depend upon having the kind of freedom and independence that we hope will eventually be established in the great far eastern Pacific area. We indoctrinated them with that spirit. They have preserved that spirit and given expression in their country to the great views of constitutional rights, through the sentiments expressed by their President Magraysay.

If the war of 1898 had not been fought we would not now have that friend in the Far East, the Philippine Islands, which is a point that the researchers in history, to which the gentleman from Illinnois referred, have overlooked entirely. It was the Spanish-American War that gave us the opportunity to establish freedom and independence in the Far East through the Philippine Islands.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the distinguished and able gentleman from Illinois, who has again so eloquently and forcefully presented the cause in which he is so deeply interested, which should and does appeal to every truly patriotic American. He has pointed out that this war was won by volunteers, fired by the spirit of youth with a vision of the destiny of our country. We have become the world power envisioned by these volunteers. We must not shirk the obligations owed to their widows.

I want to assure the gentleman that I shall support the bill for the support of the widows of the Spanish-American War and I certainly hope the gentleman will have success in the other body as well as in the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to our beloved majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I join with my colleagues in congratulating my dear friend from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] on taking the floor today to make the stirring and eloquent speech he has in commemoration of those who fought at Manila, and particularly those who went down with the United States battleship *Maine*.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is the only Member of this House who served during the Spanish-American War. The Members of the House have an affection for the gentleman from Illinois. One of the reasons for the deep affection we have for him is his loyalty to the comrades who served with him and all those who served our country during the Spanish-American War.

The fact that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] takes the floor to make the stirring and eloquent remarks he has in relation to the anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine*, and particularly with reference to those brave men who went down with the *Maine*, is the best evidence of his love and affection for all those who served our country so ably and so well during that war.

The remarks of my friend from California [Mr. McDONOUGH] are very appropriate as to the far-reaching effect that has flowed from the Spanish-American War. On the occasion of the anniversary exercises in this House for our late President, William McKinley, I made reference to the far-reaching effects of the Spanish-American War in the life of our country.

My State of Massachusetts is one State of the Union that has shown in a most effective and concrete manner the extent to which we honor those who served in the Spanish-American War, and particularly those who went down with the *Maine*. I am very happy that I am on the floor while my friend from Illinois is making his eloquent speech of commemoration, and I thank the gentleman for yielding to me so that I might make my slight contribution of tribute.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, from the bottom of my heart I thank the majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK] for the friendship he has shown on every occasion to the cause of the Spanish War veterans and the widows who so sorely are in need.

The Ninth Massachusetts was brigaded with the regiment of infantry in which I was a corporal. We trained together. We went to Cuba together. Occasionally today I hear from one of the veterans of the old Ninth Massachusetts and always there is warm reference to our distinguished and beloved majority leader. I know the veterans of the old Ninth Massachusetts will appreciate the gentleman's joining us today in paying tribute to the memory of the 266 American heroes whose lives were wiped out in Havana Harbor 59 years ago tomorrow. Spanish War veterans everywhere have a very soft spot in their hearts for JOHN McCORMACK.

Mr. Speaker, I marvel how little this generation understands the great events of the Spanish American War period and their relation to the problems of today. Let me refer briefly to one incident. The Spanish War period ran from 1898 through 1902 and included the Boxer Expedition when our troops marched with those from Germany, Japan, Russia and Great Britain to the rescue of the imprisoned personnel of the embassies in Peking. Reaching Peking, these troops scaled the walls of that city and it was there that the great son of Illinois, Captain Riley, was killed.

In the march to Peking the Russians were our allies, but they could not be controlled. They wantonly were killing Chinese men, women, and children and throwing their mangled bodies into the river. At one time the Americans attacked them in force to end such inhuman conduct. This is part of the record of that period.

The American soldiers were the first foreigners to set foot in the Forbidden City. For a year or so American soldiers policed the sacred grounds that theretofore no foreigners had ever entered. The relation of the Americans with the Chinese was most cordial in striking contrast to that of the Russians with the Chinese.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Mississippi). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to commend the gentleman from Illinois for his fine statement. The gentleman performs a great service to the House by reminding us on this anniversary every year of the great contribution made by the gallant men of the Spanish-American War to the destiny of this Republic. I have a colony of Spanish-American war veterans in my district. I am proud to number them among my constituency. I join my colleague in saluting them and their comrades and widows on this date.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF BLACKBURN COLLEGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, no one person, institution, or organization can rightfully take credit for the phenomenal, if not fantastic, growth of America. But when we analyze our progress and development we must take cognizance of the immense contribution our educational institutions have made in catapulting our Nation into a position of world leadership.

One candle lighting the darkness of this continent over the past 100 years is an educational institution located in the Land of Lincoln, known to all as Blackburn College.

Yesterday, February 13, 1957, Blackburn marked its 100th anniversary of the granting of its charter by dedicating a $350,000 science building constructed entirely by student labor. Appropriately enough, this new addition to the Blackburn campus will stand as a cornerstone as this institution enters its second century of educational progress.

For any person or any institution to exist for 100 years is indeed a praiseworthy accomplishment, for time is most destructive, and few can boast of having withstood its ravages for so long a period.

To me, the centennial anniversary of a school is even more noteworthy than is the 100th anniversary of an individual, for in a school such as Blackburn many lives, richened by college experience, have matured in the span of a century of educational and social growth. The influence of such a school is unlimited as its students go into the world to become leading citizens and to share their education with many hundreds of others whose personal lives are brightened by the light of knowledge and strengthened by the practical lessons in self-discipline and cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, I appear here in the House today to take note of this centennial anniversary which will be celebrated

by Blackburn College throughout this year. I do so with a feeling of pride and humility. I am especially proud because Blackburn is my college and is located in my hometown of Carlinville, Ill. I am humble because I feel that I personally benefited by attending this institution, whose learning and labor program is unique, not only in the State of Illinois but also throughout the world.

SELF-HELP COLLEGE

Mr. Speaker, the story of Blackburn is the story of America. Its development is typical of the democratic development of this country itself. Blackburn is not an ordinary college. It is a self-help school where every student is required to carry his share of the load by working on the college property 15 hours each week. The Blackburn self-help plan has truly been a plan of democracy at work.

Rev. Gideon Blackburn, a Presbyterian minister, founded the forerunner of the present institution in 1837. Twenty years later, on February 13, 1857, the college received its charter from the State of Illinois, and this is officially considered as the actual beginning of the present college. Blackburn was originally established as a Presbyterian theological seminary and still maintains some contact with the Presbyterian Church. But people of all denominations, from all nations, attend this college today. One of the present ushers is Jewish, and the chaplain is an Episcopalian. There has never been any racial segregation at Blackburn College, and the chairman of one of the most important committees on the campus is a quiet, popular Negro boy from Virginia.

The work-plan was brought to Blackburn College by Dr. William M. Hudson, who became president in 1912 and made the school what it is today. This work-plan is not just a device to help students who could not otherwise go to college. It is a liberal education in community effort that trains hands in skills, levels executive ability and stresses the spiritual value of shared work.

Dr. Hudson in advocating the now famous work-plan system called for young people who ordinarily could not afford to attend college. It was his idea that these vigorous young men and women could work on the college's farm and aid in the construction of new buildings that would necessarily be needed as time went by.

It was not easy in the early days; stock for the farm and building material had to be begged or borrowed. Dr. Hudson, however, soon showed tangible evidence of the success of his project. He found more and more people willing to give him support and more and more students interested in working to secure an education.

In the early fall of 1927, the main building of Blackburn College was completely destroyed by fire only 3 weeks before the opening of the school year. Dr. Hudson was determined to keep the school open. In the few weeks which were left, he secured abandoned railroad coaches and hastily converted them into offices, reading rooms and classrooms.

Under the inspiration and guidance of President Hudson, the college was gradually built up, and students came from all over the United States as well as many from other countries to take advantage of the work, study, play tradition that has given Blackburn the high scholastic standing that it enjoys today. In 1945 Dr. Hudson retired leaving a rich legacy of 33 dedicated years to his dream of a college. His successor, Dr. Robert P. Ludlum, is carrying on the tradition of this school and is continuing to expand the student enrollment as well as the institution itself. Dr. Ludlum is an energetic person and an inspired educator. He believes in the democracy-in-action idea at work at Blackburn, feeling it is the duty of a school to do more than to formally educate and that graduates of Blackburn are mentally adult and fully aware of the wonderful virtue of being useful to themselves and to others.

Although this famous work-plan started as an economic measure, it was retained because of its educational value. All students work equal time and, therefore, have equal time for study and relaxation. The jobs range in variety from farm chores and construction work for the boys to kitchen maintenance and secretarial duties for the girls. The work, although sometimes difficult, is never toil because everyone participates, and the atmosphere is always one of good will and cooperation. The students at Blackburn live in modern, two-student rooms in attractively furnished dormitories. There is a beautiful modern dining room, and each student receives three nourishing, well-balanced meals for approximately $1 per day. Blackburn College is a coeducational liberal arts college offering a bachelor of arts degree in eight different areas as well as offering professional courses in prelaw or medicine. The college is fully accredited by the State of Illinois for teacher training.

AMERICA'S MOST EXCLUSIVE COLLEGE

Mr. Speaker, it has often been said that Blackburn is America's most exclusive college. It is exclusive, however, not for the select few who can afford a higher education but for those who desire to participate in a self-help program.

In the early days of the work-study system, the prospective students had to sign a statement saying that they were financially unable to attend another school, but there is no longer any such restriction. Today, many boys and girls from well-to-do families are among the enrollment of approximately 350 students. Students in all economic brackets like the Blackburn tradition because a common goal makes a more unified, friendly student body, and everyone has a definite feeling of being an integral part of a vital growing organization. There is no room for snobbery in their hearts, for the students at Blackburn recognize the dignity of labor. The work they do lives on with the Blackburn Institution. The cornerstone is not laid by a visiting dignitary but by the students through the ages who have laid the bricks in the buildings at the institution as they have worked their way to a higher place in life through the self-help program at Blackburn.

Blackburn is not the only work college in the country. There are two others—Berea College in Kentucky and Park College in Missouri, both with commendable work programs. But it is my understanding that Blackburn is the only college in the country where the students are building and have built the actual college plant. All of the meals are cooked and served by students. Some of the food served is grown by students and some of the meat comes from animals raised by students on corn grown on a Blackburn farm.

When a student leaves Blackburn, he carries with him a part of the deep tradition of self-reliance and resourcefulness. He realizes the necessity of being a useful member of society and an active, functioning citizen. Perhaps this accounts for the large number of graduates who have taken responsible places in public life and the military service.

The spirit of Blackburn is well brought out in the following quotation from the September 1953 issue of Red Book magazine:

> Blackburn College, in Carlinville, is indeed a rare college. Fortunate are the students who go there, and they know it. . . . Many a university graduate from the finest schools in the land has yet to learn what the Blackburn freshman discovers in his first few months at the college. That is the satisfaction, even the enjoyment of work, and its value in developing skill and self-reliance and revealing latent abilities.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SIKES for 20 minutes on Monday and Thursday next.

Mr. VAN ZANDT for 30 minutes on Monday, February 18.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. NATCHER and to include editorials.

Mr. DURHAM.

Mr. LONG and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HORAN in four instances.

Mr. WEAVER and include two articles.

Mr. RADWAN (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FINO and to include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

Mr. HUDDLESTON.

Mr. HOLTZMAN (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRD (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EBERHARTER (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WALTER.

Mr. NORRELL (at the request of Mr. FEIGHAN) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZELENKO (at the request of Mr. BREEDING) and include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 394. An act to waive the limitation on the time within which a Medal of Honor may be awarded to Comdr. Hugh Barr Miller, Jr., United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on Feb. 11, 1957, present to the President for his approval a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3845. An act extending for 1 year the time in which the Boston National Historic Sites Commission shall complete its work.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, February 18, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

> "I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by each of the following Members and Delegates of the 85th Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948:

ALABAMA

1. Frank W. Boykin.
2. George M. Grant.
3. George W. Andrews.
4. Kenneth A. Roberts.
5. Albert Rains.
6. Armistead I. Selden, Jr.
7. Carl Elliott.
8. Robert E. Jones.
9. George Huddleston, Jr.

ARIZONA

1. John J. Rhodes.
2. Stewart L. Udall.

ARKANSAS

1. E. C. Gathings.
2. Wilbur D. Mills.
3. James W. Trimble.
4. Oren Harris.
5. Brooks Hays.
6. W. F. Norrell.

CALIFORNIA

1. Hubert B. Scudder.
2. Clair Engle.
3. John E. Moss.
4. William S. Mailliard.
5. John F. Shelley.
6. John F. Baldwin, Jr.
7. John J. Allen, Jr.
8. George P. Miller.
9. J. Arthur Younger.
10. Charles S. Gubser.
11. John J. McFall.
12. B. F. Sisk.
13. Charles M. Teague.
14. Harlan Hagen.
15. Gordon L. McDonough.
16. Donald L. Jackson.
17. Cecil R. King.
18. Craig Hosmer.
19. Chet Holifield.
20. H. Allen Smith.
21. Edgar W. Hiestand.
22. Joe Holt.
23. Clyde Doyle.
24. Glenard P. Lipscomb.
25. Patrick J. Hillings.
26. James Roosevelt.
27. Harry R. Sheppard.
28. James B. Utt.
29. D. S. (Judge) Saund.
30. Bob Wilson.

COLORADO

1. Byron G. Rogers.
2. William S. Hill.
3. J. Edgar Chenoweth.
4. Wayne N. Aspinall.

CONNECTICUT

1. Edwin H. May, Jr.
2. Horace Seely-Brown, Jr.
3. Albert W. Cretella.
4. Albert P. Morano.
5. James T. Patterson.

At large

Antoni N. Sadlak.

DELAWARE

At large

Harry G. Haskell, Jr.

FLORIDA

1. William C. Cramer.
2. Charles E. Bennett.
3. Robert L. F. Sikes.
4. Dante B. Fascell.
5. A. S. (Syd) Herlong, Jr.
6. Paul G. Rogers.
7. James A. Haley.
8. D. R. (Billy) Matthews.

GEORGIA

1. Prince H. Preston.
2. J. L. Pilcher.
3. E. L. (Tic) Forrester.
4. John J. Flynt, Jr.
5. James C. Davis.
6. Carl Vinson.
7. Henderson Lanham.
8. Iris Faircloth Blitch.
9. Phil M. Landrum.
10. Paul Brown.

IDAHO

1. Gracie Pfost.
2. Hamer H. Budge.

ILLINOIS

1. William L. Dawson.
2. Barratt O'Hara.
3. Emmet F. Byrne.
4. William E. McVey.
5. John C. Kluczynski.
6. Thomas J. O'Brien.
7. James B. Bowler.
8. Thomas S. Gordon.
9. Sidney R. Yates.
10. Harold R. Collier.
11. Timothy P. Sheehan.
12. Charles A. Boyle.
13. Marguerite Stitt Church.
14. Russell W. Keeney.
15. Noah M. Mason.
16. Leo E. Allen.
17. Leslie C. Arends.
18. Robert H. Michel.
19. Robert B. Chiperfield.
20. Sid Simpson.
21. Peter F. Mack, Jr.
22. William L. Springer.
23. Charles W. Vursell.
24. Melvin Price.
25. Kenneth J. Gray.

INDIANA

1. Ray J. Madden.
2. Charles A. Halleck.
3. F. Jay Nimtz.
4. E. Ross Adair.
5. John V. Beamer.
6. Cecil M. Harden.
7. William G. Bray.
8. Winfield K. Denton.
9. Earl Wilson.
10. Ralph Harvey.
11. Charles B. Brownson.

IOWA

1. Fred Schwengel.
2. Henry O. Talle.
3. H. R. Gross.
4. Karl M. LeCompte.
5. Paul Cunningham.
6. Merwin Coad.
7. Ben F. Jensen.
8. Charles B. Hoeven.

KANSAS

1. William H. Avery.
2. Errett P. Scrivner.
3. Myron V. George.
4. Edward H. Rees.
5. J. Floyd Breeding.
6. Wint Smith.

KENTUCKY

1. Noble J. Gregory.
2. William H. Natcher.
3. John M. Robsion, Jr.
4. Frank Chelf.
5. Brent Spence.
6. John C. Watts.
7. Carl D. Perkins.
8. Eugene Siler.

LOUISIANA

1. F. Edward Hébert.
2. Hale Boggs.
3. Edwin E. Willis.
4. Overton Brooks.
5. Otto E. Passman.
6. James H. Morrison.
7. T. A. Thompson.
8. George S. Long.

MAINE

1. Robert Hale.
2. Frank M. Coffin.
3. Clifford G. McIntire.

MARYLAND

1. Edward T. Miller.
2. James P. S. Devereux.
3. Edward A. Garmatz.
4. George H. Fallon.
5. Richard E. Lankford.
6. DeWitt S. Hyde.
7. Samuel N. Friedel.

MASSACHUSETTS

1. John W. Heselton.
2. Edward P. Boland.
3. Philip J. Philbin.
4. Harold D. Donohue.
5. Edith Nourse Rogers.
6. William H. Bates.
7. Thomas J. Lane.
8. Torbert H. Macdonald.
9. Donald W. Nicholson.
10. Laurence Curtis.
11. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.
12. John W. McCormack.
13. Richard B. Wigglesworth.
14. Joseph W. Martin, Jr.

MICHIGAN

1. Thaddeus M. Machrowicz.
2. George Meader.
3. August E. Johansen.
4. Clare E. Hoffman.
5. Gerald R. Ford, Jr.
6. Charles E. Chamberlain.
7. Robert J. McIntosh.
8. Alvin M. Bentley.
9. Robert P. Griffin.
10. Elford A. Cederberg.
11. Victor A. Knox.
12. John B. Bennett.
13. Charles C. Diggs, Jr.
14. Louis C. Rabaut.
15. John D. Dingell.
16. John Lesinski.
17. Martha W. Griffiths.
18. William S. Broomfield.

MINNESOTA

1. August H. Andresen.
2. Joseph P. O'Hara.
3. Roy W. Wier.
4. Eugene J. McCarthy.
5. Walter H. Judd.
6. Fred Marshall.
7. H. Carl Andersen.
8. John A. Blatnik.
9. Coya Knutson.

MISSISSIPPI

1. Thomas G. Abernethy.
2. Jamie L. Whitten.
3. Frank E. Smith.
4. John Bell Williams.
5. Arthur Winstead.
6. William M. Colmer.

MISSOURI

1. Frank M. Karsten.
2. Thomas B. Curtis.
3. Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.) Sullivan.
4. George H. Christopher.
5. Richard Bolling.
6. W. R. Hull, Jr.
7. Charles H. (Charlie) Brown.
8. A. S. J. Carnahan.
9. Clarence Cannon.
10. Paul C. Jones.
11. Morgan M. Moulder.

MONTANA

1. Lee Metcalf.
2. LeRoy H. Anderson.

NEBRASKA

1. Phil Weaver.
2. Glenn Cunningham.
3. Robert D. Harrison.
4. A. L. Miller.

NEVADA

At large

Walter S. Baring.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1. Chester E. Merrow.
2. Perkins Bass.

NEW JERSEY

1. Charles A. Wolverton.
2. Vacant.
3. James C. Auchincloss.
4. Frank Thompson, Jr.
5. Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr.
6. Florence P. Dwyer.
7. William B. Widnall.
8. Gordon Canfield.
9. Frank C. Osmers, Jr.
10. Peter W. Rodino, Jr.
11. Hugh J. Addonizio.
12. Robert W. Kean.
13. Alfred D. Sieminski.
14. Vincent J. Dellay.

NEW MEXICO

At large

Vacant.
John J. Dempsey.

NEW YORK

1. Stuyvesant Wainwright.
2. Steven B. Derounian.
3. Frank J. Becker.
4. Henry J. Latham.
5. Albert H. Bosch.
6. Lester Holtzman.
7. James J. Delaney.
8. Victor L. Anfuso.
9. Eugene J. Keogh.
10. Edna F. Kelly.
11. Emanuel Celler.
12. Francis E. Dorn.
13. Abraham J. Multer.
14. John J. Rooney.
15. John H. Ray.
16. Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.
17. Frederic R. Coudert, Jr.
18. Alfred E. Santangelo.
19. Leonard Farbstein.
20. Ludwig Teller.
21. Herbert Zelenko.
22. James C. Healey.
23. Isidore Dollinger.
24. Charles A. Buckley.
25. Paul A. Fino.
26. Edwin B. Dooley.
27. Ralph W. Gwinn.
28. Katharine St. George.
29. J. Ernest Wharton.
30. Leo W. O'Brien.
31. Dean P. Taylor.
32. Bernard W. Kearney.
33. Clarence E. Kilburn.
34. William R. Williams.
35. R. Walter Riehlman.
36. John Taber.
37. Sterling Cole.
38. Kenneth B. Keating.
39. Harold C. Ostertag.
40. William E. Miller.
41. Edmund P. Radwan.
42. John R. Pillion.
43. Daniel A. Reed.

NORTH CAROLINA

1. Herbert C. Bonner.
2. L. H. Fountain.
3. Graham A. Barden.
4. Harold D. Cooley.
5. Ralph J. Scott.
6. Carl T. Durham.
7. Alton Lennon.
8. A. Paul Kitchin.
9. Hugh Q. Alexander.
10. Charles Raper Jonas.
11. Basil L. Whitener.
12. George A. Shuford.

NORTH DAKOTA

At large

Usher L. Burdick.
Otto Krueger.

OHIO

1. Gordon H. Scherer.
2. William E. Hess.
3. Paul F. Schenck.
4. William M. McCulloch.
5. Cliff Clevenger.
6. James G. Polk.
7. Clarence J. Brown.
8. Jackson E. Betts.
9. Thomas L. Ashley.
10. Thomas A. Jenkins.
11. David S. Dennison, Jr.
12. John M. Vorys.
13. A. D. Baumhart, Jr.
14. William H. Ayres.
15. John E. Henderson.
16. Frank T. Bow.
17. J. Harry McGregor.
18. Wayne L. Hays.
19. Michael J. Kirwan.
20. Michael A. Feighan.
21. Charles A. Vanik.
22. Frances P. Bolton.
23. William E. Minshall.

OKLAHOMA

1. Page Belcher.
2. Ed Edmondson.
3. Carl Albert.
4. Tom Steed.
5. John Jarman.
6. Toby Morris.

OREGON

1. Walter Norblad.
2. Al Ullman.
3. Edith Green.
4. Charles O. Porter.

PENNSYLVANIA

1. William A. Barrett.
2. Kathryn E. (Mrs. William T.) Granahan.
3. James A. Byrne.
4. Earl Chudoff.
5. William J. Green, Jr.
6. Hugh Scott.
7. Benjamin F. James.
8. Willard S. Curtin.
9. Paul B. Dague.
10. Joseph L. Carrigg.
11. Daniel J. Flood.
12. Ivor D. Fenton.
13. Samuel K. McConnell, Jr.
14. George M. Rhodes.
15. Francis E. Walter.
16. Walter M. Mumma.
17. Alvin R. Bush.
18. Richard M. Simpson.
19. S. Walter Stauffer.
20. James E. Van Zandt.
21. Augustine B. Kelley.
22. John P. Saylor.
23. Leon H. Gavin.
24. Carroll D. Kearns.
25. Frank M. Clark.
26. Thomas E. Morgan.
27. James G. Fulton.

28. Herman P. Eberharter.
29. Robert J. Corbett.
30. Elmer J. Holland.

RHODE ISLAND

1. Aime J. Forand.
2. John E. Fogarty.

SOUTH CAROLINA

1. L. Mendel Rivers.
2. John J. Riley.
3. W. J. Bryan Dorn.
4. Robert T. Ashmore.
5. Robert W. Hemphill.
6. John L. McMillan.

SOUTH DAKOTA

1. George S. McGovern.
2. E. Y. Berry.

TENNESSEE

1. B. Carroll Reece.
2. Howard H. Baker.
3. James B. Frazier, Jr.
4. Joe L. Evins.
5. J. Carlton Loser.
6. Ross Bass.
7. Tom Murray.
8. Jere Cooper.
9. Clifford Davis.

TEXAS

1. Wright Patman.
2. Jack Brooks.
3. Lindley Beckworth.
4. Sam Rayburn.
5. Bruce Alger.
6. Olin E. Teague.
7. John Dowdy.
8. Albert Thomas.
9. Clark W. Thompson.
10. Homer Thornberry.
11. W. R. Poage.
12. Jim Wright.
13. Frank Ikard.
14. John Young.
15. Joe M. Kilgore.
16. J. T. Rutherford.
17. Omar Burleson.
18. Walter Rogers.
19. George Mahon.
20. Paul J. Kilday.
21. O. C. Fisher.

At large

Martin Dies.

UTAH

1. Henry Aldous Dixon.
2. William A. Dawson.

VERMONT

At large

Winston L. Prouty.

VIRGINIA

1. Edward J. Robeson, Jr.
2. Porter Hardy, Jr.
3. J. Vaughan Gary.
4. Watkins M. Abbitt.
5. William M. Tuck.
6. Richard H. Poff.
7. Burr P. Harrison.
8. Howard W. Smith.
9. W. Pat Jennings.
10. Joel T. Broyhill.

WASHINGTON

1. Thomas M. Pelly.
2. Jack Westland.
3. Russell V. Mack.
4. Hal Holmes.
5. Walt Horan.
6. Thor C. Tollefson.

At large

Don Magnuson.

WEST VIRGINIA

1. Arch A. Moore, Jr.
2. Harley O. Staggers.
3. Cleveland M. Bailey.
4. Will E. Neal.
5. Elizabeth Kee.
6. Robert C. Byrd.

WISCONSIN

1. Lawrence H. Smith.
2. Donald E. Tewes.
3. Gardner R. Withrow.
4. Clement J. Zablocki.
5. Henry S. Reuss.
6. William K. Van Pelt.
7. Melvin R. Laird.
8. John W. Byrnes.
9. Lester R. Johnson.
10. Alvin E. O'Konski.

WYOMING

At large

Keith Thomson.

ALASKA

Delegate

E. L. (Bob) Bartlett.

HAWAII

Delegate

John A. Burns.

