head of an international organization owes his allegiance to that organization, and must shape his policies in line with majority opinion of its membership.

When he assumed his office, Mr. Morse took the following oath:

I solemnly undertake to exercise in all loyalty, discretion, and conscience the functions that have been entrusted to me as Director General of the International Labor Office, to discharge these functions and regulate my conduct with the interests of the International Labor Organization alone in view, not to seek or accept instructions in regard to the performance of my duties from any government or other authority external to the International Labor Organization, and at all times to uphold the constitution of the International Labor Organization.

It is my understanding that Mr. Morse is an exceptionally able man, which he must be to hold the position he does. I simply wish to point out that the fact that Mr. Morse is an American citizen does not make him, in the ILO, an official representative of the interests of the United States. To carry through his job with honesty and integrity, he must follow the thinking of majority ILO membership, and such thinking is contrary to the philosophy of the United States.

I would like to mention another individual currently in the limelight in connection with ILO affairs, Joseph E. Johnson, president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Last year, when the NAM and the United States chamber launched a serious blast of criticism of the ILO, the administrative branch of the Government set up an independent committee composed of college professors to look into the matter. Mr. Johnson was the chairman.

The Johnson committee came up with a report to the effect that, although there were many things wrong with the ILO, it was nevertheless a glorious institution. I have always been intrigued by the unfailing instinct of people in Government to select a committee chairman who will come up with a report which suits their purposes.

Mr. Johnson showed up this June as one of the advisors on the United States Government delegation to the ILO Conference in Geneva. No doubt this is merely a singular coincidence.

I think it is high time that the Congress of the United States turned the spotlight on the ILO.

The Congress has not been in the least backward in turning the spotlight on organized labor. Why should we hesitate as far as the ILO is concerned? It is rather interesting that, when Dave Beck was wanted by Senator McCLELLAN's committee, the first story was that he could not come because he was on his way to attend an ILO meeting in Hamburg. I believe the time has come for the Congress to take a new look at this whole ILO proposition.

I should like to explore this pertinent question—can anyone from the Labor or State Department, or any place else, point specifically to any particular advantage or accomplishment gained for the people of the United States as a result of our participation in the ILO?

I say that either the United States should be more effective in the ILO than it is now, or we should get out of it—one or the other.

But the correct answer can only be obtained by really digging into the subject. That is why I think we should have a joint Congressional investigation.

Mr. McGrath, who has devoted many months of time and effort to the ILO, was once told by a member of the State Department that as to ILO matters there were "global considerations which no mere businessman could be expected to understand." Perhaps there are global considerations which no mere Congressman can be expected to understand. If so, I would like to know what they are.

It is my present intention to introduce at the next session of the Congress a joint resolution calling for a complete investigation of the International Labor Organization.

SENATE

FRIDAY, AUGUST 30, 1957

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Albert P. Shirkey, D. D., minister, Mount Vernon Place Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, the alpha and omega, the beginning and the end, we call upon Thee for Thy benediction upon our President, every Member of the Senate, and all members of our Government. Take these weary servants of the people and refresh them by Thy grace. Enlighten them for these closing hours of decision. May God's presence protect them on their homeward journey, and make their hearts glad in the thanks of a grateful nation for their unselfish service.

What has been done in this Chamber that is weak make strong, overrule all things done in error, and forgive that which has been done for political profit at the cost of a nation's integrity and strength. Bless without measure the good things that have been undertaken for God and humanity.

Gracious God, save us from our enemies without who seek our destruction, and help us to overcome by faith the enemies within of fear and confusion, to the end that we may become a wiser and stronger Nation and a better leader in the world.

In the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings for the legislative days of August 28 and August 29 was approved without reading.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1636) for the relief of Delfina Cinco de Lopez, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

H. R. 6006. An act to amend certain provisions of the Antidumping Act, 1921, to provide for greater certainty, speed, and efficiency in the enforcement thereof, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6908. An act to authorize modification and extension of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans, to restore eligibility for hospital and medical care to certain veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States residing in the Philippines, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8139. An act for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Pochon Dike;

H. R. 8490. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to rice acreage allotments; and

H. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution placing certain individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, and in the islands of Leyte and Samar after July 4, 1902, and their survivors, in the same status as those who served in the Armed Forces during the Philippine Insurrection and their survivors.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

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

H. R. 6006. An act to amend certain provisions of the Antidumping Act, 1921, to provide for greater certainty, speed, and efficiency in the enforcement thereof, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution placing certain individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, and in the islands of Leyte and Samar after July 4, 1902, and their survivors, in the same status as those who served in the Armed Forces during the Philippine Insurrection and their survivors; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 6908. An act to authorize modification and extension of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans, to restore eligibility for hospital and medical care to certain veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States residing in the Philippines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 8139. An act for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Pochon Dike; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8490. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to rice acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on Thursday, August 29, 1957, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 1645. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant easements in certain

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

lands to the city of Las Vegas, Nev., for road widening purposes;

S. 2080. An act relating to the computation of income for the purpose of payment of death benefits to parents or pension for non-service-connected disability or death in certain cases;

S. 2500. An act to make uniform the termination date for the use of official franks by former Members of Congress, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt.

RECOMMENDATION OF APPOINTMENT OF SENATOR PASTORE TO THE UNITED STATES DELEGATION TO THE FIRST GENERAL CONFERENCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there are few Americans who have devoted their talents to the problems involved in atomic energy with more energy and more selflessness than has the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] is one of the ablest and hardest working Members of the United States Senate; and he is an effective legislator, with the tenacity and the determination that get things done.

One of his special projects has been the International Atomic Energy Agency, recently approved by the Senate. He has given it careful thought and careful study, and has contributed to the understanding of its meaning.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I take a great deal of personal pleasure in recommending his appointment to the United States delegation to the First General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency. I know that all Members of the Senate will have complete confidence in the high quality of the service the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] will perform.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to join the distinguished majority leader in the recognition being given to our colleague, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

There is no Member of this body who is more assiduous in his application to duty, no Member of this body who has taken a greater interest in the affairs of his State, and no one who has applied himself more thoroughly, in a detailed manner, to the questions relative to the development of the atom and hydrogen weapons, as well as to the experiments which take place in the area of the peaceful development in this new scientific field.

I would say that the State of Rhode Island is indeed fortunate to have a man of Senator PASTORE's ability representing it in the Senate, and the Nation is indeed blessed that we have in him a man who will represent all of us so conscientiously and capably at the forthcoming conference.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Montana very much.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. In accordance with the order entered on yesterday, there is a limitation of 3 minutes on statements made during the morning hour today. Morning business is now in order.

REPORT OF NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the secretary, National Trust for Historic Preservation, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that trust for the calendar year 1956, which, with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESOLUTION OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF ARKANSAS BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Arkansas Bar Association, relating to the appointment of a judge of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

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

RESOLUTION OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF ARKANSAS BAR ASSOCIATION

Whereas the retirement of Judge Thomas C. Trimble of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas has produced a very substantial backlog of cases, both criminal and civil, which are urgently in need of disposition; and

Whereas the normal volume of judicial work handled by Chief Judge Harry J. Lemley of the United States District Courts for the Eastern and Western Districts of Arkansas and by Judge John E. Miller of the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas occupies the full time of these judges so that they cannot take over and dispose of the volume of litigation heretofore handled by Judge Trimble's court; and

Whereas there are many lawyers in Arkansas qualified by training, experience, temperament, and character to be fit and outstanding members of the Federal judiciary; and

Whereas great injustice to the public has been worked because of the absence of a full-time judge for the eastern district of Arkansas, whether the problem is viewed from social, civic, or economic point of view; and

Whereas the truism that "Justice delayed is justice denied" has been abundantly demonstrated in the eastern district of Arkansas since January 14, 1957: It is therefore

Resolved by the executive committee of the Arkansas Bar Association in meeting assembled this date at the office of the association in Little Rock, That:

1. The Attorney General of the United States be urged to recommend to the President of the United States the name or names of a suitable person or persons to be appointed judge of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas, and that the President of the United States promptly act thereon;

2. That a copy of this resolution be transmitted immediately to the Attorney General of the United States, the President of the United States, to the American Bar Association committee on Federal judiciary, and to all Members of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives from Arkansas.

Dated this August 28, 1957.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII—MINORITY VIEWS (PT. 2 OF S. REPTS. 1163 AND 1164)

Under authority of the order of the Senate of August 29, 1957,

Mr. MALONE, as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, submitted his minority views on the bill (S. 49) to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, and (S. 50) to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, which were ordered to be printed as part 2 of Senate Reports Nos. 1163 and 1164, separately.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. IVES, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. MCNAMARA):

S. 2888. A bill to provide for registration, reporting, and disclosure of employee welfare and pension benefit plans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. BEALL (for Mr. NEELY):

S. 2889. A bill for the relief of Luna Maria Pennacchia and her children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 2890. A bill for the relief of Carmen Amelia Piedra (Carmita Piedra); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS (for Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 2891. A bill to amend the statute relating to the punishment of contempt of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2892. A bill for the relief of Branislav (Branko) Horvat and Dragomir (Drago) Horvat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2893. A bill for the relief of George Melnichenko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 2894. A bill for the relief of Norma Matilda Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 2895. A bill to limit the percentage depletion allowance for oil and gas wells to oil and gas wells located in the United States and its Territories and possessions; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2896. A bill to require disclosure by aliens entering the United States with diplomatic or semidiplomatic status to disclose any past connection with the espionage service or secret police of any Communist or Communist-dominated nation;

S. 2897. A bill making it a criminal offense for any alien to enter the United States on a diplomatic passport under an alias or any name other than his own true and full name;

S. 2898. A bill making it a criminal offense to enter into collusion with any foreign government to evade the laws and regulations of the United States relating to the issuance and use of passports;

S. 2899. A bill providing for the loss of citizenship of United States nationals who assist in the communization of any foreign state or accept employment under a Communist foreign government;

S. 2900. A bill to amend the statute relating to the punishment of contempt of Congress;

S. 2901. A bill to require the furnishing of certain information by holders of passports issued under authority of the United States;

S. 2902. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to parole into the United States certain aliens whose testimony is sought by any committee of the Congress; and

S. 2903. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 2904. A bill to amend section 132 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, relating to Congressional adjournment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 2905. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide a headquarters site for Mount Rainier National Park in the general vicinity of Ashford, Wash., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. FREAR:

S. 2906. A bill to provide for the increase, modernization, and stockpiling of railroad equipment in order to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense; to create and establish a public agency with powers to carry out the provisions of this act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 2907. A bill to provide assistance to communities, industries, business enterprises, and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. CARROLL:

S. 2908. A bill to establish a Great Plains Administration; to provide for the control of floods and the alleviation and control of drought conditions in the Great Plains region; to provide for the more effective conservation, development, and use of the resources of the Great Plains; to provide for the administration of Federal programs in such region so as to meet more effectively the distinctive needs and problems of the region; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 2909. A bill to amend section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 2910. A bill for the relief of Antonio Leonardo Ventura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 2911. A bill to provide for the preparation of a compilation of educational material concerning communism, as contrasted with Americanism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. J. Res. 132. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO REFERENCE OF CERTAIN HOUSE BILLS TO COMMITTEES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am submitting for appropriate reference a resolution amending rule XIV of the Senate rules. My purpose in doing so is to invite thoughtful consideration of a change to settle the conflict between rule XIV and rule XXV. Rule XXV, as amended by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, provides that all bills, resolutions, and so forth, "shall be referred" to the appropriate legislative committee. Rule XIV, on the other hand, establishes a procedure for placing a House-passed bill on the calendar upon objection to further proceedings on the bill by one Senator after the second reading, but prior to reference of the bill to a committee.

When rule XXV was adopted, apparently no consideration was given to the conflict with rule XIV. The conflict has arisen several times, however, and always on matters in which there was great divergence of opinion.

On May 3, 1948—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 4, pages 5168–5169, of the 80th Congress, 2d session, former Senator Downey, of California, objected to further proceedings on the tidelands bill after the second reading. The Chair ruled that the bill should be placed on the calendar and it was. On the very next day the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 4, pages 5219–5229 of the 80th Congress, 2d session—attempted to have the same procedure carried out with relation to the oleomargarine tax repeal bill. An objection was made to this procedure, and a debate followed on the point of order raised by the Senator from Arkansas relating to the priority of rules XIV and XXV. The late Senator Vandenberg, as Presiding Officer, submitted to the Senate the question on the point of order. The bill was referred to committee.

Recently when H. R. 6127, the civil-rights bill, was received from the House, the same conflict arose when the minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], objected to further proceedings after second reading. A point of order objecting to this procedure was overruled by the Vice President, and the bill was placed on the calendar—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 85th Congress, 1st session, pages 9778–9828.

I have taken part in all of these discussions and participated in the procedural debate over the interpretation of the rules; as a result, I believe that this conflict should be resolved and language offered to the Senate which will settle the difference of opinion over the interpretation of rules. The need for clarification of these rules was ably pointed out as long ago as 1948 by the late Senator Vandenberg, when he was President pro tempore, during the debates of that year—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 4, page 5223, of the 80th Congress, 2d session.

The clarification which my resolution suggests provides that if objection is made to further proceedings after the second reading of any measure that comes over from the House, the question shall be put by the Presiding Officer to the Senate whether the bill should be referred to a committee or placed on the calendar. By majority vote and without debate, the Senate shall determine the disposition of the measure.

I have conferred with both the Parliamentarian and legislative counsel, and I believe the suggestion is in a satisfactory form for the consideration of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

This conflict does not arise often, but when it does arise, it is generally on a matter of national interest. For this reason, I believe that if the amendment is considered worthy, it may avoid in the future a debate on questions of procedure rather than merit.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 197) submitted by Mr. SALTONSTALL, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended—

(a) by renumbering sections 5 and 6 as 6 and 7, and

(b) by striking out section 4 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"4. Every bill and joint resolution reported from a committee not having previously been read, shall be read once, and twice, if not objected to, on the same day, and placed on the calendar in the order of their reading when reported.