PUERTO RICO

Resident Commissioner

Antonio Fernós-Isern.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

467. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for reports on the acreage planted to cotton, to repeal the prohibitions against cotton acreage reports based on farmers' planting intentions, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

468. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report stating that an adequate soil survey and land classification of the lands in the Hayden Lake unit, eastern division, Rathdrum Prairie project, Idaho, has been completed as a part of the investigations required in the formulation of a definite plan for project development, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

469. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a report covering the contracts negotiated by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics for the period July 1 to December 31, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 413, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

470. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report which presents a survey of the background, operations, and administration of our basic stockpiling program, pursuant to section 708 (e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

471. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,'" approved May 1, 1906, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

472. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to borrow motor vehicles for use in a motor-vehicle driver education and training course in the public schools of the District of Columbia, to excuse the owners of vehicles loaned to public, private, or parochial schools for driver training purposes from the payment of certain fees and taxes during the period of such loan, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

473. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska,' as amended"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

474. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting recently issued publications as follows: (1) Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1955; and (2) Estimated Future Power Requirements of the United States, 1955–80; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

475. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report with respect to the present status of negotiations with prospective purchasers of the falling water to be produced by the Trinity River division of the Central Valley project, pursuant to Public Law 386, 84th Congress (H. Doc. No. 94); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

476. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1077), to remove restrictions on the use of a portion of the Springfield Confederate Cemetery, Springfield, Mo., and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

477. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report stating that proceedings that have been concluded with respect to the following claim:

Joseph Chitto et al., Members and as the Representatives of and on the Relation of the Choctaw Indians East of the Mississippi River, Petitioners, v. *The United States of America, Defendant* (Docket No. 52); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

478. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Capt. Thomas C. Curtis and Capt. George L. Lane"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

479. A letter from the Deputy Postmaster General, transmitting a tabulation showing the number of envelopes, labels, wrappers, cards, and other articles bearing penalty indicia procured or accounted for through this Department during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 785, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

480. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

481. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the Sixth Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education on the administration of Public Laws 874 and 815, 91st Congress, as amended, including a detailed statement of receipts and disbursements for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, pursuant to subsection 7 (c) of Public Law 874 and subsection 208 (c) of Public Law 815; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

482. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill for the relief of Joe Kawakami"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

483. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill for the relief of Robert Burns DeWitt"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

484. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act to authorize a change in the maximum interest rate permitted on United States savings bonds"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

485. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting correspondence with reference to the case of Chung-Liang Liang, A-6263743, involving the provisions of section 6 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1953, as amended, and requesting the case be returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 348. A bill to amend section 12 of the act approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676), relating to the admission into the Union of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington by providing for the use of public lands granted to the States therein for the purpose of constructing, reconstructing, repair, renovation, or other permanent improvement of public buildings at the capital of said States; with amendment (Rept. No. 56). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 202. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 57). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 23. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Arthur H. Compton as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; without amendment (Rept. No. 58). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 158. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 128; with amendment (Rept. No. 59). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 62. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of 5,000 additional copies of House Report No. 2966, 84th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 60). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 82. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on the national highway program for the use of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives; with amendment (Rept. No. 61). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 97. Resolution authorizing the printing of the United States Defense Policies Since World War II as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 62). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 104. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on excise taxes held by the Committee on Ways and Means during the 84th Congress, 2d session; without amendment (Rept. No. 63). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 120. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Public Law 880, 84th Congress, the social security amendments of 1956, without amendment (Rept. No. 64). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 6. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing with illustrations and binding of proceedings in connection with the acceptance of the statue of the late Chief Justice Edward Douglass White without amendment (Rept. No. 65). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 7. Concurrent resolution to print for the Committee on Public Works certain data on the Arkansas, White-Red River Basins and water resources of the New England-New York region; without amendment (Rept. No. 66). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Report of Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary pertaining to Spanish sheepherders; without amendment (Rept. No. 67). 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. COOPER:

H. R. 4734. A bill to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act to authorize a change in the maximum interest rate permitted on United States savings bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED:

H. R. 4735. A bill to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act to authorize a change in the maximum interest rate permitted on United States savings bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 4736. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit employees to deduct their contributions under private unemployment compensation disability benefit plans where such contributions are in lieu of contributions otherwise required by State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 4737. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that interest received by individuals upon United States savings bonds shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4738. A bill to provide salary increases for Government employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 4739. A bill to encourage new residential construction for veterans' housing in rural areas and small cities and towns by raising the maximum amounts in which direct loans may be made from $10,000 to $12,500, to authorize advance financing commitments, to extend the direct loan program for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 4740. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4741. A bill to amend the act of August 24, 1912, to increase the compensation of members of the legislature of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BECKER:

H. R. 4742. A bill to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be paid compensation at the rate of $2.50 per day for each day spent in hiding during World War II or the Korean conflict to evade capture by the enemy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 4743. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the minimum hourly wage provided for therein to $1.25; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4744. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 3 of the Securities Act of 1933, to provide that responsible officers or other persons shall be liable in damages on account of untrue statements or material omissions in statements or documents filed under such subsection as a condition of exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4745. A bill to authorize the enlargement of the administrative headquarters site for Isle Royale National Park, Houghton, Mich., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 4746. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to review certain claims for benefits and payments under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 4747. A bill to reorganize the Capitol Police force in order to increase its efficiency in the performance of its duties; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 4748. A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1955, to extend the time during which annual assessment work on unpatented mining claims subject to that act may be made; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4749. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to connect the sewage system of St. Joseph's Indian School with that of the town of Chamberlain, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 4750. A bill to amend section 313 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4751. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, in order to correct certain inequities in the computation of service in the Coast Guard Women's Reserve; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 4752. A bill to amend titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act so as to further assist the States in extending aid for medical care to persons eligible for public assistance under such titles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4753. A bill to amend section 3731 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to appeals by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4754. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to fees of United States marshals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4755. A bill to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4756. A bill to amend section 544 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the bonds of United States marshals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4757. A bill to include certain officers and employees of the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the General Services Administration, and Federal probation officers within the provisions

of sections 111 and 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to assaults and homicides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 4758. A bill to provide for transmission in the mails at the rate provided for books of 8-millimeter films and related matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4759. A bill relating to the definition of head of household for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4760. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that a deceased employee shall be "completely insured" if at his death he was entitled to an annuity which began to accrue during 1948 on the basis of an application filed before 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 4761. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the western district of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 4762. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to allow credit for certain service rendered States or instrumentalities thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 4763. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 4764. A bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954 to provide that counterpart funds used by a committee of Congress overseas shall be charged against the amount available to such committee from the contingent fund of the Senate or the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 4765. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide insurance thereunder against the cost of hospitalization for insured aged persons and their dependents and survivors, and for insured disabled persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4766. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit supervisiors to be considered as employees under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. R. 4767. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H. R. 4768. A bill to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the county of San Jacinto, Tex., and authorizing named parties to bring suit for title and possession of same, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 4769. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 4770. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit policemen and firemen in positions covered by retirement systems to obtain social security coverage on the same basis as other State and local employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 4771. A bill to give all producers of commodities eligible for inclusion in the 1957 acreage reserve program an opportunity to participate therein; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 4772. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the northern district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 4773. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits in certain cases for brothers, sisters, and other relatives of individuals who die fully insured under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 4774. A bill to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H. R. 4775. A bill to repeal the ban on filling the vacancy in the judgeship for the middle district of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 4776. A bill to restore to the rolls certain emergency officers heretofore granted retirement pay; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4777. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 4778. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 4779. A bill to continue the exemption from the Classification Act of 1949 of certain employees whose compensation is fixed and adjusted in accordance with prevailing rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4780. A bill to prohibit the mailing of certain material by a Member of Congress, under his frank, to destinations outside the State or district which he represents; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 4781. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, so as to change the interest rate applicable to loans and to provide for the payment by borrowers of a fee to assist in paying the administrative costs incident to loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 4782. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 4783. A bill to authorize the Chief of Engineers to survey areas of water supply shortages and to prepare reports and recommendations thereon with a view to alleviation of shortages in order to assure future development of the Nation; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4784. A bill to authorize a survey and investigation with respect to the relocation of the Ferry County Highway, paralleling Lake Roosevelt, Columbia Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4785. A bill to establish a Columbia Interstate Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 4786. A bill to provide for the procurement of judge advocates and law specialist officers for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4787. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the rank of certain officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 4788. A bill to amend section 313 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, pertaining to burley tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4789. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act to require conservation practices on land placed into the soil reserve; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 4790. A bill providing for price reporting and research with respect to forest products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4791. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large retail establishments whose activities affect interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 4792. A bill to repeal the tax on the transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 4793. A bill to amend title V of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 4794. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on lacrosse sticks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4795. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 4796. A bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 4797. A bill to establish a Federal policy concerning the termination, limitation, or establishment of business-type operations of the Government which may be conducted in competition with private enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H. R. 4798. A bill to eliminate the financial limitation on real and personal estate holdings of the American Historical Association; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 4799. A bill to provide that coverage for lawyers under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system shall be on a voluntary basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4800. A bill to provide that coverage for self-employed farmers and ranchers under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system shall be on a voluntary basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 4801. A bill to increasse the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 4802. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Columbia Basin Project Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 4803. A bill to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Chicagoland Commerce and Industry Exposition, to be held at

Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 4804. A bill for the relief of the Newington School District, New Hampshire; to the Committee on the Judicary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 4805. A bill to provide that pensions for non-service-connected death shall be extended to the widows and children of deceased World War II and Korean veterans under the same conditions as apply to the widows and children of deceased World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4806. A bill to provide that the declining balance and certain other methods of depreciation shall be available for income tax purposes only in the case of property with a useful life of 10 years or more, and to terminate the provision for amortization of emergency facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4807. A bill to provide that pension for non-service-connected permanent and total disability may be paid to single veterans who have a dependent parent, and whose annual income does not exceed $2,700; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4808. A bill to permit any veteran of both World Wars to elect to have his service in World War I counted as service in World War II for the purpose of determining eligibility for certain benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4809. A bill to release and quitclaim all rights and interests of the United States in certain real property to Walnut Ridge, Ark.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 4810. A bill to provide for payments by the United States to local educational agencies from the proceeds of sales of federally owned land; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4811. A bill to release and quitclaim all rights and interests of the United States in certain real property to the Newport Special School District, Jackson County, Ark.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 4812. A bill to release and quitclaim all rights and interests of the United States in certain real property to Newport, Ark.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 4813. A bill to extend the life of the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H. R. 4814. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the western district of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4815. A bill to provide permanent authority for the Postmaster General to establish postal stations at camps, posts, or stations of the Armed Forces, and at defense or other strategic installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 4816. A bill to repeal section 309 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, relating to protests in cases where instruments of authorization are issued or renewed without hearing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 4817. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4818. A bill to make the evaluation of recreational benefits resulting from the construction of any flood control, navigation, or reclamation project an integral part of project planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 4819. A bill for the establishment of a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to study the outdoor recreation resources of the public lands and other land and water areas of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. R. 4820. A bill to provide for research, study, and prevention and treatment of effects of atomic and nuclear radiation on human health, development, and living conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4821. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to extend and improve existing housing programs, to establish new programs to meet special housing needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 4822. A bill for the establishment of a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to study the outdoor recreation resources of the public lands and other land and water areas of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4823. A bill to make the evaluation of recreational benefits resulting from the construction of any flood control, navigation, or reclamation project an integral part of project planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 4824. A bill to provide for voluntary coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system for self-employed physicians and dentists; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 4825. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in operation of industries affecting commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 4826. A bill to authorize the per capita distribution of certain funds belonging to the members of the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAUND:

H. R. 4827. A bill to provide that Imperial and San Diego Counties in the State of California shall constitute a new and separate judicial district to be known as the southern district of California, and to redesignate the present southern district of California as the central district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4828. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to incerase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHUFORD:

H. R. 4829. A bill to increase the national marketing quota for burley tobacco by 10 percent; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHUFORD (by request):

H. R. 4830. A bill to authorize revision of the tribal roll of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4831. A bill to amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4832. A bill to establish an effective student exchange program with Latin American countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 4833. A bill to provide for research and technical assistance relating to the control of salt-marsh and other pest mosquitoes of public health importance and mosquito vectors of human disease; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4834. A bill to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 4835. A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 4836. A bill to provide for examination, licensing, and regulation of dispensing opticians and optical technicians in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 4837. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income-tax exemption for a taxpayer if he or his spouse is totally and permanently deaf as well as blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 4838. A bill to incorporate the Military Order of the Purple Heart, a national organization of combat wounded composed solely of Purple Hearters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4839. A bill to authorize the President to appoint to the grade of general in the Army of the United States those officers who, in grade of lieutenant general, during the period from March 15, 1947 to March 31, 1953, commanded United States Army in Europe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4840. A bill to incorporate the Metropolitan Police Relief Association of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. R. 4841. A bill to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children or mentally or emotionally ill children, and to encourage the development of programs of rehabilitation for such children through grants to nonprofit institutions and to State educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 4842. A bill to provide for the control of certain advertising on federally owned or controlled lands adjacent to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and to encourage such control on other lands adjacent to such National System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 4843. A bill to incorporate the USCDC (United States Civil Defense Council); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 4844. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of employers who are engaged in activities affecting interstate commerce, to eliminate certain exemptions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 4845. A bill to provide for the recomputation of annuities of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government retired under section 1 (d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as

amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. J. Res. 230. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to personnel employed by the House Committee on Ways and Means in connection with the investigations ordered by House Resolution 104, 85th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. J. Res. 231. Joint resolution to amend title III of the National Housing Act to provide interim assistance for home loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. J. Res. 232. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States repealing the 16th amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. J. Res. 233. Joint resolution to encourage and foster the cooperation of private and State historical commissions with the National Historical Publications Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. J. Res. 234. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Kansas:

H. J. Res. 235. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. J. Res. 236. Joint resolution requesting the President to instruct the permanent representative of the United States to the United Nations to request the Security Council without delay to convene the Arab States and the state of Israel and other interested nations in a peace conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. J. Res. 237. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the popular election of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. Res. 166. Resolution to authorize the Select Committee on Small Business to investigate and study the problems of small business with respect to basic and applied scientific research and development work; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. Res. 167. Resolution providing for sending the bill H. R. 3875 and accompanying papers to the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States against granting concessions on textile imports from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN: Resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts calling for the expulsion of Soviet Russia from the United Nations Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States against granting concessions on textile imports from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States against granting concessions on textile and fish imports from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States against granting concessions on textile imports from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take such action as will provide a suitable and proper system of flood control in order to avert another such disaster in the valley of the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 4846. A bill for the relief of Mario Bellich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4847. A bill for the relief of Lea Kummer O'Connell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4848. A bill for the relief of Gudrun Luebik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 4849. A bill for the relief of Reza Rezazadeh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 4850. A bill for the relief of Ester Pollak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 4851. A bill for the relief of Mrs. M. E. Shelton Pruitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4852. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Altacher Kefauver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. R. 4853. A bill for the relief of Stephen Kuang-Tao Hsu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4854. A bill for the relief of Victoria Galea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 4855. A bill for the relief of Evangelia G. Alexandris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 4856. A bill for the relief of Charles Henry Willsmore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 4857. A bill for the relief of Arsene Kavoukdjian (Arsene Kavookjian); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 4858. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Wilma Aldridge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4859. A bill for the relief of Ingeborg F. Bauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 4860. A bill for the relief of Alex P. Collins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 4861. A bill for the relief of Yrjo (George) Israel Erkinpoika Haapanen, Anna Esther Alfhild Haapanen (nee Talkari), Seppo Pellervo Haapanen, Timo Juhani Haapanen, and Eira Telervo Haapanen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 4862. A bill for the relief of Han Liang Huang and Zing Wei Tang Huang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 4863. A bill for the relief of Daniel Ventura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4864. A bill for the relief of Roger Fouti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4865. A bill for the relief of Shamouil Shamilzadeh; his wife, Shoushan Shamilzadeh; and their son, David Shamilzadeh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4866. A bill for the relief of Mr. Abraham A. Rubin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4867. A bill for the relief of Raffaele Gargiulo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4868. A bill for the relief of Pierre Negler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4869. A bill for the relief of Yenovk and Siranouche Shegerian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4870. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Safura Rahmatulla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN (by request):

H. R. 4871. A bill for the relief of Chi-Tsu Tsang; his wife, Yung-tsing Hwang Tsang; and their children, Arlene Bai-Hwa Tsang, Betty Lai-Hwa Tsang, Carl Yang-Hwa Tsang, Doris Tiau-Hwa Tsang, and Diane Si-Hwa Tsang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. R. 4872. A bill for the relief of Sister Gabriele (also known as Mikalina Vaicaityte); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 4873. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Vallefuoco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H. R. 4874. A bill to amend the act of July 2, 1956, entitled "An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the Columbia Historical Society in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 4875. A bill for the relief of the dependents of John Henry Wright, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H. R. 4876. A bill for the relief of Chun Tin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 4877. A bill for the relief of Paul J. Rackl and George E. Rackl, copartners, doing business as Craftsmen's Plastics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 4878. A bill for the relief of Nicoleta P. Pantelakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 4879. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Delfina Cvavez-Soto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 4880. A bill for the relief of Olaf Nielsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 4881. A bill for the relief of U. C. Martin, Blair Jones, and the estate of R. A. Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUND:

H. R. 4882. A bill for the relief of Kathleen R. Ranes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4883. A bill for the relief of Gregario Gasman Ancheta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4884. A bill for the relief of Ruth Erika Lerche Conrad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4885. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Navarette-Navarette; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4886. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yio Gik Him (nee Guadalupe Reyes Chip); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4887. A bill for the relief of Ta-Kwan Wue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 4888. A bill for the relief of Ignazio Boffoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4889. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Agnes Olson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4890. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret (Corner) Scarrit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 4891. A bill for the relief of Rosa M. Sinfuego; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4892. A bill for the relief of Jose Nicolas Villador; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 4893. A bill for the relief of Edith Kohn Vogel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H. R. 4894. A bill for the relief of Henning B. Dieter, Rolf Dieter, and Annelies Dieter Wiskott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 4895. A bill for the relief of Josip Kavran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4896. A bill for the relief of Marica Sutej; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Alabama: The New Economic Horizon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1957

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the Home Builders Association of Alabama is launching a new trade magazine called the Alabama Builder. For the first issue, Mr. Arthur E. Stewart, of Montgomery, Ala., executive vice president of the association, has called on me to contribute an article dealing with the future of Alabama. With the thought that my article expressing strong faith in our State's bright economic future may be of interest to the Members, I am happy to include it in the RECORD under leave heretofore granted.

The article follows:

Alabama's economic horizons were never brighter.

A great new industrial era is about to dawn in our State. Indeed, few other sections of the earth have such a brilliant outlook in prospect for the future.

We in the South are sometimes prone to overlook our own potentialities in scanning the distant skies. For long years our chambers of commerce have battled for every plant, every factory, every national shop located in Alabama. The day is approaching, however, when we shall no longer have to go out in search of industry. Industry has found us.

Alabama has what few other areas can offer. In short, we have the natural resources—water, in particular—and labor supply. Alabama enjoys a mild climate, which workers more and more are demanding. And our State has the space which new industries require.

In our lifetimes we have seen our agricultural economy happily balanced with industry. Now, Alabama has diversification of industry. The day is just around the corner when we will see the decentralization of industry in our State. Large plants no longer seek the large industrial centers of the East. They are looking South, and particularly to Alabama.

The key to our economic future lies in the development of what we have—our resources.

We have in abundance what no other section of the United States has enough of, and that is water. Water alone can bring great industrial advances, for there are numerous factories which cannot operate without plenty of water. These industries have to go where they can get the water they need.

Over 1,000 American cities were short of water last year. Outside of the Southeast, the United States has an annual rainfall of about 22 inches. In Alabama, our rainfall totals about 50 inches per year. Abundant water is in Alabama, and it's one of our biggest assets.

Our mild climate is also going to assist us in attracting more industry. Before the advent of the 40-hour week, factory workers had little time except for sleep and work. Now, they look for outside relaxation and recreation in their leisure hours. This means that workers are going to want to live in a climate where they can be out of doors the year around. Alabama affords workers this opportunity.

We offer sites away from the crowded, congested areas of the large industrial centers of today. A modern assembly-line factory requires space which is difficult to locate in most cities. For this reason, industry is heading for the wide open spaces. There, efficient new plants can be designed, allowing plenty of room for parking. The highly industrialized centers of the United States have about reached the saturation point. As renovations and expansions are required, the exodus will begin.

Not only are more and more plants going to be moving south but more plants will be started here than ever before. We have the capital to launch industry. This is because of the fact that our growth and prosperity as a State is dependent, to a large degree, upon the continuing expansion of our industries.

New plants mean more payrolls, and consequently more money spent at home for new clothes, new automobiles, new homes. Increased buying power raises our standard of living and boosts the economy of our entire State.

We do not have to depend on heavy industry alone, however. In many fields, we have certain advantages over other areas. Take tree farming, for instance. Money does grow on trees in Alabama. Or take our cattle industry. We've got the green pastures and the mild climate it takes.

If our great resources are properly developed, Alabama can become one of the most prosperous sections of the world. I have complete confidence in our economic future. In my humble opinion, Alabama is on the verge of an economic awakening and a vast industrial expansion.

Ben Phipps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1957

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I am privileged to pay a tribute to one who served faithfully and well for nearly a quarter of a century in the Federal service.

The usual thing is for all of us to criticize bureaucrats. Somehow we seem to get a lift by doing that. How much better it would be if we were more discerning and paid tribute and allowed credit where it was due.

Today I have that privilege. The case at point is a man whom I have known all my life. We were roommates at college. No kinder, friendlier or more responsible man ever lived. He was dedicated to his duties and performed them with enlightened zeal.

When Ben Phipps passed away I lost a friend, his neighbors lost a counselor and the Federal service lost one of those who fully understood the constructive purposes that inaugurate the many Federal programs that we have caused to be initiated and who tried diligently and successfully to carry out the will of Congress.

The death of Benjamin R. Phipps at Wenatchee, Wash., on January 18, 1957, brought to a close some 22 years of distinguished service to farm families in Washington State.

Ben Phipps had been serving Washington farmers as assistant State director of the Farmers' Home Administration for the past 4 years. Previous to that he had been a field representative with a large portion of the State under his direction. Mr. Phipps' first appointment with the Agency, then known as the Resettlement Administration, was in July 1935, as county rehabilitation supervisor at Wenatchee.

The Secretary of Agriculture awarded Mr. Phipps a citation for superior service in May of 1949, the highest type of award ever given for work in his agency. Among the accomplishments leading to the award was State leadership in number of improved farm practices set up on family farms under a supervisor's guidance.

Born on a farm near Wenatchee in 1904, Mr. Phipps had prepared himself for his specific service by graduating in 1929 from Washington State College at Pullman with a bachelor of science degree majoring in horticulture.

Immediately after his graduation, he went to Los Angeles city schools to teach elementary agriculture, but left after a year because of illness. For a few years he operated an orchard and farm on his own account near Wenatchee before his entry into Federal service. In 1934 and 1935 he worked for the Washington Emergency Relief Administration and the Rural Rehabilitation Corporation and then transferred to the predecessor agency of the Farmers' Home Administration.

He is survived by his widow, Mrs. Benjamin Phipps, who lives in Wenatchee.

Private Enterprise and Publicly Owned Corporations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1957

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the American business community is now witnessing a major struggle by a leading industrial corporation to gain control of another company. This type of acquisition is no new phenomenon on the American scene. However, in the case of the Penn-Texas Corp., which is endeavoring to acquire control of the management of Fairbanks, Morse & Co., of Chicago, a normal business rivalry is being used to aim unwarranted smears and character attacks against a distinguished American citizen, his company, and his associates.

It is basic to the system of private enterprise that the management of publicly owned corporations should reflect the will of the stockholders and not the capricious whims of paid officeholders.

The chairman of the board of the Penn-Texas Corp., Mr. Leopold D. Silberstein, has been leading an effort by his company and his associates to acquire control of Fairbanks, Morse & Co. The Penn-Texas Corp. had its inception in May 1951, when Mr. Silberstein bought control of the Pennsylvania Coal & Coke Co., which was then a dying enterprise. The company operates in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. My district includes communities whose people had a direct economic stake in the mines of the Pennsylvania Coal & Coke Co. It is, therefore, natural for me to take a keen interest in the history of this company and the part played by Mr. Silberstein and his associates in reviving a dying enterprise and restoring its idle workers to gainful employment. This was achieved by progressive, far-sighted management concepts. It was accomplished by mechanizing the Pennsylvania Coal & Coke mines to reduce operating costs. Within 1 year after the introduction of the new management, the company was able to report profits.

Since that time, the Penn-Texas Corp. has become a company whose components include some of the most respected names in American industry. These components take in the Industrial Brownhoist Corp., of Bay City, Mich.; the Quick-Way Truck Shovel Co., of Denver; the Pratt & Whitney Machine Tool Co., of Hartford; the famous old Colt Firearms Co.; the Liberty Produce Co., of Long Island, manufacturers of precision aircraft parts; the Hallicrafters Co., of Chicago; the Bayway Terminal Corp., of New Jersey, and the Crescent Co., of Rhode Island.

The Penn-Texas Corp. is doing vital work for our Government, which is evidence in itself of the respect and confidence reposed in Mr. Silberstein and the management of his companies.

It is therefore a shocking derogation of our fundamental American concepts of fair play that a respected citizen who has made, and continues to make, a highly useful and constructive contribution to the economic progress of our country and several of our individual communities should be a target of unbridled attack by business rivals whose derelictions in their own affairs are open to serious challenge. The shortcomings of the Fairbanks, Morse management were apparent as long ago as 1941, when a distinguished Member of the Senate, the Honorable STYLES BRIDGES of New Hampshire, disclosed that company's singular role in the so-called public ownership movement of that period. Senator BRIDGES' remarks are in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 8, 1941, commencing on page 57.

The methods that have been used in connection with management control of Fairbanks, Morse are now a subject of inquiry by the Securities and Exchange Commission. I hope that this agency will examine with the closest scrutiny the charges and countercharges that have characterized this entire matter.

In my view, Mr. Silberstein and his associates are justified in feeling confident that a fair and open inquiry will afford the best evidence that they have been unfairly and maliciously attacked by the Fairbanks, Morse incumbent management and its hirelings.

For myself, I want to make it plain that I resent deeply the unsupported character attacks against Mr. Silberstein and his associates and I intend in all respects to see to it, both in and out of Congress, that these most useful citizens are accorded the fair treatment that is due every decent member of our community.

The Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1957

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, an agreement of great significance to the free world has just been signed. The Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany, speaking for 22 Jewish organizations throughout the Western World, and IGIL—I. G. Farben in liquidation—have reached an agreement whereby IGIL is making available approximately $7.5 million to compensate former inmates of the infamous Auschwitz concentration camps who had been compelled by Hitler's SS Corps to labor in IG facilities. About $7 million of this amount will be paid by the Claims Conference to former Jewish concentration-camp laborers, while the balance will be distributed directly by IGIL to former non-Jewish concentration-camp workers.

This agreement holds great moral significance to the free world because it was negotiated not under threat of force or through intimidation but by the free will of the parties involved. The payment is voluntary; as a matter of fact, the agreement does not disturb the IG contention, borne out by the Nuremberg trials, that they were forced to use the concentration camp labor by the Nazi SS who kept the workers under their own rigid disciplinary control. The German liquidators of the once famous IG trust have welcomed the opportunity to redress some of the wrongs of the Nazi era, an era which the new Germany seeks to leave behind as it emerges as a full partner in the free world.

The moral victory gained by this agreement is emphasized by the fact that it was concluded between nongovernmental bodies. It serves as a fitting successor to the restitution agreement between Germany and Israel. Indeed, how many of us would have imagined some 15 years ago that what has just transpired would have been possible. Our efforts to restore free-world morality are truly bearing fruit.

The Late Dr. John Von Neumann

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1957

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of sorrow that I ask permission to address the House. On Friday, February 8, Dr. John Von Neumann, Commissioner on the Atomic Energy Commission, died, after a long battle with cancer. His illness, however, did not keep him from attending important Commission meetings until close to the end. He often left the hospital in an ambulance to attend these meetings.

Dr. Von Neumann was a most unusual and brilliant genius. His specialty was the most difficult kind of mathematics. He was able to devise the mathematical approach for the solution of many of the problems of the day. This mathematical approach could be used to study economic behavior, social organization, and even strategy in war. Dr. Von Neumann used this mathematical ability as the key to unlock a secret in the modern concept of physics through his contributions in the development of the quantum theory, a physical theory arrived at through the use of mathematics.

But even this ability of mathematical analysis was not his only gift. For he saw the need for finding a new way of making mathematical computations and he applied his highly specialized mathematical skill to the more concrete task of creating an electronic computing machine which would perform the tedious mathematical work quickly and accurately. Because he was able to build the first electronic computer, this country was mathematically armed with a machine capable of performing the necessary difficult calculations involved in the design of the very first hydrogen weapon.

For this work, Dr. Von Neumann was awarded the first Fermi award, granted by the Atomic Energy Commission in April 1956. He was also given the Medal of Freedom by the President.

Dr. Von Neumann made many appearances before the joint committee. While his outstanding intellectual capacity was always apparent, the members of the joint committee will always remember him for his humble but forthright attitude. He was indeed a genius who made many outstanding contributions to the defense of this Nation. I need not remind anyone that he came to this country in 1930 from Hungary and he lived a life symbolic of the freedoms he found here and he helped in the defense of those freedoms without thinking of personal financial gain for himself. His abilities and his genius will be sorely missed in this country in the years to come.

Drought Relief Equality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1957

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, it is with keen disappointment that I have noted the lack of action on the part of the Department of Agriculture in connection with the drought situation which existed in western Louisiana during the latter part of 1956 and January of 1957. It is very difficult to understand why the western parishes of Louisiana, which are separated from the eastern counties of Texas only by the Sabine River, are not treated equally in the matter of drought relief. Certainly the matter of a boundary line could not make any material difference in the climatic conditions of these adjacent areas.

In September 1956, Gov. Earl K. Long of Louisiana requested that certain areas of Louisiana be declared as disaster areas because of the existing severe drought. Other States were also suffering from drought conditions and also asked for relief through the disaster program.

Despite the fact that Governor Long submitted his request in September of 1956, the Louisiana State Disaster Committee was not brought into the picture until late January 1957 at which time winter pastures had begun to produce and the drought condition had become alleviated. The excuse given for denying the request for disaster relief was that the Louisiana Disaster Committee in their recommendations did not indicate the need for relief. Certainly the drought conditions that existed in September of 1956, at which time the original request for relief was made, did not exist in the same degree in late January of 1957 when the recommendation was made. It would seem to me that in fairness to all areas which should share equally in the disaster relief program, that requests should receive attention as soon as practicable after having been submitted to the Department of Agriculture.

It cannot be said that our State officials were lax in their efforts to secure drought relief. The Louisiana State Commissioner of Agriculture, S. J. McCrory, has been in constant touch with Department of Agriculture officials since the September request was made. He made a special trip to Washington and conferred with officials there together with members of the Louisiana congressional delegation in an effort to secure action. There have been letters, telegrams, and telephone conversations from the Commissioner's office as well as from members of the Louisiana delegation in Congress concerning this problem. I wonder why Louisiana farmers are being deprived of disaster relief benefits, whereas practically every county in Texas and all those Texas counties along the western border of Louisiana have been declared as drought areas by Federal authorities.

This constitutes another phase of the agricultural program which is disheartening and discouraging to our Louisiana farmers and which is frustrating to our public officials who are striving so diligently to secure the much-needed aid required by agriculture in Louisiana.

FEBRUARY 13, 1957.

HON. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am greatly disturbed over the general condition of our farmers in Louisiana and the handling of the drought relief program has certainly done little to alleviate their distress. It is particularly hard to explain to farmers residing in the western parishes of Louisiana why they do not qualify for drought relief, whereas farmers across the state line in the eastern counties of Texas do qualify for drought relief.

The unfairness in the way this drought relief program has been handled is clearly spelled out in the attached release from the Louisiana Department of Agriculture and Immigration, Baton Rouge, La. I wholeheartedly endorse the position and the statements of Louisiana State Commissioner of Agriculture, S. J. McCrory, relative to this matter. Since farmers in my congressional district look to me for an explanation as to why they were not afforded an equal opportunity to participate in the drought relief program, I, in turn, would appreciate very much having a realistic explanation from you which I can pass on to them.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

GEO. S. LONG,
Member of Congress.

Fighting Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1957

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, one reason why we have far less juvenile delinquency in the Kensington area of Buffalo, N. Y., is because the citizens there take an active interest in promoting activity for teen-agers.

After considerable success with the Kensington Little League, organization is now under way to form two leagues—a Babe Ruth League for baseball and a Pop Warner League for football.

It takes the effort of the fathers in the district to supply the necessary stimulant for such activity. It is being done, and I want to take my hat off to this small but important segment of America.

Pesticides—These Agricultural Chemicals Protect Your Food and Assure Unparalleled Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1957

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, during the past year many of us have received inquiries on the use of pesticides in the production of food. While most were seeking information, some showed alarm and fear.

In checking with the Food and Drug Administration and the United States Department of Agriculture, they assure me that our food supply is safe as far as pesticides are concerned.

I have had an opportunity to examine two articles, written by authorities in this field, which deal directly with this subject and am quite certain that my colleagues will find them both factual and very interesting as well as enlightening.

The first article, High Quality Food Supply Aided by Pest Control, was written by Dr. A. L. MILLER, my colleague from Nebraska, who authored Public Law 518 of the 83d Congress. This amendment to our Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act requires that a tolerance or an exemption from a tolerance be established for a pesticide chemical, when a residue remains, before it may be used in the production of food.

The second article, Consumers Given Unparalleled Protection, was written by Dr. Bernard E. Conley, of the American Medical Association.

The articles follow:

HIGH QUALITY FOOD SUPPLY AIDED BY PEST CONTROL

(By Hon. A. L. MILLER, M. D.,[1] Member of Congress, Nebraska)

It has given me much satisfaction to have sponsored the most recent major amendment to our Nation's Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for, with the passage of the bill, it gives complete assurance that our food is safe insofar as agricultural chemicals are concerned.

The American food supply, undoubtedly, is the safest in the world. In recent years, we have experienced sweeping changes—not

[1] Dr. A. L. MILLER practiced medicine for 30 years, and served as director of public health, State of Nebraska. He is a fellow in the American College of Surgeons, and is now serving his seventh term in Congress.

only in production, processing and distribution but in diets as well. All have been beneficial.

The average person's diet now contains 15 percent more calcium, 25 percent more riboflavin, 20 percent more thiamine and niacin, 15 percent more iron, about 5 percent more protein and 5 percent more of vitamins A and C, than it did 25 years ago.

The American diet is better because we eat more milk products, meat, poultry, eggs, vegetables, and fruits, but it is still not the best possible.

As I have pointed out, we now have 5 percent more vitamins A and C in our average diet. However, dietitians feel this should be increased considerably. These vitamins are found in leafy green and yellow vegetables and citrus fruits. These crops could never be produced in sufficient quantity without the use of agricultural chemicals for these specialty crops are highly susceptible to infestation and complete destruction by various pests. Of the more than 80,000 kinds of pests in the United States, about 7,000 are injurious to crops. Over 80 high-vitamin crops could never be produced without the use of agricultural chemicals.

Looking at the long-range problem—and it is a very serious one—one cannot help but become highly concerned over whether we will be able to produce enough food and fiber for our population even within the next 25 years.

Dr. Grover W. Ensley, staff director of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, recently pointed out that our population can be expected to increase to about 190 million persons by 1965. It can be expected that our diet level will continue to rise, but even if we are to feed 175 million people at the same rate as we have now, our domestic consumption of farm products must increase 9 percent. On this basis alone, by 1960, we would need to have each year about 2 billion more pounds of meat, an additional 500 million dozen eggs, an extra billion pounds of milk solids, and about 8 million tons more of feed grains than we produced in 1952.

Even as we must produce more food, vast armies of the rival world—insects—are devouring billions of dollars of food annually. They are attacking incessantly—the planted seed, the growing crop, stored foods, and even in the home. Insects are not the only source of loss. Weeds drain the vital juices of over $4 billion worth of United States crops annually.

Public Law 518, popularly known as the Miller amendment, is the vehicle which the Food and Drug Administration uses to establish, on a scientific basis, the amounts of chemical residues which can remain on crops. Literally millions of dollars are spent in research checking the safety of the various chemicals which are used.

These residues are very minute, many as low as one-tenth of a part per million. Others, due to their chemical structure, leave no residues whatsoever, and some are not harmful to humans and require no tolerance.

Of course, everyone should wash fresh fruits and vegetables and follow other commonly accepted steps for the safe handling of food. I say this as a medical doctor and as a former director of public health for the State of Nebraska. This should be done not only to wash away any residue, but to wash away filth from rodents, or flies and other insects. While many illnesses and deaths have been caused by the latter, the United States Public Health Service reports that there has been no illness or death attributed to the proper use of agricultural chemicals.

Public Law 518 is an excellent example of progress being speeded by legislation. I sincerely feel this law serves the interests of everyone, because it sets up standards of safety for all.

CONSUMERS GIVEN UNPARALLELED PROTECTION

(By Dr. Bernard E. Conley,[2] secretary, committee on pesticides, American Medical Association)

Pesticides play an important role in providing the Nation's food supply and protecting the public health. Thanks to the Miller amendment to the Federal Food and Drug Act the consumer is assured of an unparalleled degree of protection.

The Miller amendment requires the pretesting of a pesticide chemical for the protection of the consumer.

Safety is based on knowledge. We as members of the committee on pesticides of the American Medical Association are very much interested in any program or effort to increase people's knowledge of how to use pesticides properly.

Pesticides can be safely used. However, disregard for the basic safety measures and precautions may result in accidents. Persons using pesticides should read the directions carefully and take the precautionary steps outlined on the label.

Naturally, we are interested in the safety program of the pesticide industry being sponsored by the National Agricultural Chemicals Association in cooperation with the National Safety Council. This program is a forward step in educating everyone concerned with the safe and judicious use of these materials.

[2] Dr. Bernard E. Conley received S. M. and Ph. D. degrees from the department of pharmacology of the University of Chicago, and is now a research associate there. He is presently secretary of both the committee on toxicology and the committee on pesticides of the American Medical Association.

Cooperative Relationship Between Postal Organization and New York Postmaster Robert H. Schaffer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1957

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, it is not always that we hear of employee groups speaking well of their employers. So that when we do hear of an extremely satisfactory relationship between, not one but several, labor organizations and the boss, that deserves special attention and commendation. I refer specifically to the cordial and cooperative relationship that exists between postal organizations in the New York post office and Postmaster Robert H. Schaffer.

In a letter addressed to me and signed by the presidents of nine employee organizations in the New York post office, these groups reaffirm their wholehearted support of Postmaster Schaffer. They state that they are enjoying more benefits than ever existed. The morale of their combined membership has improved as a result of changes introduced by Postmaster Schaffer. They salute him for his progressive mindedness and for his genuine cooperation in improving labor-management relationships in the post office. In substance, they extend a vote of confidence to Mr. Schaffer, whom the boys in New York affectionately and respectfully refer to as Ray.

I wish to join these postal groups in their expression of satisfaction for a man who has creditably filled the office of postmaster with honor, dignity, and humaneness. I concur in this salute to Ray.

Jones' Doorknob

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1957

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill which gives the Army engineers and other interstate agencies, a clear mandate and a full congressional authorization to seek out sites which would be adequate for storing water as stored water. Your first thoughts on this idea might be that it is superfluous, since upstream developments with power, reclamation, domestic water, navigation, flood control, recreation, and wildlife, all may, and usually do, add some storage water to the Nation's rivers and streams. However, I must point out, that up to now, water storage has been merely incidental or in addition to. It has never been the initial, and therefore, the prior consideration.

I was born on the banks of the Wenatchee River, a very short mile from its confluence with the mighty Columbia. As a boy, I used to search for arrowheads along that river and watch the sternwheelers churn upstream from Wenatchee to Riverside, Wash., in high water and sail downstream from Pateros to Wenatchee in low water. Even then we used to talk of the high water of 1894—which came "clear up to Jones' doorknob." The Jones family lived in a house near the Columbia. We do not have to think back 63 years ago to remember water up to Jones' doorknob. The terrible flood of 1948 and the flood last summer have focused our attention anew on flood control and have accented our observations and our efforts on those developments that will help us to avoid the devastations of extreme high water.

Yes, today, stored water means flood control and water stored during the runoff is the simple key to our future power development throughout the Nation. Speaking for the district I represent, stored water is the key to development of the Columbia River drainage basin. It is a must that we should know the potential in the light of the newest knowledge and procedures—and we should know the other problems involved and how to solve them. Stored water should be the main accent on our plans for future power development and future power supply.

A recent survey of power needs throughout the United States estimates that by 1975 the need for power will have increased 90 percent. Thus, we have reached a point now, in the overall development of the Columbia and other

rivers, when we must make the storage, as stored water, the first and primary consideration in any part of that development, and the farther we go up the system toward the Great Divide, the more important the fact should be. Aside from the problems of fish, which we all want fully met, storing water is now, more than ever, the very crux of our strivings for more power, more flood control, better navigation, better reservoir level control and adequate water for irrigation and domestic uses. The very naive lady who asked: "What do you do with the water after you get the electricity out of it?"—brought forth the well-known fact that you never get electricity out of water as long as it is falling. The same bucketful, stored, if possible, could have its electricity removed a score of times before it joined the Pacific.

I feel that by placing emphasis on storage, as stored water, we are beginning to place new emphasis on the potentials of the important but lesser tributaries. In my own district new projects have become feasible because of other developments, as in the case of the Omak-Goose Lake possibilities which I had the Army engineers first explore in 1946. Possible combinations with Chief Joseph Dam and power output now make this a project worthy of full study. Another possibility in my district is the Wenatchee hydro project which would store water in the Lake Wenatchee area. I believe, this is sometimes referred to as the Chiwawa.

Let me sum up by saying that as long as we have mountain ranges, and canyons with water flowing down them, we will have the responsibility of harnessing that water for progress and guarding against the damage of floods. Those mountains and those canyons also give us the God-given opportunity to make the most of our storage potential with a minimum of cost.

I must say that we are making new starts for immediate promise to our power needs, and some multiple benefits. But the need is for the much broader view—stored water, during the spring runoff that can be regulated to supply the benefits of a maximum flow the year around. The promise of escape from interruptive power, the elimination of floods and their damage, the realization, at last, of the full value of our mighty river assets—these are within our grasp.

The key, as I have said, is storage. Storage first, and the others will be added to it.

Insulting Remarks About Mexicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1957

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which was sent today to Mrs. Frederic A. Groves, national president of the Daughters of the American Revolution:

DEAR MRS. GROVES: Permit me to commend you for disassociating yourself and the policies of your national organization from the undemocratic remarks about Mexicans, made by Mrs. Charlotte C. Rush, a member of your Denver, Colo., chapter. Your statement should further serve to indicate that the DAR has come a long way since the unfortunate Marian Anderson incident in 1948, in espousing the ideals of real Americanism. As the Representative in Congress of a principal segment of the Mexican population in Detroit, I can proudly attest to their loyalty and fine citizenship.

It is no secret that treatment of Mexicans in certain parts of this country, coupled with attitudes reflected in such remarks made by Mrs. Rush is a source of animosity I know to exist against white Americans among many people in Mexico. I hope that your quick rejection of her statement will contribute toward assuaging their feelings and binding the ties demanded by decent instincts and our common interests with the Mexican people.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

Spanish Sheepherders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1957

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 107, a resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary or any subcommittee thereof, to conduct studies and investigations relative to matters within the committee's jurisdiction, which includes immigration, I have submitted today to the House a report containing findings and recommendations arrived at after a study of the problem of Spanish sheepherders was made last year.

The House Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality undertook last year to check on reports, according to which a considerable number of sheepherders admitted to the United States under three special laws passed in 1950, 1952, and 1954, respectively, have abandoned their employment with ranchers in the Western and Mountain States and drifted into the mining industry, dairy farms, various processing plants, and restaurants, mostly in California and Nevada, to the detriment of our woolgrowing industry.

A careful review of the results of our investigation has caused us to recommend that no special immigration laws admitting sheepherders for permanent residence be enacted by the Congress in the future. Instead, and mindful of the interests of the ranchers and woolgrowers as well as of the needs of our textile industry, we are recommending that after the practice of admitting sheepherders under special legislation is discontinued, they be permitted to enter this country under existing general laws which provide for the importation of needed workers on a temporary basis. This system has for the last few years worked to everybody's satisfaction in the case of agricultural laborers coming from the British West Indies for the purpose of supplying the necessary manpower for our citrus fruit growers, tobacco farmers, and sugar beet planters.

We have found that the circumstances of employment in the sheepraising and woolgrowing industry are no different from the employment of foreign skilled workers in other branches of agriculture. We therefore do not believe that the sheepherders should benefit from special, preferential and privileged treatment. Our studies have conclusively shown that the legitimate interest of American employers will be better served if workers for the sheepraising and woolgrowing industry were admitted temporarily for appropriate periods of time, and that at the conclusion of such periods they were required to return to their country of origin and to their families, while other workers—from domestic labor sources, if available—or other foreign workers similarly skilled be given an opportunity to accept temporary employment.

My report urges the Immigration and Naturalization Service to implement this recommendation and to use their experience obtained in the administration of the British West Indies program in establishing procedures after consultation with the Department of Labor, the interested labor unions, the National Woolgrowers Association of Salt Lake City, Utah, and with the California Range Association, of Fresno, Calif., under which skilled sheepherders could enter this country on a rotating basis so as to assure a continuous supply of this type of labor.

Most of the sheepherders admitted to the United States under special legislation came from Spain. Under the special laws, the immigration quota for Spain was reduced by 50 percent through the fiscal year 1960 under a "mortgage" provision in order to have the 750 quota immigrant visas issued to the special sheepherders "paid up" over several years. In fairness to immigrants born in Spain, we recommend in our report that this mortgage be canceled as of the beginning of the forthcoming fiscal year. This recommendation has already been implemented in a bill which I introduced in the Congress in January of this year.

The Madisonville Messenger of Madisonville, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1957

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, it came as no surprise to those of us who know the Madisonville Messenger of Madisonville, Ky., when the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Post 5480, presented it with a

plaque in appreciation of the paper's contribution to public safety.

In 1956 Kentucky suffered 769 traffic fatalities of the 40,200 throughout the United States. The Messenger, realizing some time ago the seriousness of the situation, began a crusade for public safety consisting of excellent news stories, photographs showing the horrifying results of traffic accidents, and backed this with a series of editorials. This program undertaken by the Messenger has been evaluated by the National Security Council as ranging up to 10 times its recommended performance.

The city of Madisonville is very fortunate in having a newspaper that has always been published in a fair and impartial manner. A newspaper that reports factually matters of concern to the community, State, and Nation, and with a firm editorial stand taken and upheld. The credit for publishing such an outstanding newspaper goes to the owner, Edgar Arnold, Sr., ably assisted by his son, Edgar Arnold, Jr.

Madisonville owes a debt of gratitude to Mr. Arnold and his son as excellent newspapermen, dedicated citizens, and outstanding Kentuckians. With the development of each fair and impartial newspaper a community in our Nation becomes a safer, better place to live, and freedom of the press takes a new and deeper meaning.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1957

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing in the House of Representatives a civil-rights bill which contains the four-point program called for by the President, and, in addition, contains the following four provisions:

First. Strengthening of basic civil-rights statutes by increasing punishment where death or maiming result from violations of these statutes.

Second. Clarification of these basic civil-rights statutes to facilitate prosecutions under them.

Third. Provision for judicially enforced penalties and remedies both criminal and civil in cases of segregation in interstate transportation.

Fourth. Provision for a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights with subpena powers.

The issue of civil-rights legislation is hardly a new one. Since 1944 both Democratic and Republican Party platforms have advocated an overhaul and reinforcement of the existing machinery. On two occasions President Truman tried to enact a civil-rights program, but on both occasions Senate filibusters defeated him.

The present administration has also encouraged efforts to end the many and degrading forms of discrimination which can be found throughout the country. Where progress has been significant—in the antidiscrimination measures of the armed services and other Federal activities—we take pride in a feeling of accomplishment. In the field of congressional legislation, we look forward to successful enactment of this legislation during the current Congress.

The first point in the four-point program of the President calls for the creation of a bipartisan commission to investigate asserted violations of civil rights and to make recommendations, appraising Federal laws and policy in attempting to insure equal protection under the laws of the Constitution. The commission would have the power to subpena, but would be, above all, a moral force. By bringing study and publicity to bear upon the problem, the commission would have an educational influence on all phases of public opinion.

The second point of the proposals calls for an enlargement of the Department of Justice. Thus civil-rights questions, formerly handled by a small section of the Criminal Law Section, would in their own right constitute a major new field.

The teeth of the program are found in the third and fourth points, where the Attorney General is at last given power to institute proceedings in behalf of the aggrieved party in a discriminatory action. And these proceedings may, for the first time, constitute civil action. In other words all those persons unable to afford the expense of an involved criminal suit on their own behalf would be protected from illegal discrimination, as they are now from such criminal offenses as kidnaping. In particular, the right to vote, one of the cornerstones of our great country, will be protected.

By passage of this bill then it would be possible to insure a greater approximation of equal protection under the law to all citizens. It would be possible to reduce the great economic waste that results from discrimination, a waste estimated by Elmo Roper to cost American industry at least $30 billion a year. It would also be possible to cut the social costs, the irrevocable damage done to innocent individuals who have suffered because of their race, religion, or sex. It would be possible for all citizens to enjoy the political rights promised by the Bill of Rights.

Opponents of this measure base their arguments upon a concept of the Constitution that is justified neither by the original intent of the framers, nor by the present times. The States are, indeed, given residual powers in the Constitution, but in no way can those powers be construed to mean violation, or even just neglect, of decisions handed down by the Supreme Court. In no way should they mean the refusal of suffrage rights to citizens on grounds of ill-concealed racial prejudice. Moreover, as was frequently pointed out in the hearings of the House Rules Committee last year, instances of discrimination are not limited to any one State, or even any one geographical distribution of States, a fact which only increases the desirability of the civil-rights legislation proposed.

One more element, perhaps more significant than any other, has also led me to introduce these proposals. The passing of such a measure will show to the world, more dramatically than any other word or gesture, that the United States is a land where freedom and opportunity really are equal for all. Free nations everywhere will appreciate the extent of our freedom, just as totalitarian and puppet governments will try to discredit it. Insofar as we can uphold these highest standards of justice, we can prove ourselves equal to our mighty heritage of freedom, and worthy of our responsibilities of leadership.

Budget Suggestions and Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1957

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, every off election year I send to the people I represent in the Fourth Congressional District in Nebraska a questionnaire which deals with the many problems facing the Congress. This year I will include a list of farmers' bulletins from which they may select 4 or 5 for their use.

Mr. Speaker, I have had many letters from Nebraska which indicate a serious concern about the size of the Federal budget and some of the new spending programs recommended. All the letters complain about the budget being too high and that wasteful spending must be trimmed out of the budget.

To analyze, condense, and summarize the budget for the 85th Congress is quite a task. It actually weighs more than 6 pounds and contains 1,521 pages. It lists thousands of items and carries an overall expenditure of nearly $72 billion. This is the largest peacetime budget in our history.

The President has indicated he is greatly concerned about inflation. He recognizes that excessive spending can jeopardize our Nation's economy. I agree with him wholeheartedly. I believe, also, that the first way to control inflation is to cut Federal spending. It cannot be done when there are many new items and programs for spending in the budget.

I know the budget is inflationary. It just seems, Mr. Speaker, that the President has had rather liberal-minded individuals giving him economic advice. The budget does not reflect, in my opinion, a course of action that would help put the brakes on the tide of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I have made some specific recommendations to the Bureau of the Budget and the President as to how and where the budget can be cut, and they are as follows:

1. Adopt all the Hoover Commission recommendations and save about $5 billion.

2. Sharp cutdown or complete elimination of our economic foreign aid pro-

gram. It now goes to 40 different countries and costs about $5 billion a year.

3. Reduce the number of Federal employees that now total about 2,400,000 by not hiring additional employees when vacancies occur until the payroll has been reduced at least 10 percent. The cost of the present civilian Federal payroll is about $11 billion a year. The present budget calls for adding about 27,000 more persons.

4. Stop advocating new programs for Federal spending. This would include Federal aid to education and 6 or 8 additional items recommended by different departments of government. This would save in the neighborhood of $3 billion.

I believe if these suggestions are followed, we could cut about eight or ten billion dollars from the present budget.

I want to represent the folks of the Fourth District honestly. I want to go along with the President when I feel he is right. I just could not go along with the Middle East resolution which included additional spending in this area of about $200 million now and an additional $400 million later on. If our drafted boys went to this area, some might even be under foreign leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the budget, as I understand it for 1958, is as follows:

	Billion
Interest on the public debt	$7.4
National defense	39.5
Veterans benefits	5.0
Foreign aid	5.0
The Federal payroll	10.2
Miscellaneous items (subsidies, grants-in-aid, etc.)	4.7
Total Federal budget	71.8

QUESTIONS

1. Where would you cut this budget?
2. Should postal rates meet expenses?
3. Do you favor Federal aid to education?
4. What type of farm program do you suggest?
5. Do you favor a meeting of the President with top rulers of other countries? Including Russia and Red China? Yugoslavia?
6. Do you favor economic or military aid to Communist-controlled countries?
7. Do you favor foreign aid of any kind?
8. Does the present trend in Government point toward socialism?
9. Do you favor a balanced budget before a cut in taxes?
10. Do you favor statehood for Alaska? Hawaii?

Send replies to Congressman A. L. MILLER, room 1025, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Milwaukee Celebrates National Crime Prevention Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 14, 1957

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared, entitled "Milwaukee Celebrates National Crime Prevention Week," together with two articles on the same subject from the Milwaukee Journal of February 10, 1957, showing how cities can and do fulfill their responsibilities.

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

MILWAUKEE CELEBRATES NATIONAL CRIME PREVENTION WEEK

In last Sunday's issue of the Milwaukee Journal, there were two most interesting articles which I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues. They were written in connection with the current celebration of National Crime Prevention Week.

LOW RATE OF CRIME IN MILWAUKEE

The first article, appearing on page one of the second part of the Journal, reported the pleasant fact that commercial gambling in Wisconsin's largest city is probably at a lower rate than in any comparable-size city in the Nation.

Milwaukee has been, remains, and will be, a clean town. We are mighty proud of that fact. We are proud of its model law enforcement. Even more important, we are proud of its law-abiding citizenry.

The second article illustrated the "Why" of Milwaukee's excellent record. The article described some of the plans for the grassroots celebration of Crime Prevention Week. Included in that particular article was a description of the splendid observances by Milwaukee religious leaders, and by laymen, law enforcement experts, and others. All of these fine observances are designed to keep the citizenry well-informed on the nature of the crime prevention problem.

EVERY CITIZEN'S JOB

Crime prevention is every man's and every woman's job. Keeping a community vice-free depends on teamwork—public law enforcement, religious leadership, laymen support. Yes, it is helped by good work being done by upstanding private investigation agencies, as well—those agencies which uphold the highest standards of professional conduct.

POLICE JOB BELONGS LOCALLY

As a former member of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee, I have always pointed out this fact: America will reduce its very high crime rate when all the local communities throughout the land become genuinely determined to do the basic job of law enforcement themselves.

OUR HUGE CRIME PROBLEM

We remember that for 1956, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, reported that there were as many as 2½ million major crimes unforunately committed in the United States. That shocking figure is enough to give deepest pause to all of us.

Uncle Sam through the ever-alert FBI and other arms can and will do his job to help the States and localities on combatting the many crimes involving Federal jurisdiction.

But the basic answer to the battle against crime must come from relentless State and local enforcing of their own anticrime laws. For, if there is any concept which is basic to this Nation, it is this: Police work—law enforcement—basically is not a Federal problem; it is a local problem and it must remain so. We do not believe in a national police force.

A KEY POINT IN FBI STORY

One of the greatest glories of the FBI under J. Edgar Hoover has always been that it has so superbly fulfilled its work within its own jurisdiction, while carefully refusing to infringe on any rights which must reside basically in the States and localities.

In his universally acclaimed book on the FBI, entitled "The FBI Story," the noted reporter, Don Whitehead, wisely stresses this fact: Mr. Hoover's and the FBI's great judgment in refusing the efforts of those who unwisely wanted to convert the FBI into a national police force. How right they have been in resisting any such misguided effort.

LID IS TIGHT ON GAMBLING—NEVER SO QUIET HERE, POLICE INSPECTOR SAYS ABOUT PRO ACTIVITY

(By Doyle K. Getter)

Commercial gambling has almost come to a standstill in Milwaukee. For a city of this size, it has probably less gambling going on than anywhere else in the country, according to men familiar with such activity.

"I've never seen it so quiet," Police Inspector Hugo Goehlen said Saturday. "We hear of an occasional floating card game, but they are small and never in the same place."

Police raided 10 floating games last year, cards and craps, without picking up a single professional gambler of any stature. Just small fry engaged in dime or quarter betting.

Not one gambler purchased a Federal gambling occupational tax stamp last year in Milwaukee. There is no commercial gambling house in the city, no regular horse handbook. Just 3 or 4 curbstone bookies, whose office is in their hat.

NO BASEBALL POOLS REPORTED

There were no baseball pools reported in Milwaukee last summer. Eight and ten years ago a football better could find football pool tickets in almost any tavern. There were more than 20 different pools.

Last fall three football pools, limited largely to factories, made a brief appearance. Police arrested and obtained convictions against 2 men for having tickets of 1 of the pools in their possession. That pool disappeared, and the other two pools disappeared with it.

There is not a commercial crap game in the city, according to dice players who ought to know. The old Ogden Social Club has disappeared, along with another crap game that met infrequently in hotel rooms.

FEDERAL TAX KILLED POLICY

Policy, which used to support 11 wheels in the Negro district with the nickels, dimes, and quarters of many hundreds of players, has been dead in Milwaukee since the Federal gambling tax went into effect in 1951. One wheel tried to make a comeback in 1954. It collapsed after a week.

Of the 40 to 50 professional gamblers whose names made news in the John Doe investigation of gambling here in 1948, fewer than a handful are still in business here—gambling business, that is.

Several have turned to roofing and siding business and have found it pays better, frequently much better, to be legitimate than illegitimate.

* * * * *

POLICE ARE TOLERANT

One tried booking basketball at the beginning of the season but his losses were so high that he quit. He made big money during the lush gambling years and is still probably well off.

At least two of the old-timers have moved to Nevada and are now in the gambling business legally.

Most of what gambling there is in Milwaukee is done in private homes or clubs—gin and poker games, contract bridge for stakes.

CRIME WEEK PLANS LISTED—YUL BRYNNER TO AID

Crime Prevention Week, which begins Sunday, probably will be the biggest concerted effort the city has seen to get the crime prevention message across to parents and youth.

The main attraction will be the shaven-headed stage and screen star, Yul Brynner, who will speak at the dedication of a monolith of the Ten Commandments at 10:30 a. m. Monday at the city hall and at a rally for parents and youth at 7:30 p. m. Monday at Marquette University Brooks Memorial Union, 620 North 14th Street.

Crime Prevention Weeks were observed in Milwaukee in the 1930's. A National Crime Prevention Week was started in 1947 by the National Exchange Club, a service luncheon club, with the Milwaukee branch of the group sponsoring activities here. This year for the first time the club and the metropolitan commission on crime prevention have joined forces for an enlarged effort.

SERMONS ARE SCHEDULED

On Sunday, religious emphasis day, many announcements and sermons concerning crime prevention are expected to be given in Milwaukee area churches. Fifty thousand inserts on the subject have been prepared to be slipped into church bulletins. The Milwaukee Catholic archdiocese and the Milwaukee Ministerial Association are cooperating in the effort.

Brynner will speak at the monolith dedication along with Judge E. J. Ruegemer, St. Cloud, Minn., national chairman of the Eagles youth guidance commission and originator of the monolith idea; Donald Hayne, Hollywood, Calif., executive assistant to Cecil B. De Mille, producer of the Ten Commandments, and District Judge Robert W. Hansen, former national president of the Eagles. Mayor Zeidler will accept the monolith from Judge Hansen for the city.

Ray MacArthur, crime prevention commission member, will preside. Rabbi Louis J. Swichkow, of Beth El Ner Tamid Synagogue, will give the invocation. The Rev. Hoover T. Grimsby, pastor of Ascension Lutheran Church, will give the benediction. Pastor Grimsby is chairman of the metropolitan crime prevention commission and cochairman of Crime Prevention Week with Arthur Johnson, 6224 North Berkeley Boulevard, Whitefish Bay, a member of the Milwaukee Exchange Club. In case of bad weather, the dedication will be in the city hall rotunda.

EVENING RALLY SLATED

At the evening rally, speakers wil be Brynner, Judge Ruegemer, and Hayne. Robert J. Cunningham, president of the Exchange Club, will preside.

Monday also being schoolday in crime prevention week, assemblies on crime prevention have been planned in many public and parochial schools. Some will be addressed by members of the Exchange Club and law enforcement agencies. Four schools will be presented trophies of the Exchange club for outstanding safety cadet records.

On Tuesday, law enforcement day, policemen in uniforms will visit the lower grades in schools to tell the children that they should regard them as their protectors and friends. Each child will receive a paper badge saying "Crime Prevention Police."

PROGRAMS SCHEDULED

On Wednesday, youth activities day, youth groups will hold crime prevention programs or have exhibits to show profitable uses for leisure time, such as hobby activities. Probably the largest program will be at the Milwaukee Boys' Club, 1640 North Franklin Place, which will hold a mothers and sons dinner and work in the crime prevention theme.

Thursday, Exchange Club day will be marked by a luncheon of the Exchange Club at the Milwaukee Athletic Club. Some 30 Milwaukee and suburban police officials, plus youth group leaders, members of the metropolitan crime prevention commission and principals of the 4 schools winning safety awards will be guests of honor.

Public institute day, Friday, will be observed at Brooks Memorial Union. A panel of youth leaders from 4 high schools will discuss "Youth and the Community" at 9:30 a. m. The members will be Barbara Brickhouse, Bay View High School, president of the Milwaukee Inter-High School Student Council; Michael Kramer, Messmer High School, Catholic representative on the metropolitan youth commission; Susan Lins, Rufus King High School, a member of the police youth advisory board, and Robert Rosenberg, Milwaukee Country Day School, president of the Milwaukee AZA Council of B'nai B'rith.