"5. In the case of any bill or joint resolution of the House of Representatives, if objection is made to the second reading of such bill or joint resolution on the same day as the first reading thereof, such bill or joint resolution shall be laid before the Senate on the next legislative day by the Presiding Officer and shall be read the second time. The Presiding Officer shall then submit to the Senate the question, 'Shall this bill (or joint resolution, as the case may be) be referred to the committee having legislative jurisdiction thereof?' which shall be determined without debate. If the question is decided in the affirmative, the bill or joint resolution shall be referred to

the committee having legislative jurisdiction. If the question is decided in the negative, the bill or joint resolution shall be placed on the calendar."

EXTENSION OF GREETINGS TO THE PEOPLE OF THE FEDERATION OF MALAYA ON THEIR INDEPENDENCE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on August 31, the Government of the Federation of Malaya will achieve its independence as a sovereign nation within the British Commonwealth. This action will bring to seven the number of nations, now free, which before World War II were under British control.

We in America congratulate the people of the Government of the Federation of Malaya on this historic occasion, and are proud to welcome them into the ranks of the free nations.

Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and myself, I submit a resolution, for the immediate consideration of which I request unanimous consent. The resolution extends the most cordial greetings of the Senate to the Legislative Assembly of the Government of the Federation of Malaya, on the occasion of the independence of the Government of the Federation of Malaya.

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

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 198) as follows:

Whereas it is the policy of the Government of the United States to encourage the orderly evolution of peoples throughout the world toward self-government or independence; and

Whereas the people of the United States support the concept that other peoples should have an opportunity freely to choose their own national destiny under circumstances which will enable them to assume and maintain an equal station among the free nations of the world; and

Whereas the Government of the Federation of Malaya is achieving independence on August 31, 1957: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States extend its most cordial greetings to the Legislative Assembly of the Government of the Federation of Malaya on the occasion of the independence of the Government of the Federation of Malaya, express the earnest hope that the Assembly and the people of the Government of the Federation of Malaya will enjoy continuing success in the development of a sovereign democratic state, and reaffirm the friendship of the people of the United States for the people of the Government of the Federation of Malaya.

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

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, it gives me great satisfaction to join with my distinguished colleague from New Jersey in welcoming this new nation to the family of nations, and I do so with particular pride because this welcome comes from two of the smallest States in the United States. Representing Rhode Island, as I do, I can speak for the oldest sovereign State in the Western Hemisphere greeting the newest State on the other side of the world.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXV BY CREATING A COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS AND CHANGING PROVISIONS AS TO SERVICE ON COMMITTEES

Mr. EASTLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 199), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended by—

(1) amending subparagraph 17 in paragraph (k) of section (1) by inserting after the word "Measures" a comma and the following: "other than private bills and resolutions,", and

(2) inserting in section (1) after paragraph (o) the following new paragraph:

"(p) Committee on Claims, to consist of nine Senators, to which committee shall be referred all private bills and resolutions concerning claims against the United States and all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating thereto."

SEC. 2. Effective for the remainder of the 85th Congress, section (4) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"(4) (a) Each Senator shall serve on 2 standing committees and no more; except that not to exceed 21 Senators of the majority party who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or the Committee on Claims may serve on 3 standing committees and no more.

"(b) In the event that during the 85th Congress members of 1 party in the Senate are replaced by members of the other party, the 30 third-committee assignments shall in such event be distributed in accordance with the following table:

"Senate seats		Third-committee assignments	
Majority	Minority	Majority	Minority
48	48	23	7
49	47	21	9
50	46	19	11
51	45	17	13".

SEC. 3. Effective at the beginning of the 86th Congress, section (4) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"(4) Each Senator shall serve on 2 standing committees and no more; except that not to exceed 19 Senators of the majority party, and not to exceed 7 Senators of the minority party, who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or the Committee on Claims, may serve on 3 standing committees and no more."

SEC. 4. The Committee on Claims is authorized and directed as promptly as feasible after its appointment and organization to confer with the Committee on the Judiciary for the purpose of determining what disposition should be made of proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters theretofore referred to the Committee on the Judiciary during the 85th Congress which are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Claims.

STUDY OF ACTIVITIES IN CERTAIN CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICAN COUNTRIES INIMICAL TO INTERESTS OF COUNTRIES FRIENDLY TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CURTIS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 200), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas activities directed toward the removal of heads of governments in certain Central American and South American countries seek to depose leaders of governments friendly to the United States; and

Whereas these activities may be a cumulative effort tending toward a conspiracy to depose heads of governments inimical to international communism: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, or a subcommittee thereof, make appropriate studies of these activities for the purpose of advising the Senate whether the Monroe Doctrine is being violated and whether existing statutes and treaties enable the United States to take any actions that may be necessary or desirable to avoid encroachment upon governments of Western Hemispheric countries who seek to resist international communism.

WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS DISCLOSURE ACT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act."

This proposed legislation is the result of several years' study by various subcommittees of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The investigation of welfare and pension plans was begun in 1954 under the chairmanship of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and continued with three sets of hearings in 1955 and 1956 by the subcommittee of which I was chairman. The bill drafted by that subcommittee was reintroduced in this Congress as S. 1122 and furnished the basic framework for this new bill.

The present proposed legislation is specifically the work of the Special Subcommittee on Welfare and Pension Plans Legislation, of which the able junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is chairman. After extensive legislative hearings, this clean bill was drafted and has been reported favorably from the special subcommittee, and it is expected that action will be taken by the full Labor and Public Welfare Committee early in the next session of Congress. The chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. KENNEDY, has graciously invited me to introduce the revised bill, although I am no longer on the committee, and I am very glad to continue to be associated with the efforts to secure favorable consideration for it.

The bill provides for the registration and annual reporting to the Federal Government of specified financial and other information covering the operation of employee welfare and pension benefit

plans and the disclosure of such information to the public and to interested parties.

The administration of the act would be placed in the Department of Labor.

The bill covers virtually all welfare and pension benefit plans except those administered by a governmental instrumentality. However, during the first 2 years following the enactment of this legislation, plans covering fewer than 100 employees are not required to file annual reports. In addition, should the Secretary find that compliance with the act would be burdensome on certain categories of plans covering fewer than 100 employees—classified on the basis of the number of employees covered—he could exempt them from both the registration or reporting requirements of the act for such period as he deems desirable.

The bill provides for an advisory council to assist and advise the Secretary in carrying out the purposes of this act.

The bill provides penalties for making false entries or statements and for embezzlement or other violations. It also provides penalties for kickbacks and other forms of self-dealing.

Provisions are made in the legislation for cooperation with States having employee welfare and pension benefit statutes with a view to the establishment of standards reporting forms and to assist the States in the discharge of their responsibilities in this area. In the case of multi-State plans the act provides that no person shall be required to file with agencies of States having disclosure statutes except those of the State in which the plan has its principal office.

The requirements of the act would be in force for 4 years following the date of enactment.

I want to congratulate the special subcommittee which has been working on this bill and particularly its chairman, Senator KENNEDY, for the constructive steps it has taken to advance the favorable consideration of this needed measure. The changes made in the new bill have clarified and strengthened it in many respects, and I hope the measure will have the broad support which this thoughtful work of the subcommittee deserves.

On two points, however, I believe the present bill may be further improved by the Labor Committee.

The first and most serious of these matters is in the disclosure provisions in section 7 (2), where the persons responsible for the management of the plans are required to provide information only to those participants or beneficiaries who request it. Limiting disclosure in this section to those who request the information, in my judgment, would make the bill fall far short of its basic objectives, to keep all participants and beneficiaries fully informed about the status of their welfare and pension plans, to let so much daylight into the operation of the plans that potential wrongdoers may be deterred, and to provide the greatest possible assistance to the self-policing of the operation of such plans.

My doubt about the present draft of the bill is that the very plans which may be most in need of the fullest disclosure and most careful scrutiny by their covered workers may also be the ones in which because of intimidation or other reasons, the workers are most reluctant or fearful about requesting financial information on the plans. If disclosure on the other hand is automatic, the participants and beneficiaries do not have to face the dangers of economic reprisals to secure information. And workers who may have been both uninformed and apathetic about the status of their welfare and pension plans may develop a greater interest in their operation and negotiation and be stimulated to greater participation in the affairs of their union or of the company by which they are employed.

The second point on which I have a question is whether the figure of $50,000 in section 6 (e) (1) (D) may not be too large. In small funded plans it might permit a fairly heavy concentration of the fund in one security without the necessity of reporting it.

I hope both of these matters may have the full committee's careful consideration before its final action on the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a section-by-section analysis of its provisions, may be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2888) to provide for registration, reporting, and disclosure of employee welfare and pension benefit plans, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. IVES, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. MCNAMARA), 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. 2888

A bill to provide for registration, reporting, and disclosure of employee welfare and pension benefit plans

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act."

FINDINGS AND POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that the growth in size, scope, and numbers of employee welfare and pension benefit plans in recent years has been rapid and substantial; that the continued well-being and security of millions of employees and their dependents are directly affected by these plans; that they are affected with a national public interest; that they have become an important factor affecting the stability of employment and the successful development of industrial relations; that they have become an important factor in commerce because of the interstate character of their activities, and of the activities of their participants, and the employers, employee organizations, and other entities by which they are established or maintained; that they substantially affect the revenues of the United States because of the billions of dollars involved in these plans and the fact that their income in many cases is exempt from taxation under the income tax laws, and a great percentage of the costs of and contributions to these programs are deductible in computing taxable income for the purposes of such laws; that owing to the lack of public and employee information concerning their operation, gross abuses and opportunities for abuses have developed in the management and operation of some of these plans to the detriment of the beneficiaries, and without uniform minimum legislative safeguards may gravely threaten the soundness and stability of these plans, undermine public confidence in them, endanger responsible management-labor relations, and result in loss of revenue to the United States; and that it is therefore desirable in the interests of employees and their beneficiaries, for the protection of the revenue of the United States, and to provide for the general welfare and the free flow of commerce, that disclosure be made with respect to the operation and administration of such plans.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this act to protect interstate commerce, the revenue of the United States, and the interests of participants in employee welfare and pension benefit plans and their beneficiaries and the interests of employers and the public in such plans, to conserve the moneys involved in such plans so as to assure that they are utilized for their intended purposes, and to provide adequate safeguarding thereof, by requiring the registration and reporting to the Federal Government of financial and other information with respect thereto, and disclosure of such information.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. (a) When used in this act—

(1) The term "employee welfare benefit plan" means any plan, fund, or program which is communicated or its benefits described in writing to the employees, and which was heretofore or is hereafter established by an employer or by an employee organization, or by both, for the purpose of providing for its participants or their beneficiaries, through the purchase of insurance or otherwise, medical, surgical, or hospital care or benefits, or benefits in the event of sickness, accident, disability, death, or unemployment.

(2) The term "employee pension benefit plan" means any plan, fund, or program which is communicated or its benefits described in writing to the employees, and which was heretofore or is hereafter established by an employer or by an employee organization, or by both, for the purpose of providing for its participants or their beneficiaries, by the purchase of insurance or annuity contracts or otherwise, retirement benefits, and includes any profit sharing plan which provides benefits at or after retirement.

(3) The term "employee organization" means any labor union or any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee, association, group, or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning an employee welfare or pension benefit plan, or other matters incidental to employment relationships; or any employees' beneficiary association organized for the purpose, in whole or in part, of establishing such a plan.

(4) The term "employer" means any person acting directly as an employer or indirectly in the interest of an employer in relation to an employee, and includes a group or association of employers.

(5) The term "employee" means any individual employed by an employer.

(6) The term "participant" means any employee or former employee of an employer or any member of an employee organization who is or may become eligible to receive a benefit of any type from an employee welfare or pension benefit plan, or whose beneficiaries may be eligible to receive any such benefit.

(7) The term "beneficiary" means a person designated by a participant or by the terms of an employee welfare or pension benefit plan who is or may become entitled to a benefit thereunder.

(8) The term "person" means an individual, partnership, corporation, mutual

company, joint-stock company, trust, unincorporated organization, association, or employee organization.

(9) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Labor.

(10) The term "State" means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the Canal Zone.

(11) The term "commerce" means trade, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States, or between any foreign country and any State, or between any State and any place outside thereof.

(b) Any two or more employee welfare benefit plans or any two or more pension benefit plans shall be considered to be "related plans" for the purposes of this act if they have substantially common officers or administrators, cover employees of the same employer, or are otherwise established, operated, or administered on a common basis.

COVERAGE

SEC. 4. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), this act shall apply to any employee welfare or pension benefit plan if—

(1) it provides benefits for employees employed in two or more States;

(2) some or all of the benefits thereunder are provided by or through the facilities of a service or other organization having its principal office outside of the State in which the principal office of the plan is located;

(3) it is established or maintained by any employer or employers engaged in commerce or in any industry or activity affecting commerce or by any employee organization or organizations representing employees engaged in commerce or in any industry or activity affecting commerce or by both; or

(4) the income of such plan is claimed to be exempt from taxation under the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by reason of its nature or activities, or the costs of or contributions to such plan are claimed as allowable deductions in computing taxable income under such provisions.

(b) This act shall not apply to an employee welfare or pension benefit plan if—

(1) such plan is administered by the Federal Government or by the government of a State, by a political subdivision of a State, or by an agency or instrumentality of any of the foregoing;

(2) such plan was established and is maintained for the purpose of complying with applicable workmen's compensation laws; or

(3) such plan is exempt from taxation under section 501 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and is administered as a corollary to membership in a fraternal benefit society described in section 501 (c) (8) of such code or by an organization described in section 501 (c) (3) of such code.

REGISTRATION

SEC. 5. (a) The person or persons, as defined by the Secretary, charged with or having responsibility for the overall management of any employee welfare or pension benefit plan shall register such plan with the Department of Labor in accordance with this section. Except as provided by section 8 (b), employee welfare or pension benefit plans established prior to the effective date of this act shall be registered within 90 days after the promulgation by the Secretary of the applicable regulations, and such plans established on or after the effective date of this act shall be registered within 90 days after their establishment or after the promulgation of such regulations, whichever is later.

(b) The registration of an employee welfare or pension benefit plan shall be in the form prescribed by the Secretary, shall be signed by the person or persons charged with or having responsibility for the overall management of the plan, and shall include their names and addresses, their official positions with respect to the plan, and their relationship, if any, to the employer or to any employee organization; the approximate number of persons covered or expected to be covered by the plan; the type and scope of the plan; whether the plan is mentioned in a collective bargaining agreement; copies of the plan or of the bargaining agreement, trust agreement, contract, or other instrument, if any, under which the plan was established and is operated; the source of the financing of the plan and the identity of any organization through which benefits are provided; whether the records of the plan are kept on a calendar year basis, or on a policy or other fiscal year basis, and if on the latter basis, the date of the end of such policy or fiscal year; and such other related data and information as the Secretary shall determine to be necessary to carry out the policy of this act. Amendments to the registration reflecting changes in the data and information included in the original registration, other than data and information also required to be included in annual reports under section 6, shall be filed with the Department of Labor, at such time or times, and in such form, as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe.