PANEL SESSION LISTED

At 2 p. m. Friday there will be a panel on "Where and How Has the Community Failed?" Members will be John E. Burke, warden of the State prison at Waupun; Marvin R. McMahon, superintendent of the Wisconsin School for Boys at Waukesha, and Sister M. Euphrasia, director of girls at the House of Good Shepherd. Maurice Wolkomir, a member of the metropolitan crime prevention commission, will be moderator.

Again on Sunday many churches are expected to present a crime prevention message, this time in connection with the opening of Brotherhood Week.

Some of the Crime Prevention Week activities will extend over several days. Thousands of upper grade pupils in elementary schools are expected to take guided tours of the safety building and suburban police departments during the week. They will receive booklets on the work of the police department. The booklet will be given out at the other programs in the week, as well.

Each day except Tuesday, which is Lincoln's Birthday and a legal holiday for county offices, a dozen or so selected young people will visit courts to observe procedures.

Discussion of Proposed Civil-Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. F. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1957

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a discussion of proposed civil-rights legislation which I was recently requested to prepare by Mr. Gordon Freeman, managing editor of the Pine Bluff Commercial, a daily newspaper published in my congressional district at Pine Bluff, Ark.

The discussion appeared in the Sunday edition on February 3, 1957, under the caption "What Is Meant by Civil Rights? NORRELL Answers Oft-Asked Query," and with the following editor's note:

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Because of inquiries by readers asking an explanation of legislation on civil rights, the Commercial went to Congressman NORRELL for this data. He has written an article packed with information, and it is especially timely, since a modified form of the measure will be the subject of hearings on February 4 by the House Committee on the Judiciary.)

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED CIVIL-RIGHTS LEGISLATION

(By W. F. NORRELL)

Many questions have arisen in the minds of citizens as to what is meant by civil rights, and what would be the effect of a proposed new Federal law that has the outward appearance of undertaking to increase the protection every citizen is granted by statutory law in the exercise of the rights conferred upon him by the Constitution of the United States.

In this sense, civil rights relate to the individual citizen's right to legal proceedings under the Constitution and statutory law for the protection of his rights, privileges, and immunities.

An American citizen has many rights. They are secured by the Constitution. They are guaranteed to him by constitutional amendments known as the Bill of Rights and by the laws enacted thereunder to provide a course of action in the courts for the redress or remedy of an infringement upon his rights.

Each clause of the Constitution was designed for the protection of the individual—of his life, his liberty, and his property.

The first 10 amendments to the Constitution placed limitations upon the National Government with respect to protection of fundamental rights of persons. Comprising the Bill of Rights, these amendments guarantee, among other things, the four freedoms with which everyone is familiar: freedom of worship, of speech and of the press, of assembly, and of petition. Another guarantees the security of citizens against unlawful search and seizure of persons and property. Others guarantee the right of due process of law (the established course of proceedings in the courts), and to the right of trial by jury.

The 10th amendment embodies the doctrine know as States Rights, holding that all rights not specially delegated by the Constitution to the National Government belong to the separate States. The constitutions and statutory laws of the separate States further protect his rights at the local level.

Our Constitution was built upon the fundamental principle that government derives its just power from the consent of the governed—which means the people. Our rights have always been defended by specific limitations of power in the National Government, and by the division of power between the National and State Governments.

Under the United States Constitution, each State has sovereign authority—the right to govern itself within its own area and to enact laws and regulations within the framework of the State constitution for safeguarding and promoting the general welfare of a community and its citizens. Thus the maintenance of law and order is primarily a State and city responsibility. Thus it is that the State has authority to prescribe necessary regulations governing public education, voting qualifications of its citizens, and the many others that protect and promote the welfare of the citizens of a community.

Turning now to the legislative measure which was proposed in 1956 by Attorney General Brownell and recommended by the President, one of the questions at issue was whether the National authority should be expanded to reach matters which have historically been within the jurisdiction of the States and the people. For example, it would extend Federal jurisdiction over the regulations in the separate States of the right to vote.

Specifically, the legislation proposed the creation of a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the National Government, with authority to investigate allegations that certain citizens of the United States are being deprived of their right to vote or are being subjected to unwarranted economic pressures by reason of their color, race, religion, or national origin.

The Commission would be authorized to hold hearings at any time or place, and authority would be vested in the Attorney General to subpena any citizen for attendance and testimony and/or to produce rec-

ords in evidence if so ordered; and any failure to obey such order may be punished as contempt of court.

The powers of the Commission would also include the use of services of voluntary personnel in the investigations prescribed, whose traveling and subsistence expenses would be paid by the Federal Government. A full-time staff director and unspecified number of personnel for the Commission, and a new Assistant Attorney General in the Department of Justice, to be in charge of a new Civil Rights Division with a large staff of lawyers, would be authorized.

Another part of the measure proposed the amendment of existing criminal conspiracy statutes, which provide that an individual has the right to a course of action in the courts for damages as a result of conspiracies to deprive him of rights to equal protection of the laws and equal privileges under the laws.

The two new sections proposed to amend the existing civil rights statutes would empower the Attorney General in the name of the United States to bring civil actions or other proceedings in Federal courts whenever any persons have engaged or are about to engage in any acts or practices which would deprive any other person of any right or privilege secured by the act. This action could be brought even before State judicial and administrative remedies now required by law were exhausted. The United States would be liable for costs of the litigation. And the Attorney General could institute action in the Federal courts without the knowledge or without the consent of the person designated as the aggrieved party.

The foregoing sections would attempt to legislate in areas where the Congress has no constitutional authority to act, and would invade the sovereign authority of the several States. The 14th amendment to the United States Constitution under which the new legislation is proposed, is directed against State action denying civil rights, but it does not give the Congress authority over the actions of private individuals.

A fourth part of the proposed legislation would amend the civil voting statute by making it unlawful for a private individual as well as persons acting under State authority to interfere with the right to vote at any general, special, or primary election concerning Federal offices; and would authorize the Attorney General in the name of the United States to bring a civil suit for damages or injunctive relief whenever any person has engaged or is about to engage in any act or practice which would deprive any other person of the right to vote. This part also abolishes the present requirement of exhausting State administrative and judicial remedies before proceeding to Federal courts.

The Federal Government cannot, either through the executive, the judicial, or the legislative branches, exercise any power not expressly granted to it by the Constitution. Our forefathers who framed the Constitution knew the dangers of concentration of governmental powers in a centralized system, and the counterbalance of power for the protection of the basic rights of the people is found in the 10th amendment.

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited to it by the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

This proposed legislation, which was brought before the House in the previous Congress, would in effect attack the sovereignty of all the States and the real civil rights of all the people—of all races, creeds, and points of origin. It has been well said that it could ultimately violate more rights than allegedly it intended to protect.

New measures have been introduced in the present Congress, some of which are similar to the old measure under discussion, and several of which contain some modifications and other changes. The House Committee on the Judiciary has scheduled hearings to begin on February 4.

The National Guard Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1957

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, the following is the statement which I submitted on February 9, 1957, to Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Committee on Armed Services in connection with the pending hearings on the Military Reserve program:

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT C. BYRD, SIXTH DISTRICT, WEST VIRGINIA, PRESENTED TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1 OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, FEBRUARY 9, 1957

Mr. Chairman and members of Subcommittee No. 1, I am deeply grateful for this opportunity to add my voice in protest against the recently proposed order of the Secretary of Defense, to become effective April 1, 1957, under which enlistees of the National Guard would be required to take the same 6 months' basic training as the short-term reservists.

If the Secretary's decision is grounded upon views similar to those in his utterance that the National Guard was a foxhole for dodgers during the Korean conflict, it manifestly follows that the Secretary's order was an arbitrary act without justification. Moreover, I believe my feeling is amply justified in the light of the history and ever-ready performance of the National Guard.

Under the Reserve Forces Act of 1955, pursuant to which the Secretary issued his directive, the basic training program is authorized to be "not less than 3 months or more than 6 months." In the past, neither in time of war nor in time of peace has the Army considered necessary a 6 months' basic training program. As a matter of fact, it is my understanding that the Army program under the 1955 act contains only 8 weeks of basic training with the remainder in travel, furlough, unit training, and supposedly some individual specialist training. It does seem indefensible for the Army now to state that it takes 6 months to train a basic soldier—the same period of time that has been considered sufficient training for commission as second lieutenant.

If the contemplated program is inflicted upon the National Guard, it has been estimated that the present strength of 405,000 will be reduced by 100,000 within 2 years. Mindful of this fact, the National Guard Association proposed a mandatory 3-month program which was not accepted by the Department. It has also been pointed out that a National Guard man enlists after graduation from high school, and at that time a 6-month training program would interrupt his first year of college. A 3-month basic-training program could permit the individual to return for service school or advanced individual training in many fields provided by the Army school system.

Should the Secretary persist in his demand for a 6-month single dose, then it is not unreasonable to assume that there is a method to his madness; namely, a desire to subject the Guard to the same central control as is exercised over the Reserves. It should not be forgotten, however, that the National Guard is normally subject to the control of the State, and its commander in chief is no less than the governor himself. The Constitution of the United States provides that the President shall be Commander in Chief of the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States. In other words, the President does not have the same duty and power over the militia as he does over the Military, Air, and Naval Forces.

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States provides that the Congress shall have power—

"To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States, respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress."

In 1820 the Supreme Court of the United States in *Houston* v. *Moore* (5 Wheat. 1, 16) had occasion to rule on the validity of a State statute which prescribed penalties for failure to obey the President's call of the militia. In upholding the State statute the Supreme Court in its opinion stated, in part, as follows:

"It is admitted on the one side, that so long as militia are acting under the military jurisdiction of the State to which they belong, the powers of legislation over them are concurrent in the General and State Government. Congress has power to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining them; and this power being unlimited, except in the two particulars of officering and training them, according to the discipline to be prescribed by Congress, it may be exercised to any extent that may be deemed necessary by Congress. But as State militia, the power of the State governments to legislate on the same subjects, having existed prior to the formation of the Constitution, and not having been prohibited by that instrument, it remains with the States, subordinate nevertheless to the paramount law of the General Government, operating upon the same subject."

It was not until the National Defense Act of 1916 that the Congress saw fit to exercise this constitutional power. The 1916 act contains specific provisions on the instruction, training, and discipline of the National Guard. I am not aware that those provisions can be construed to mean that the guard shall be subject to the identical training program that is required for the various branches of our Armed Forces. Likewise, there is a question in my mind concerning the authority of the Secretary of Defense to issue the instant directive under the provisions of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955.

Since its history, which can be traced to the early 17th century, the National Guard has played an important part in providing well-trained troops and units for the several wars in which the United States has engaged. The National Guard, aware of its part in preserving the defense of our country, has pointed out that the underlying purpose of greater combat readiness can be had with a basic training program of less than six months' duration. The guard has pointed out that a shorter program would permit it to maintain National Guard strength at about its present level.

In my opinion, the recommendations of the National Guard in the instant controversy warrant the consideration of the subcommittee from the standpoint of the interests of our National Government. Moreover, we should not lose sight of the possible effect which the Secretary's proposal could have upon the very maintenance of law and order within our States. Any action by the Federal Government which will serve to subordinate the normal supervision of the various States over the guard might well result in the implication of our National Government in local disorders and issues. So long as the guard's training

program can achieve the greater combat readiness called for by the Congress, I do not believe it is unreasonable to ask the Secretary of Defense to defer to the recommendations that have been submitted on this issue by the guard itself.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the subcommittee give serious consideration to the probable effects of the proposed order of the Secretary of Defense.

Columbia River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1957

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I am privileged to explain to my colleagues a bill I have today introduced to create a locally controlled interstate commission for the progressive development of the great Columbia River.

Mr. Speaker, in 1945 I first introduced a bill which provided for the establishment of the Columbia Interstate Commission. I have reintroduced this legislation in every succeeding Congress since then and, today, I did so again.

I was born on the banks of the Columbia River and the maximum development of this mighty stream has always been close to my heart. I fully realize that in order to obtain the maximum benefits, many problems must be encountered, discussed and, eventually, solved.

In previous Congresses, much legislation has been introduced providing for the orderly development of the Columbia, such as the so-called Valley authority bills. I have been conducting my own study over a period of many years on this subject and my bill is a result of this study and it has been objectively and constructively criticized.

I might say that I have been sympathetic to the sincere objectives of the standard proponents of the valley authority principle, however, I have encountered numerous obvious defects in the authority bills. My bill is designed to remedy these errors and still attain the objective of comprehensive regional development.

I wish to make a brief statement summarizing my proposed bill pointing out the essential differences between it and the other bills. I assure you—they are not the same.

The purpose of my bill is to provide a vehicle for the orderly development of the tremendous resources with which God has blessed this region; to give voice to the residents of the Pacific Northwest in determining the policies directing the course of this development; to extend the benefits of that development to the growth of the true, native private enterprise in the area and to guarantee to the Federal Government a sound administration of the projects in the Columbia region in which the taxpayers have a multibillion dollar investment.

My basic objections to the valley authority bills have been mainly:

First. No adequate provision was made to give the people of the area—through their State governments—an effective voice in policy matters.

Second. Provisions made in the valley bills for local advisory councils have been proposed on a pressure group basis. This is a black mark on American traditions.

Third. No effective guaranty has been made as to rights of employees of the authority either through civil service or collective bargaining.

Fourth. The authority proponents, attempting to avoid colonialism by Wall Street, have advocated colonialism by Washington, D. C. I feel that either condition for the Pacific Northwest is intolerable. My bill, I feel, would give all responsible people and agencies a chance to express their desire for balanced progress.

I have written this measure in a sincere attempt to bring the people of the area affected fully into the governing and operation of the Columbia River. I have tried, in this measure, to properly recognize the place of the States. This bill creates a real partnership between the States and the Federal Government.

This matter was a real issue in the last presidential campaign. The warning signals against Federal domination were raised and demands were made by many for more home rule and States' rights.

My bill is an attempt to meet the issues of today as they affect the Columbia River.

This present Columbia Interstate Commission bill is based on 10 years' study of all valley authority proposals and alternative schemes. It gives statutory authority to the principle of the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee and allows immediate progress on the programs of the Army engineers and Bureau of Reclamation but transfers the balance of control to the people living in the Pacific Northwest States.

The Columbia River is both an interstate and international stream. Since it drains large areas of western Montana, a small part of Wyoming, nearly all of Idaho, and more than half of Oregon and Washington, and draws one-third of its flow from British Columbia in Canada, the interests of both the Pacific Northwest and the Nation require that its resources be harnessed in an orderly manner.

The Columbia River is North America's most potent stream: Developed to the fullest, it can bring 3,840,000 acres of new land under cultivation, insure an adequate water supply to 1,500,000 partially thirsty acres, develop some 45 million horsepower in electricity, nourish a $100 million fisheries industry, supply water for atomic energy and supersonic aeronautical research—and still have water left over for navigation and other purposes.

The Columbia River will be developed, inevitably, in the public interest. National defense, the need for the resources of the Northwest and growing population in the area require it. The only question is whether the basic control of its development will rest in Washington, D. C., Wall Street, or within the area through which its mighty waters flow.

The Columbia Interstate Commission bill answers the demand of the people of the Pacific Northwest for an agency capable of carrying out an orderly, comprehensive program of development of the Columbia region's resources, through the use of Federal investment and the abilities of specialized Federal agencies, which at the same time guarantees to residents of the region a full measure of local control in determining the policies to be followed in attaining this development. Dozens of organizations and thousands of people in the Northwest are on record as favoring the creation of a Federal corporation to supervise resource-development activities in the Columbia River region provided it gave them a real voice in controlling the corporation's activities. The Columbia Interstate Commission bill is the only proposal which meets that requirement.

The Columbia Interstate Commission consists of two main elements: A board of commissioners, consisting of one man each nominated by the Governors of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington, and one named at large and directly appointed by the President, all serving staggered 7-year terms, would provide continuity in the supervision and construction of projects for development. The board members would receive salaries of $15,000 per year and must be free of any connection with businesses which would be affected by the corporation's activities.

The advisory council set up under CIC would consist of the governors and other representatives of those 4 States and 1 representative of the State of Wyoming, 17 in all. The advisory council, whose composition would constantly reflect changing political sentiment with each general election, would keep the commission's activities in line with the will of the people. By holding public hearings on all project proposals and issuing reports on them before they could be sent to Congress, the advisory council would provide a constant check on the commission's activities. The CIC is the only proposal for comprehensive river development in which the residents of the area have a truly representative voice in its control.

The Columbia Interstate Commission bill is the only proposal for a Federal corporation which guarantees the full benefits of collective bargaining to its laborers and mechanics, and the security of civil-service status to its administrative personnel.

The Columbia Interstate Commission, under authorization from Congress, would assume responsibility for all activities of reclamation, navigation, flood control, pollution control, power generation, fisheries conservation, watershed protection, and such other activities as may be desirable in making the resources of the area available to farmers and industries of the area. At the same time, it provides for continued operation of existing agencies, such as the Soil Conservation Service, in those fields where such operation is preferable.

The Columbia Interstate Commission does not invade the field of private enter-

prise. While preserving the traditional public-preference provisions of Federal power development, it allows the people of any given area to have the form of local power distribution they prefer. It is the only Federal power development proposal which gives first consideration in power distribution to farmers and home consumers. The CIC provides for opening up resources of the Northwest to new industries, agriculture, and to veterans seeking a source of expanding economy.

The Columbia Interstate Commission preserves the general principles of reclamation, flood control, and river-development policies built up over a long period of Federal history, but adapts those principles to the regional concept of interstate cooperation in the Pacific Northwest. It is the only proposal making specific provision for cooperation with Canada for international water-development planning.

The Columbia Interstate Commission bill provides for full repayment to the United States Treasury of all Federal money borrowed or appropriated for power and irrigation projects. It also provides for payments in lieu of taxes to State, county, and municipal governments whenever such taxes would be applicable.

The Columbia Interstate Commission is the only proposal for Columbia River development providing for an advisory council not composed merely of pressure groups. It is the only proposal making specific provision for conservation of fisheries. It is the only proposal providing for full public hearings on all activities of the corporation.

The Columbia Interstate Commission allows residents of the Pacific Northwest to determine for themselves the priority of project planning—to protect the forests, fisheries, navigation, grazing lands, mining areas, Indian rights, and the like. It is the only proposal requiring specific representation of each of the States affected.

The Columbia Interstate Commission is tailored to the needs of the Pacific Northwest.

Negro History Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1957

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, as most of my colleagues are aware the week of February 10 began the annual national observance of Negro History Week, a salute to the progress and hard-won achievements of black Americans.

Analyzing historical developments is by no means one of my personal skills; but I feel that very little disagreement will be encountered if we divide the 100-year-old Negro struggle for first-class citizenship into three general stages.

In the first stage we would find Negro leaders whose courageous efforts put national attention on the injustice of slavery. These great men and women—some in bondage and some free—spoke loudly and acted boldly to stir much public sentiment against the inhuman practice of working, treating, and selling men, women, and children as if they were animals.

Such fighters as Nat Turner, who led a slave rebellion, Phyllis Wheatley, Sojourner Truth, and Frederick Douglas were, in a large part, responsible for growing northern resentment which led to the Civil War and emancipation.

These brave crusaders very well could have considered the abolishment of slavery as victory enough to allow them to rest on their laurels, but, those who lived did not rest. They continued to contribute their aid and counsel in the critical readjustment that followed.

The end of slavery created many problems for both Negroes and whites, serious problems that led to friction, violence, and the birth of Jim Crow. By the beginning of the 20th century—almost 50 years after emancipation—racial relations had reached such a critical point that some compromises were bound to be advanced.

Most of us remember the approaches to a solution that were made by Booker T. Washington and Marcus Garvey. Washington promoted a theory which, while bringing about a climate of interracial cooperation for the immediate good, was never intended to serve as a permanent pattern. Garvey, on the other hand, hit on the idea of ridding white America of its problem by having all Negroes leave the country and start their own republic in Africa. Garvey attracted much attention with his UNIA movement, but his efforts also generated waves of protest from Negroes who saw no solution in leaving, and from clear-thinking whites who did not want to see them leave.

This, indeed, was a period of dilemma and frustration; of half-truths and hollow promises; of brave arguments and violent rebuttals. It was during this period that two organizations which have become the prime champions of social, political, and economic equality for Negroes came into being—the NAACP and the CIO.

These groups threw their memberships open to anyone who believed in true democratic principles and freedom of opportunity, and this is what Negroes wanted. The emergence of a vigorous, intelligent type of Negro leadership is proof that Negro history, as an uphill fight for freedom, has reached its third and final stage.

We have seen the ground laid for ultimate victory by Mary McLeod Bethune and Walter White. We have been kept abreast of developments by Robert S. Abbott, Robert L. Vann, and John H. Johnson. We have been brought closer to economic independence by C. C. Spaulding, Dr. Maceo Walker, and Charles C. Diggs, Sr. We have contributed to the pride and happiness of the Nation through Joe Louis, Jackie Robinson, Nat "King" Cole, Duke Ellington, Marian Anderson, and Dorothy Dandridge. We have made equality have real meaning through the efforts of Thurgood Marshall, Roy Wilkins, and our NAACP.

We have shown that we have political unity and intelligence by electing 5 Negro Congressmen since 1900, 3 in the past 15 years. We have demonstrated through Rev. Martin Luther King that we never intend to leave this Nation, nor do we see the need to compromise with democratic principle. We are fully conscious, now, that we are Americans, too; and that there is no turning back from our desires and rights to enjoy every blessing promised to every citizen of this Nation.

Today, the climax of Negro history, as such, is being written. Today, through securing equal housing, equal education, and equal economic opportunity through achieving equal voting privileges, through electing qualified men to high public offices, through insisting on the right to contribute our talents and energies to America's progress, Negro citizens are writing the most glorious chapter in Negro advancement.

The Negro is confident and inspired by the knowledge that, in fulfillment of the responsibilities of citizenship, he has worthily contributed to the social and cultural advancement of our national life. In the following poem, with which I have taken certain liberties, written by Rev. William Holmes Borders, distinguished pastor of Wheat Street Baptist Church, Atlanta, Ga., the Negro declares his Americanism:

I AM SOMEBODY

I am somebody—
I am a poet in Langston Hughes.
I am an author in Frank Yerby.
I am a creator of rhyme in Paul Lawrence Dunbar.
I am a Christian Statesman in J. R. E. Lee.
I am a diplomat in Ralph A. Bunche.

I am somebody—
I am somebody. I am a soldier in Gen. B. O. Davis.
I am courage in Crispus Attucks and Dorie Miller.
I am a humorist in Eddie "Rochester" Anderson.
I am a television artist in Nat "King" Cole.
I am a concert singer in Leontine Price.
I am a renowned baritone in Robert McFerrin.
I am a great contralto in Marion Anderson.

I am somebody—
I am somebody. I am an athlete in Harrison Dillard and Ira Murchison.
I am a basketball star in Bill Russell and Wilt Chamberlain.
I am an intelligent pen in the hand of DuBois.
I am a college president in Mordecai Johnson.
I am a breaker of world records in Jesse Owens and Eddie Tolan.

I am somebody—
I am somebody. I am an orator in P. James Bryant and Howard Thurman.
I am a preacher in C. T. Walker and L. K. Williams.
I am a composer in Nathaniel Dett.
I am an actor in William Marshall, Frank Silvera, Sidney Poiter, and James Edwards.
I am a boxer in Sugar Ray Robinson.
I am a knockout punch in Floyd Patterson.
I am a baseball player in Jackie Robinson and Hank Aaron.
I am a home-run hitter in Larry Doby and Willie Mays.
I am a world famous pitcher in Don Newcombe and Satchel Paige.

I am somebody—

I am somebody. I am a scientist in George Washington Carver.

I am an industrial educator in Booker T. Washington.

I am a Congressman in WILLIAM L. DAWSON, ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, and CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr.

I am a skin specialist in Dr. Lawless, of Chicago, and teach what I know at Northwestern University.

I am a judge in Wade H. McCree and Elvin L. Davenport.

I am a musicmaker in Duke Ellington and Ella Fitzgerald.

I am a pathologist in Julian Lewis and serve on the University of Chicago faculty.

I am the first successful operator on the human heart in Daniel Hale Williams.

I am an entertainer in Eartha Kitt and Harry Belafonte.

I am somebody—

I am an Assistant Secretary of Labor in J. Ernest Wilkins.

I am loyalty in the armed services.

I am insight in Sojourner Truth and Frederick Douglas.

I am an advocator of justice in Roy Wilkins and Thurgood Marshall.

I am a labor leader in A. Phillip Randolph.

I am somebody—

I am somebody. I am a molder of character in Nannie Burroughs.

I am a banker in R. R. Wright and L. D. Milton.

I am a certified public accountant in Jesse Blayton and Richard Austin.

I am a sculptor in Henry O. Tanner.

I am a businessman in Alonzo Herndon and Charles C. Diggs, Sr.

I am a grand specimen of womanhood in Mary McLeod Bethune.

I am a publisher in John Sengstacke, Mrs. Robert L. Vann, and John H. Johnson.

I am somebody—

I am somebody. I am an insurance executive in C. C. Spaulding.

I am a zoologist in Ernest E. Just.

I am a historian in Carter Woodson, J. Hope Franklin, and J. A. Rogers.

I am a lover of education in Charlotte Hawkins Brown.

I am a beautician in Madames Walker, Washington, and Malone.

I am a trustee in slavery. I protected my master's wives and daughters while he fought to keep the chains of slavery about my body.

I am a bishop in W. A. Fountain and George Baber.

I am a ball of fire in Richard Allen.

I am a laborer in John Henry.

I am a true Christian, for indeed, I practiced the religion of Jesus at points better than my master from whom I learned it.

I am somebody.

The climax of Negro history is today being written in the extension of the frontiers of democracy to encompass freedom and justice for all people.

Your Congressman Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1957

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I herewith insert in the RECORD my address delivered Saturday, February 23, over Radio Station WHK, Cleveland, on the regular weekly program conducted by WHK Radio Station to enable the Congressmen from the Greater Cleveland area to offer regular reports from Washington to their constituents. This program is known as Your Congressman Speaks and my address follows:

This is my first report from Washington since last July when Congress adjourned.

Immediately upon the convening of the 85th Congress we were confronted with what the present administration called an issue involving war or peace. This has more lately been termed the Eisenhower doctrine for the Middle East.

Congress was warned by the President and the Secretary of State that unless Congress adopted a resolution making clear to the Russians that the United States intended to prevent further infiltration of Russian influence in the Middle East area, the Russians would then engage in actions which might very well bring about world war III. This has been the overriding issue in Congress since the day it convened.

During debate on the floor of the House, I expressed very serious misgivings and grave reservations about the Eisenhower resolution. In the first place, the resolution was very limited in that it suggested opposition only to international communism. The clear inference was that national communism was acceptable to the administration. I expressed concern that the loose wording of the Eisenhower resolution would make it possible for the Communist dictator Tito to infiltrate the Middle East with his brand of communism and that the administration would not be empowered to stop him. Upon questioning during the debate, I was assured that the Eisenhower resolution did not intend to do this despite its faulty language. The second concern I expressed was that if Congress did pass the Eisenhower resolution we would, in fact, be endorsing support for what Secretary Dulles has fanatically defended as national communism or independent communism. I raised this question in the House because for many months I have been concerned with the lack of understanding shown by Secretary Dulles of the latest Kremlin tactical maneuver to confuse the leaders of the free world on the basic question of communism. To those people who have been compelled to live under the tyranny of communism, there is absolutely no difference between the two brands and it is obvious that the Russians have merely invented the slogan of so-called national communism as a device for confusing gullible people throughout the world. Again I received assurance that in voting for the proposed Eisenhower resolution, I would not be endorsing the devotion of Secretary Dulles to the misguided notion that we can defeat the Communist conspiracy by splitting its camp into various so-called national or independent segments.

It was only after receiving assurances on the floor of Congress on these vital points that I voted for the resolution. By this process I removed any doubt on these two critical points as to the intention of Congress with respect to the Eisenhower resolution. I shall keep a close watch on developments to make certain that the Eisenhower administration does not violate the spirit of the resolution or the intent of Congress.

Upon conclusion of Senate hearings, the resolution was amended to make it clear beyond any doubt that we are prepared to use force if the Russians move into the Middle East.

While Congress has been giving very careful study to the proposed Eisenhower doctrine for the Middle East, Secretary of State Dulles suddenly and unexpectedly proposed that sanctions be imposed upon Israel unless it abided by a United Nations resolution calling for the withdrawal of the Israeli troops from the Gaza strip. The new Dulles proposal for sanctions against Israel raises a series of very pertinent questions which apparently had not occurred to the Secretary of State or his advisers in the Department of State. Those questions are—

First, how could we recommend to the United Nations that sanctions be imposed against Israel for noncompliance with a United Nations resolution when we have made no effort to impose sanctions upon the most infamous aggressor, the Soviet Union, for its failure to comply with a United Nations resolution passed last December, calling for the removal of all Red army troops from Hungary. In this connection it will be recalled that after the Hungarian freedom fighters had driven the Russians out of Budapest and had won 4 historic days of freedom and independence, the Red army reinvaded Hungary in the early morning hours of November 4. At the very time the Red army had reentered Hungary with 5,000 tanks, 200,000 reinforcements of infantrymen and supported by a major effort of the Russian Air Force, the Russian representative in the United Nations, then meeting in emergency session, was assuring all the United Nations delegates that the Russian troops were withdrawing and there was no cause for the United Nations to be concerned with developments in Hungary. A few hours later, when the cruel and shocking truth of the Russian slaughter of the Hungarian patriots was made known to the free world, public indignation reached the point where forthwith and decisive action by the United Nations appeared necessary for the survival of the United Nations itself. This caused the United Nations General Assembly eventually to pass a resolution demanding the withdrawal of all Russian troops from Hungary, a resolution which the Russians and their satellites voted against and which, up until today, the Russians have refused to recognize.

It would be a violation of all that is just and decent if we, as a nation, were to support any resolution imposing sanctions against Israel unless equal sanctions were simultaneously voted against the Russian Communists. There is firm support for this position among all people who seek a just and lasting peace, and the prevention of world war III.

The second pertinent question raised by the Dulles proposal to apply sanctions only against little Israel is whether our current foreign policy is based upon the notion that we should punish little nations when they stand up for principle. It is important that the American people remember that Israel has taken a public stand against the Russian Communists and has pledged itself to fight against any Russian maneuvers in the Mideast area. Has Colonel Nasser, the Egyptian leader, given similar assurances to our Government? The answer is "No." The record shows that Colonel Nasser has been receiving military assistance and economic aid from the Russian Communists. Before the conflict in the Middle East broke out, it was a known fact among competent newspapermen—but apparently not to the Central Intelligence Agency of our Government—that there were over 5,000 so-called Russian technicians on Egyptian soil, who in fact were Russian military officers, jet pilots, and Russian secret-police operatives. It is also interesting to note that the Israeli troops captured a stockpile of 1 million Russian-made army blankets in the first days of the conflict—which indicates the number of so-called volunteers the Russians intended to parachute into Egypt. On the record, there can be no reasonable doubt that it would be national folly to put any dependence upon Colonel Nasser. He has collaborated with

the Russian Communists and betrayed his own people.

Congress now has been called upon to cooperate with the administration by simply putting a rubber stamp on Mr. Dulles' proposals. We should not depart from our time-honored position as protector of the smaller and persecuted nations. We should not depart from the principle of equal treatment for all nations, large and small. We Democrats stand ready to give full cooperation to the Eisenhower administration in meeting any and all situations which in any way threaten the safety, progress, and security of the American people. We are prepared to take an active part in the formulation of foreign policy. We are prepared to help the administration out of its present confused position, but we must be in on all phases of planning the rescue.

It is regrettable that our Government took only half-hearted action in connection with the Hungarian revolution and the heroic effort of the Hungarian people to throw the Russian Communists out of their beloved homeland. If the courage of the Eisenhower administration in facing up to this matter was one-half that of the brave little children of Hungary, the conspiracy of communism would be in its death throes and we would be on the way to lifting the terrible burden of taxation from the backs of the American people.

It will be to our everlasting discredit if we, as a nation, fail to take action in support of the cause of Hungarian freedom and national independence. It is not too late for us to take action. Popular public opinion can force the Eisenhower administration to call for the expulsion of the Russians from the United Nations unless they get out of Hungary.

The United States and the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 14, 1957

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address entitled "The United States and the United Nations," which I delivered on Monday night, February 11, at Georgetown University.

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

THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED NATIONS

In the Nation's Capital we meet here tonight at a time when the world remains divided. On the eve of the birth date of the Great Emancipator we recall the words of Abraham Lincoln in his house divided speech of 1858:

"If we but knew where we are and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it."

Twelve years ago at San Francisco the United Nations came into being. Men of good will at home and abroad had high hopes that this organization might be the foundation upon which a system of international law and order could be built that could preserve peace with honor for ourselves and our children.

There are five major defects in the functioning of the United Nations. If not corrected now, any one of them could result in the United Nations going the way of the League of Nations:

These are:

1. The abuse of the veto power by the Soviet Union.
2. A growing "double standard" of international morality.
3. The increasing trend to bloc voting.
4. An expanding tendency to interfere in the internal affairs of member nations.
5. Unwillingness of many of the 80 members to equitably share the monetary costs and other obligations of the United Nations and its related activities while insisting on a full and equal voice in the making of decisions, the burdens of which must be assumed by others.

ABUSE OF VETO BY THE SOVIET UNION

In the Security Council of the United Nations the veto power has been used 86 times. Of the permanent members having the veto power the record is as follows: Soviet Union, 79 times; France, 4 times; Great Britain, 2 times; China, 1 time; and United States, 0 times.

Was the veto intended to permit a permanent member to invalidate its obligations under the charter? I think not. Is there either logic or morality in assuming that the charter obligations are binding or can be enforced upon the law-abiding or the small nations but are invalid against a lawless nation armed with a veto? Such a condition cannot continue to be acceptable to the American people or free men anywhere.

Is it not time that we recalled the admonition in Second Corinthians:

"Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: For what fellowship has righteousness with unrighteousness and what communion has light with darkness?"

Unless the charter now contains a means of circumventing a Soviet veto we are tragically enmeshed in a spider web in which the spider has all the advantages over the fly, the butterfly or the moth.

Article 108 relating to amendments to the charter states:

"Amendments to the present charter shall come into force for all members of the United Nations when they have been adopted by a vote of two-thirds of the members of the General Assembly and ratified in accordance with their respective constitutional processes by two-thirds of the members of the United Nations, including all the permanent members of the Security Council."

Unless the Soviet Union can be expelled from membership in the meantime, that Godless Communist totalitarian dictatorship holds a veto in perpetuity on any charter amendment.

A GROWING DOUBLE STANDARD OF INTERNATIONAL MORALITY

This second weakness stems in part from the first—the Soviet abuse of the veto power. But even without the veto this defect might still exist, being based on a fear of Soviet power or an attempt of the neutralists to play both ends against the middle.

The Afro-Asian bloc voted for prompt action against the British, French, and Israeli aggression in Egypt and time after time abstained from voting on the several resolutions relative to Soviet aggression against the people of Hungary.

Even now they are urging sanctions against Israel, which has at least partially complied with the United Nations resolution to withdraw from Egypt, while they remain silent on the Soviet refusal to pay the slightest attention to the Hungarian resolutions.

Is the United Nations to condone a doctrine of "might makes right"? Are the processes of the United Nations to be applicable to the free nations and not to the dictatorships? To the small and not to the large? To Israel because Gaza is not evacuated, but not India or the U. S. S. R. because Kashmir and Hungary are not evacuated?

India, through its present representative at the United Nations, Krishna Menon, has assumed the leadership of the Afro-Asian members, though there is some evidence that this is not entirely satisfactory to all the members representing Asian and African countries. As a matter of fact, a number of the neutralist countries of Asia and Africa broke away from the Indian leadership on several of the resolutions relating to Soviet aggression against Hungary. This was the first hopeful sign challenging the danger of bloc voting, where preconceived viewpoints may act to prevent the United Nations from functioning on the facts presented rather than on predetermined positions.

THE INCREASING TREND TO BLOC VOTING

Since the inception of the United Nations there has been an increasing trend to bloc voting in the General Assembly. By combining blocs it is possible to prevent action by the General Assembly in those cases where a two-thirds majority is required.

With an increase in the membership of the so-called Afro-Asian bloc, this tendency has become more noticeable.

AN EXPANDING TENDENCY TO INTERFERE IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF MEMBER NATIONS

The Charter of the United Nations, in article 2, section 7, states: "Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present charter; but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under chapter VII."

Despite this there is a movement, particularly among the Afro-Asian nations, to inject the United Nations into matters clearly within the domestic jurisdiction of a member state.

If this trend continues it will not be long before the United Nations is injecting itself into a study of the class system in India and the segregation problem in some sections of the United States. Both of these are problems in the respective countries concerned as there are comparable situations existing in most other nations of the world.

However, these problems must be solved by the people and the governments directly concerned and not by intervention or interference by the United Nations. Already the Republic of South Africa has withdrawn from active participation in the United Nations deliberations because of what they felt was unwarranted action by the United Nations.

UNWILLINGNESS TO SHARE EQUALLY THE COSTS AND OBLIGATIONS OF UNITED NATIONS MEMBERSHIP

In the support of the United Nations the United States now bears the largest and approximately one-third of the total cost and a higher percentage in some of the related agencies.

The United States contributes $16 million of a total assessment of $48 million; 11 nations contribute less than $25,000 each.

The United States contribution is paid each year in dollars which are usable in all areas of the world. Of the other 79 members of the United Nations, there are a number who because of economic conditions within their country are unable to meet their assessments. Others pay their assessments in full but in a local currency which has little or no value elsewhere in the world.

In the debate on the creation of the United Nations emergency force in the Middle East, a number of nations abstained because they did not wish to be bound to assume any of the cost of such an operation. Others voted in favor of the force but reserved the right to determine what, if anything, they should contribute to its upkeep. Still others agreed to apply the present ratio

for the allocation of expense that is now used in support of the United Nations itself but if subsequent costs are involved they reserved the right to make a lesser contribution if they made any contribution at all.

It is going to be very difficult to expect the nations which are bearing the heavy burden of costs to continue to assume that burden if smaller nations under the sovereign equality section of the charter continue to insist on the voting of obligations without a willingness to assume their full share of the burdens.

Since the admission of Japan on December 18, 1956, we now have 80 members in this organization.

On December 11, 1956, in the House of Lords, Lord Cherwell, the Right Honorable Frederick Alexander Lindemann, said:

"The population of the biggest is more than 1,000 times greater than that of the smallest. The discrepancy in wealth and power is far more than ten-thousandfold. Yet in the Assembly, which is the ultimate governing body of the United Nations, each has an equal vote.

"Thus barely 5 percent of the world's population can carry the day against the other 95 percent, and 10 percent could claim a two-thirds majority in the Assembly.

"Or, to put it another way, half the population of the world is represented by four delegates and the other half by 75 delegates. What is more, these nations are represented in the Assembly by any group or body or individual which may succeed in seizing power.

"Anybody who has seized power—I believe, for instance, Mr. Kadar in Hungary—can, and does—send a delegate to vote on his behalf."

No adequate reappraisal of the United Nations has yet been made. Nor, in the limited time we have here tonight, is it intended that these remarks of mine can do that assignment which, I believe, needs to be done.

Like all human institutions, the United Nations has its assets and its liabilities. It is unfortunate for that organization that some of its friends oversold it to the people of the United States. Perhaps, because of that, we expected more than it was able to accomplish.

Both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations have made the United Nations a keystone of our foreign policy. Both of our major political parties have endorsed the United Nations in the two party platforms. These party platforms were adopted before the Soviet aggression against Hungary and the futility of U. N. resolutions was known.

Does the record of the United Nations warrant a continuation of our policy and our support?

That the United Nations has achieved constructive accomplishments in a number of areas of activity and geographic locations no fairminded person will deny. For example, the 1946 withdrawal of Soviet forces from the Province of Azerbaijan in Iran.

To be sure, the withdrawal of the Soviet Union was made after much delay and considerable pressure by the United Nations, the Government of Iran, the United States, and Great Britain. The latter two countries also had forces in Iran during World War II and withdrew them in advance of the Soviet withdrawal though as part of the understanding that all three nations would withdraw their troops.

In 1946, it must also be remembered, the free world had the atomic weapon and the Communist world did not. Can this explain the Soviet-delayed obedience to a United Nations resolution then and its failure to respect any of the resolutions relative to Hungary in 1956 and 1957.

In other areas and at other times the success or failure of United Nations action is, to say the least, debatable.

Korea is the classic example. Despite the 1950 action of the Security Council calling on all members (then 60 in number) to assist the Republic of Korea in its defense against North Korean and Chinese Communist aggression, only 16 member nations outside the United States supplied any armed forces. These amounted to 40,000 or less than 10 percent of the more than 450,000 supplied by the United States.

If we consider the combined forces of the United States (450,000) and the Republic of Korea (600,000) the United Nations supplied less than 5 percent of the effective manpower.

Is this an acceptable standard of collective security? My answer is definitely and emphatically "No."

Nor can all the propaganda put out by nor all the apologists for the United Nations make it so.

The United States, in addition, supplied more than 90 percent of the resources used to gain the stalemated armistice in Korea.

Largely, I believe, because of our United Nations entanglements we declined to permit our pilots to follow Communist planes across the Yalu in hot pursuit, and we allowed the Communists a sanctuary across the river for their arsenals, staging centers, ammunition depots, and transportation network.

Never before in all of our history have our field commanders been so handicapped or our men asked to die in a war they were not permitted to win.

But at least, with the exception of the Soviet bloc and a few neutralists, even though the manpower and material resources of the 60 nations was not fully committed, the moral force of the United Nations was mobilized against the Communist aggressor.

The words in the United Nations Charter are still as noble and challenging as they were in 1945 when first adopted.

Let me read some of its notable provisions:

Article I: "To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: To take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace."

Article 2, section 4: "All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

Section 5: "All members shall give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the present charter, and shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action."

I might add that these are clearly obligations on all members, including those on the Security Council. They are binding on the permanent as well as the nonpermanent members.

To continue:

Article 2, section 1: "The organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members."

Section 2: "All members, in order to insure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present charter."

At the time of the Korean aggression the Soviet Union and supplied the guns, tanks, ammunition, and planes to make war against the United Nations forces. And to make their disrespect of the United Nations Charter complete, they publicly admitted it.

At that time I urged that steps be taken to expel the Soviet Union from membership under article 6.

Article 6: "A member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the principles contained in the present charter may be expelled from the organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council."

Or at the very least that they be suspended from the exercise of their rights and privileges under article 5.

Article 5: "A member of the United Nations against which preventive or enforcement action has been taken by the Security Council may be suspended from the exercise of the rights and privileges of membership by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council. The exercise of these rights and privileges may be restored by the Security Council.

The question may be asked, "How is the Soviet veto to be avoided?" I believe it can be avoided by invoking a proviso of section 3 of article 27, where there is an issue clearly a violation of the charter which relates to the specific settlement of disputes under chapter VI.

Article 27, section 3: "Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of seven members, including the concurring votes of the permanent members: *Provided*, That in decisions under chapter VI and under paragraph 3 of article 52, a party to a dispute shall obstain from voting."

If the Soviet Union makes a point of order that they are exempt, let the point of order be overruled by the Chair and sustained by the other Security Council members.

At this point the Soviet Union might decide to walk out, as Hungary did last December. So be it.

If the action of the U. S. S. R. during the Korean and Hungarian conflicts are examples of what we must contemplate for the future, the United Nations will have a better chance of survival without the Soviet Union than with it. I believe this to be the case.

Of course, this procedure would no longer be available once Communist China was admitted as a member and received a permanent seat on the Security Council.

In that case the Soviet Union could veto action against Red Chinese aggression in Asia, while Communist China could reciprocate by using the veto on any Security Council action against the Soviet Union in Europe or the Middle East.

On June 29, 1945, Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg in a Senate speech spoke on the charter of the United Nations. In the course of his remarks he discussed the veto which had been agreed to at Yalta.

"There was no other basis available to the American delegation at San Francisco. The late President Roosevelt pledged his country to this formula at Yalta. We Americans have a habit of keeping our country's word—a habit, by the way, which needs to become contagious if any sort of world order shall survive. The late President exempted from the formula the right of a great power to veto an inquiry by the Security Council into its own dereliction; and we at San Francisco successfully resisted an extreme interpretation which would have permitted the use of the veto against full hearing and discussion of any other threats to peace and security. Otherwise the Yalta formula was clear. To have denied it at San Francisco would have been to kill the Conference before it ever got under way.'"

Then he went on to point out the responsibility that went with this power. It is this sacred public trust mentioned by Senator Vandenberg that the rulers in the Kremlin and their agents at the United Nations have continuously violated.

"To meet these special and particular responsibilities the great powers obviously must have special and particular authority.

Without the latter, the former are impossible. This special and particular authority may be looked upon as special and particular privilege. But, in the last analysis, it is the privilege of serving the world. If it ever becomes a selfish privilege, an exploited privilege, this organization will die of cancer.

"These privileges which the great powers thus accept are the most sacred public trust ever created in the affairs of men. It is indispensable that this obligation be accepted in this spirit by all concerned."

Thus spoke Senator Vandenberg at the birth of the United Nations almost 12 years ago.

Now we have had the experience of the practical operations of that organization for more than a decade. We have a right and a duty to weigh the assets and the liabilities.

The Soviet Union has time after time violated the "sacred public trust" and used its veto power as a "selfish privilege" 79 times.

Do we have to sit back and take it, or do we have some constructive alternatives?

I have mentioned several here tonight. Legalistic arguments will be advanced as to why nothing can be done. Inertia on the part of governments who do not want to disturb the status quo will be a barrier. Fear of the Soviet reaction or of its resignation will be advanced for remaining quiet. Those who believe the United Nations is Utopia will brook no criticism.

As for me, I am unimpressed by these arguments or these obstacles.

The safety of our country and the survival of this Republic and other free nations is involved.

Nations can die while delegates talk. In World War II Holland was attacked and surrendered to Nazi Germany in 6 days, Belgium in 20 days.

From October 27, 1956, to January 10, 1957, a period of 76 days, the General Assembly passed 10 resolutions, while freedom in Hungary was strangled to death and the United Nations stood impotent.

As I see it, our policy in regard to the United Nations should make it clear:

1. That our foreign policy is an American policy and is not and will not be tied as a tail to a United Nations kite.

2. The United Nations cannot take a moral leadership in the world unless the Soviet Union veto can be limited to those matters which impinge on its sovereignty and not those where the Soviet Union is violating the sovereignty of others. Hence, we should not compromise our moral leadership by diluting it with a Communist lack of international morality.

3. On the basis of its record to date, no free nation, including our own, dare risk its security on the United Nations ability to function effectively.

4. As an international forum for debate and discussion, it has a real value, but a substantial question remains as to whether this limited value is worth the price?

5. If the United Nations is to be saved for use as an effective agency for collective security, steps must be taken to remedy its defects now, not a year from now or 10 years hence.

I believe human freedom is a greater force than totalitarian tyranny. Under the present charter, the dictatorships have made a mockery of the noble words in that document. We should make a mighty effort to make United Nations deeds coincide with the charter's words.

It was America and our constitutional form of government to which Lincoln referred in his second annual message to Congress. Nothing, including the United Nations, must be allowed to compromise that message, which was so eloquently stated in these words:

"Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation. * * * We—even we here—have the power and bear the responsibility. In giving freedom to the slave we assure freedom to the free. * * * We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last, best hope of earth."

Five Great Crises Confronting the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 14, 1957

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on Monday, February 11, my distinguished colleague [Mr. TALMADGE], in response to an invitation extended by joint resolution of the two houses of the General Assembly of Georgia, delivered an address before a joint session of that body. The theme of the Senator's address was the five great crises confronting the American people. I am sure Senators will find this able address to be most informative and interesting, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

(Address of United States Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE, of Georgia, delivered before a joint session of the Georgia General Assembly meeting at the State capitol. Mr. TALMADGE was invited to speak by a joint resolution of the State legislation authored by Senator Clint Brannen, of Unadilla, and Senator Wilton Hill, of Reidsville. The theme of the Senator's address was the five great crises confronting the American people.)

Governor Griffin, Lieutenant Governor Vandiver, Speaker Moate, members of the general assembly, and my friends, your thoughtful invitation for me to speak to you was an unexpected honor. It is one I accept with pleasure and satisfaction for the wishes of the people of Georgia and their most representative embodiment—the Georgia General Assembly—are my commands.

I thank you all and extend special appreciation to the authors of the joint resolution inviting me here, my good friends, Senators Brannen and Hill.

I commend our courageous chief executive, Gov. Marvin Griffin.

I commend our able lieutenant governor, Ernest Vandiver.

I commend our forthright speaker of the house, Marvin Moate.

And I commend the distinguished members of this legislature.

I commend you for your vigor, for your patriotism, and for your determination to stand firm and immovable at the ramparts of defense in this life-or-death struggle to preserve our sacred institutions.

You have demonstrated your courage in turning back assault after assault on constitutional processes darker and more insidious than those hurled against the people of this State in the days of reconstruction.

For this, the people of Georgia and loyal, thinking Americans the country over are grateful to you.

I am proud to be a soldier in your ranks. Addressing you seems like old times for me.

These hallowed halls hold pleasant memories of warm friendships and the drama of fiery debate of years past.

I see here many old friends and many new faces and I extend to you all my heartfelt greetings.

It is with humility and a deep sense of gratitude that I acknowledge the cordial reception and substantial assistance accorded me at the outset of my service in the United States Senate by that wise statesman and sagacious gentleman of gentlemen, my colleague, our beloved and respected senior Senator, Richard B. Russell.

A hearty thank you also goes to all of the capable and dedicated members of the Georgia delegation in the House who have extended to me every help possible.

And I would like to say here that the other Members of the House and the Senate I have been privileged to meet, as well as representatives of the press, radio, and television, have been friendly, thoughtful, and patient.

I shall strive at all times to reciprocate this courtesy in both act and deed.

This is my first trip back home to Georgia on the weekend.

Many friends from Georgia have been coming by to visit with me both at the office and at our house in Falls Church, Va. I appreciate these visits very much for two reasons. First, I enjoy the company and seeing old friends and, second, I get many shades of opinion from each person with whom I talk about pending national issues. This is of inestimable value to me in developing a proper perspective on questions of the day.

Whenever any of you are in the vicinity of Washington, I wish you would say to yourself, "Herman wants to see us; we shouldn't go back to Georgia without dropping by to see him."

It is essential for every Senator or Congressman, if he is to represent his constituents effectively, to have the benefit of their views and counsel on important matters. Unfortunately, many Georgians seldom get to Washington. The lengthy sessions make it hard to keep abreast of thinking in the home State.

I am expecting the people of Georgia to keep me informed and advised through personal visits and letters and in matters of extreme urgency by telegraph or telephone.

It is my solemn conviction that our Nation is in this hour confronted with five great crises, any one of which if not met and overcome, will result in the gravest of consequences in the future.

These crises are:

1. The constitutional crisis.
2. The farm crisis.
3. The military security crisis.
4. The world crisis.
5. The economic crisis.

The most serious of these crises is the attack on constitutional government. I say this for it goes to the very heart of our existence as a Nation.

Once we lose our rights under the Constitution, we cannot defend ourselves against these other threats.

What threats have been posed to constitutional government in the last few years?

We have seen the United States Supreme Court, in a series of partisan political decisions, openly flout the Constitution of the United States, and, in defiance of established law and precedent, substitute in their stead impractical and unproved socialistic theory.

These decisions contain no more logic nor demonstrate any more responsibility than the fanatical utterances of a soap box orator in Central Park.

The Federal judiciary has invaded and sought to obliterate the reserved rights of the States in many fields of their internal activity.

The Court has sought to outlaw separate schools and segregation laws in 17 States.

The Court has sought to outlaw antisedition laws in 12 States, Alaska and Hawaii.

The Court has forced Federal regulation of natural-gas production in 30 States.

The Court has sought to limit the power of States and cities to discharge employees

when they plead the 5th amendment against self-incrimination.

The Court has sought to usurp State authority in cases of criminal appeals.

These decisions are unconstitutional on their face.

They are not the law of the land, as some falsely insist on calling it.

They are the law of force, and force alone.

It is not the people of the South who defy the Constitution; it is, rather, they who uphold it.

When a Federal district judge, acting under this peculiar new doctrine of force, issues a blanket edict that anyone who exercises the right of freedom of speech in this country may be hauled into court and fined for criminal contempt without a jury trial, then, I say to you, the time has come for us to restore the real constitutional law of the land.

We will never submit to unlawful and unconstitutional tyranny.

We are going to resist its imposition with all of the strength at our command.

We are not going to sit idly by while freedom of speech is destroyed and thought control is imposed on the people of this Nation.

We are not going to sit idly by while an unconstitutional, arbitrary, and illegal extension of Federal judicial power is attempted.

This is not only an attack on the rights of the States to govern their own affairs, but constitutes a gross abuse of judicial processes imperiling the civil liberties of every American citizen.

As a result of this outrageous usurpation of power, many bills are being introduced in the Congress to check this growing danger.

These measures will have my wholehearted support.

And it is my intention, as soon as they are prepared to offer proposals to remove our schools from Federal judicial authority, to require a reasonable minimum of experience for the appointment of Federal judges and to insure a jury trial in all cases of contempt citations by Federal courts.

Equally dangerous to the liberties of all the people of the whole United States are the so-called civil rights proposals now pending.

This nefarious six-point program is a grave threat to our traditional concept of constitutional government.

If it is enacted an army of Federal agents will swarm over every State harassing and intimidating the people and usurping the functions of local law-enforcement authorities.

The so-called civil rights commission that is proposed would be empowered to subpena any American and haul him off to Washington for the purposes of brain washing and interrogation.

Under another one of these bills the United States Attorney General would be placed in the position of representing private individuals.

Still another proposal would write into law a provision overturning the legal doctrine of the ages requiring an exhaustion of administrative remedies as a prerequisite to judicial relief.

Every fledgling lawyer knows that the real civil rights of every citizen of this country are contained in the first 10 amendments to the Constitution.

These 10 amendments have been known since the beginning of this Nation as the Bill of Rights.

They are written in plain, unmistakable language.

From them spring all the rights necessary for the preservation of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the serious nature of these civil-rights bills and their far-reaching implications for evil results.

It shall be my purpose to use what limited influence I may have in the fight to prevent these measures from being foisted on the American people.

Another dangerous proposal is that of limiting debate in the United States Senate.

For all practical purposes there has been unlimited freedom of discussion on all issues in the United States Senate since the year 1806.

The present rule XXII, under which the imposition of cloture is permitted in the Senate, was adopted in 1917 and was revised in 1949. It provides for cutting off debate only after an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Senators duly chosen and sworn.

This provision affords an adequate safeguard against abuse of the privilege of free speech and at the same time helps to maintain the delicate balance of powers afforded under our form of government.

The right of a Senator to present all of the facts in connection with an issue, to turn the light of truth and justice and fairness on that issue goes to the very heart of the protection of minorities, individuals, and States as well.

As long as the United States Senate remains a forum free and unfettered, as long as a vigorous and determined minority of Senators can present all of the facts surrounding any measure, the rights of the people of this country will be more nearly secure.

Now, of major concern to us in Georgia, is the farm crisis.

We have found out that the Republican Party has nothing to offer the farmer of this country but privation and despair.

Declining farm prices, aggravated by the Benson plan of flexible price supports, coupled with discrimination in the administration of the soil-bank program, and the natural disasters of flood and drought, all have combined to deal a heavy blow to American agriculture.

I regret that it looks now as though the Congress will not pass any effective major farm legislation this session. The hostile policies of the Secretary of Agriculture toward rigid farm price supports at 90 percent of parity would assure a Presidential veto.

You are, of course, familiar with the utter discrimination being practiced in the operation of the soil-bank program. Some States are being grossly favored over others. Even counties within the States are discriminated against. The benefits are being administered on an unfair first-come, first-served basis and cover only a fraction of the needs already demonstrated.

The records show that the Southeast was granted far less than its proportionate share of these funds.

Such a situation demands immediate corrective action.

As a representative of the people of Georgia, and as a member of the Senate Agricultural Committee, I am working diligently to obtain:

1. Equal treatment in the distribution of these benefits to all farmers; and

2. For all States their just share of funds available for this purpose.

I have said before and repeat now my conviction that unless something is done, and done soon to give the farmer a better opportunity, this Nation will suffer irreparable damage.

Another cause of grave concern to every citizens is the state of America's military security.

About 10 days ago, the Subcommittee on the Air Force of the Senate's Committee on Armed Services released a report on airpower and its findings are cause for alarm.

Russia is leading us in the development of many weapons and aircraft, is rapidly closing the gap in others, is graduating twice as many scientists and engineers as we are and is ahead in some phases of guided-missile development. She has four times the number of submarines as the United States and a greater capability for production.

These startling disclosures make it imperative that there be a general reevaluation of our whole defense effort.

I was shocked recently at the statement questioning the patriotism of men in the National Guard during the Korean emergency.

Our memories are not so short that we do not recall what took place when the Korean emergency was declared. While those at the Pentagon were scurrying about searching for their paper armies, the Georgia National Guard and our reservists in this State were ready for orders, and many of them took their places on the firing line in foreign lands.

Today we find ourselves in the midst of another world crisis.

Communist imperialism and domination moves toward the Middle East. It threatens that area's vast oil resources which represent two-thirds of the world's total reserves.

The President and the Secretary of State have recognized this fact.

They have asked Congress for adoption of a twofold resolution calling for the United States to serve notice to the world that she will defend the Middle East against any armed aggression by Russia or her satellite countries.

And, further, that the President be given unlimited authority to utilize, without regard to existing law or regulation, an amount not to exceed $200 million in both arms and economic aid funds for countries in the Middle East.

The President is the only responsible official in the country who has access to full reports from the overseas intelligence agencies of our Government.

The responsibility for action in such situations largely must be his, subject to the constitutional safeguards of congressional authority.

There is much sentiment to separate the military aspects from the aid request made by the President.

That would be the wisest policy for the Congress to follow.

I do not favor any plan whereby American troops would be committed for an indefinite period to wage diplomatic wars such as the Korean police action, where the hand of victory was stayed by an indecisive State Department.

Nor do I favor any commitment of American soldiers to United Nations control under any circumstances without prior consent of Congress.

I do not favor giving the President blank check authority to parcel out foreign aid.

There is talk that some of this money may be used for Nile Valley development in Egypt and in the Sudan. This would create another great cotton growing area which would put the American farmer out of business as far as its export market is concerned.

I do not favor the United States assuming unilateral responsibility for defense of the Middle East. Our failure to support Britain, France, and Israel in restoring order to the area will be recognized by historians as a costly diplomatic mistake and a military blunder of catastrophic proportions.

During the last decade our Nation has shown the greatest growth of any period in its history.

Yet this growth is being threatened by irresponsible Federal Government fiscal policies.

The brave pronouncement of stabilizing the cost of living has fallen by the wayside.

The policy of hard money for the people and easy money for bureaucrats doesn't make sense.

During the coming fiscal year the Federal Government expects to collect in taxes out

of the people of this country the stupendous total of $75.8 billion.

This means that about one-sixth of the gross national product of the country is paid in taxes to the Federal Government.

One wonders how long this Nation will survive such a drain on the economy.

In conclusion, I make this observation.