REPORTING

SEC. 6. (a) The person or persons, as defined by the Secretary, who are charged with or have responsibility for the overall management of any employee welfare or pension benefit plan shall file with the Department of Labor an annual report with respect to such plan. Such report shall be filed within 120 days after the end of the calendar year (or, if the records of the plan are kept on a policy or other fiscal year basis, within 120 days after the end of such policy or fiscal year) but, except as provided by subsections (a) and (b) of section 8, not more than 1 year after the date of its registration under section 5, and annually thereafter.

(b) A report under this section shall be in such form as the Secretary shall prescribe, shall be signed by the person or persons by whom it is required to be filed, and each such report shall include the following, together with such related data and information as the Secretary shall determine to be necessary in the public interest and to carry out the policy of this act:

(1) The name, address, and description of the plan or program, including the type of plan and the type of administration; the schedule of benefits; copies of any substantial changes in the plan or in the trust agreement, contract, or other instrument under which the plan was established and is operated, which have been made since the previous filing; and the names, titles, and addresses of any trustee or trustees and of any person or persons charged with or having responsibility for the overall management of the plan, and their official positions with respect to the plan, and their relationship, if any, to the employer or to any employee organization, and any other offices, positions, or employment held by them.

(2) The amount contributed by the employer or employers; the amount contributed by the employees; the amount of benefits paid or otherwise furnished; the number of employees covered; a detailed statement of assets, liabilities, receipts, disbursements, and other financial activities of the plan; the salaries and fees charged to the plan, to whom paid, in what amount, and for what purposes. The information required by this paragraph shall be certified to by an independent certified or licensed public accountant, based upon a comprehensive audit made on behalf of the participants and conducted in accordance with accepted standards of auditing, but nothing herein shall be construed to require such an audit of the books or records of any bank, insurance company, or other institution providing an insurance, investment, or related function for the plan, if such books or records are subject to examination by any agency of the Federal Government or the government of any State.

(c) If some or all of the benefits under the plan are provided by an insurance carrier or service or other organization such report shall include with respect to such plan (in addition to the information required by subsection (b)) the following, together with such related information as the Secretary shall determine to be necessary in the public interest and to carry out the policy of this act:

(1) The premium rate or subscription charge and the total premium or subscription charges paid to each such carrier or organization and the approximate number of persons covered by each class of such benefits.

(2) The total amount of premiums received, the approximate number of persons covered by each class of benefits, and the total claims paid by such carrier or other organization; dividends or retroactive rate adjustments, commissions, and administrative, service, or other fees (other than routine fees not in excess of $50 paid in connection with determining the eligibility of individuals for insurance or for receipt of benefits) or other specific acquisition costs, paid by such carrier or other organization; any amounts held to provide benefits after retirement; the remainder held by such carrier or other organization; and the names and addresses of the brokers, agents, or other persons to whom commissions or fees were paid, the amount paid to each, and for what purpose: *Provided*, That if any such carrier or other organization does not maintain separate experience records covering the specific groups or programs it serves, the report shall include in lieu of the information required by the foregoing provisions of this paragraph (A) a statement as to the basis of its premium rate or subscription charge, the total amount of premiums or subscription charges received from the plan, and a copy of the financial report of the carrier or other organization and (B), if such carrier or organization incurs specific costs in connection with the acquisition or retention of any particular plan or plans, a detailed statement of such costs.

Such insurance carrier or organization shall certify to the person or persons charged with or having responsibility for the overall management of the plan, within 90 days after the end of each policy year, the information necessary to enable such person or persons to comply with the requirements of this subsection and subsection (e) (2), and a copy of such certification shall accompany such report.

(d) Details relative to the manner in which any funds held by an employee welfare benefit plan are held or invested shall be reported as provided under paragraphs (B), (C), (D), and (E) of subsection (e) (1).

(e) Reports on employee pension benefit plans shall include, in addition to the applicable information required by the foregoing provisions of this section, the following, together with such related information as the Secretary shall determine to be necessary in the public interest and to carry out the policy of this act:

(1) If the plan is funded through the medium of a trust, the report shall include—

(A) the type and basis of funding, actuarial assumptions used, the amount of current and past service liabilities, and the number of employees, both retired and nonretired, covered by the plan;

(B) a summary statement showing the assets of the fund, broken down by types, such as cash, investments in governmental obligations, investments in nongovernmental bonds, and investments in corporate

stocks. Such assets shall be valued on the basis regularly used in valuing the investments held in the fund and reported to the United States Treasury Department if a statement of the assets of the fund is required to be filed annually with the United States Treasury Department, or shall be valued on such basis as is prescribed by the Secretary if such a statement is not so required to be filed with the United States Treasury Department;

(C) a detailed list, including information as to cost, present value, and percentage of the total fund, of all investments in securities or properties of the employer and of each other party in interest as defined by the Secretary;

(D) a detailed list, including information as to cost, present value, and percentage of the total fund, of all investments in a security or property (other than obligations the interest or principal of which is guaranteed by the United States), if the cost or present value thereof, whichever is lower, exceeds 5 percent of the fund or $50,000 whichever is larger, or 10 percent of the current value of the outstanding securities or obligations of any one issuer;

(E) a detailed list of all loans made to the employer and to each other party in interest as defined by the Secretary.

(2) If the plan is funded through the medium of a contract with an insurance carrier, the report shall include—

(A) the type and basis of funding, actuarial assumptions used in determining the payments under the contract, the amount of current and past service liabilities based on those assumptions, and the number of employees, both retired and nonretired, covered by the contract; and

(B) except for benefits completely guaranteed by the carrier, the amount of all reserves accumulated under the plan.

(3) If the plan is unfunded, the report shall include the total benefits paid to retired employees for the past 5 years, broken down by year; the number of employees, both retired and nonretired, covered by the plan; any actuarial assumptions or evaluations made during the last 5-year period; and a statement reflecting the average age and duration of employment of the employees, the average salary or wage if the benefits are related to salaries or wages, and the average age of the retired employees, for any one year during the last 5 years next preceding the filing of the report.

DISCLOSURE

SEC. 7. Disclosure of information contained in a registration or annual report or other document filed under this act shall be made to the participants and their beneficiaries and other persons as follows:

(1) The Secretary shall make copies of such registration, annual report, or other document available for examination in the public documents room of the Department of Labor; and

(2) The person responsible for the overall management of the plan shall make copies of such registration, annual report, or other document available upon request for examination by any participant or beneficiary at the principal offices of the plan, and shall provide information from any such registration, report, or other document, in as brief summary form as the Secretary shall prescribe to carry out the policy of this act, to each participant or beneficiary requesting it.

PLANS COVERING FEWER THAN 100 EMPLOYEES

SEC. 8. (a) Section 6 shall not apply to any employee welfare or pension benefit plan which, together with any related plan or plans, covers fewer than 100 employees until the expiration of 2 years following the date of enactment of this act.

(b) The Secretary may exempt from the requirements of section 5, relating to registration, or section 6, relating to annual reports, or of both such sections, for such indefinite or other period or periods as he may determine, any category or categories of employee welfare or pension benefit plans (classified on the basis of the number of employees covered) which together with any related plans cover fewer than 100 employees, if he finds that compliance would be unduly burdensome to such plans or, because of the number of such plans, would place an undue administrative burden on the Department.

(c) During any period for which an employee welfare or pension benefit plans is exempt under subsection (a) or subsection (b) from the requirements of section 5 or section 6 it shall not be required to make disclosure as required by section 7, but in lieu thereof the person or persons having responsibility for the overall management of such plan shall make available for inspection by any participant or beneficiary or other interested person at the principal offices of the plan or such other place as may be prescribed by the Secretary such of the information specified by section 6 as may be requested, except that the information specified by subsection (b) (2) of such section shall not be required to be certified to by an independent public accountant as provided in such subsection unless the Secretary deems such certification necessary to carry out the policy of this act and so provides in his regulations.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 9. (a) There is hereby established an Advisory Council on Employee Welfare and Pension Benefit Plans (hereinafter referred to as the "Council") which shall consist of 13 members to be appointed in the following manner: 1 from the insurance field, 1 from the corporate trust field, 2 from management, 4 from labor, and 2 from other interested groups, all appointed by the Secretary from among persons recommended by organizations in the respective groups; and 3 representatives of the general public appointed by the Secretary.

(b) It shall be the duty of the Council to advise the Secretary with respect to the carrying out of his functions under this act, and to submit to the Secretary recommendations with respect thereto. The Council shall meet twice each year and at such other times as the Secretary requests.

(c) The Secretary shall furnish to the Advisory Council an executive secretary and such secretarial, clerical, and other services as are deemed necessary to the conduct of its business. The Secretary may call upon other agencies of the Government for statistical data, reports, and other information which will assist the Council in the performance of its duties.

(d) Appointed members of the Council shall be paid compensation at the rate of $50 per diem when engaged in the work of the Council, including travel time, and shall be allowed travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently and receiving compensation on a per diem when actually employed basis.

POWERS OF THE SECRETARY

SEC. 10. (a) The Secretary is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to utilize any information submitted under the provisions of this act for statistical and research purposes and to compile and publish such studies, analyses, reports, and surveys as he deems appropriate.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to make such studies as he deems necessary to serve as a basis for making recommendations for further legislation concerning matters to which this act relates.

(d) The Secretary is authorized to make such expenditures and, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel, including attorneys, as may be necessary to perform the functions imposed by this act. Attorneys appointed under this section may appear for and represent the Secretary in any litigation, but such litigation shall be subject to the direction and control of the Attorney General.

(e) All pertinent accounts, correspondence, memorandums, papers, books, and other records of any employee welfare or pension benefit plan shall be subject at any time or from time to time to such reasonable, periodic, special, or other examinations by representatives of the Department of Labor as the Department may deem necessary to accomplish the policy of this act.

STUDIES WITH RESPECT TO STANDARDS OF CONDUCT AND CIVIL SUITS

SEC. 11. The Secretary shall cause to be conducted a study for the purpose of determining the desirability and feasibility (1) of establishing and requiring compliance with standards of conduct in matters concerning the management and operation of employee welfare and pension benefit plans by persons serving as officers, agents, employees, trustees, or custodians of such plans or otherwise occupying positions of responsibility in, or exercising authority or control over, the management or operation of such plans or having a fiduciary relationship to such plans or their participants or their beneficiaries, and (2) of authorizing the Secretary to institute civil suits against any such persons who have been guilty of gross misconduct or gross abuse of trust in respect of any employee welfare or pension benefit plan for the purpose of enjoining such persons from further serving in such capacities, or for the purpose of recovering from them on behalf of the plan the amounts of any financial losses suffered by the plan or its participants or their beneficiaries by reason of such misconduct or abuse of trust. Upon the conclusion of such studies the Secretary shall transmit to the Congress his conclusions and recommendations with respect thereto.

INVESTIGATIONS; INJUNCTIONS

SEC. 12. (a) The Secretary may, in his discretion, make such investigations as he deems necessary to determine whether any person has violated or is about to violate any provision of this act or any rule or regulation thereunder, and may require or permit any person to file with it a statement in writing, under oath or otherwise as the Secretary shall determine, as to all the facts and circumstances concerning the matter to be investigated. The Secretary is authorized, in his discretion, to publish information concerning any such violations, and to investigate any facts, conditions, practices, or matters which he may deem necessary or proper to aid in the enforcement of the provisions of this act or in the prescribing of rules and regulations thereunder.

(b) For the purposes of any investigation provided for in this act, 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 (15 U. S. C. 49, 50), are hereby made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Labor or any officers designated by him.

(c) Whenever it shall appear to the Secretary that any person is engaged or about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of the provisions of this act, or of any rule or regulation thereunder, he may in his discretion bring an action in the proper district

court of the United States, or United States court of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, to enjoin such acts or practices, and upon a proper showing a permanent or temporary injunction or restraining order shall be granted without bond. The Secretary may transmit such evidence as may be available concerning such acts or practices to the Attorney General, who may, in his discretion, institute the necessary investigations and criminal proceedings.

(d) The district courts of the United States, and the United States courts of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, to restrain violations of, to enforce any duty created by, or to compel disclosure of any information required to be submitted to the Secretary in accordance with this act or the rules and regulations thereunder. All actions under this subsection shall be brought on behalf of the Secretary.

PENALTIES

SEC. 13. (a) Any person who willfully violates or fails to comply with any provision of this act or the rules or regulations promulgated thereunder shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

(b) Any person who makes a false statement or representation of a material fact, knowing it to be false, or who knowingly fails to disclose a material fact, in any registration, report, certification, or other document or information required under the provisions of this act or the rules or regulations promulgated thereunder, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

(c) Any person who makes any false entry in any book, record, report, or statement required by law or appropriate regulation thereunder to be kept or made for any such welfare or benefit plan, with intent to injure or defraud such plan or any participant or beneficiary thereunder, or to deceive anyone authorized or entitled to examine the affairs of such plans, or who willfully destroys any such books, records, reports, or statements unless authorized by appropriate regulations, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

(d) Any person who embezzles, steals, or unlawfully and willfully abstracts or converts to his own use or to the use of another, any of the moneys, funds, securities, premiums, credits, property, or other assets of any employee wellfare or pension benefit plan, or of any fund connected therewith, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

(e) Any person charged with or having responsibility for the overall management of any employee welfare or pension benefit plan, or being an officer, trustee, custodian, or employee of any such plan, or an officer of any employer any of whose employees are covered by such plan, or an officer or employee of any employee organization any members of which are covered by such plan, who receives or agrees to receive any fee, kickback, commission, gift, or thing of value with intent to have his decision or action on any question or matter concerning the procurement of property or insurance or other services for or in connection with such plan influenced thereby; and any person who pays or agrees or attempts to pay any fee or commission or makes or agrees or attempts to make any gift or transfers or agrees or attempts to transfer anything of value to any person charged with or having respon-ibility for the overall management of any employee welfare or pension benefit plan, or to any officer, trustee, custodian, or employee of any such plan, or officer of any employer any of whose employees are covered by such plan, or officer or employee of any employee organization any members of whch are covered by such plan, with intent to influence or attempt to influence his decision or action on any question or matter concerning the procurement of property or insurance or other services for or in connection with such plan, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both. Nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to prohibit the payment to or acceptance by any person of usual salary or compensation for necessary services performed in the regular course of his duties as such an officer or employee.