Washington needs to pause for reflection and for a re-evaluation to realize fully once again from whence comes all freedom, all equality, all strength, all integrity, all security and all those other precious attributes identified with our growth as a Nation.

There must be a complete return and a sincere rededication to the fundamental teachings of the Holy Writ.

There must be a renewed respect for the true meaning of the Constitution and a respect for law as it is written.

There must be a practical recognition of the fundamental laws of nature.

There must be an instillment of sound business practices into the Government.

And, there must be a solid determination on the part of all public servants to keep faith with the people.

Americans must be freed of the attendant evils of bureaucracy, red tape, intimidation, and tyranny so that our people may once again be masters of their own destiny.

Sometimes we may be justified in feeling frustrated with the policies of our Government.

But we must never sell America short nor should we discount the loyalty, the courage, the honesty, the ability, and the sincerity of purpose of the American people.

They have demonstrated again and again their rugged determination to meet and to overcome whatever challenge may confront them.

Because of this, I am confident that the Nation will survive in spite of all the mistakes governmental leaders may make.

As for me, and the future of this country, I put my faith in Almighty God and in the sound judgment of my countrymen as we work shoulder to shoulder for right and justice.

To this concept, I am pledged.

To this concept, I give my energy and devotion.

Modern Republicanism As I See It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 14, 1957

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on Monday night of this week, I was privileged to address a splendid Republican dinner in San Bernardino, Calif., which was sponsored by the Republicans of San Bernardino and Riverside Counties. The chairman in charge was Gen. Carl C. Bank, United States Army, retired, a West Point classmate and wartime associate officer of President Eisenhower's.

At General Bank's suggestion, I addressed myself to the theme, Modern Republicanism As I See It. Inasmuch as both of our major political parties appear to be reappraising their guiding tenets and restating the fundamentals of their political faiths, Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of my Lincoln Day address in California.

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

MODERN REPUBLICANISM AS I SEE IT

(By Senator KARL E. MUNDT)

My fellow Republicans, it is indeed a pleasure and a challenge for me to address this fine Lincoln Day banquet here in California tonight. By the next presidential election your State appears certain to be the second most populous in the Union and Californians in high places are equally certain to be among the most respected and renowned voices in our Republican Party at that time.

I have long been privileged to include among my personal friends many of the nationally known and respected Republican leaders of California. As one who has addressed well over 30 meetings in your State over the past dozen years or so it always gives me pleasure to salute these California leaders as I visit among you. As you know, our great Vice President, DICK NIXON, has been a close associate of mine both in the House and in the Senate. This friendship has continued during his career as Vice President where he has been doing an outstanding job. Our great and good Republican leader of the Senate is another close friend of mine; BILL KNOWLAND is a man commanding the respect of the entire Senate and his growing influence extends throughout the land, I was among those campaigning for the reelection of TOMMIE KUCHEL as I visited California several times during the recent election. Tommie is a comer in the Senate and when he dons his new mantle as senior Senator from California after the retirement of BILL KNOWLAND his influence will correspondingly expand. I know and admire your great Governor, Goodwin Knight, who has done much to keep this great State in the Republican ranks and whose record of good government is a credit to our party.

You have many fine Republican Members in the House of Representatives from California. I cannot here tonight salute and name them all but I do want to mention two of the typically fine, progressive, patriotic, and courageous young Republicans that you have in Washington today. PAT HILLINGS, is a man with a future, and his consistent record of service in the House marks him as a superior Congressman by every standard. DONALD JACKSON, with the added advantage of being born in South Dakota, is establishing a record in the Halls of Congress of which every Californian should be proud. His great work on the House Committee of Un-American Activities has made him nationally known and his sturdy voice and dependable vote in support of sound and successful policies in Washington mark DON JACKSON as a top-flight Congressman with sufficient seniority of service to place him in a command position in the House.

So, indeed, California is indeed fortunate in the type of Republicans it has selected to elevate to high office. They serve as a tribute to your good judgment.

After more than 100 years of achievement and service as a political party, it seems fitting that on the anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birth we should devote some time to appraising the present-day purposes and programs of the Republican Party which Lincoln helped to found and which he greatly honored by his service as President of the United States.

Lincoln was a man of vision and action and these qualities he did much to breathe into the early life and activities of the Republican Party. More than a century later, our great party continues to serve as a national vehicle to implement the sound suggestions of citizens of vision and to move forward actively and aggressively to new and expanded vistas of individual opportunity.

My invitation to address this gathering carried the suggestion that I speak to the topic of Modern Republicanism. I think this is a most fitting subject for this important occasion since the emancipation proclamation of Lincoln's day freed men from the shackles of human slavery and in our generation our great party continues its mission of expanding human liberty and of freeing our citizens from the shackles of political power and the exalted, all-embracive centralized government.

We hear and read the phrase "Modern Republicanism" frequently these days, and I am indeed happy to have the opportunity of discussing it before this intelligent and important audience.

Since the President first introduced this phrase into our present-day political vocabulary, he has not had either the time or the opportunity to detail for us exactly, precisely, and completely what he envisions as a Republican policy suited to that term. A few of his associates have offered their individual views and a great many columnists, commentators, and editorial writers have attempted to place their own interpretation upon what the President has in mind. President Eisenhower, himself, has made a few brief and rather general statements on the subject in news conferences and public statements, but in the main, and with regard to specific suggestions, he has not set out in clear detail his own interpretation and ideas of a political and economic philosophy patterned and tailored to fit the phrase, "Modern Republicanism."

Speaking for myself, as a Republican Member of the United States Senate from the State of South Dakota, may I say first of all that I like the phrase. I like it because like most of you I recognize that any effective partisan position, public program, or political party today must be modern and up to date if it is to prevail and if it is to meet the problems of our time. I like it also because it gives fully as much emphasis to the term "Republicanism" as it does to the term "Modern."

Insofar as I personally am concerned, and speaking with what knowledge I have of the Eisenhower program and the President's point of view, here is what I believe Modern Republicanism offers to the voters of America. In all events, this is what I believe it should imply and this is what I believe it should proclaim.

In the field of foreign policy, I think that Modern Republicanism means that the Republican Party today offers to the voters of America a program of leadership dedicated to the cause of peace and prepared to exercise the strength and resources of this Republic to strengthen the forces of freedom throughout the world by programs within our economic means and short of war. The Republican Party abominates communism and has a consistent, courageous record of opposing it both at home and abroad. We reject communism not only as an organized form of tyranny and a godless conspiratorial movement, but we also reject the programs, the policies, the drift toward absolute statism, and the socialistic experiments which lead so directly into communism.

Our foreign policy is devoted alike to the maintenance of peace and to the preservation of freedom. We abhor war, but we likewise refuse to cringe before communism or to barter our liberties and freedoms as the price for peace. We are dedicated to those activities and programs which will tend to weaken the power of communism wherever it tries to promote or push its tyrannical concepts beyond the borders of Communist Russia itself. We support programs and policies designed to strengthen our friends throughout the free world. We invite the so-called neutral nations to leave

their ivory towers of unreality and to cooperate with the free world to the end that peace and freedom may be preserved and so that sovereign nations may continue their rights of self-determination.

Recognizing that the march of history has placed the mantle of world leadership squarely upon our country in this momentous hour, we propose to lead from strength and to exercise the full responsibilities required of world leadership in our own enlightened self-interest and in the overall interests of world peace and international justice.

President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles have been doing a magnificent job in exercising American world leadership in the interests of peace and international justice. They deserve the commendations of all Americans.

Peace is a bipartisan objective and Democrats and Republicans alike have contributed toward its preservation. It is our Republican position today to so administer our international responsibilities as to warrant the continued cooperation of citizens of both our great political parties.

MODERN REPUBLICANISM AT WORK AT HOME

In the field of domestic policy, I am sure that President Eisenhower's concept of a program moving forward under the banners of Modern Republicanism incorporates, first of all, the words and wisdom of Abraham Lincoln, whose memory we honor here tonight, in the following quotation that I have heard the President use so frequently: "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all or cannot do so well for themselves in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves government ought not to interfere." In one way or another, at one time or another, I have heard Dwight D. Eisenhower use those words so frequently that I am convinced they are one of the enduring guideposts that he has in mind in shaping a program for today which will be both modern in function and truly Republican in concept.

I am confident, in the second place, that Modern Republicanism has a second guidepost which we could probably define in three short and eternally timely sentences. They are: Hold fast to that which is good. Test carefully that which is new. Move steadily toward that which is better.

As the doctrine of Modern Republicanism is applied to the ceaseless flow of new problems which present themselves to the Federal Government, I believe that Modern Republicanism also means that we shall continue using some such screen as the following in determining those things which should be undertaken by the Federal Government and those things which should be considered beyond the purview of the central state. For example, when there are those among us requesting that the Federal Government undertake some new project for the general welfare, I believe these five criteria have generally been employed by the Eisenhower administration, and I feel they should consistently be used in testing the wisdom and propriety of any such undertaking:

1. Is the project or program necessary?
2. Will it work?
3. Can we afford it?
4. Is it impossible to solve the problems or to meet the need by local or private undertaking?
5. Is it impossible to solve the problem or meet the need through a partnership arrangement between the State and the Federal Government, or between the people and the central state?

It is only after affirmative answers have been made to questions like these that government under Modern Republicanism as I envision it will enter into new and novel undertakings in unexplored areas of activity.

Modern Republicanism, I believe, rightfully recognizes the concern of the Federal Government in the general welfare of our people. It does not expect the citizens of our atomic age to enjoy only the opportunities and blessings of the era of the kerosene lamp. It denies alike the false concepts that some of our citizens are condemned to a lifetime of hamstrung opportunities or that some of our citizens are privileged characters guaranteed a lifetime of unearned enjoyments or special favoritism.

However, on programs to promote the general welfare, Modern Republicanism proposes to use political persuasion and leadership instead of the punitive political power employed by the New Deal and the Fair Deal. We propose to employ the concepts of political partnership programs instead of resorting to the outmoded formula of the paternalistic state.

By any comparison of the techniques of the Fair Deal and the New Deal, embodying as they do their consistent exercise of programs expanding the central power of the all-inclusive state, any form of republicanism designed to restore and retain power in the hands of the people is, in fact, an ultramodern approach to public problems. The antiquated, outmoded, and disproved formula of the topheavy paternalistic state were discredited in countless countries of Europe and Asia long before they were dusted off and tried again under new names and with new selling slogans by the architects of the New Deal and the Fair Deal.

Even if Modern Republicanism chose to embrace only the traditional forms of freedom encompassed by our constitutional forefathers at Philadelphia and set in motion during the early formative days of this Republic, it would be modern indeed compared to the throwback to tyrannical powers by the central state which played such an inherent part in so many of the changes proposed by our political adversaries during their recent 20-year span of authority in Washington.

Let us turn now to some specific illustrations of appropriate devices by which Modern Republicanism moves forward to meet the problems of our people within the true framework of liberty and freedom which characterizes our way of life as free Americans.

Let us take for example such an obvious necessity as the right of our citizens to purchase insurance against unpredictable and unavoidable disasters whether man made or from the caprice of nature. Few among us, I am sure, would deny the right of individual citizens to purchase insurance against disaster. Private enterprise throughout the history of the country has done a magnificent job of establishing a fabric of insurance protection whereby citizens have been able to purchase, at reasonable actuarial rates, insurance to protect them against illness, against death, against accident, fire, tornado, hail, public liability, and a long list of other perils of one form or another.

However, the farmers of America until comparatively recently, in our national history, have not been able to employ the use of insurance to protect them against the most disastrous, the most unpredictable, and the most crippling of all their contingencies—total loss of crop as a result of drought, insect plagues, or other caprices of nature. For years, farmers and farm leaders urged the private insurance industry to work out actuarial tables and set up policy provisions enabling the farmer to enjoy the opportunity of protecting himself by insurance as his city cousin was permitted to do if he were a merchant trying to guard himself against burglary and fire a physician trying to protect himself against accusations of malpractice, or almost any other city dweller faced with any other peril. Understandably, America's insurance industry was reluctant and unable to assume the risk of writing policies at reasonable rates in an unexplored field like crop insurance.

Consequently, modern Republicans supported in Congress the initiation under a previous administration of a crop-insurance program to supply a need private capital was unable or unwilling to provide. In this program our friends in the other political party defined a need and met it not by unnecessary encroachments into private or State affairs but by the partnership formula which is so evident in the program of Modern Republicanism. Under the Eisenhower administration, consequently, this crop-insurance program has been improved, refined, and extended and to it we have added a program of flood insurance devised along analogous lines and providing protection to supply another unmet need.

Let us turn to another area of American activity. For years New Dealers and Fair Dealers among us promoted within our midst the concept of state medicine. Socialized medicine, they told us, was the only way in which the Federal Government could manifest an interest in improving the overall health and physical well-being of our people. The Congress consistently refused to take that long and fateful step into the realm of socialism. Instead, Congress approached the problem in conformity with the type of considerations that Modern Republicanism recognizes as a responsibility to the people, but which avoided the centralized control and the socialized devices which lead so directly to the development of the authoritarian state.

Congress passed legislation whereby on a partnership basis the Federal Government makes available to States companion funds to help erect hospitals in areas needing them to meet needs defined by local and competent authorities within the State. Our Republican administration has provided increasingly generous funds to stimulate research in a host of areas dealing with cancer, heart disease, cerebral palsy, arthritis, and many other maladies the eradication or alleviation of which would contribute greatly to the general welfare. By stimulating medical and scientific research, Congress has helped to meet the needs of the people in a way which encourages rather than discourages the genius of private medicine and the health program of America which has remained unexcelled anywhere in the world.

The Eisenhower administration recognizes the Federal Government as a partner of the States and as a partner of the people. It has steadfastly refused to consider the Federal Government as the master of either. Sometimes it participates with the States or with communities as a big brother—sometimes as a little brother—in the solution of their problems, but it consistently refuses to participate as an opulent and petulant sugar daddy picking up the check for all expenditures and issuing directives for all the people to obey.

WHAT CHARACTERIZES "MODERN REPUBLICANISM?"

Sometimes the question is asked either by honest interrogators or by chronic critics—"Just what is the difference between Modern Republicanism and either the New Deal or the Fair Deal?"

Regardless of the motivation which might inspire such a query, it is a fair question and it deserves a clear and consistent answer. The distinctions become as clear as the path to the country schoolhouse when Modern Republicanism is defined and described in terms of the programs, policies, and purposes which it embraces as I understand and utilize the phrase. And speaking for myself, I am confident that these programs, policies, and purposes which I describe here tonight are not substantially different from what the President has in mind. Certainly, until and unless he, himself, spells out those differences and enunciates some new defini-

tions of his own, I am content to believe that between the Modern Republicanism of the Eisenhower era and the Fair Deal of Harry Truman or the New Deal of FDR there are many sharp and substantial differences.

Among them—to answer the foregoing question directly, I would list the following in addition to those already developed here tonight:

Modern Republicanism believes that the Federal Government should live within its means. It has balanced the budget and proposes to keep it balanced. That has been typical of Republican administrations for many years—but clearly it is a modern departure from the history of government during the preceding two decades.

Modern Republicanism is opposed to State socialism and it opposes it in practice as well as in principle. Like our political opponents, we criticize the weaknesses and frustrations of socialism, but unlike our political opponents, we practice what we preach. The Eisenhower team in the executive agencies and in Congress has supported programs which have divested the Federal Government of many functions, operations, and actual ownership situations which were inherited by it when we took over the administration on January of 1953.

You ask for examples? I am glad to give them to you: Our Government owned synthetic rubber plants that have been sold to private owners and operators. The Federal Barge Line of the Missouri-Mississippi River has been sold to a private company which now makes a profit plying the same river route where the Federal Government consistently operated at a loss. Many parcels of real estate have been sold and are being sold thus relieving the Federal Government of ownership costs and problems while putting the property back on the tax rolls where it belongs. The President has recommended over 2,000 divestments—some small and some large—whereby he has ordered the return to private ownership and operations of such curious experiments in socialism as coffee roasting plants; barb wire factories, paint factories, machine shops, pop bottling works, furniture factories, and a host of other fabricating and repair works operated by the Defense Department or by other agencies of the Government when President Eisenhower took the oath of office.

And on the credit side of the ledger, I can think of no single step backward into socialism or sidewise into the creeping morass called communism that has been taken by Republicans in these modern times.

Modern Republicanism—to cite another difference between it and the outmoded concepts of statism paraded before us under New Deal and Fair Deal labels—believes in and supports the rights of States and the dignity of the individual citizen as guaranteed under the 10th amendment to our Constitution—that crowning arch of our entire Bill of Rights. Under our predecessor Presidents since 1932, the functions of the State governments were slowly being down-graded to the point where they would be left no revenues to tap and no authorities to exercise. They were in danger of degenerating into institutions performing only ceremonial functions.

The Central State was getting stronger and the State capitals of each of our 48 great commonwealths were growing weaker. The centripetal force of the dizzy days of dealers new and fair by which the propulsion power of government was moving everything toward the center has ended. States are once again looked upon as important entities. The great new Eisenhower highway building program, for example, moves forward as an achievement of Modern Republicanism. The States and the Federal Government plan, and promote, and pay together as we initiate and implement the greatest highway-building program in the world.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have thus far listed five important differences between Modern Republicanism as we view it in practice and the New Deal and the Fair Deal as we view them in retrospect. They are:

1. Modern Republicanism embraces the concept of partnership procedures rather than that of centralized and exalted political power.

2. Modern Republicanism does not accept new approaches to old problems simply because they are new but accepts them only if they produce progress when the people themselves or the local authorities are unable to provide solutions.

3. Modern Republicanism believes the Federal Government should live within its means.

4. Modern Republicanism is opposed to State socialism in both principle and practice.

5. Modern Republicanism proceeds in conformity with constitutional concepts and recognizes both the validity and importance of the 10th amendment setting out the doctrine of the rights of States and the political authority of individual citizens.

There are, of course, many other important differences between the Modern Republicanism of today and the Fair Deal and the New Deal of their respective eras. Those things from those eras which were good and sound and in the interests of promoting opportunity and well-being in conformity with our American concepts, we have retained. Some have been expanded and improved. In other important areas, as indicated by the five foregoing points of difference, we have pointed America in a new direction and moved forward with new and strengthened impetus.

But some of these other and additional differences should at least be enumerated here tonight:

Modern Republicanism has put an end to corruption and cronyism in government.

Waste has become an ugly word in Washington again and to a great degree it has been curtailed and stopped.

Employment of Communists in high places has been abruptly halted and even our most articulate and active opponents recognize that achievement to the point where suggestions about subversives in government are now not even heard.

Emphasis has once again been placed upon projecting our system of private ownership so as to provide expanding opportunities for increasing numbers of our citizens.

The reward of merit system has been utilized to produce progress; success through political favoritism is once again the exception to the rule.

In the all-important field of taxation, taxes are again considered as a means of raising revenue for the Federal Government and not as a punitive device for pushing reforms, punishing rivals, or rewarding friends.

Americans who have developed an ethical maturity in the exercise of personal freedoms and traditional liberties can move forward to pinnacles of personal success in the clear knowledge that so long as they violate no laws and do nothing to impinge upon the freedoms and opportunities of their fellow citizens, the Federal state will protect one and all against discrimination, favoritism, and unfair and un-American governmental snooping into their personal lives and the intimidation of their private practices.

The symbol of America is once again that bewhiskered gentleman in the big hat—Uncle Sam—rather than the furtive figure of a blue-nose busybody known as Peeping Tom.

It is the function of government under the mantle of Modern Republicanism to do better those things which government should do at all and to refrain entirely from doing those things which no American government should at all undertake.

Modern Republicanism believes that there is nothing wrong with America that the importation of any foreign ideology can cure or that adherence to our constitutional concepts cannot correct.

Thus we favor cooperative grants-in-aid to stimulate better hospitals and the faster advance of the curative arts, but we oppose socialized medicine.

We favor the Federal encouragement of education but not Government schools or centralized control over the curriculum and the teachers using it.

We favor the expansion of REA and RTA where needed but not the unnecessary imposition of public power whereby politicians from the central government own and operate the generation of power and determine who shall get it first and cheapest.

We favor the development of the great new force of atomic power by partnership projects with private enterprise where possible and not through socialized projects which give the know-how and experience to the Government and comprise a threat to all the privately owned utilities and oilfields in America.

We favor competitive bidding over force-account contracts on Federal construction—we believe private contractors, engineers, and builders can build the necessary Federal structures more economically and effectively than Government bureaus and political employees.

We believe a stabilized dollar and an honest monetary system better serves the public than arbitrary Federal action designed to create inflation or deflation and devoted to relating economic curves to the political polls of prevailing public opinion.

In short, Modern Republicanism believes that America—the most modern, up-to-date, and efficient country of them all did not get to be the biggest, strongest, and most influential nation in the world by doing everything all wrong.

In 1960, the American voter is going to confront something, in my opinion, that he has not witnessed in a quarter of a century. He is going to face a presidential election in which principles and policies are going to dominate the scene over the importance of personalities. He is going to the polls to vote for ideas and ideals dear to his heart rather than for or against individuals whom he loves or hates. Since 1932, Americans in the main have voted for or against dynamic individuals because they either liked or disliked the man at the top of the ticket. Neither party seems likely in 1960 to produce a candidate so popular or unpopular; so pleasing or so displeasing; so well loved or so ardently hated that voters, in the main, will determine their votes by their like or dislike of the personality involved.

In my opinion, it is good that we appear to be facing an election where issues rather than individuals will become the dominant and determining factor.

I believe that in 1960, Americans will write the answers rather clearly that they want to have recorded to at least five major and prevailing questions:

How big do they want government to grow?

How much do they want government to cost?

How much do they want government to own and operate?

How much do they want government to control and regulate?

How far do they want America to move in the direction of the welfare or the paternalistic state?

It is my conviction that Modern Republicans will embrace the position and that the American voter will select the party that answers those five questions by indicating that government should be less costly, smaller in size, more restricted in scope, less pushy and punitive in character, and closer to the concept that, "That government is

best which governs least." I expect our political adversaries and opponents to embrace the position they supported so consistently from 1932 until 1952; namely, that government is an institution which should steadily increase in size and expand in function.

Thus, I believe issues are in the making which will once again divide our two parties from each other. I anticipate there will be a considerable transmigration of voters and political adherents as the lines of battle become steadily more visible. Some who are Republicans today will move over to join those who believe in bigger and more embracive Federal operations. Some who are Democrats today—not New Dealers or Fair Dealers, but Jeffersonian Democrats or Constitutional Democrats of the type that prevail in so many areas of the South and the Southwest—some who are today called Democrats primarily because they are not Republicans will cross over to join up and become an active, articulate part of our modern Republican Party and position.

Speaking for myself, I welcome such a movement and countermovement of political forces and of partisan adherents. For too long our two major parties have meant too little to too many who support them. On too many issues, the parties' platforms have served more to confuse the voters than to clarify opposing points of view. It is long past time when we should reexamine our faiths and find that party in which we feel the most comfortable and can be associated with the greatest percentage of congenial and like-minded citizens.

Modern Republicanism regards the past not as a hitching post to tie America to the status quo but as a guidepost toward a constantly better future. We reject the concept of the leftwing which apparently regards the past simply as a launching ramp into the great unknown.

Our great President has frequently emphasized the importance of party responsibility as a companion to the doctrine of individual accountability in the administration of public programs. As Republicans, this means we must meet that challenge by electing in 1958 a Republican Congress to team up with our Republican President. We must increasingly elect Republican officials in our State, county, and municipal elections so that in implementing the partnership concept of government which is so inherently a part of our political philosophy we shall find people of authority at various levels of government dedicated to that concept and eager to make it operate successfully. Having chartered a consistent forward-moving course in full harmony with American concepts, we need to equip ourselves with the manpower required to operate it effectively, economically, and efficiently.

When I first ran for Congress out in South Dakota, I took as a slogan a theme from which I have never had occasion to depart. It was my own, personal definition of what I considered to be the appropriate province of the Federal Government. I defined it then as I deem it to be today—simply, "To Provide a Fair Chance for a Free People." No American citizen should receive less than that. No American citizen should expect more. Each of us should be given a fair chance to succeed in a free economy extending its rewards on a merit system. Thus, A Fair Chance for a Free People is the basic formula our country should and must make available to each and all.

Beyond providing that basic formula for opportunity and justice, organized government today—and always on this continent—recognizes its responsibility to promote conditions, programs, and policies which will assist the unfortunate, strengthen the weak, ease the burdens of the ill and aged, and in general concern itself with the general well-being of its people.

In fact, there is nothing new or modern or novel about that concept of the full responsibility of government. It started on this continent in the year 1789 when our Constitution was adopted, including those all-important words so prominent in its preamble. Let me recall them to you again: "We the people of the United States in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for a common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Every word in that preamble—every word in our Constitution—was chosen, selected, and interpreted with meticulous care. Today, the program of Modern Republicanism finds its lode-star in the words of that preamble which so carefully and clearly defines the duty of government to be "to provide for the common defense" and "to promote the general welfare." The Army, the Navy, the Marines, and the Air Force and their arms and armanent including nuclear weapons we provide. Schools, hospitals, decent labor conditions, old-age assistance, etc., we promote. Therein lies, in my opinion, the fundamental difference in our concept of freedom and the formula of the welfare state, of socialism, and any other concept of the ultimate and uncontrollable state.

Our first great President—the immortal Washington—added his own words of guidance to us all when he said: "Government, like fire, is always a dangerous servant and a fearful master."

Modern Republicanism, as I see it, accepts that axiom. We believe that of equal importance to the controls which government must exercise is the fact that the people must control their government. We modern Republicans believe, as I envision our mission, that the Federal Government is the sum total of its parts but that it is not the total governmental entity of these United States. We believe that private initiative and free enterprise have brought more happiness and greater welfare to more people in our one area of the world than has been brought to the rest of the human race by all the other economic and political formula of all the other countries of the world in all of human history.

We believe freedom must be exercised to be eternal. We believe in the dignity of the human soul and the individual citizen and reject the concept that infallability is the characteristic of big government. We abhor all unnecessary and unnatural monopolies—whether private or political—but we recognize that political monopoly is the curse of half the world today and that private monoplies against the general welfare can be dispersed and ended by free men and women utilizing rightfully the functions of sound constitutional processes.

Tonight I have discussed and defined what I believe Modern Republicanism implies and portends for America. I have detailed and described what I envision to be its creed. This that I have devoted myself to tonight is what I believe it to be—what I believe it should be—what I believe it is.

In closing let me in all events summarize for you what I have said—this I believe.

Food for Thought About Our Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1957

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am privileged to include a speech delivered by the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, at the Spokane Farm Forum.

Actually Mr. Benson's address is an analytical and critical inventory of American agriculture today.

He complains that existing legislation tends to tie his hands and deny the full force of the Department to adequately serve the rural businessmen of today.

Certainly our agricultural place in the commerce of the world deserves a long look. It is for this reason that I urge a close, critical, and constructive consideration of the Secretary's speech.

I deem this an honor, a privilege, and a challenging responsibility. It is a pleasure to be with you. This is the first time my schedule has permitted me to attend the Pacific Northwest Farm Forum, but I have followed the reports of your very successful meetings. I congratulate you on this your fourth annual forum. I am highly privileged to be able to share thoughts and ideas with you.

This is my country. I am at home here. I was born, and reared in Idaho, and I farmed and traveled the State for 8 years for the University of Idaho. Because your roads were better, I often traveled through Oregon and Washington to get from Boise to the panhandle of Idaho.

Out here in the great Pacific Northwest you have good farms and good country. Your industry and your agriculture have grown side by side. And that is as it should be. That is what has made this entire Nation of ours the choice land—the almost incredibly blessed land—it is today: The free capacity of our people to cooperate—to prosper together—to grow together.

The general theme of your forum—Building a Healthier Farm Economy—has been the general theme of our thinking in the Department of Agriculture since this administration came into office. Our objective has been, and is, a prosperous, expanding, and free agriculture.

We took over at a discouraging time for farmers. Prices had been dropping for nearly 2 years. Yet, under the incentive of 90-percent emergency price support, production was running wild. Agriculture was borrowing tomorrow's prosperity and spending it today. It was like a man head over heels in debt trying to get out of debt by borrowing more money.

When we took office there were $2½ billion worth coming in. Production controls had been removed. Many farmers were producing not for markets—not for stomachs—but for Government loans and warehouses. I felt like somebody suddenly asked to take over a train hurtling through the night at 90 miles an hour with the throttle stuck wide open and the brake level thrown out the window.

Our job was to build a healthier farm economy. But agriculture was traveling in a vicious circle. Rigid and unrealistic supports were pricing commodities out of their normal markets and into storage, while at the same time encouraging more production. This in turn was driving market prices even lower, causing still more dependence on price support and still bigger surpluses in Government warehouses.

Our hands were tied by legislation which made rigid price support mandatory through the 1954 crops. So the surpluses inevitably mounted higher and higher before we could do anything effective to slow the build-up.

Government should not be in business in competition with its tax-paying citizens. As a Nation we should leave to private enterprise those things which private enterprise is willing and able to do. I believe that continued substitution of Government for pri-

vate trade would mean, in time, the socialization of agriculture and the end of freedom as you and I know it.

Yet the Commodity Credit Corporation, in its price-support operations, had become the market for a wide variety of food and fiber that no one else seemed to want. CCC's obligation to acquire these commodities is so extensive that it staggers the imagination. When its bins and warehouses become filled, still more storage space is provided. When CCC begins to run out of money, either its notes are cancelled or its borrowing authority is extended.

Twenty-one years ago the capital funds of CCC totaled $100 million. Today CCC not only has those funds, but in addition it has a borrowing authority of $14.5 billion—145 times as much as in 1936.

That tells the story of how Government has moved in.

Our first task in building a healthy farm economy was to get agriculture out of the price-support straitjacket. The farm economy cannot be frozen to the past, to uneconomic patterns, to some historical condition that changing markets have made, or will make, unrealistic. Agriculture must be flexible, adjustable. Freedom to change must be retained in the hands of each farm family. Only a free and flexible agriculture can stay tuned to its markets; and only an agriculture that stays in tune with its markets can be expanding and prosperous.

During the past 4 years three great victories have been won for the benefit of farm people.

The battle against rigid price supports was won in the 83d Congress and successfully defended in the 84th.

We secured enactment of legislation to reduce production of surplus crops with a soil-bank program.

And this administration sponsored and secured passage of legislation to speed up the disposal of Government-owned farm commodities. Now, for the first time in many years a Secretary of Agriculture is able to report such favorable peacetime developments as the following:

Prices received by farmers have been running 5 to 7 percent above a year ago.

Realized net farm income in 1956 was 5 percent above 1955. There have been only 2 years since 1947 that farm income increased. One was 1951, during the Korean war. Another was 1956, a year of peace.

Investment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in farm products owned and under loan are expected to total approximately $7.6 billion on June 30, 1957, a net reduction of $700 million in a period of 12 months. This will be a net reduction of approximately $1.3 billion since the peak holdings of February 1956.

Domestic consumption is increasing. Diets are improving. Markets are expanding at home and abroad.

Our outlook specialists expect further modest increases in farm prices and farm incomes during the year ahead. They anticipate further decreases in surplus holdings and a better balance of supplies and markets.

Our exports of farm commodities are running at an alltime high. For the July–December period of 1956, these exports were 39 percent higher in value than for the same period of 1955, and 45 percent larger in quantity.

United States wheat shipments in the current 1956–57 marketing year may be in the neighborhood of 450 million bushels, 30 percent more than a year earlier.

A big part of this larger export demand has come to the Pacific Northwest, partly because most of the sales for foreign currency agreements have been made with Asian nations.

As a result of heavy Pacific Northwest exports, the carryover in this area next July 1 will be greatly reduced. Because of this active export demand, Pacific Northwest wheat prices, as you know, are much higher relative to support levels than are prices in most other parts of the country. Prices of soft white wheat at Portland early this month were at a high for the season to date—37 cents above the effective loan.

The national wheat situation is improving. Winter seedings last fall fell to the smallest acreage since 1913, nearly a third less than average. Based on conditions as of December 1 and on normal conditions for the remainder of the growing season, the 1957 winter wheat crop may be about 625 million bushels.

Wheat farmers signed up 10.7 million acres in the 1957 winter wheat acreage-reserve program of the soil bank. If they take about 3 million acres of spring wheat out of production the total wheat crop may be about 810 million bushels.

Domestic use and exports may be around 950 million bushels in 1957–58. A crop of 810 million bushels, therefore, would be 140 million bushels below consumption. This would bring about a substantial reduction in carryover at the end of the 1957–58 marketing year.

Actually, prospects of a reduction in carryover in the Pacific Northwest in 1957–58 are relatively more favorable than for the Nation as a whole. Forward export commitments will result in continued heavy exports. This will not only further reduce the carryover in this area, it will also maintain prices well above the support levels.

Now let's take a quick look at a few other crops. About one dollar in eight of farmers' total cash receipts in both Oregon and Washington comes from milk. As your population grows, a larger proportion of milk is being used in fluid form.

This proportion is likely to increase in the next several years. Milk prices received by farmers in the past several months have been equal to or a little above a year earlier. The outlook for 1957 is encouraging.

Our Government stocks of dairy products are way down. We have no butter on hand. Our stocks of dried milk are small. Only cheese stocks are of significant size, and these also are down sharply from 1954. All this, of course, has been an expensive operation. We are continuing to move dairy products through the 480 program and other operations at considerable cost to the Government.

In the years since the war, beef cattle have recaptured and increased their market. The cattle industry has satisfied a fast-growing demand by consumers for beef. Last year both the number of cattle on farms and the quantity of beef produced were at record highs. Consumers on the average ate about 84 pounds of beef, the most in this century. When we recall that beef consumption averaged 55 pounds in 1951, the increase becomes truly phenomenal.

The Northwest has shared in this expansion. Your producing herds have been on an uptrend. You have taken advantage of new advances in cattle feeding. You feed your cattle a more scientifically balanced ration, and you produce a better quality animal in less time and at less cost.

We are now at the crest of the present cattle cycle. Although the cycle is not yet far enough along to move immediately into the next stage of reduced supplies and higher prices, we are headed in that direction. Prices in January were a dollar higher on the average than a year ago—up 7 percent. This is in spite of the fact that the devastating drought in the Southwest is forcing many farmers and ranchers to throw their cattle on the market.

The poultry industry is growing in importance here in the Northwest. This quick-changing, progressive industry offers opportunity for resourceful persons. Though the picture is changing, a western regional research project a few years ago showed that per capita consumption of chickens in the Western States was only two-thirds to three-fourths as large as the average for the entire country.

As for fruits and tree nuts, here again we can look for an expanding market. Most of the 1956 crops here in the Northwest were smaller than in 1955, mainly because of weather. Average prices were higher. Looking ahead, we see a rapidly increasing population and an expanding economy. There is almost certain to be a larger per capita market for frozen and canned fruits, vegetables, and juices—and for milk, meat, poultry, and eggs. Studies of food consumption indicate very strongly that as incomes increase these foods make up more and more of the diet.

Of course, agriculture is not out of the woods. As we all know, our farm people are feeling the pressure of a price-cost squeeze. Much of this squeeze comes from rising costs. Ten years ago—in 1947—net farm income was at an all-time high. Four-fifths of the drop in net farm income since 1947 has come from increased production expenses. Only one-fifth of the decline has resulted from lower gross farm income.

Farm people have a saying which expresses their view eloquently. "Collective bargaining," they say, "means that labor and industry bargain together and then collect from us."

There is much truth in this saying, and I think that everyone in the country is concerned, not just farmers. When there is, as now, strong demand for industrial products and a tight labor market, soft settlements of wage disputes are all too frequently made, with wage increases outrunning gains in productivity. These increased costs are passed forward to consumers in the form of higher prices and backward to producers of many raw materials, especially farm products, in the form of lower returns.

The adverse effects of soft wage settlements hit farmers harder than any other group, because farmers lack bargaining power. Furthermore, farmers get hit twice, once when they buy and once when they sell.

But all consumers feel the pressure of rising prices. The threat to overall economic stability is the greatest danger of all. Inflation is nobody's friend.

All groups, including labor and industry, should so conduct themselves as to check the development of a condition contrary to the national welfare. Experience indicates that if needful restraints are not exercised voluntarily, there is a resort to stronger measures—measures contrary to the goals of a free society.

We can build a healthier farm economy. But we can do so only if we keep our agriculture dynamic.

Today's farms are fewer and larger. In 1940, there were 6.1 million farms in the United States. Now there are only 4.75 million.

Output per man-hour has gone up 96 percent. The number of people working in agriculture has gone down 27 percent.

Just before World War II, farm people made up 23 percent of the population. Now they are only 13 percent, and the figure may drop further.

These trends are full of meaning. One conclusion that stands out crystal clear is that farm people must look to the support of their city neighbors for such agricultural programs as may be needed.

Programs that clearly do not serve all the people will have hard going.

Most of the programs affecting agriculture fall into two broad groups. In one group are programs designed to increase farmers' efficiency in producing and marketing—such as research, education, conservation, electrification. In the other are programs intended primarily to improve here and now the relative prices and incomes received by farmers.

Programs in the first group benefit not only farmers but the Nation as a whole. They produce a better product, find new uses for crops, enable farmers to grow more units per acre, more meat per animal, more milk per cow, more eggs per hen. They result in food and fiber of better quality; food that is more nutritious, fiber that is better fitted to specific uses.

They expand existing markets—create new markets. They cut marketing costs—reduce spoilage in transportation, handling, and processing.

Programs that produce such results sell themselves to the people.

Programs of the second type—programs directly concerned with the relative prices and incomes of farmers—also should be expected to prove that they serve the whole people. Price supports are useful as aids in promoting orderly marketing and fostering stability of farm income. But we know that they can be so used as to fail of their purpose. Misused, they cause more problems than they solve. They involve much larger expenditures of public money than, for example, programs of research and education. They involve the Government in producing, marketing, and price making of farm products. They do not reduce costs. They do not increase efficiency.

The misuse of price support helped bring on our present huge surpluses. Our technicians estimate that accumulated surpluses and excessive output have reduced net farm income by nearly $2 billion a year, or about 20 percent.

We are concentrating, as we properly should, on surplus disposal and on the soil-bank program to restore a balance in agriculture. We are both asking and requiring farmers to accept strict production controls in order to get our from under our surpluses.

But the problem on the horizon, as I see it, is this: Under present law, farmers face continued controls. Chief effect of the disposal operations will be to boost the level of price support while continuing all the paraphernalia of production controls. And production controls have been only partially effective.

Our special programs of surplus removal will, with the existing formulas in the law, have the effect of boosting prices of the basic commodities back to 90 percent of parity. Controls will be continued in an effort to keep supports at that level. The evidence is that the high price supports will cause loss of markets and that the controls will be less than properly effective.

In agriculture, therefore, because of the price objective in the basic law, committed to continuous production controls on the one hand and continuous surplus disposal operations on the other? If this be true, would it not be well to reexamine the price objective? This is a question to which not only the Congress but farmers and all of our people should devote much careful thought.

In building a healthier farm economy, then, we must focus our efforts on measures that serve agriculture directly and all our people at least indirectly.

Let me mention very briefly a few areas in which the interests of agriculture and the whole Nation clearly go hand in hand.

In many areas of America water is the greatest limiting factor for both agricultural and industrial development.

Our present national use of water is approaching 200 billion gallons per day. This use is expected to double in 25 years.

We must save all the water we can. We must conserve more water if we are to keep our surface and underground reservoirs full, and our soil moisture up to what it should be.

We must use more effectively the best storage we know about—the earth itself. Our soils and underground reservoirs constitute the greatest potential storage we have.

We need to intensify our research as applied to the Northwest on the best way to use and conserve every drop of water that falls from the heavens.

Second. Conservation of land and timber.

Conservation is more than terraces to control soil erosion, important as that practice may be. It is more than the planting of trees and grass, despite the fact that this is one of our most important means of achieving conservation.

Conservation is using our resources in such a way that the needs of people today and tomorrow are best served. It is getting a larger return of the product without eating up the capital.

Here in the Northwest, a very large part of your income is derived from forests and forest industry. Operation Outdoor is vitally important. As you know, last week we announced the creation of the Three Sisters Wilderness area and the Mt. Washington and Diamond Peak wild areas in Oregon. This adds 32,000 acres to the national forest wilderness area bringing the total to about 750,000 acres in Oregon.

There are many aspects of conservation that I should like to discuss with you if there were time: The preservation of unique scenic areas in their natural state which we are proving in the national forests—the operation of the national forests on a multiple-use sustained-yield basis for the benefit of all our people— the need for maintaining a healthy, privately operated forest products manufacturing industry—the enlargement of fish and wildlife values—the agricultural development of the Columbia River Basin.

These are some of the aspects of conservation here in the Northwest in which we are all intensely interested. We want to do the best possible job we can in all these fields—working with the States—working with you, the people. We know that the only successful programs of conservation are those initiated and developed by the local people, and managed by them, with the help of both State and Federal Governments where needed. That is our philosophy. That is our goal.

Third. Research and extension.

The most basic longtime program for agriculture is a program of research and education. We all know what hybrid corn has meant to agriculture and to the American people. Between 1931 and 1933 we used around 110 million acres of land to grow about 2.5 billion bushels of corn. In the past 3 years we have been using about 79 million acres to produce nearly 3¼ billion bushels of corn.

Of course, there were other factors besides hybrid seed, but the net result is that we are producing about 30 percent more corn on about 30 percent fewer acres than we did a quarter century ago.

Wheat yields on a national basis have gone up 40 percent since the early 1930's.

Last year we produced on less than 16 million acres nearly as much cotton as we produced on more than 40 million acres around 1930.

In 1940 there were nearly 11 million persons engaged in agriculture. With the same level of productivity per worker as existed in 1940 it would have required 15 million farm workers to product last year's output. The 1956 output was actually produced with 8 million workers.

It is not sufficient, however, merely to produce our food and fiber efficiently. We must also market them efficiently. We must find new markets and new uses. We must expand existing markets. We must constantly seek ways to process and merchandise our foods and fibers at lower costs and in a manner more attractive to consumers at home and abroad.

Research finds the facts and extension carries them to the field.

In the years I have been Secretary, Federal appropriations for agricultural research have increased 75 percent. Included in these Federal appropriations, the grants to State agricultural experiment stations have increased by 115 percent.

Likewise Federal appropriations for extension work have increased 54 percent.

The Federal appropriation for agricultural research now totals $102.5 million. The Federal extension appropriation totals $53.5 million.

Extensive research is going forward on all of the crops of major importance to the Northwest—production research and marketing research. Research is steadily making progress in adapting crops to new areas. Perhaps soybeans or some other alternative crop can satisfactorily be adapted to portions of the Pacific Northwest.

We know what the development of frozen fruits and vegetables has meant to growers here and in many other fruit and vegetable areas. But we sometimes forget the long road that was pioneered by researchers before these developments became possible.

For more than 50 years the packaging and preservation of frozen foods have been under continuous study by Department scientists.

Way back in 1904 and 1905 scientists in the United States Department of Agriculture were conducting experiments with frozen fruits. The first USDA bulletin on this subject was put out 50 years ago.

A special frozen pack laboratory was established in Seattle in 1930. It led to better quality and lower processing costs. It was a critical time in the birth of this new industry, and these were critical developments.

Then, in the midthirties, our four agricultural regional research laboratories were set up. The western laboratory, at Albany, Calif., adopted a program of research in frozen foods as a major activity.

The point I want to stress is this. Most of the progress in our agriculture has come about through such developments as those I have been mentioning. We push ahead through research and education. We go forward on the vehicle of new ideas—new ways of producing more efficiently, marketing more effectively, ideas for using established crops in new ways—ideas for developing new crops.

Besides conservation, research, and education, we have a common interest in development programs. Our rural development program is successfully launched. It is helping open the doors of opportunity to the million and a half farm families with incomes of less than $1,000 a year. This is a program destined to grow in influence and worth.

A fifth vital need in building a healthy farm economy is credit. Credit needs must be met for production requirements, farm purchase, and emergency needs.

In all our farm programs the emphasis must be on building an expanding, prosperous, and free farm economy for the benefit of the entire Nation.

Our immediate task is to achieve a balance between production and the market demands of peacetime, to eliminate surpluses, to rebuild normal markets and to develop new ones, and to encourage and strengthen the marketing system upon which farm people and the entire Nation depend.

Our continuing objective is expanding opportunity, bigger markets, and higher incomes for farm people, all in an atmosphere of freedom. The freeing up of agriculture is foremost among our goals.

As I close I would like to pay tribute to one of this Nation's greatest leaders in the cause of freedom. He did such big things that the world has almost forgotten some of the lesser events that came to pass under his leadership—such as the establishment of the Department of Agriculture, the beginning of Federal research programs, the start of the system of land-grant colleges and universi-

ties. I am speaking, of course, of Abraham Lincoln.

There is a quality about Lincoln that we sometimes overlook. Carl Sandburg points out that Lincoln used the word "responsibility" almost as often as he used the word "freedom."

Let us take to our hearts Lincoln's concept of responsible freedom. Listen to his words: "It is for us, the living, rather, to be dedicated to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us."

Let us apply these words to ourselves, as we deliberate here in this great Pacific Northwest farm forum on building a healthier farm economy.

With God's help, and in the cause of responsible freedom, let us go forward.

Fifth Annual Dedicatory Prayer Breakfast at the Mayflower Hotel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 14, 1957

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, last Thursday morning 950 persons, including the Vice President, members of the Cabinet, the courts, Members of the Senate, Members of the House of Representatives, Government officials, delegates to the conference, and representatives of the Council of Christian Leadership Groups attended the Presidential prayer breakfast at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D. C. Conrad Hilton was host on the occasion.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the program and transcript of the proceedings of this service.

In my opinion, this prayer breakfast, attended by outstanding leaders in every field will add much to the religious life of our Nation.

There being no objection, the program and transcript of proceedings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM FOR PRESIDENTIAL BREAKFAST, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, FEBRUARY 7, 1957

Presiding: Hon. FRANK CARLSON, United States Senate, president, International Council for Christian Leadership.

Invocation: Mr. Richard Halverson, assistant executive secretary, International Christian Leadership.

Scripture lesson: Hon. BROOKS HAYS, Representative from Arkansas. (Isaiah 42: 1–4; Titus 2: 11–14.)

Message of welcome: Senator FRANK CARLSON.

Greetings from our host: Mr. Conrad Hilton.

Message: The Vice President of the United States, Hon. RICHARD NIXON.

Greetings from the House of Representatives Breakfast Prayer Group: Hon. JAMES B. UTT, of California.

Greetings from the Senate Breakfast Prayer Group: Hon. JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi.

Address: Christian Responsibility, Mr. Kenneth Keyes, Miami, Fla.

Prayer of dedication: Abraham Vereide, executive secretary of International Council of Christian Leadership.

The fifth annual prayer breakfast was opened by Senator FRANK CARLSON, president of the International Council of Christian Leadership.

FIFTH ANNUAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

Senator CARLSON. We are going to have the invocation this morning by Richard Halverson. Following that we will remain standing and have a verse for the President, a hymn led by Fague Springman, of the music department, University of Maryland.

Mr. HALVERSON. Let us unite together in prayer.

Our Heavenly Father, we gather together this morning in this comfortable fellowship knowing that there are millions of men and women who never know the comfort that we enjoy and who would never dare to meet in fellowship in the name of Jesus Christ.

We meet here in reflection and respect for our Government leaders, and there are millions who fear and hate those who are over them in rule and authority.

We meet here to enjoy good food and drink, and there are millions who never know the luxury of a full stomach.

Our Heavenly Father, deliver us from the complacency that would make us indifferent of these gifts that come so easily and grant as we gather here this morning in the name of Jesus Christ that this breakfast shall be a testimony to the fact that we take Christ seriously and we in America love God and believe that we are called of Him to serve Him. Use these blessings to Thy glory we pray in Christ's name. Amen.

(Solo.)

Senator CARLSON. We are going to enjoy the breakfast, but during this breakfast period I would like to announce that we are going to be favored by some music, songs, and a quartet. This quartet is known as the Visionaires and they have just flown over from Manila, the Philippine Islands, where they have concluded a very fine and effective evangelistic campaign.

We are going to be favored at this time with one number from the Visionaries quartet. And immediately following that number we will hear from the distinguished Congressman from the State of Arkansas [BROOKS HAYS], who will read the Scripture lesson, Isaiah 42: 1–4, Titus 2: 11–14.

We meet here this morning at a prayer breakfast. It was 23 years ago in Seattle, Wash., that a group of men met and organized the first laymen's breakfast prayer group. It also founded International Christian Leadership. This is in reality the annual meeting of these breakfasts. There are prayer groups all over this Nation. And it is also the first session of the International Christian Leadership.

Today there are hundreds of these prayer groups meeting in foreign countries as well as all over our Nation. It is a laymen's movement for spiritual deepening and for consideration of the practical problems which can be solved, we believe, through vital Christianity.

Membership in the United States is made up of all segments of our social and economic life—from commerce and industry, from government, the House and the Senate, labor, banking, all of the professions. Awakened and concerned laymen believe that the solution to this crisis lies in taking the initiative in practicing and promoting moral and spiritual principles in our daily lives. They believe the root of the American greatness is a Christian heritage. They believe that in these troubled and uncertain times we need and must rely on divine guidance.

It was St. Paul who wrote, "The effectual, fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much."

The theme for this meeting is mobilizing Christian men around the world to assume their responsibility in human affairs.

This session is the first session of the International Christian Leadership. We are going to have meetings for the next 3 days. While I am on my feet I want to announce a very important annual banquet dinner tonight. I urge you to make it a point to attend. Dr. Billy Graham will be the speaker. It will be in the presidential room of this hotel at 7:30. Tickets will be available across the hall.

This morning is the fifth consecutive year that we are privileged to be the guests of a great American, who has made an outstanding success in the business world. We applaud him for this great success, but I want to commend him for his deep and fundamental interests in the problems of mankind.

It was several years ago that our host wrote the prayer, "America on Its Knees." I am advised that he has personally printed and distributed in practically every country on the face of the globe a total of over one-half million copies of this prayer.

America has a great heritage, and, we of this generation, owe much to those who have gone before, but we do have an obligation to preserve for future generations—our children and their children—the fundamental principles advocated by the Man of Galilee who walked the shores 2,000 years ago.

I am pleased this morning to present to you our host, Mr. Hilton. [Applause.]

Mr. HILTON. Mr. Vice President, Mr. Chief Justice, Mr. Chairman, Reverend Clergy, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen: First, I should like to say my congratulations to all of you, to ourselves on this fifth anniversary of our prayer breakfast. It is an outgrowth of an original small group of Senators and Members of the House who for years met regularly to pray together.

The prayer breakfast has quietly grown into a national event. It has survived I think because in between our annual prayer meetings we have learned to do something more about religion than just talk about it. In these past 5 years I think we have come to realize most deeply that we had better do more than just talk about religion if we want to survive.

We have learned that the democracy which forgets its God is a democracy that is through. I am not saying that religion is good because it helps democracy. That is like saying it is good because it helps business. What I am saying is that religion for a country is not something to be accepted or rejected as the nation is inclined. I am saying that religion, your relationship with God as a nation and as individuals, is of first importance.

This sum of our obligations to a personal God is what gives us dignity as a nation, dignity as persons. Let us illustrate. A man is standing at 50th and Park Avenue in New York City. He is waiting for the light to turn. Who is he?

To the statistician standing at the window high above, he is one unit in a crowd.

To the biologist, he is a specimen.

To the physicist, a formula of mass and energy.

To the chemist, a compound of substances.

He is of interest to the historian as one of the billions of beings who have inhabited this planet of ours.

To the politicians, as a vote.

To the merchandiser, as a customer.

To the mailman, as an address.

The behaviorist sees him from his office across the street and tags him as a man modified by conditioned reflexes.

And the psychiatrist in the next suite as a particular mental type, deviating in one way or another from the alleged normal.

Each science pinpoints the poor fellow from some particular angle and makes him look foolish, like the candid camera shot that catches you in the middle of a yawn. Let any of these specialists get hold of you and get you to look at yourself through his

single eye, and what you see will not be a man, but a fragment of a man.

You will be the elephant examined by the five blind men. One felt his ear and said, "An elephant is like a blanket." Another his tail and said, "No; like a rope." The third his leg and insisted "Like a tree." The fourth bumped into his side and decided it was "Like a wall." The last grabbed his trunk and said, "Definitely an elephant is like a snake."

But what is man like? Why are all these experts focusing their spotlight on him? Why is he the target of biologists? Why has man a finger in every pie? Why is he so universally important? By what right? What is it that is the center of him that holds the attention of the universe and gives him a unique dignity?

Beware of asking. That way lies religion. And religion, according to our Communist friends, is the enemy of man, the enemy of democracy.

According to the Supreme Soviet the people is religion, the absolute sovereignty of the people without subjection to God or the laws of justice. For communism the new democracy, the new gospel according to Marx and Lenin, gives order and significance to the whole of the human past and direction for the human future.

Man was born yesterday, and in the new gospel lies his salvation.

I tell you that is wrong. When 2,000 years have gone to the making of a Christian people they cannot be scaled down to materialism in a small, mean, slavish view of themselves, either by Communist teachers or by Soviet tanks.

But to avoid it we must return to a Christian realism and be aware that both democracy and Christianity today are fighting the same animal. You and I know that communism would wipe both off of the face of the earth. However, I am convinced that under the influence of this common enemy democracy and Christianity are coming together in a fashion. But the cementing of the union is not yet accomplished. Perhaps that is where we come in.

One thing I am quite sure: that democracy cannot do it alone. Christianity and democracy must stop walking down individual roads or prepare for the destruction of our common world.

I am not trying to impose religion on anybody, but the minimum reading of history will convince you that religion is the background of our modern democratic ideal, and the two forces had better get together if democracy is to work.

Now I should like to close with a suggestion for the next year's prayer breakfast. I propose it not as your host but as a simple member of our group here this morning.

First, let me say that there are over 79 countries in the United Nations, most of which are non-Christian. My suggestion is this: Next year we might invite to our breakfast two members from each of our foreign non-Christian religions who live in Washington in the diplomatic service of their respective nations. For instance, we might have with us 2 Buddhists, 2 Shintoists, 2 Mohammedans, 2 Hindus and the like.

I make this suggestion because of the new stature which the United Nations has assumed in the past few months. There has been a change in the character of that organization resulting from the recent accession of 19 new members a few months ago, most of which are of the Afro-Asian bloc, now the largest section of the Assembly.

I should like to see the unifying principle of the United Nations be anti-atheism rather than anti-colonialism or anti-communism. The Afro-Asian is a potent bloc in world councils today and will go onward year by year with the addition of newly emancipated African peoples. I see great good in inviting these men who believe in God, but who are not Christians, to break bread with us, a non-sectarian Christian group; to join us for breakfast and conversation, children of a common Father.

And now, Mr. Vice President, a year ago I had the pleasure of presenting a silver plaque to President Eisenhower on which was engraved the prayer that he delivered on the occasion of his first inauguration. Today I take pleasure in presenting to President Eisenhower, through you, a similar silver plaque containing a prayer he delivered on the occasion of his second inaugural address. With it go our affectionate greetings and wishes for his continued good health and happiness, and that continued success may come to him in the great work that he is doing in bringing peace to a troubled world. [Applause.]

Vice President NIXON. Senator Carlson, Mr. Hilton, Mr. Chief Justice, all of the distinguished guests and ladies and gentlemen who are here this morning: Before accepting this plaque on behalf of the President I would like to say just a word on behalf of all of us who are your guests this morning for allowing us again to be with you for what has now become this annual event on our calendars.

This is a very unusual breakfast in many respects that I think of. For some of us it is quite rare to get up this early in the morning to come downtown to breakfast, I can assure you. For many of us it is also rare, I would say, to get up this early in the morning for a worship service; and for virtually all of us it is most unusual to add to our traditional ham and eggs not only doughnuts, and not only sausage, but hominy grits as well.

May I say also that it is a great privilege to welcome our visitors from out of Washington who are here for the two events that are being commemorated on this particular occasion. I will regret that I will not be able to be present personally tonight—because of an engagement at the White House—for the dinner which will be held across the hall, at which Billy Graham will be speaking. I notice that he has been sitting right here. I know that he is preparing for what I think is one of the most courageous crusades that he has undertaken.

I think most of us will agree that this young and vigorous religious leader has been courageous in many instances in moving into areas where they said it couldn't be done. [Applause.]

I learned 6 months ago that Billy Graham and his associates had contracted to take Madison Square Garden for 3 months beginning this summer. I realize that here is a man who certainly had the strength of his convictions, and he was willing to back it up in this very tangible way. So may I take this occasion before he speaks tonight to wish him and all of his people well in this new venture which we will be witnessing in a very few weeks.

Now may I officially accept on behalf of the President of the United States this plaque. I know that he has always enjoyed his attendance at these breakfasts in the past. This morning he has a National Security Council meeting. It will begin at 9 o'clock. And that of course explains why he cannot be in more than one place at one time. The President almost always does that but even he has not found a way to attend more than one meeting at one particular time.

I think that there is no more appropriate way to express appreciation for him for this plaque, and also to initiate these conferences that will be held in the next few days, than to read the message which he sent to all of you and to us this morning.

"Please give my greeting to your guests assembled in the Capital City for the fifth annual prayer breakfast. In the company of fellow believers united in faith and hope there is strength for renewed effort to serve our God and neighbor. In such a spirit the magnitude of our common tasks diminishes, the obstacles to their accomplishment less and less formidable. This is a time to confront our common problems with confidence. I am sure the Nation and the world can and will find the wisdom and courage, the inspired leadership required for the living of these days. Congratulations and best wishes to you all. Dwight D. Eisenhower." [Applause.]

Senator CARLSON. Thank you, Mr. Vice President, and Mr. Hilton.

First, Mr. Hilton again for this splendid breakfast and your generosity to each and all of us and for your kindness in permitting us to come as your guests; and for the Vice President in being with us this morning.

I am not going to read any number of messages but I do want to read one this morning that comes from the honorary president of the International Council of Christian Leadership. It is a message from Her Royal Highness Princess Wilhelmina of Holland:

"I offer you on the occasion of your meeting my best wishes. May the light you received within radiate through all ICCL undertakings in the midst of a battle for everyday life, and you be the channels through which the living water flows into the spiritual distress of our world."

We are especially honored to have at our head table this morning some people who are not going to participate in the program. It is always a feeling of satisfaction and comfort and security when we have with us our distinguished guest, the Chief Justice, Hon. Earl Warren.

We have at the superior table a very personal friend of mine. I am delighted to have him here. He is a regular attendant at these breakfasts, the assistant to the President of the United States, Governor Sherman Adams.

We have here at the head table Governor Sigurd Anderson, who is chairman of the entire conference proceedings for the next 3 days. Governor Anderson.

We also have with us Judge Boyd Leedom, who is vice chairman and director of the executive council of the International Christian Leadership.

As I have stated before, every Wednesday morning we have a prayer breakfast in the United States Senate. They have a prayer breakfast in the House of Representatives on Thursday morning. We are favored this morning to have greetings from these two groups.

We are going to be represented from the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, Hon. JOHN STENNIS, and from the House by the very able and distinguished Congressman, Hon. JAMES B. UTT.