TERMINAL DATE

SEC. 14. This act shall be effective for a period of 4 calendar years from the date of its enactment. On or before January 1 of each year, the Secretary shall make a complete and comprehensive report to the Congress of his operations under this act. The report filed on or before January 1, 1961, shall include the recommendations of the Secretary as to the continuance, simplification, or modification of this act.

COOPERATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

SEC. 15. (a) The heads of other Federal departments and agencies shall cooperate with the Secretary in furnishing information, data, reports, and such other material as may be necessary to the effective administration and enforcement of this act. The Secretary shall make available to the Internal Revenue Service such of the information furnished to or obtained by the Department of Labor under this act as the Secretary of the Treasury may need for the purpose of enabling such Service to administer more effectively the Federal income tax laws. The Secretary shall also provide for the making available of information furnished by employee welfare and pension benefit plans pursuant to this act to other departments and agencies of the Government to assist in the performance of the functions of such departments and agencies. The secretary shall cooperate and consult with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and with the heads of such other departments and agencies as he deems appropriate regarding the administration of this act, and with the consent of the respective heads of such departments and agencies may utilize the facilities of such departments and agencies for such research and other purposes as the Secretary deems appropriate.

(b) In order to avoid burdensome and unnecessary effort and expense to employee welfare and pension benefit plans and to the Government resulting from a multiplicity of forms, the Secretary shall consult and cooperate with the heads of the various departments and agencies of the Government with a view to developing standardized forms for use in the reporting of information relating to such plans required by this act, the internal revenue laws, or other laws of the United States, or regulations promulgated thereunder.

COOPERATION WITH STATES

SEC. 16. (a) The Secretary shall consult and cooperate with any State officers or agencies having responsibility for the administration of State laws requiring the disclosure of information concerning employee welfare and pension benefit plans, with a view to developing standardized forms for such purpose, developing means of facilitating compliance with such laws, and avoiding burdensome and unnecessary effort and expense resulting from a multiplicity of forms. Before prescribing forms under this act for registration and reporting, and for summaries which may be required for distribution to participants and beneficiaries, the Secretary shall obtain information with respect to the format and content of forms employed in connection with such State laws, and shall have in mind the requirements of such State laws in prescribing forms under this act.

(b) In order to assist the States to discharge such responsibilities as they may have with respect to employee welfare and pension benefit plans, the Secretary shall by regulation require the persons responsible for the registration, reporting, and summaries required by this act to file copies of such documents, or any portions thereof, with a State agency upon its request.

(c) In the case of an employee welfare or pension benefit plan providing benefits to employees employed in two or more States, no person shall be required by reason of any law of any such State to file with any State agency (other than an agency of the State in which such plan has its principal office) any information included within a registration, report, summary, or other document filed pursuant to this act if copies of such registration, report, summary, or other document are filed with the State agency, and if copies of such summary or such portions of the registration, report, or other document, as may be required by the State agency, are distributed to participants and beneficiaries in accordance with the requirements of such State law with respect to scope of distribution. Nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any State from obtaining such additional information relating to any such plan as it may desire, or from otherwise regulating such plan.

EFFECT OF OTHER LAWS

SEC. 17. The provisions of this act, except section 12 (d) and section 16 (c), and any action taken thereunder shall not be held to exempt or relieve any person from any liability, duty, penalty, or punishment provided by any present or future law of the United States or of any State affecting the operation or administration of employee welfare or pension benefit plans, or in any manner to authorize the operation or administration of any such plan contrary to any such law.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 18. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected.

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

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS DISCLOSURE ACT

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE

This section provides that the act may be cited as the "Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act."

SECTION 2. FINDINGS AND POLICY

(a) The findings recognize the tremendous growth of these plans, the millions of employees and dependents affected, the billions of dollars involved, the preferential tax treatment given the plans, their effect upon commerce, the unavailability of information to participants with respect to their operation, and the abuses which have developed in some of them in the absence of legislative safeguards.

(b) The policy is to protect the interests of the participants, the beneficiaries, and the public by requiring registration, reporting, and disclosure of information concerning the operation of such plans.

SECTION 3. DEFINITIONS

Section 3 (a) (1), "Employee Welfare Benefit Plans," and (2) "Employee Pension Benefit Plans": The plan must be established by an employer or by an employee organization,

or by both, and the plan, or the benefits which it provides, must be communicated to the employees in writing.

Section 3 (a) (3), "Employee Organization": The definition includes any employee benefit association.

Section 3 (a) (9): The "Secretary," who is charged with the administration of the act, is the Secretary of Labor.

Other terms defined include "employer," "employee," "participant," "beneficiary," "person," "Secretary," "State," "commerce," "related plans.'

SECTION 4. COVERAGE

The act applies to all plans which actually operate in interstate commerce (subsec. (a) (1) and (2)); or are established or maintained by employers or by employee organizations representing employees who are engaged in interstate commerce or are in an industry or activity affecting interstate commerce (subsec. (a) (3)). The act also applies to any plan where the income of the plan is claimed to be exempt from tax, or where the cost of or contributions to any such plan are claimed as deductions from income under the Internal Revenue Code. Subsections (a) (1) and (2) base jurisdiction on the actual interstate activities of the plan. Subsection (a) (3) employs the National Labor Relations Act and Taft-Hartley Act jurisdictional concepts, and subsection (a) (4) is based upon the tax treatment of the plans and of the employer contributions thereto.

Section 4 (b) exempts plans if (1) they are administered by Federal or State government, or by a political subdivision or instrumentality thereof; (2) they are established for the purpose of complying with workmen's compensation laws; or (3) they are administered as a corollary to membership in fraternal benefit societies exempt under section 501 (c) (8) of the Internal Revenue Code or by an educational or eleemosynary organization exempt under 501 (c) (3) of the IRC. Compulsory temporary disability insurance would not be included if administered by a State agency, but if self-insured or insured through a commercial carrier, they are included.

SECTION 5. REGISTRATION

All plans are required to register with the Department of Labor, except that the Secretary may exempt plans covering fewer than 100 employees as provided in section 8 (b). The registration requires information with respect to the identity, type, and size of the plan and such related information as the Secretary may deem necessary.

SECTION 6. REPORTING

All plans must report annually to the Department of Labor, except that plans of fewer than 100 employees are exempted for 2 years by section 8 (a) and for any such additional period as the Secretary may deem necessary under section 8 (b).

The annual reports require a description of the plan and its benefits and information with respect to its financial operation which is to be based upon a certified audit.

If the plan is insured, additional pertinent information relating to premiums, claims, commissions, fees, etc., is to be certified to by the insurance or other organization. If a pension plan is funded, in addition to information relating to receipts, disbursements, and financial position, actuarial information is required.

In a trusteed plan, a summary statement as to the composition of the investment portfolio is also required, except that full details are required with respect to investments in securities or property of and/or loans to employers, sponsors, or other parties in interest, or if the investment in any one security or property amounts to more than 5 percent of the fund or 10 percent of the current value of the securities of any one issuer. Profit-sharing plans with pension features are treated the same as trusteed pension plans.

Unfunded pension plans are also required to file actuarial information and information with respect to the operation of the plan.

SECTION 7. DISCLOSURE

It is the intent of the act to permit public disclosure of the information filed in the registration, annual report or other document furnished under the act at the principal offices of the plan and in the public document rooms of the Department of Labor, and to provide information to each beneficiary requesting it in as brief summary form as the Secretary shall prescribe to carry out the policy of the act.

SECTION 8. PLANS COVERING LESS THAN 100 EMPLOYEES

The bill gives a 2-year moratorium to all plans covering less than 100 employees from the reporting provisions, and gives the Secretary of Labor discretionary authority to exempt such small plans from either the registration or the reporting requirements for such further periods as he deems necessary, if he determines that such registration or reporting would be too burdensome on such plans or if the administration of them would be too burdensome on the Department. However, such exempted plans are otherwise required to comply with the act and the beneficiaries thereof may, upon request, obtain the same information at the plan headquarters that would be required in the registration and report.

SECTION 9. ADVISORY COUNCIL

The council consists of 13 members appointed by the Secretary and includes 2 members from management, 1 from insurance, 1 from banking, 4 from labor, 2 from other interested groups, and 3 public members.

SECTION 10. POWERS OF THE SECRETARY

This section grants various powers to the Secretary such as the power to make rules and regulations, the authority to make studies and to recommend legislation, the authority to hire employees and the authority to make examinations of records of employee welfare and pension benefit plans.

SECTION 11. STUDIES WITH RESPECT TO STANDARDS OF CONDUCT AND CIVIL SUITS

The Secretary is charged with the responsibility of conducting a study and making recommendations deemed feasible with respect to standards of conduct in matters concerning the management and operation of employee welfare and pension benefit plans and with respect to the advisability of authorizing the Secretary to institute civil suits against plan officials for gross misconduct or gross abuse of trust for the purpose of removing or disbarring such officials and recovering losses from them on behalf of the plan or beneficiaries.

SECTION 12. INVESTIGATIONS AND INJUNCTIONS

This section gives the Secretary the usual authority to make investigations necessary to determine whether the act has been or is being violated, to apply to Federal courts for subpenas, and to apply to the appropriate Federal court for injunctive relief to prevent violations of the act.

SECTION 13. PENALTIES

Section 13 provides criminal sanctions for violations of the act, perjury in registration or report statements, false entries in books or records, embezzlement from welfare or pension funds, and for paying or receiving kickbacks, commissions, or anything of value for influencing the procurement of insurance or other services or property incident to the operation of an employee benefit plan.

SECTION 14. TERMINAL DATE

Section 14 provides that the act shall be effective for a period of 4 calendar years from the date of its enactment and requires the Secretary to make an annual report to the Congress.

SECTION 15. COOPERATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

Section 15 (a) provides for general cooperation between Federal agencies and particularly with the Secretary of the Treasury.

Section 15 (b) requires the Secretary to consult and cooperate with the heads of the various Government agencies with a view toward developing standardized forms.

SECTION 16. COOPERATION WITH THE STATES

Section 16 would supersede State laws with respect to employee benefit plan registration, reporting and disclosure, in the case of multi-State plans, except in the State of the plan's home office, if copies of the information required by the Federal act are supplied the State agency and the State requirements with respect to scope of distribution of information to beneficiaries are met.

SECTION 17. EFFECT OF OTHER LAWS

This section provides that (except as provided under section 12 (d) and section 16 (c)) any action taken under this act shall not exempt or relieve persons from liabilities or duties provided by any laws of the United States or of any State affecting the operation or administration of employee welfare or pension benefit plans.

PUNISHMENT FOR CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on behalf of my very distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the statute relating to the punishment of contempt of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by my colleague in reference to the proposed legislation, 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. 2891) to amend the statute relating to the punishment of contempt of Congress, introduced by Mr. CURTIS (for Mr. HRUSKA), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. CURTIS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HRUSKA

I have today requested my colleage, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] to introduce on my behalf, a bill which has for its purpose an amendment of the contempt of Congress statute made necessary by the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the so-called Watkins case.

One of the most troublesome features of the Supreme Court decision in the Watkins case was the apparent holding that the pertinency of a question must be explained to the witness so that he understands it, before he can be required to answer. This rule would be, of course, administratively impossible.

By amendment of the statute governing Congressional contempt (2 U. S. C. 192) it is believed this problem can be overcome.

My bill seeks to accomplish this result. It would operate to restor the right of Congress to judge the pertinency of its questions.

It should be noted that in the Watkins decision, the court did not rule that the committee had no right to ask a question for lack of pertinency, or had no right to judge the pertinency of its own questions; but only that, under the contempt statute, and in a

criminal prosecution, the witness (the defendant-to-be) was entitled to have the pertinency of the question as certain as any other element of the case against him.

This proposed amendment will meet the court's requirement by specifically providing that the question is pertinent unless the witness objects, and that if the witness objects and the committee rules the question is pertinent, that ruling is controlling.

Of course, no statute could give the committee the right to make a wholly unreasonable ruling, and, therefore, no legislation could take away from the court a right of review including the right to review the question of pertinency. However, it is believed that enactment of the amendment here proposed would change the basis of such review, so that whereas the court now looks to the substantive question of pertinency, after enactment of this proposed amendment, the court would look to the reasonableness of the committee's ruling. In effect, this amounts to a prima facie presumption of pertinency where the committee has ruled that a question is pertinent, and a defendant claiming that a question was not pertinent would have to bring forth evidence to show that it was not.

In order that the full import of the amendment may be more readily understood, section 192 of the United States Code, if this amendment is approved, will read in full as follows:

"Every person who having been summoned as a witness by the authority of either House of Congress to give testimony or to produce papers upon any matter under inquiry before either House, or any joint committee established by a joint or concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, or any committee of either House of Congress, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the question under inquiry, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of not more than $1,000 nor less than $100 and imprisonment in a common jail for not less than 1 month nor more than 12 months: *Provided,* That for the purposes of this section any question shall be deemed pertinent unless timely objection is made thereto on the ground that such question lacks pertinency, or when such objection is made, if such question is ruled pertinent by the body conducting the hearing; and on any question of pertinency, the ruling of the presiding officer shall stand as the ruling of the body unless reversed on appeal."

LIMITATION OF PERCENTAGE OF DEPLETION ALLOWANCE FOR OIL AND GAS WELLS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. On behalf of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to limit the percentage-depletion allowance for oil and gas wells to the United States, its Territories and possessions. The purpose of this bill is to repeal the depletion allowance which, I think, now is rather recklessly allowed to the producers of foreign oil, to the great disadvantage of the domestic producers of oil.

The report recently filed by myself with the Judiciary Committee on the petroleum investigation, Investigation No. 19, reads as follows:

It is recommended that the 27½-percent depletion allowance granted petroleum producers be limited to production within the United States and its Territories.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, an extract from the report which was filed. The extract refers to depletion.

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

The bill (S. 2895) to limit the percentage-depletion allowance for oil and gas wells to oil and gas wells located in the United States and its Territories and possessions, introduced by Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. CARROLL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The extract from the report presented by Mr. O'MAHONEY is as follows:

[From Statement by Garith M. Nevill, assistant counsel, appendix to report]

DEPLETION

During the course of the oil hearings considerable testimony was developed concerning depletion allowances granted American oil companies on foreign crude production. At one point Senator CARROLL developed that such costs as dry holes, terminal facilities, exploration and development, depreciation, losses, royalties, and rentals are all deductible expense items. Then, in addition, the producing companies can take a further deduction for percentage depletion based on 27½ percent of gross income.[1]

The concept of a depletion allowance or special tax deduction[2] for the exhaustion of oil and gas properties was originated in 1913 as a domestic measure aimed at obtaining greater domestic production during a period of world crisis. The history of cost and subsequently percentage depletion, shows that originally it was adopted by the Congress as a formula permitting a more rapid recovery of investment, as an inducement to obtain greater production of oil and gas at a time when foreign production by American companies was of little importance to the overall economy.

As first approved by Congress, depletion allowance on oil and gas was a tax exempt deduction from operating income granted to cover capital consumed in the operation of the oil or gas well. The capital in question was the value of the property as of March 1, 1913, or the cost, if acquired after this date. Once this capital investment had been recovered, the allowance was no longer available. In 1918, the base was enlarged to cover the value of the property at the time of the discovery or within 30 days thereafter. Then, to overcome administrative difficulties from the use of discovery value, percentage depletion was introduced in 1926. A figure of 27½ percent of gross income was selected to give approximately equal dollar deductions as had been allowed under the 1918 statute. This method, unlike the cost and discovery value methods, has no overall limit so that deductions continue as long as the property is producing income.

The effort and concern today, as it was just prior to World War I and in 1918 when the basic concept of depletion allowance on oil and gas was introduced into the tax structure, is to encourage exploration and development of new oil reserves within the continental United States to assure a safe productive capacity and supply of petroleum in time of war or national emergency. That this concept of aiding domestic production of oil and gas is the currently accepted justification for depletion allowance is borne out by Congressional action taken during World War II when percentage depletion was extended in 1942 to 3 nonmetals and in 1943 to 10 additional nonmetallic minerals. Furthermore, the 1942 and 1943 expansions of percentage depletion were limited in the enabling legislation to the period of the war emergency to encourage domestic production of minerals needed to meet wartime demands.

In February 1955, the Cabinet Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy issued a report in which the following statement is found:

"Present tax provisions on coal, oil, and gas production have been an important factor in encouraging development of energy sources at a pace about in keeping with demand. Any changes which may be proposed in the future must be analyzed in terms of their probable effect on development of domestic resources needed for economic progress and national defense as well as the fiscal and tax policies of the Government."

Although the domestic industry is finding more oil and gas than it produces, the rate of this increase in proven reserves has been declining in the past several years. Hence, as pointed out by the Cabinet Committee, every inducement should be given to encourage domestic exploration as against overseas development. This approach is clearly within past Congressional intent, as expressed in the tax legislation affecting depletion allowances and national defense considerations.

Assuming justification for the 27½-percent foreign percentage depletion allowance formula in 1926, such depletion allowance is inconsistent with the original legislation to encourage domestic discovery, since yields, costs, and producing areas are so different today from what they then were. It would seem that today percentage depletion on foreign oil gives the foreign operator a special tax advantage over the domestic producer.[3] This condition in itself could result in some inducement to an American company to select foreign development over domestic. For example, where the costs of extraction abroad are low relative to the value of the oil and gas produced, the 27½-percent depletion allowance, when translated into dollars, is much greater on the oil produced than when applied to high-cost domestic production. The amount of the deduction, under the present law, cannot exceed 50 percent of net in any one year. This may result in the domestic producer not being able to take advantage of the full 27½-percent depletion allowance unlike the low-cost foreign producer who is not apt to be affected by this 50-percent limitation. A high net return possible on low-cost Middle East production could result in a much greater dollar allowance on a barrel-for-barrel basis to the producing company than would be possible under a lower net return realized on high-cost domestic oil.

Mr. W. A. Delaney at one point in his testimony compared an average daily production per well in Oklahoma of 9 barrels with that of Kuwait of around 7,600 barrels.[4] There is a tremendous dollar advantage of percentage depletion allowance of Kuwait production as compared to Oklahoma. Thus, foreign depletion has the effect of needlessly widening the profit spread between domestic and foreign oil. This increases the commercial advantage of importing, thus further limiting the domestic market.

As the domestic market is cut back the cost of the reduced production is increased on a per barrel basis. Mr. Delaney, when describing in his testimony such costs, stated:

"The cost of producing oil is related to the number of barrels of oil produced over the man-hours involved plus the cost of material and supplies that are required to furnish and service the wells."[5]

[1] Hearings, pp. 1412, 1425, 1426.

[2] Current Antitrust Problems, pt. II, pp. 592–595, Celler committee.

[3] Hearings, pp. 1436, 1453.

[4] Hearings, p. 887.

[5] Hearings, p. 887.

The present system of percentage depletion conceived to increase domestic exploration and production is actually weighted in favor of foreign investment. Full depletion allowance on foreign production results in increased exploration for foreign oil. As foreign production is increased, the economic survival of the small, independent domestic producer is further jeopardized by loss of both domestic and foreign markets. Mr. Whiteford of Gulf Oil, during his appearance before this subcommittee, testified that:

"No country develops oil reserves except to the extent that it may have prospective markets." [6]

Subsidized foreign oil is one of the most direct of all ways to reduce market prospects for the domestic product.

As pointed out above, the economic defense of generous percentage depletion results from national policy to provide an incentive or subsidy for certain selected minerals for reasons of national defense and domestic economic advancement. The incentive value of percentage depletion for domestic production of oil and gas has been blunted by extending the favors to all the world, thus defeating the original concept. At one point in the record Senator KEFAUVER elicited a statement from Mr. Rathbone, of Jersey, that foreign operations were much more profitable than domestic but cost savings on foreign production could not be passed on to the domestic consumer without putting domestic independents out of business. Mr. Rathbone stated that domestic producers are not in a sound economic position:

"He has not been so far the last several years, and the evidence on that, I believe, is indisputable. It is perfectly true that profits from our foreign operations * * * are very large and, as I said to you, I certainly would not want in any way to ever be accused of trying to utilize profits from foreign operations to destroy anything in the United States."

If the consumer cannot obtain the foreign product at a lower price [7] and the domestic industry is endangered by a restriction of markets,, why should the taxpayer be asked to continue to subsidize foreign production only to make profits for the foreign operator?

A discontinuance of foreign depletion would, at least in the short run, result in the payment of more tax dollars to the United States Treasury. A tabulation placed in the record by Aramco during the hearings [8] shows that on the present tax base the United States Treasury would obtain from Aramco $61 million plus in 1955 and an estimated $63 million plus in 1956 if the foreign depletion allowance was removed from the tax statutes. The schedule submitted by Aramco is as follows:

SCHEDULE II.—*Effect of percentage depletion on aggregate United States taxes*

[Thousands of dollars]

	1955	1956 estimated
1. Taxable net income	339,831	353,178
2. Percentage depletion	148,167	152,006
3. Taxable net income without percentage depletion	487,998	505,184
4. United States income tax without percentage depletion	61,010	63,233

For the above reasons, it is suggested that this subcommittee may wish to recommend that the 27½ percent depletion allowance granted petroleum producers be limited to production within the United States and its Territories.

[6] Hearings, p. 1259.
[7] Hearings, p. 880.
[8] Hearings, p. 1441.

AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT RELATING TO ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 132 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, relating to Congressional adjournment. The bill is identical to one which I introduced on August 2, 1955, the purpose of which was to end the midsummer madness in which we indulge at almost every session of the Congress. The purpose of the bill was to enable the Congress to adjourn during the heat of summer, and return later in the fall.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks which I made on August 2, 1955.

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

The bill (S. 2904) to amend section 132 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, relating to Congressional adjournment, introduced by Mr. O'MAHONEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The remarks presented by Mr. O'MAHONEY are as follows:

AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT RELATING TO ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act, in the hope that it may afford the Committee on Rules and Administration in the next session an opportunity to bring an end to this midsummer madness in which we indulge about this time every session.

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

The bill (S. 2752) to amend section 132 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, relating to Congressional adjournment, introduced by Mr. O'MAHONEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

LET US END THIS MIDSUMMER MADNESS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The logjam in which this session of Congress is coming to an end dramatically illustrates the necessity for an amendment of the Legislative Reorganization Act which requires adjournment on July 31. Although this is a requirement which is more honored in the breach than in the observance, and although the leadership has made every effort to complete the work of Congress in an orderly manner, the plain fact is that the work is not completed and cannot be completed when so many Members of Congress are in a rush to go to Russia, to Europe, to Asia, and sometimes home. The acting majority leader [Mr. Clements] has been particularly effective, but procedural reform is overdue.

The result of the present system is that the advocates of immensely important legislation are clamoring for last-minute action and seeking to push through bills even though the Members as a whole, including even the members of the committees to which the bills are assigned, have not had the opportunity to read the measures or the reports thereon which have been hastily prepared.

The sad fact is that this method of legislating can only result in undermining the legislative powers of Congress. We have more business affecting everybody in the Nation than ever before in history. Witness, for example, the housing bill. This program was initiated during the Roosevelt-Truman administrations. It has been adopted by President Eisenhower. It is opposed by substantial numbers of his own party. The House, in order to effect a compromise, struck all public housing from the bill. The conference restored 45,000 units of the 135,000 President Eisenhower wanted. The Wherry housing law, which allowed private construction of dwellings at airbases and military stations of all kinds, has been repealed, and all of this has been transferred to the Department of Defense. Members of the Armed Services Committee themselves were doubtful of the wisdom of the change.

Whatever may be the merits about this measure, it illustrates the haste in which legislation is being pushed through in the last days of a midsummer session, when, because of the heat, Members are physically worn out by prolonged sessions of both the committees and the two Houses. It may truthfully be called a midsummer's madness, for neither the committees nor either House can properly legislate in the atmosphere which here exists.

The theory of the Legislative Reorganization Act was that committees should never be permitted to meet during a session of either House. They have been meeting day and night during these closing sessions.

The remedy is to revise the Legislative Reorganization Act so that Congress may recess during the hot summer days and Members may take their vacations in their homes or wherever the essential investigatory duty of Congress calls. I am, therefore, introducing a bill to amend the law by providing that both Houses shall be in recess from the middle of July to the second Monday in September of each year unless otherwise provided by Congress. This would eliminate the mad rush in the heat of July and August, and would enable Congress to give intelligent and orderly attention to the legislation before it during the fall, with ample time to adjourn for Christmas.

I hope the Committee on Rules and Administration in the next session will hold hearings on this bill.

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

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

"*Be it enacted, etc.,* That (a), section 132, of the Legislative Reorganization Act is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 132. The two Houses of Congress shall be in recess during the period beginning on July 15 and ending on the second Monday in September, in each year, unless otherwise provided by the Congress.'

"(b) The amendment made by this act shall be effective beginning with the 2d session of the 84th Congress."

HEADQUARTERS SITE FOR MOUNT RAINIER NATIONAL PARK

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide a headquarters site for Mount Rainier National Park in the general vicinity of Ashford, Wash. The transfer of the National Park Service headquarters from Longmire to Ashford, just outside the park, is part of the National Park Service's mission 66 plans for Mount Rainier National Park.

It is necessitated by the fact that the present headquarters site and equipment storage area at Longmire is subject

to annual flooding, and that the condition of buildings at the existing headquarters is such that they will very soon have to be replaced.

The Park Service has advised us that the cost of replacing the existing buildings at their present location and providing adequate protection against spring floods will be at least as costly as moving the headquarters outside the park where not only will the headquarters be free from flood threat, but also it will be comparatively free from heavy snow.
ing the summer season when the flood

The move also will enable the Park Service to turn the existing headquarters site at Longmire into a picnic area durthreat each year has ended, thus making available a badly needed additional large picnic area.

The purpose of introducing this proposed legislation at this time is so that the Congress may act on it early in the next session and the Park Service may have authority to acquire the land it requires for its new headquarters before the land is taken for other purposes or before the land value increases greatly.

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

The bill (S. 2905) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide a headquarters site for Mount Rainier National Park in the general vicinity of Ashford, Wash., and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED RAILROAD EQUIPMENT ADMINISTRATION ACT

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to create a governmental agency for financing railroad equipment. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill, 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. 2906) to provide for the increase, modernization, and stockpiling of railroad equipment in order to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense; to create and establish a public agency with powers to carry out the provisions of this act; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FREAR, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

The statement presented by Mr. FREAR is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FREAR—PROPOSAL COVERING CREATION OF GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY FOR FINANCING RAILROAD EQUIPMENT

PLAN

1. A new Government agency shall be created, to be known as the Railway Equipment Agency, or with some similar nomenclature, with initial capital of $500 million, with the understanding that more will be advanced by the Government from time to time as may be needed.

2. The railroads shall have the right to apply to this Equipment Agency for long-term net leases for such new equipment as they may desire. The exact length of such leases shall be on the same basis for all companies, but shall be varied in term, taking into consideration, the true economic life of the type of equipment in question. For example, diesels probably should be leased for 15 years and freight cars for 20 years, and passenger equipment perhaps on a 10-year basis.

3. The basic rental shall be determined in accordance with the following principles:

(a) During the term of the lease, the rental shall be sufficient to completely amortize the cost of the equipment, less the estimated scrap value of the equipment at present-day prices.

(b) The interest factor shall be one-quarter of 1 percent above the estimated cost of money to the Agency for the length of period involved.

(c) Interest shall be calculated on the declining balance with respect to that portion of the cost which is amortized, and on a straight line basis with respect to the portion that is not amortized, that is, estimated scrap value.

(d) The rental shall be absolutely net and all repairs of whatsoever nature shall be made by the leasing railroad.

4. The agency shall have the right to borrow up to four times its capital; in other words, up to 80 percent of the cost of the equipment. At the end of the lease for any equipment, the governmental body having control over the stockpiling of strategic materials for national-defense purposes shall have the option of purchasing any equipment it desires from the transportation agency at the fair value of the equipment, to be determined at that time. Any equipment not thus purchased for stockpiling for defense purposes shall be sold for scrap by the transportation agency, with the proceeds recaptured by the transportation agency.