First we will have a word of greeting from Congressman UTT, followed by Senator STENNIS.

Congressman UTT, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Chief Justice, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure to bring you greetings from the House prayer breakfast group. I will say that we are affiliated with the ICL. We meet every Thursday morning in the family dining room of the Senate. We have about 100 members with an average attendance of between 40 and 50 members. I might say that we are a little bit selfish, which perhaps isn't the Christian spirit, but we do not permit visitors nor do we permit outside speakers. We kind of feel it is a family devotional affair. We can take down our hair and we can have more freedom and candor of expression regarding our religious experiences and inspirations without outside visitors and for that reason we confine it to Members of the House and one or two other people who are in regular attendance.

I might say that it is entirely nonpolitical and nondenominational. We have about the same amount of Democrats as we do Republicans, and I might say Christianity being the common denominator of man we have no seniority in that one section of the House. A freshman Congressman is a peer of the oldest Congressman who belongs to our group, and has the same seniority that anyone else has.

Among our members we have some terrific fighters, some terrific Sunday school teachers. And I have heard—with all due respect to my minister from the First National Presbyterian Church, Mr. Billy Graham—some of the finest sermons in the sanctuary of God that I ever expect to hear come from laymen. It is truly a fine religious experience.

We have also a melting pot. The Democrats finally decided that the Republicans weren't the devil's advocates. We Republicans discovered that the Democrats weren't all that we said about them during the campaign.

I might also say that the doctrine of predestination takes high priority over the Eisenhower Mid-East Doctrine. We have a considerable amount of banter between the denominations there, more than we do over any political problems. And I might say that it generally revolves around the Baptists and around the Presbyterians.

There are some Baptists. BROOKS HAYS, who just read the Scripture, is a Baptist, and he believes that 20,000 Leagues Under the Sea was a story about baptism by immersion.

When you cross these denominations it is terrific what you get. My mother was a Methodist and my father a Baptist. Out of that holy union were born five little Presbyterians.

I can hardly account for that. But we do have a terrific group there. And I think it has an effect upon Congress and our legislation. We are there to dedicate ourselves to God and to help preserve this, a nation under God.

Senator CARLSON. We will now hear from Senator STENNIS, of the Senate prayer breakfast group.

Senator STENNIS. Mr. Vice President, Mr. Chief Justice, Mr. Hilton, and other friends, it is my great privilege to bring you greetings from the Senate breakfast group. Certainly all of us here this morning gain spiritual strength from each other. Our regular weekly meetings which are attended by from 12 to 18 or 20 Senators, are based primarily on fellowship, personal fellowship and Christian fellowship. We meet there in an exchange of thought on spiritual matters. And as we sit around the table as individuals coming from all parts of the Nation, representing all the Christian faiths, and different party affiliations, we realize and recognize that the real common bond between us is based on spiritual values, and I believe in the oneness of God.

And this exchange of thought and discussion there on spiritual values gives us a better understanding of each other and our responsibilities, and our problems, as we seek solutions to our national matters. And as we search for spiritual truth we help each other to realize that all of us strive in vain as we seek an enduring peace unless spiritual values are at the foundation of our entire efforts.

So let us, as individuals, charged with the responsibility of representing our people in the leading Nation of the world, quietly and humbly and without a show of pretense, let us let the American people know that spiritual values do have a place and do control our basic and fundamental actions here. In that way we can contribute to the faith of our people and keep burning alive the great basic Christian principles which are the basis after all of our great form of government.

I end as I start, with the thought that all of us gain spiritual strength by meeting here today.

God bless our President and our host. [Applause.]

Senator CARLSON. Thank you, Senator STENNIS, and Representative UTT.

We have been blessed in this Nation by men and women who have visions and who had the courage and convictions to carry those visions into effect. We have been blessed because we have had leaders in the business world, in government, and in prominent places in our entire economy as Christian leaders. This morning we are going to have a message from one of those outstanding Christian businessmen who has given much time to advance that thought. He comes from Miami, Fla. He is president of the National Association of Real Estate Dealers in the United States. He is going to speak on Christian responsibility. I now present Kenneth Keyes. [Applause.]

Mr. KEYES. Mr. Vice President, Mr. Chief Justice, Senator CARLSON, ladies and gentlemen, one of the words that came to have a very real meaning to us during the last war was the word "priority." We learned that things most important to the war effort had to be given the right-of-way over everything else; that they had to come first. And I believe with all my heart, friends, that the thing this world needs most today is for believers in the Lord Jesus Christ to put first things first.

In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus said, "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness." And he promised that if we would do that all things necessary to our well-being would be provided.

Now when we pause to think about it the reasons why God should have first priority over our lives are very clear and very plain. God is certainly entitled to first claim on our time because He controls our time. The years that you and I will spend on this earth are in God's hands. God should have first claim on our energies and our abilities because He gives us our energies and our talents of varying kinds.

And it follows very logically that God should have first claim on our money, for the dollars we earn are simpy the end product of our God-given time, energy, and ability.

It isn't really difficult to recognize that God is clearly entitled to first claim on our lives and what we produce with them, but the hard part comes when we try to apply this truth and make it work in the busy world in which we live.

Surely if we are to put God first, there must be a portion of each day set aside for the reading of His word, and for a vital prayer. We must never be too busy to respond to calls for service in our church. We must witness for Him in our businesses and professions, and use our energies and abilities to serve Him in our daily living.

Many of us find it especially difficult to put God first in our money making.

God wants us to remember always that it is He who gives us the time, energy and ability to earn the dollars we receive. He gives us in His word a simple practical plan that we are to adopt as a reminder that all of our blessings come from Him. God asks us to set aside the first tenth of our income or profits, the Scriptural tithe, to dedicate that tenth to His glory and use it to further His work on earth.

It is interesting to note I think that when God first established the Jewish people he gave them the law of the tithe in these words: "And all the tithes of the land, whether of the seed of the land or the fruit of the tree, is the Lord's." Note that God didn't say the tithes should be given to the Lord. He said the tithe is the Lord's. It belongs to God.

And centuries later in accusing the people of failure to keep this law God didn't say, "You haven't been liberal enough"; God didn't say, "You haven't done your duty on this matter of giving." God said: "Ye have robbed me of tithes in offering."

Our Lord was tithing when he was here on earth. The early church considered it the duty of every Christian to tithe. And the early believers must have considered tithing not only a duty but also a high privilege, for history records that Saint Cyprian, the Bishop of Carthage, once punished the people of his congregation by forbidding them to bring their tithes and offerings until the ban was lifted.

There are some Christians today who conscientiously believe that the law of the tithe was binding only on the Old Testament believers. I do not hold this view, but to me the legal angle is unimportant especially if we substitute this question: Should not our love for God, our gratitude to Him for the salvation we have through His Son, and our appreciation for all the other blessings that He provides so abundantly, prompt us to give as much as the Old Testament believer was commanded to give under the law?

If we answer this question honestly surely we would all agree that the tenth is the minimum Christians should use for God's honor and glory.

God usually blesses financially when we share our incomes liberally with him. We read in Malachi: "Bring ye the whole tithe into my storehouse and prove me now herewith, sayeth the Lord, if I will not pour out a blessing there shall not be room enough to receive it."

In 20 years in speaking on this subject I have yet to meet a tither who was faithful in giving God his tenth who did not receive a real blessing. Even though the income doesn't increase, God somehow seems to make the nine-tenths go further than the ten-tenths did before.

If time permitted, I could tell you of many leaders of industry and finance who honor God with their tithe—Colgate, Haines, Hershey, Kellogg, Penney, Wanamaker, to name just a few.

I could tell you of a real-estate salesman who started tithing when he worked for us in the middle thirties, later established his own office in another city and put 25 percent of his income into a special bank account in the name of the Lord. Or the story of the North Carolina lumberman who after tithing for many years increased God's tithe to 15 percent, then 20 percent, and finally dedicated 50 percent of the profits of his planing mill to the Lord.

I could tell you about the well-known industrialist who put not 25 percent, not 50 percent, but 90 percent of all his assets in a fund for religious purposes and is still getting along just fine on the 10 percent.

But I can sum up their experience in just one short sentence: We can't outgive God. The more of our time, our energy, our ability, and our money we use to further His work on earth, the more God will pour out His blessing.

But the financial blessing that usually comes to the tither isn't the main consideration. The spiritual blessing is far more important. When we tithe we have the satisfaction of knowing that God's prior claim is being recognized in this vital money-making part of our lives. With this knowledge comes the realization that we are actually in partnership with God. We need not worry about our business deals when He is at the helm of our ship.

It is glorious to have God as a partner, to know that he will guide and direct our lives, if we acknowledge Him.

But there is another equally important facet to tithing. It brings great joy to the tither's heart to feel that he is God's partner, too. Our tenth helps erect buildings to the honor and glory of God, helps to operate churches where Christ's message can be proclaimed to a world that needs it today, helps to send missionaries to carry the

gospel of God's love to the far corners of the earth.

It is thrilling to have a part with God in all these things.

Many years ago I heard a true story I shall never forget. It took place on the coronation date for King George VI.

On his way to his office an English gentleman invited a ragged little lad to see the parade from the balcony of his building near Westminster Abbey. Hand in hand they worked their way through the crowds that lined the street and finally reached the balcony. As the parade came along the man named for the boy the different regiments as they proudly marched by. He pointed out the Ambassadors of some of the important countries as they passed in their stately carriages. But he noticed that the little lad didn't seem to be at all interested until the King's carriage came along, and then with beaming face he looked up at the man and said, "Mister, do you see them lamps on the King's carriage? How brightly they shine."

"Lad, I don't understand you at all," said the man. "All those interesting things passed in review before your very eyes and all you seemed to see were the lamps on the king's carriage."

"But Mister, you don't understand," replied the boy. "The girl that I work for had the contract to refurbish the King's carriage and it was my job to polish them lamps."

Would to God that you and I in this busy day in which we live could each demonstrate in our own lives the singleness of purpose shown by that little English lad. Or if we could just put in a secondary place in our thinking and our living, our jobs, our businesses, our sports, our pleasures, our social lives, and put God and his kingdom first ahead of everything else. What a different world this would be.

And just as we as individuals have a responsibility to put God first, using our time, energy, ability, and money to further the work of His kingdom here on earth, God likewise challenges us today as a nation to use our moral, physical, and spiritual strength to honor Him in this troubled world in which we live. Our country was brought into being under God. We recognize our dependence upon Him and our national motto "In God We Trust." And in spite of the fact that we as individuals and as a nation have at times strayed far from Him, God has blessed and prospered us above all the countries on earth.

And God who controls the destinies of all nations has seen fit to elevate our United States into a position of unquestioned world leadership.

These blessings impose upon us a responsibility which far transcends the mere making of loans or grants of money, food, or other material aid to our less fortunate neighbors, helpful as these are.

We must impart something of our spiritual strength to the peoples of these lands.

May we therefore through God-centered Christian statesmanship lead the peoples of the world to recognize clearly, first, that America today is in position to help others primarily because God has blessed our Nation whose foundations were laid in trust in Him, and, second, that our help to others is prompted not only by defense considerations but also by a sincere desire to be faithful stewards of the blessings that God has poured out so abundantly upon us.

May we therefore as individuals and as a Nation gratefully acknowledge that all of our blessings come from God and recognize more fully that we have a responsibility and indeed a challenge to administer our stewardship, using our time, energy, ability, and money in ways that will honor God and help our fellowman.

Senator CARLSON. Mr. Keyes, we deeply appreciate that splendid message on Christian responsibility. It is a very inspiring message.

We are going to rise and have a prayer of dedication by our very fine friend Abraham Vereide, and we will sing together, led by Fague Springman, "Mine Eyes Have Seen the Glory of the Coming of the Lord."

Mr. VEREIDE. Open our hearts to be aware of Thee, O Lord. For here and now we desire to do just what we have been challenged to do, recognizing our stewardship, and to dedicate ourselves and our Nation afresh to Thee. We thank Thee for revealing Thyself to us and saving us from groping in the dark and stumbling in ignorance, but we can walk forth in the blessing sunshine of real truth, and in the knowledge of Thee through Jesus Christ, Thy Son, and know that in Him and through Him we have been relived and we have forgiveness. May we therefore, O God, learn this day and every day to humble ourselves and to pray and to forsake every evil way and to seek Thee and Thy face. And so we thank Thee for this hour and the opportunity of being together, and our Lord God we pray for Thy blessing with infinite wisdom and Thy guidance to our President, our Secretary of State, our judiciary, our whole Cabinet and their associates, our Senate and House, our military leaders, and our people in the Federal, State, and local level.

Lord God Almighty, we pray for Jesus' sake, forgive us and help us to rise to every difficulty, that we may with courage and character like granite go forward with stamina and strength to do Thy will in all things.

So we thank Thee for hearing us and accepting us this day and granting us Thy blessing for Christ's sake, and to Thee be the glory here at home, throughout the world, and in the endless ages to come. Amen.

(Group singing.)

Lincoln's Birthday Address by the Secretary of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 14, 1957

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address delivered by the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, at the capital of my State, Pierre, S. Dak., on the anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birth, may be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, EZRA TAFT BENSON, AT LINCOLN DAY CELEBRATION, PIERRE, S. DAK.

It is a pleasure to join with you here tonight in honoring the memory of the Nation's first Republican President—a man whose words, whose deeds, whose selfless devotion to the cause of human liberty are still so much a part of our American heritage. I am especially happy to have the privilege of attending a Lincoln Day dinner in South Dakota because your State has a great Republican tradition—and I am convinced it will continue to march in the front ranks of the party.

I believe this because I believe that the fundamental things our party stands for are right.

PARTY OF THE FUTURE

In his acceptance address at the Republican National Convention in San Francisco last August, President Eisenhower called the Republican Party the "party of the future." The President said:

"Now, the first reason of the five I shall give you why the Republican Party is the party of the future is this:

"First, because it is the party of long-range principle, not short-term expediency.

"My second reason for saying that the Republican Party is the party of the future is this: It is the party which concentrates on the facts and issues of today and tomorrow, not the facts and issues of yesterday.

"Third: The Republican Party is the party of the future because it is the party that draws people together, not drives them apart.

"And now the fourth reason: The Republican Party is the party of the future because it is the party through which the many things that still need doing will soonest be done—and will be done by enlisting the fullest energies of free, creative, individual people.

"Finally, a party of the future must be completely dedicated to peace, as indeed must all Americans. For without peace there is no future."

So long as the Republican Party remains dedicated to those principles set forth by the President, it will fulfill its role as the party of the future.

Moreover, I believe that these basic principles set forth by President Eisenhower apply in the field of agriculture, just as they do in other areas of American life.

In its approach to the problems of the farmer, I believe we must always be guided by long-range principle, not short-term expediency.

I believe that as Republicans we must concentrate on the facts and issues of today and tomorrow, not on the facts and issues of yesterday.

I believe we must work toward drawing farm and city people more closely together and not drive them apart.

I believe further that the many things which still need doing in the field of agriculture can best be done by enlisting the fullest energies of free, creative, individual people. And I would emphasize that word "free" for the individual, be he farmer, businessman or professional man, can invariably solve his own problems better as a free man than he can when shackled with government controls and regimentation.

MUST UNDERSTAND PROBLEM

I believe also that to solve any problem, agricultural or otherwise, we must first understand clearly what the problem is. In that connection, I am reminded of a rather famous Lincoln story. It was during the Civil War at a time when the Union forces had suffered severe reverses and President Lincoln was under heavy personal attack by many newspapers.

"I guess I'm like the chap who was riding along a backwoods trail and was caught in a storm," Lincoln said. "He kept plodding ahead until his horse gave out and then it grew dark. He had only the lightning to show him the trail. The thunder was terrifying and when one bolt seemed to crash at his very feet he fell on his knees. 'Oh Lord,' he prayed, 'if it's all the same to You, give us a little more light and a little less noise.' "

I am positive that most American farmers would add to that prayer a hearty "Amen."

We could use "a little more light and a little less noise" in discussing farm policy. The whole broad field of agriculture involves much more than just acres and animals and machines. Most important of all it involves farm people—22 million of them.

Agriculture is also of vital concern to the 148 million of our people who live in the villages, towns and cities of the Nation—for all

of us are consumers—all of us must eat—all of us must buy clothing—and therefore all of us have a direct interest in the continued production of adequate supplies of food and fiber. That is another way of saying that all Americans have an important stake in the maintenance of a free, prosperous and expanding agriculture.

It is appropriate to speak here of the tremendous contribution to our higher standards of living that has been made through the enormous increases in agricultural productivity. As I mentioned a moment ago, there are 22 million farm people in the United States. They comprise only about 13 percent of our total population. When I was a farm boy in Idaho in the early 1900's there were about 32 million farm people in the Nation, and they made up more than one-third of our total population.

Then 1 farm worker—and there were some 13 million of them—then 1 farm worker produced enough food and fiber to provide for his own needs and those of 6 additional persons in the towns and cities. Today the farm labor force numbers a little more than 8 million, and each of these workers produces enough for himself and 19 others. Output per man-hour on the farms of America has shot upward by more than one-third in just the last 10 years.

THREE DEVELOPMENTS

Now, this amazing revolution in agriculture has brought three important developments:

First, for farmers themselves it has required increasingly greater investments in land and equipment. To remain competitive in a changing agricultural world farmers have become more efficient. They have adopted the newest techniques in crop and livestock production. Many of them have expanded the size of their farming operations to utilize the full potential of expensive machines and equipment. Along with this, farmers have borne most heavily the burden of price-depressing surpluses that accumulated as agricultural output climbed faster than effective demand.

Secondly, the record production of food and fiber from the farms of America has provided consumers in this country with the highest level diet in our history—and at reasonable prices. It has also made possible the sharing of our abundance with other less fortunate nations. The production miracles performed by American farmers in recent years not only have served our national interest but, at the same time, have been dedicated to the cause of freedom and human need throughout the world.

A third consequence of our amazing agricultural efficiency is reflected in the total national economy. Literally millions of people who would be engaged in farming under a less efficient system are instead working in factories and at the various trades and professions. They are building homes, highways, automobiles, television sets, and a multitude of things that we associate with our daily living. They are in such field as science, education, medicine, and law. A substantial part of our basic strength as a Nation stems from the fact that so small a percentage of America's total labor force is required to meet our food and fiber requirements. Nowhere else on the face of the earth do so few people produce so much to feed so many.

From all of this it is clear that the major benefits of our vastly expanded agricultural productivity have accrued to the Nation as a whole, rather than to farmers as a group. Agricultural abundance has held down prices paid by consumers for food and fiber but it has also depressed farm prices and income. To emphasize this point, I cite the estimate by economists of the United States Department of Agriculture that net farm income last year would have been one-fifth higher—$2 billion more—had it not been for the existence of price-depressing surpluses.

Farmers themselves know from experience that excessive supplies can exert tremendous downward pressure upon free-market prices. This administration also is keenly aware of that fact. From the very beginning, our efforts have been mainly directed toward achieving a better balance between supply and demand. We have sought to accomplish this in three ways: by increasing consumption at home, by boosting exports to other countries, and now, through the soil bank, by retiring a part of our agricultural plant from active production.

This administration will maintain adequate stockpiles of food and fiber. Our national security demands that we keep on hand sufficient reserves of wheat, corn, cotton, and other key commodities. Such supplies are a safeguard against critical shortages which might develop as a result of drought or other natural disasters. The short corn crop of 1947, for example, forced a significant reduction in livestock numbers and thereafter a curtailed supply of meat. That hurt farmers and consumers alike.

In safeguarding our economy through the maintenance of adequate reserves, however, we need to distinguish between necessary stockpiles and unmanageable surpluses. The plain truth is we now have supplies of a few major crops in excess of what any foreseeable emergency would demand. We must pull them down to more nearly normal proportions as a means of strengthening farm prices and at the same time reducing heavy storage costs which now approach $1,200,000 a day.

It would be unfair, however, to ask farmers to bear, in the form of lower prices and income, a major share of the cost of maintaining for all of us an adequate reserve of food and fiber. We are determined that farmers shall be free to sell their commodities in the open market without the constant threat of Government competition.

In that connection, the Department of Agriculture has adopted a policy of withholding wheat for export sale so that farmers may move their own current marketings directly into channels of trade rather than into Government hands. As supply and demand come into better balance, it will be possible for Government to withdraw completely from the business of acquiring and merchandising farm commodities—a function which traditionally and properly belongs to private enterprise. That will be a happy day for farmers and for all of us.

Because the Government itself encouraged a vast expansion in farm productivity to meet the unprecedented demands of war and postwar rehabilitation, this same Government has a moral obligation to assist farmers in making the adjustment to peacetime conditions and in restoring a marketing system that moves the products of agriculture into consumption rather than into Federal ownership. The full attainment of those objectives is a major goal of this administration.

In our determination to foster conditions under which farmers will share equitably in the Nation's unprecedented prosperity, we shall never attempt to apply political remedies to economic problems. While it is true that individual farmers have their own political preferences, American agriculture as a business is completely nonpartisan.

The consequences of unwise, shortsighted farm policies affect all farmers, whatever their political affiliations. Drought, floods, hailstorms, and insects attack the crops of Republicans and Democrats with impartiality. The problems of surpluses and high operating costs know no party lines.

While experience demonstrates that partisan treatment often compounds agriculture's ills, the political approach has never succeeded in curing the patient.

ATTACK PROBLEM, NOT SYMPTOMS

This administration has steadfastly sought to attack the basic causes of the farm problem rather than its symptoms. As I mentioned a few minutes ago, we have concentrated our efforts upon the fundamental problem of surpluses. We have encouraged increased consumption. We have sought to bring production into better balance with current needs. One of the first tasks we undertook was to regain lost and shrinking export markets.

The results of that action are now clearly apparent. In the 1954 fiscal year the dollar value of farm exports was up 7 percent over the previous 12-month period. In fiscal 1955 they climbed an additional 4 percent. And for the last fiscal year they were up still another 9 percent. For the final 6 months of 1956, farm exports were running at the highest rate in history. Since July 1953 we have moved into use abroad and at home $8 billion worth of surplus agricultural commodities.

The Republican 83d Congress enacted the Agricultural Trade and Development Act as a device for expanding farm exports without unduly disturbing world markets.

The sharply increased use of American farm products both at home and abroad is making itself strongly felt in the market place.

Prices received by farmers in recent months have been running from 5 to 7 percent higher than a year ago.

Realized net farm income in 1956 was 5 percent above the 1955 level. This reverses a downward trend which continued at an almost uninterrupted pace since 1947. In fact, farm income has shown increases during only 2 years since 1947. One of these was the Korean war year of 1951. The other was 1956—a year of peace.

The outlook is for further modest increases in farm prices and income during the year ahead. The size of those increases will depend largely upon our ability to keep exports moving at a high rate and upon the effectiveness of the Soil Bank in retiring from production a part of our agricultural plant. For some areas which have been hard hit by drought—and South Dakota is among the seriously affected States—rain is, of course, the most important unknown factor in the farm income equation.

I would point to one further piece of evidence that the overall farm situation is showing substantial improvement. Commodity Credit Corporation's investment in farm commodities is expected to total about $7.6 billion next June 30. That would represent a reduction of about $700 million for the fiscal year and a drop of $1.3 billion from the record high reached during February 1956.

While I would not minimize the seriousness of a situation which finds the Government owning outright or having under loan $7.6 billion worth of farm commodities, I am gratified that at long last our accumulations are decreasing, rather than increasing. There could never be solid, basic strength in free-market prices of farm products so long as production continued to outstrip demand and new surpluses were piled upon old surpluses year after year.

LARGE AGRICULTURAL BUDGET

Only last month, the President submitted to Congress the largest agricultural budget in history. It calls for expenditures totaling $5.3 billion during the next fiscal year. This represents an increase of $2.4 billion over the budget submitted for the first full fiscal year of the Eisenhower administration.

During the last fiscal year, realized costs of programs designed primarily to support farm prices and income reached $1.9 billion. This figure is equal to about 16 percent of farm operators' net income in 1956. The costs of these programs will probably increase sharply during 1957 as our surplus-disposal efforts are stepped up and the soil bank gets into full operation.

In pointing to these vast outlays, I neither criticize nor apologize. If the programs they represent are considered temporary for the

most part and, if they get the job done, it will be money well spent. To have taken any other course would have been even more costly and, in the long run, harmful to American agriculture.

CORN PROBLEM

Because corn is so important to the farm economy of part of your State, I should like to speak briefly on the problems posed by the present price-support program.

In a referendum held December 11, 1956, corn farmers were given a choice between a continuation of the allotment program and a shift to a "base acreage" program for 3 years, after which acreage controls would no longer apply. As you know, 61 percent of the corn farmers who voted approved the base-acreage approach, but this fell short of the two-thirds required under the law.

As a result, we must now administer a corn program with allotments fixed according to law at a very low level, 37.3 million acres. Price supports were set in accordance with a schedule provided by law at $1.36 per bushel. The allotment is so low that compliance will in all likelihood be negligible. Few corn farmers will be inclined to reduce below their limited allotments in order to participate in the soil bank. Consequently, corn supplies could increase further, corn prices could be low, livestock production could be excessive and the whole feed-grain-livestock balance could be disturbed.

The problem is broader than corn. Farmers who have signed up or expect to participate in the acreage reserve program with cotton or wheat or tobacco, or even in the conservation reserve, must plant within their corn acreage allotments. It seems obvious that we need a new program which would give farmers a realistic corn acreage allotment for price support purposes and would provide a basis for operating an acreage reserve program.

People tell me that the base acreage program would have carried in the referendum except for the feeling that corn was being removed from the list of "basic" commodities.

Corn is a basic crop economically and legally. I have no wish to see it removed from the list of basic crops. In fact, I would be happy to see it designated as a "super-basic" crop if the Congress wishes because that is what it is. What I desire and what corn farmers desire is a program that works. The evidence is that the corn allotment program does not work. Sixty-one percent of the corn farmers who voted have said essentially that and we should heed their counsel.

DROUGHT PROBLEM

As you know so well, here in South Dakota, all or parts of 15 States are in the grip of a severe and prolonged drought. This drought, now in its 6th and 7th years in some areas, has exhausted the resources of many farmers and ranchers. Despite the fine spirit of these people and despite a broad program of assistance on the part of the Federal Government, the situation remains critical for many families.

President Eisenhower recently made a 2-day tour of the drought area. At the same time a special meeting on drought and other natural disasters was held at Wichita, Kans., involving some 190 farmers, ranchers, businessmen, agricultural leaders and workers, and Government officials. At the close of his tour the President received progress reports from this group and expressed his own views as well.

As immediate steps in meeting the drought problem, these proposals have been laid before the Congress, with the President's approval:

1. Authority has been requested to use $25 million from the disaster revolving fund, to provide additional emergency feed assistance to farmers and ranchers in the drought area.

2. Extension until June 30, 1958, has been requested for $25 million of unobligated funds appropriated for Agricultural Conservation to enable the Department of Agriculture to make payments to farmers to carry out wind-erosion and other emergency conservation measures.

3. An additional appropriation of $26 million has been requested under Title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, primarily for refinancing farm indebtedness by direct loans.

Longer range measures already in operation include the Great Plains Program, the program on upper watersheds and the Conservation Reserve of the Soil Bank.

During the period from June 30, 1953, through August 31, 1956, the Department of Agriculture provided $629 million of Federal funds in order to relieve distress brought about by natural disasters, chiefly drought. This is in addition to purchase programs for livestock products, which had their origin at least partly in drought problems. In South Dakota we have made available nearly $6.5 million in the form of emergency credit, feed grain and roughage and free food.

From our extensive experience in administering emergency drought programs, the one conclusion which stands out among all others is an urgent need to make these programs a joint undertaking by the Federal, State and local governments. We believe this would materially improve the effectiveness and administration of these programs. Greater State and local responsibility would facilitate the development of programs better adapted to the particular circumstances within individual States.

There is one thing about our people in the drought-stricken areas which has always impressed me, as I know it did the President on his recent tour. That is their courage, their determination to stick it out. They look to the future with confidence and I am enough of an optimist to believe that confidence will be vindicated.

The best years for American agriculture are still ahead of us. Research, education, and market expansion—the tools which have brought so much progress to our farms in the past—promise even greater gains for the future. Agriculture must be geared to keep pace with the ever-expanding demands for the products of American farms and ranches, for ours is a growing, dynamic Nation.

I am convinced that our farm economy is headed in the right direction and I base that conviction upon the fact that agricultural prices are rising while surpluses are diminishing. With such weapons as the Soil Bank, more adequate farm credit and increased authority to push consumption of agricultural products both at home and abroad, we can effectively continue the fight to win for farmers a greater share of our record-breaking national income.

The future is bright—our problems of today are only passing ones.

May God grant us the vision and the resolution to work toward greater freedom for our farm people in a healthy, expanding and prosperous agricultural economy.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1957

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

Eternal Spirit, in whom alone is the strength of our hearts and the hope of our world, we come in this noonday fellowship of prayer, not so much to seek Thee, as to open our fitful, faltering lives in penitence to Thy waiting strength. In the midst of events so global and colossal that, as individuals on the confused world stage, we seem so puny and inadequate, lift us from small routines into the only greatness we shall ever know, by using us as the channels of Thy purpose and intent for mankind. Give us spaciousness of mind and a transparent purity of heart such as characterize true brotherhood which spans all barriers of border and breed and birth, so that we may see clearly and follow faithfully the things that belong to our peace and to the peace of this wounded, weary world. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 14, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. J. Res. 23. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Arthur H. Compton as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; and

H. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of 5,000 additional copies of House Report No. 2966, 84th Congress;

H. Con. Res. 82. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on the national highway program for the use of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives; and

H. Con. Res. 104. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on excise taxes held by the Committee on Ways and Means during the 84th Congress, 2d session.