5. Any lessee, subject to the approval of the Equipment Agency, may assign its lease to any other railroad in the event it no longer has a demand for the equipment, but in no event shall the new lessee receive a lease other than for the balance of the period remaining to the original lessee. Also, in the event that any lessee defaults under the terms of its lease, the Equipment Agency may recapture the equipment and re-lease it to another railroad for the remaining balance of the term, but in no event for a longer period.

6. In the event there are more applications for equipment than can be handled expeditiously (this is particularly likely to be true not only at the outset but in the event of emergencies or in periods of an upsurge in traffic), the principle of allocation shall apply.

ADVANTAGES OF PLAN

A. From the standpoint of the Government:

1. The plan as outlined will not cost the Government anything, as contrasted to the subsidies handed out to other segments of the transportation industry. In addition, it is probable that the one-fourth of 1 percent interest differential, plus the differential between the current estimated scrap value and the ultimate scrap value or proceeds realized from sale to the Government stockpiling agency, should be sufficient to pay the costs of administration, give the Government a return on its funds, and ultimately the return of its initial capital.

2. The Government will be assured that the railroad industry will be maintained in first-class condition, prepared for any emergency, and with adequate capacity.

3. The Government will have an opportunity to stockpile a substantial amount of equipment against a war emergency at a relatively low cost.

4. The Government will be assured of protection of the capacity of the railway equipment industry, so vital in the event of an emergency.

5. Maintenance of the physical condition of the railroads at a high level will serve as a stimulant to the peacetime economy and should bring in additional revenues in the form of income.

B. From the standpoint of the railroad industry:

1. It should be possible for the railroad industry to put its entire plant in first-class condition without damaging its credit. This is true not only with respect to rolling stock but road as well, since funds thus released from the equipment budget will be available for modernization of yards, signal control, and the roadway generally.

2. Such a program should make it possible for the industry to expand its capacity, thus insuring its participation in the expanding economy and stimulating the latter by providing a modern, efficient, low-cost transportation system to serve its needs properly, and also further aiding the economy through its increased purchases, and on a more regularized basis, from the whole railroad equipment industry.

3. With a modernized, efficient plant, the industry should operate more efficiently, thereby keeping costs of transportation at the lowest practicable level and at the same time earning profits.

4. As a result of the Government agency placing the orders for much of the equipment, a far greater degree of standardization of equipment should be possible, thus reducing the overall cost of equipment and thus holding down the cost of transportation.

5. Through the program outlined, the railway equipment industry should be able to put its production on much more of a mass-production basis, expand its capacity and strengthen its position.

6. If the Government finds itself in the position of leasing equipment to the railroads, then obviously, because of its financial stake in the railroad industry, it will naturally have an interest in the railroads' welfare.

7. This plan embraces the principle of the user paying full cost for Government services rendered. Therefore, if it goes through, it should strikingly point up by comparison the fact that certain other segments of the transportation industry are not paying their way.

8. By virtue of the fact that the proposed lease arrangement would be with a Government agency rather than a private corporation, all tax questions are automatically resolved. The lease arrangement would provide what is tantamount to realistic depreciation geared to the actual econmic life of the equipment. Of course, in this connection we would get the depreciation in the form of tax deductible rental.

9. An additional objection to the present pattern of leasing equipment from a private corporation is that it is costly by reason of the loss of the residual value. Under this plan the railroad at least gets credit for the estimated scrap value of the equipment.

C. From the standpoint of the public:

1. The public in general, both individually and through industries, will thus be assured of the finest in low-cost mass transportation at the lowest possible cost.

2. This is adopting 100 percent the Eisenhower administration policy that industry should pay as it goes for services rendered by the Government.

Overall, the simplicity of the plan itself has much to recommend it, together with one other important fact, namely, that it is possible to work it out on a completely voluntary basis. It is not necessary for all railroads in the industry to approve of the plan or to participate in it, but it would be available to all, and over a period of time it would appear almost a certainty that the industry as a whole would utilize it.

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1957

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide assistance to communities, industries, business enterprises, and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill, 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. 2907) to provide assistance to communities, industries, business enterprises, and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. KENNEDY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KENNEDY

The reciprocal trade agreements which this country has maintained with other nations have always had my fullest support. It is evident that if the United States is to carry out its role of world leadership, economically as well as politically, the lowering of tariff barriers must be systematically pursued.

At the same time, it is unfair to expect a certain few industries in this country to bear the brunt of our international trade policies. The sudden economic reversal which these industries suffer is the result of governmental action in lowering tariffs. It is therefore the responsibility of the Government to at least lighten the blow.

When imports reach the peril point and threaten domestic industry, great pressure is brought to bear upon the Federal Tariff Commission and upon the President to restore tariffs or impose quotas. It is my belief that the President should be provided with another alternative—namely, to assist the businesses, individuals, and communities affected to convert to new areas of production.

A bill which I am introducing today, to be known as the Trade Adjustment Act of 1957, would afford the Federal Government a means of helping businesses and individuals to help themselves. Briefly, it would extend for a limited period of time such help as the Federal Government is able to render to retrain individuals to new jobs, render technical and financial assistance for conversion of plants to other items of production, and assist communities in their efforts to attract new types of industry.

This proposed legislation would be triggered by the invoking of the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951. When the Tariff Commission recommended to the President that a particular industry was being seriously affected, the President could either restore tariffs, impose quotas, or do nothing. In the latter event, he would turn the case over to a Trade Adjustment Board which would invoke the provisions of this act to aid the injured parties.

The Board would determine whether the benefits applicable should be extended to the business, worker, or community organization applying.

What type of assistance could the Government extend? For a company, the Government could give technical assistance to determine what new lines of production would be profitable; rapid amortization benefits for building new plants; or loans through the Small Business Administration for capitalizing new equipment. For individual workers, there would be extension of unemployment compensation to supplement that provided by the State; eligibility for social security at age 60; and for workers young enough to be retrained to new jobs, assistance for a limited period of retraining. For community redevelopment corporations, there would be technical information and advice plus loans to implement their plans.

These measures were first recommended by the so-called Bell Commission, which was set up to study trade and tariff policy and made its report to the President in 1953. The Commission was organized under the able leadership of Daniel W. Bell, president of the American Security and Trust Co., of Washington, D. C. The Commission concluded that while there was no basis for compensating industries for lost trade in a free-enterprise system, there is good reason for helping industries faced with keener import competition to adjust their production to a more diversified line of products which they can produce without the need of tariffs. United Steelworkers President David J. McDonald, a leading member of the so-called Randall Commission which reported on foreign economic policy in 1954, endorsed this proposal. He pointed out that unemployment of any magnitude is of concern to the Government and that unemployment caused by Government action, as in the lowering of tariffs, should be of particular concern to the Government.

If all the industries affected by lowered tariffs were located in industrial centers where workers could find new jobs on their own, the problem would not be so severe. Unfortunately, many of these plants are located in small towns or one-industry communities where dislocated workers cannot find new work. Retraining to new skills will be of great help to the younger workers. For those 60 and over, new jobs are almost impossible to find as anyone who has faced the problems of the senior workers knows only too well. The Government, when it is responsible for their unemployment, has an obligation to see that they are adequately provided for. The provision to make them eligible for social security at 60 would accomplish this.

The effectiveness of community redevelopment corporations, when they can muster enough resources, has been demonstrated in my home State of Massachusetts (Lawrence, Mass.).

But these redevelopment corporations, particularly in today's tight-money market, are hard put to borrow the necessary funds without help from the Federal Government.

It must be emphasized that this bill creates no new bureaucracy. The services for the large part already exist in scattered agencies. Rather, this bill provides a coordinating board, made up of officials within these agencies, to direct toward tariff adjustment relief whatever capacities lie within the Federal Government. The services within the Labor Department, the Department of Commerce, and the Small Business Administration, for instance, would be coordinated and stepped up, utilizing existing personnel and technical facilities. The costs would thus be minimal; but the benefits to the economy in preventing unemployment and wastage of industrial equipment and manpower, would be considerable.

The intent of Congress, in writing reciprocal trade legislation, was clearly to prevent ruinous competition to any one industry from import trade. Inclusion of "peril point" and "escape clause provisions," authorizing increased tariffs or quotas when an industry is seriously threatened, makes that clear. But to date, out of 82 applications for relief by "injured" parties, the Tariff Commission recommended 25 for approval, but only 7 have been granted by the President—fur felt hats, hatter's fur, dried figs, alsike clover seed, watches, bicycles and toweling. I am not berating the reluctance to use the escape clause; the President should not, of course, use the "escape clause" too liberally if we are to be consistent in our stated objective of gradually reducing trade barriers throughout the world. I only point out that as far as providing relief for affected industries it has been of very little utility.

It is our hope in presenting this bill that the President will be given an instrument whereby our trade policies can be vigorously pursued, and at the same time whatever detrimental effects may result within our own boundaries can be spread over the whole economy. The whole economy benefits from freer trade. The whole economy, then, and not individual businesses and workers should help bear the burden of the transition of trade policies.

This measure would make the most of American industry's demonstrated flexibility. The rapid conversion and reconversion of plants in World War II showed the resiliency of our industry. But this was not accomplished without substantial Government assistance and governmental measures to make the transitions more smooth. It is particularly true of small industries that assistance is required during the conversion period.

In a free enterprise system, businesses and workers must be prepared to accept dislocations which result from changes in the market, new technology, or changing tastes. But when their dislocation is caused by governmental action, the Government cannot ignore its responsibility to help industries, workers and communities adjust to the new economic conditions.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A GREAT PLAINS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, a distinguished Colorado publisher and veteran newspaperman, who is also the State chairman of the Democratic Party of Colorado, Mr. Fred Betz, has been serving, at a great personal sacrifice, as my administrative assistant during the past 8 months. It is appropriate at this time that I commend Mr. Betz for the extraordinary, selfless, and invaluable service he has rendered me. I am grateful to him for many things, but especially am I grateful for the dogged attention he gave one of the most critical natural problems of our region—the recurrent drought cycle in the Great Plains. Largely through Mr. Betz' creative efforts and his diligent research, I am now about to introduce a bill to establish a Great Plains Administration. This bill is designed to furnish an instrumentality with which the people of the semiarid areas of the Great Plains may constantly study, assess, and review the programs now in operation, programs established to meet the recurrent drought cycle. This bill is concerned with drought control and flood control.

I especially call the attention of the Members of the Senate, and also the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives, to this important piece of proposed legislation, because it has a broad concept embracing hundreds of counties located in 10 States of the Great Plains region.

Over 20 years ago, a very great President, the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, began to take steps to treat seriously the problem of recurrent drought in the Great Plains area. On July 22, 1936, President Roosevelt appointed a Great Plains Drought Area Committee to

carry on a study looking toward the most efficient utilization of the natural resources of the Great Plains area. On February 10, 1937, he transmitted to the Congress the report of the committee, entitled "The Future of the Great Plains." President Roosevelt also recommended the establishment of a Great Plains territorial agency.

Early this year the present President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, made an airplane trip to that great Middle Western area of this Nation. He, too, recognized and acknowledged the importance of meeting the challenging problems which affect the Great Plains.

Mr. President, as a result of months of work, during which contacts have been made with numerous farmers, scientists, educators, and agricultural leaders in the Great Plains States, and after we had assembled the recommendations from noted farm authors and others who have lived with and studied the problems indigenous to the Great Plains region, we have drafted a comprehensive Great Plains bill.

I now introduce the Great Plains bill, and ask that this bill be referred to the Committee on Public Works. I also ask that a statement I have prepared describing the purpose of the bill, together with a section-by-section analysis of it, be printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will inform the Senator from Colorado that the reference to the bill is for the Chair to decide, after consultation with the Parliamentarian.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, before I made the request, I conferred with the Parliamentarian.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Very well; the bill will be received and referred to the Committee on Public Works; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2908) to establish a Great Plains Administration; to provide for the control of floods and the alleviation and control of drought conditions in the Great Plains region; to provide for the more effective conservation, development, and use of the resources of the Great Plains; to provide for the administration of Federal programs in such region so as to meet more effectively the distinctive needs and problems of the region; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Carroll, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.

SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1. This Act divided into sections according to the following table of contents may be cited as the "Great Plains Administration Act".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.
Sec. 2. Great Plains region (definition).
Sec. 3. Findings and declaration of policy.
Sec. 4. Great Plains Administration.
Sec. 5. Board of Directors.
Sec. 6. State and local participation.
Sec. 7. Development of plans and programs.
Sec. 8. Emergency plans for flood and drought relief.
Sec. 9. General powers.
Sec. 10. Protection of existing water rights.
Sec. 11. Payments in lieu of taxes.
Sec. 12. Government Corporation Control Act.
Sec. 13. Personnel provisions.
Sec. 14. Authorization for appropriations.
Sec. 15. Separability provisions.

GREAT PLAINS REGION (DEFINITION)

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act, the Great Plains region (hereinafter referred to as the "region") shall be deemed to consist of—

(a) that portion of the State of Colorado consisting of the counties of Las Animas, Baca, Bent, Prowers, Huerfano, Pueblo, Otero, Crowley, Kiowa, Cheyenne, Lincoln, El Paso, Elbert, Douglas, Jefferson, Adams, Morgan, Weld, Logan, Sedgwick, Phillips, Yuma, Washington, and Kit Carson.

(b) that portion of the State of Kansas consisting of the counties of Russell, Osborne, Smith, Phillips, Rooks, Ellis, Rush, Pawnee, Edwards, Kiowa, Comanche, Clark, Ford, Hodgeman, Ness, Trego, Graham, Norton, Decatur, Sheridan, Gove, Lane, Finney, Gray, Meade, Seward, Haskell, Scott, Logan, Jewel, Mitchell, Lincoln, Ellsworth, Rice, Stevens, Grant, Kearney, Wichita, Thomas, Rawlins, Cheyenne, Sherman, Wallace, Greeley, Hamilton, Stanton, Morton, Republic, Cloud, Ottawa, Saline, McPherson, Reno, Kingman, Barber, Pratt, Stafford, and Barton.

(c) that portion of the State of Montana consisting of the counties of Park, Garfield, Rosebud, Powder River, Custer, Carter, Fallon, Daniels, Sheridan, Glacier, Roosevelt, Pondera, McCone, Richland, Teton, Cascade, Dawson, Prairie, Wibaux, Meagher, Sweetgrass, Wheatland, Judith Basin, Toole, Liberty, Chateau, Fergus, Stillwater, Carbon, Golden Valley, Yellowstone, Big Horn, Treasure, Musselshell, Petroleum, Hill, Blaine, Phillips, and Valley.

(d) that portion of the State of Wyoming consisting of the counties of Sheridan, Johnson, Laramie, Platte, Goshen, Niobrara, Converse, Natrona, Weston, Crook, and Campbell.

(e) that portion of the State of Oklahoma consisting of the counties of Beckham, Roger-Mills, Dewey, Custer, Cimarron, Texas, Beaver, Harper, Woods, Alfalfa, Major, Woodward, Ellis, Washita, Kiowa, Tillman, Jackson, Greer, and Harmon.

(f) that portion of the State of Nebraska consisting of the counties of Knox, Pierce, Madison, Platte, Nance, Merrick, Hamilton, Clay, Nuckolls, Thayer, Webster, Adams, Hall, Howard, Greeley, Wheeler, Holt, Boyd, Keya Paha, Garfield, Valley, Sherman, Buffalo, Kearney, Franklin, Harlan, Phelps, Dawson, Loup, Rock, Brown, Blaine, Gosper, Furnas, Cherry, Thomas, Logan, Lincoln, Frontier, Red Willow, Hayes, Hitchcock, Hooker, McPherson, Grant, Arthur, Keith, Perkins, Chase, Dundy, Sheridan, Garden, Deuel, Cheyenne, Morrill, Box Butte, Boone, Custer, Dawes, Sioux, Scotts Bluff, Banner, and Kimball.

(g) that portion of the State of South Dakota consisting of the counties of Marshall, Day, Clark, Beadle, Sanborn, Davison, Douglas, Charles Mix, Jerauld, Aurora, Brule, Gregory, Brown, Spink, McPherson, Edmunds, Faulk, Hand, Buffalo, Tripp, Lyman, Hughes, Sully, Potter, Walworth, Campbell, Hyde, Carson, Dewey, Armstrong, Stanley, Jones, Melette, Todd, Bennett, Washabaugh, Jackson, Haakon, Ziebach, Perkins, Meade, Pennington, Custer, Shannon, Washington, Fall River, Lawrence, Butte, and Harding.

(h) that portion of the State of North Dakota consisting of the counties of Sargent, Ransom, Barnes, Griggs, Steele, Nelson, Grand Forks, Walsh, Pembina, LaMoure, Dickey, Logan, McIntosh, Emmons, Sioux, Morton, Grant, Stark, Hettinger, Adams, Slope, Bowman, Golden Valley, Billings, Dunn, Mercer, Oliver, Williams, McKenzie, Bottineau, Renville, Eddy, Williams, Divide, Burke, Mountrail, McLean, Burleigh, Kidder, Stutsman, Foster, Wells, Sheridan, Ward, McHenry, Pierce, Benson, Ramsey, Cavalier, Towner, and Rolette;

(i) that portion of the State of New Mexico consisting of the counties of Colfax, Mora, San Miguel, Torrance, Guadalupe, Lincoln, De Baca, Chaves, Eddy, Lea, Roosevelt, Curry, Quay, Harding, and Union; and

(k) that portion of the State of Texas consisting of the counties of Dallam, Hartley, Oldham, Deaf Smith, Parmer, Castro, Bailey, Lamb, Cochran, Hockley, Yoakum, Terry, Gaines, Dawson, Andrews, Martin, Sherman, Moore, Potter, Randall, Swisher, Glasscock, Midland, Ector, Crane, Loving, Winkler, Ward, Mitchell, Nolan, Jones, Fisher, Scurry, Throckmorton, Haskell, Hale, Lubbock, Lynn, Bordon, Howard, Stonewall, Kent, Garza, Baylor, Knox, King, Dickens, Crosby, Wichita, Wibarger, Hardeman, Foard, Cottle, Motley, Floyd, Childress, Hall, Briscoe, Collingsworth, Donley, Armstrong, Wheeler, Gray, Carson, Hutchinson, Roberts, Hemphill, Lipscombe, Ochiltree, and Hansford.

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 3. (a) The Congress hereby finds—

(1) the Great Plains region has distinctive characteristics in respect of climate, topography, and resource use which are substantially different from those prevailing in adjacent regions, and which are particularly marked by alternating extremes of floods and drought;

(2) these characteristics are of fundamental importance in shaping living and employment conditions within the region and in fixing the pattern of its economy and its culture;

(3) these special characteristics require special plans and programs to meet the distinctive needs and problems of the region;

(4) these plans and programs must be developed and carried out on a comprehensive basis to meet the needs of the region and its people as a whole;

(5) heretofore there have been no adequate means for developing and administering the special plans and programs which are required to meet the distinctive needs of the region; and the lack of such plans and programs has resulted in a failure to use the resources of the region most advantageously, and particularly has contributed to the excessive damage from recurring flood and drought conditions within the region;

(6) excessive damage which has resulted from recurring disasters from both floods and drought in the past has cost the region and the Nation far more than would adequate and comprehensive measures to prevent and control such damage.

(7) the development and carrying out of comprehensive plans and programs designed especially to enable the region to meet the special needs and problems arising from its distinctive characteristics in respect of climate, topography, resources, and economic and living conditions will increase the prosperity of the region, will promote the general welfare of its inhabitants, will conserve its resources, will foster trade and commerce among the States within the region and between these States and other States as well as foreign countries, will increase the revenues of and strengthen State and local governments within the region, and will contribute to the economic strength, well-being, and defense of the Nation.

(8) the first and most urgent phase of plans and programs for the region should be directed especially toward the alleviation of and relief from conditions resulting from the devastating floods and the extreme

drought, both of which have recently occurred or now prevail within the region.

(b) It is the purpose and policy of this Act to provide means for the development and carrying out of comprehensive plans and programs designed especially to meet the distinctive needs and problems of the Great Plains region; to provide for the administration of Federal programs in such region so as to meet more effectively its distinctive needs and problems; to provide for the more effective conservation, development, and use of the resources of the region; to assist in improving economic conditions within the region and in promoting the general welfare of its inhabitants; and especially to provide for the alleviation and control of flood and drought conditions in the region. It is the policy of this Act to attain these objectives (1) in a manner which will encourage people within the region to engage in agriculture and other pursuits in a manner properly adapted to the distinctive conditions of the region, and (2) in a manner which will foster suitable development and support for urban communities and trading centers within the region and adequate to meet its needs. It is the policy of this Act that its objectives shall be carried out with the fullest possible participation by the people of the region and by their State and local governments.

(c) The Congress finds that the purposes and policies of this Act can best be accomplished by establishing a regional agency of the Federal Government, to be located in the region, which will devote its full time and attention to plans and programs for meeting the distinctive needs and problems of the Great Plains.

GREAT PLAINS ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 4. (a) To assist in carrying out the purposes of this Act, there is hereby created a body corporate which shall be known as the "Great Plains Administration" (referred to in this Act as the "Administration") and which shall be an instrumentality of the United States.

(b) The Administration shall maintain its principal office at a convenient place in the region.

(c) The Administration shall be held to be an inhabitant and resident, within the meaning of the laws of the United States relating to the venue of civil suits, of any judicial district, in whole or in part, within the region in which the Administration carries on activities at the time of the commencement of suit: *Provided,* That the Administration may be sued in the district court of the United States for any such district without regard to the amount in controversy. Any proceeding brought against the Administration in a court of any State may be removed by the Administration to the district court of the United States for the district in which such proceeding is pending, and, to effect such removal, it shall not be necessary that any other party or parties defendant join in the petition for removal.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

SEC. 5. (a) The management of the Administration shall be vested in a board of five full-time Directors, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Chairman of the Board shall be designated by the President. Each of the Directors shall be a bona fide resident of the region at the time of appointment, and each Director shall maintain his residence in the region. No two Directors shall be appointed from the same State to serve on the Board at the same time. Not more than three Directors shall be members of the same political party. The Board shall be responsible for policy, directive, and general supervisory functions. The Board shall appoint a chief executive officer who shall be responsible to the Board and shall perform such functions as the Board may determine.

(b) The terms of office of the Directors first taking office after the enactment of this Act shall expire as designated by the President at the time of nomination, two at the end of the second year, two at the end of the fourth year, and one at the end of the sixth year after the date of enactment of this Act. A successor to a Director shall be appointed in the same manner as the original Directors and shall have a term expiring six years after the expiration date of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, except that a Director appointed to fill a vacancy in the Board occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

(c) Vacancies in the Board, so long as there be two Directors in office, shall not impair the powers of the Board to act, and two Directors shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of the Board.

(d) Each Director shall be a citizen of the United States and shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,000 a year. When required by their official duties to be away from their official headquarters, Directors may be paid their actual traveling expenses and a per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence.

(e) All members of the Board shall be persons who profess a belief in the feasibility and wisdom of this Act. No Director shall, during his continuance in office, be engaged in any other business.

(f) In December of each year, the Board shall submit to the Congress a report covering the activities of the Administration during the preceding fiscal year.

STATE AND LOCAL PARTICIPATION

SEC. 6. (a) The Administration shall seek the advice, assistance, and participation of the people of the region and their State and local governments and organizations, public and private, to the fullest practicable extent, in the formulation and execution of programs designed to carry out the purposes of this Act. To this end, the Administration shall make arrangements for consultation and interchange of views with appropriate representatives of State and local governments, of the educational, agricultural, labor, and business interests, and of the general public of the region. The Administration shall make arrangements for such consultation and interchange of views with respect to all phases of its activities and at all appropriate places throughout the region, and shall establish such advisory boards and councils as may be necessary or appropriate to achieve the objectives of this section. Any advisory board or council may submit for inclusion in the annual report of the Board its comments in summary form on those policies of the Administration with which it is concerned, and such comments or a summary thereof shall be included in the annual report. For the periods during which they consult with the Administration away from their regular places of work, such representatives and members of such boards and councils may, in the discretion of the Administration, receive their actual traveling expenses and a per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence.

(b) The Administration shall furnish to interested individuals, groups, organizations, and enterprises within the region any technical information, research, or other forms of assistance, information, or advice which are obtainable from the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government and which would be useful in carrying out the purposes and policies of this Act.

(c) The Administration is authorized to provide technical assistance to State and local governments, and other groups and organizations, within the region to assist in accomplishing the purposes and policies of this Act. Such assistance shall include studies evaluating the needs of, and developing potentialities for, the economic and cultural growth of the localities within the region. Such assistance may be provided by the Administration through members of its staff or through the employment of private individuals, partnerships, firms, corporations, or suitable institutions, under contracts entered into for such purpose.

DEVELOPMENT OF PLANS AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 7. (a) Working in cooperation with local, State, and regional groups, both public and private, the Administration shall develop plans and programs for carrying out the purposes and policies of this Act. Such plans and programs shall be made available to State and local governments and to private persons and groups insofar as they relate to functions which might be performed by them, respectively, to assist in carrying out such policies and purposes, and shall be submitted to the President and the Congress, and made available to the appropriate departments and agencies of the Federal Government, insofar as they relate to the nature, extent, and timing of Federal programs, projects, and activities in the region.

(b) Such plans and programs shall, among other things, provide for—

(1) the control of floods and the conservation and use of the waters of the region;

(2) fostering the use of the lands of the region for the purposes for which they may be best suited, and the most efficient conservation and management to assure the protection of watersheds and the permanent and increasing usefulness of cultivated lands, grazing lands, and forests;

(3) fostering the protection, development, and improvement of cultivated, grazing, and forest lands by flood control, irrigation, drainage, clearing, reforestation, reseeding, or otherwise;

(4) preventing of irreparable waste of natural resources from droughts, winds, floods, duststorms, and soil erosion;

(5) fostering a permanently prosperous and well balanced agriculture within the region;

(6) the conservation, management, and rehabilitation of birds, fish, and other wildlife through the development, protection, and management of such wildlife and their habitat, and the control of losses from disease or other causes;

(7) with special regard for depletable resources and for the great fluctuations that are characteristic of the region, fostering the use of the mineral, forest land, water, fish, and other resources of the region, and fostering other projects and activities and the development of industries, to assure a balanced and stable economic development, and to preserve and enhance social and cultural values;

(8) fostering the study of the region's problems by its citizens and the dissemination of the results of such study;

(9) the establishment and maintenance of recreational areas and facilities, including wilderness areas, and the protection of scenic and scientific values.

(c) Such plans and programs shall, among other things, set forth—

(1) the nature, extent, general location, sequence, and timing of major projects and activities recommended;

(2) the method by which such major projects and activities are proposed to be undertaken, including the arrangements recommended or agreed to for joint and cooperative action by the Administration, other Federal agencies, and State, local, and other agencies;

(3) with respect to each major proposed Federal project or activity, information as to the economic aspects and effects of such project or activity, including, where appropriate, estimates of costs and benefits, of the allocation of costs to the various purposes to be served, and of amounts to be repaid by the beneficiaries.

(d) The Administration shall, in cooperation with other Federal agencies concerned, prepare and submit annually to the President in connection with its budget program, and to the Congress in its annual report, a statement and explanation of the anticipated program, for the next succeeding fiscal year and such ensuing periods as the Administration may determine, for the initiation and prosecution by the Administration and other Federal agencies of all major Federal projects and activities having to do with the conservation, development, and use of the natural resources of the region, or otherwise affecting the purposes of this Act.

EMERGENCY PLANS FOR FLOOD AND DROUGHT RELIEF

SEC. 8. The Administration shall give first priority to the development of plans and programs for relief from, and alleviation of, flood damage and drought conditions recently sustained or now prevailing in the region and for the prevention and control of damage from floods and drought in the future. It shall submit plans to the Congress for emergency flood and drought relief at the earliest possible date and shall submit to the Congress further plans and programs under this section from time to time as soon as practicable.

GENERAL POWERS

SEC. 9. (a) The Administration shall have succession in its corporate name; may adopt and use a corporate seal which shall be judicially noticed; may adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws; may sue and be sued in its corporate name without regard to the provisions of title 28, United States Code, section 507; and may settle and adjust claims held by it against other parties or persons and by other parties or persons against it, for which purpose the Administration shall have, with respect to claims within the scope of title 28, United States Code, chapter 171 (tort claims procedure), the functions assigned to the Attorney General by that chapter.

(b) Subject to the policies, conditions, and limitations stated in this Act, and within the limits of funds appropriated therefor, the Administration is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain projects (including standby facilities), and to carry out activities (1) for the control and prevention of floods; (2) for the conservation and reclamation of lands and land resources; (3) for the development and conservation of forest, mineral, and fish and wildlife resources; (4) for the generation, transmission, and disposition of electric energy; (5) for the promotion of navigation; (6) for otherwise carrying out the purposes and policies of this Act; and (7) for the execution of such other responsibilities as are vested in the Administration by or pursuant to this Act; and, in connection with any of the foregoing, for the development and conservation of recreational resources and for the promotion of sanitation and pollution control.

(c) To the extent found necessary or appropriate in carrying out the foregoing subsection, or other provisions of law, but subject to the conditions and limitations herein stated, the Administration is authorized and shall have the power—

(1) to acquire real and personal property, including any interest therein, by purchase, lease, condemnation, exchange, transfer, donation, or otherwise, and to sell, lease, exchange, or otherwise dispose thereof, including donations incident to experimentation, demonstrations, or other similar uses (without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended); and to obtain services by contract, donation, or otherwise;

(2) to make payments with respect to the conservation or use of land or other resources;

(3) to provide such crop insurance and to make loans for such agricultural, industrial, and commercial purposes, and upon such terms and conditions, as the Administration may determine to be appropriate for carrying out the purposes and policies of this Act;

(4) to hold such hearings and take such testimony as it may deem advisable;

(5) to conduct economic, scientific, and technologic investigations and studies, to establish, maintain, and operate research facilities, and to undertake experiments and practical demonstrations;

(6) to make grants to colleges, universities, or other organizations or persons for conducting research;

(7) to disseminate information to help achieve the purposes and policies of this Act;

(8) subject to provisions of law specifically applicable to Government corporations, to determine the necessity for and the character and amount of its expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid; and

(9) to enter into such contracts and agreements, and to take such actions, as may facilitate the exercise of the powers now or hereafter conferred upon it by law.

(d) The Administration may construct or operate any of its projects or conduct any of its activities through or in cooperation with other departments and agencies of the United States; and it may do so through or in cooperation with States, counties, municipalities, cooperatives, individuals, educational and scientific institutions or other bodies or agencies, public or private. The Administration is authorized to use its funds in carrying out such joint and cooperative arrangements. Departments and agencies of the United States are hereby authorized to participate in the construction or operation of such projects or the conduct of such activities on terms mutually agreeable to the department or agency involved and the Administration.

(e) The Administration shall carry out its construction work by contract so far as practicable: *Provided,* That nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the Administration from undertaking construction work directly in case of emergency or unusual circumstances, in cases where no reasonable bids are received from contractors, or where necessary to provide steady employment for maintenance crews.

(f) Title to all property, with the exception of that owned by the United States and entrusted to the Administration as agent of the United States, shall be taken in the name of the Administration: *Provided,* That the title to real property acquired in the name of the Administration shall be subject to approval by the Attorney General, but the Administration may prior to approval of title by the Attorney General use such property for any purpose or in any manner permitted by the provisions of this Act. Conveyances of real and personal property, or interests therein, shall be in the name of the Administration or the United States of America, depending on the holder of the title, and may be by warranty deed, bill of sale with warranty of title, or otherwise, which may be executed by such person or persons as the Board may designate.

(g) All condemnation proceedings on behalf of the Administration shall be had in the name of the Administration. In such proceedings, and with respect to any property which the Administration is authorized to condemn pursuant to this section, the Administration shall have the rights conferred upon the United States by the Act of August 1, 1888 (25 Stat. 357), as amended, and by the Act of February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421), the provisions of both of which are hereby declared to be applicable to proceedings brought by the Administration to the same extent as though it were expressly mentioned therein, except insofar as they are inconsistent with this subsection: *Provided,* That the Administration shall be represented by the Attorney General, or an attorney or attorneys acting under his authority (which attorneys may be employees of the Administration), in all court proceedings brought for the purpose of property condemnation.

PROTECTION OF EXISTING WATER RIGHTS

SEC. 10. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as affecting or intended to affect or in any way to interfere with any vested right acquired under the laws of any State or Territory relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used in irrigation or for other purposes; and nothing herein shall in any way affect any right of any State or of the Federal Government or of any landowner, appropriator, or user of water in, to, or from any interstate stream, or the waters thereof: *Provided,* That nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the authority of the Administration to acquire real or personal property, or any interest therein.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

SEC. 11. (a) It is the policy of this Act that the finances of the State governments and subdivisions thereof shall not be impaired through the removal of taxable property from their tax rolls or through the creation of special requirements for State and local government services. In administering this section the Administration shall be guided by the general objective of avoiding, insofar as feasible, inequities between State and local taxpayers on the one hand, and Federal taxpayers on the other, in the distribution of governmental costs and burdens.

(b) The Administration, upon application made on behalf of any State or subdivision thereof, shall make payments in lieu of State and local property taxes ad valorem with respect to its real property and its tangible personal property with fixed situs: *Provided, however,* That such payments shall not be made with respect to property, or any improvements thereon, which has never been subject to such taxes, unless the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof has been required, prior to the acquisition of such property by the Administration, under any statute, or agreement authorized by any statute, to make payments in lieu of taxes thereon or to pay any portion of the revenue derived therefrom or from its use or products, in which case payments as required by this section shall be made on such property, but not on any improvements thereon made subsequent to acquisition by the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof. In determining the amount of any payment to a State or subdivision thereof, the Administration shall be guided by (1) the average amount of such taxes, if any, levied upon the property in the last two years during which the property was privately owned; (2) the current level of property tax rates and assessed valuations; (3) the average amount of the last two annual payments, if any, under the provisions of any statute, or agreement authorized by any statute, previously applicable, which required the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof to make any payments in lieu of taxes thereon or to pay any portion of the revenue derived therefrom or from its use or products; (4) the amount of increases in taxable values and other benefits arising from the activities of the Administration; (5) the special requirements for State and local government services arising from the activities of the Administration; (6) the provision by the Administration, as an incident to its activities, of any services usually provided by State or local governments; and (7) any other relevant facts.

The payments provided for in this section shall be paid to the respective officers or agencies of the taxing authorities to which taxes would be paid had the property

remained in private ownership, or to which payments would be made pursuant to law except for enactment of this Act, for distribution in the same manner and in the same proportions as the taxes or other payments in lieu of which the payments herein required are made or in such other manner or proportion as may be determined pursuant to State law.

(c) The Administration may make payments to State or local governments to help defray the expense of any special requirements for State and local government services arising from the activities of the Administration. In determining the necessity for and amount of any such payment, the Administration shall take into account (1) the amount of additional expense incurred by the State or local government in meeting these special requirements, (2) any payments in lieu of taxes made pursuant to paragraph (b) hereof, (3) the provision by the Administration, as an incident to its activities, of any services usually provided by State or local governments, and (4) any other relevant facts.

(d) The provisions of any other statute requiring the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof to make any payments in lieu of taxes on property or improvements thereon, or to pay any portion of the revenue derived from such property, or its use or products, shall be inapplicable to any property or activities of the Administration after the date of acquisition of such property by the Administration.

(e) For the purposes of this section, property owned or acquired by the United States and used or held by the Administration shall be deemed to have been acquired by the Administration.

(f) The payments authorized under this section are in lieu of taxation and the Administration, its property, franchises, and income are hereby expressly exempted from taxation in any manner or form by any State, county, municipality, or any subdivision or district thereof. The determination by the Administration of the necessity of making any payments under this section and of the amounts thereof shall be final.

(g) The Administration shall, not later than five years after the enactment of this Act, submit to the Congress a report on the operation of the provisions of this section, including (1) a statement of the amount and distribution of payments made hereunder; (2) an appraisal of the effect of the operation of the provisions of this section on State and local finances, the benefits of the program of the Administration to the States receiving payments hereunder, and the effect of such benefits in increasing taxable values within such States; and (3) such other data, information, and recommendations as may be pertinent to future legislation.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATION CONTROL ACT

SEC. 12. Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act is amended by inserting "Great Plains Administration;" after "Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation;".

PERSONNEL PROVISIONS

SEC. 13. (a) The Administration shall, without regard to any other laws, rules, or regulations relating to the employment or payment of employees of the United States, except the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to the extent that it otherwise is applicable, employ and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, agents, and consultants as are necessary for the transaction of its business, define their duties, require bonds of such of them as the Board may designate, the premiums for which shall be paid by the Administration, and provide a system of organization to fix responsibility and promote efficiency. It shall be the general policy of the Administration to employ residents of the region rather than nonresidents to the extent that such policy does not impede the most effective administration of this Act. Any employee of the Administration may be removed in the discretion of the Board. No regular officer or employee of the Administration shall receive a salary in excess of that received by the Directors. Subject to the provisions of this Act, the Administration is authorized to deal collectively with its employees through representatives of their own choosing and is authorized to enter into written or oral contracts with such employee representatives.

(b) Employees of the Administration shall have rights with respect to security of tenure comparable to those provided by the civil-service laws, and shall be protected to substantially the same extent as persons subject to such laws. Employees acquired by transfer from other establishments or agencies of the United States shall retain all pay, leave, and retirement credits which they held at the time of such transfer and, in case they subsequently are retransferred to positions under the civil-service laws, shall be credited for the purpose of seniority with the time spent as an employee of the Administration.

(c) In the employment, selection, classification, and promotion of officers and employees of the Administration, no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, but all such employments and promotions shall be given and made on the basis of merit and efficiency. It shall be unlawful for the Board to make or assist in the making of or cause to be made any employment, selection, classification, or promotion of any officer or employee of the Administration on the basis of or because of any political qualification or test, and if any Director violates this provision he shall be guilty of an offense against the United States, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both. Any officer or employee of the Administration who is found to be guilty of a violation of this subsection shall be removed by the Board.

(d) The benefits of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall extend to persons given employment under the provisions of this Act; and the right to benefits under such Act of September 7, 1916, as amended, shall be exclusive and in place of any and all other liability of the Administration and the United States to pay damages or workmen's compensation to such persons, or to the dependents, next of kin, or legal representative of such persons, or to any person otherwise entitled to recover damages, on account of injury or death within the purview of such Act.

The provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended, shall apply to all contracts in excess of $2,000 to which the Administration is a party and which require the employment of laborers or mechanics in the construction, alteration, maintenance, or repair of its buildings, dams, locks, or other structures or facilities, except that the powers of the Comptroller General of the United States thereunder with respect to payment of amounts withheld from contractors shall be exercised by the Administration with respect to funds within its control. In the determination of such prevailing rate or rates, due regard shall be given to those rates which have been secured through collective agreement by representatives of employers and employees.

(f) The Administration is authorized to request the assistance and advice of any officer, agent, or employee of any executive department, independent office, or agency of the United States to enable the Administration the better to carry out its powers successfully. The executive departments and independent offices and agencies of the United States are authorized to make such officers, agents, and employees available to the Administration with or without reimbursement upon terms mutually agreeable to such department, independent office, or agency and the Administration.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 14. To carry out the purposes of the Act there are hereby authorized to be appropriated a sum not to exceed $7,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and such additional sums as may be necessary for subsequent fiscal years.

SEPARABILITY PROVISIONS

SEC. 15. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

The statement presented by Mr. CARROLL is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CARROLL—SUMMARY OF GREAT PLAINS ADMINISTRATION BILL

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide regional plans and policies and a regional agency of the Federal Government to deal with the distinctive problems of the Great Plains.

The people of the Great Plains have been caught in the grip of devastating floods and drought from time to time. Floods and drought are the result of the forces of nature, but much of the damage is the result of the shortsightedness of man. We may not be able to prevent floods and drought, but we can do a much better job of preparing for them. Indeed we can and we must do a much better job of utilizing the resources of the Plains in normal times as well as times of extreme weather conditions.

The fact is that the Plains area is different from other parts of the country and requires different treatment. There is rarely enough water, although the shortage is worse at some times than at others. Then at other times the region is swept by terrible floods. Life in the Plains and the use of their resources have to be adapted to control floods and to make the most of the rainfall in the years when it comes and to hold down the damage in years of drought. It is possible to do this, but it will require foresight and intelligent planning for the future. That is what this bill is designed to provide.

In the past, the Great Plains region has never had the kind of planning that is necessary to meet the special problems arising from its varying and normally semi-arid climate. Instead, the region has been dominated by policies and customs framed to meet the needs of more humid areas, which are quite different. The result has been a tragic waste of both human and natural resources. Disaster has struck the Plains time and again, and the people have been prepared neither to prevent it nor to weather it. The havoc of the recent drought and floods is only the latest example.

It is only common sense to develop plans which will prevent such excessive waste in the future. These plans must be properly adapted to the region's semi-arid and unpredictable climate, because it is this distinctive climate which largely determines the living conditions and the economic status of the people who live in the Great Plains region.

The reasons for failure to develop programs adapted to the special needs of the Plains are many. Basically, the difficulty stems from the fact that no one has felt the primary responsibility for developing such programs. In a sense, the Plains areas have been in the position of stepchildren. The reasons for this are in large part geographical.

The Great Plains region consists of a part of 10 different States (North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, and Montana). In each case, it is a sparsely inhabited part of the State, containing a minority of the population. The area does not contain a single State capital, a single State university, and only one State agricultural college. It contains no large cities and few medium sized ones. It simply has not been the prime interest and the first concern of the instruments of either State or Federal governments. When this fact is coupled with the additional fact that the needs of the region are quite distinctive and different from those of other areas, it can be seen why the special programs required for the best use of the plain's resources have not been developed.

It is true that the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior have taken some steps to adapt their programs to the conditions of the Great Plains. And the Great Plains Council has provided a measure of coordination among the agencies concerned with the problems of the Plains. However, this machinery has not proved adequate to provide the really concentrated and comprehensive attack on the special problems of the Plains which the circumstances require.

While the special needs and problems of the Plains portion of each State are quite different from those of the other portion of the same State, they are very similar to those of the Plains portions of the other States. This very strongly indicates that the sensible approach to these special needs and problems is a regional one covering as a whole those portions of the 10 States which comprise the Great Plains. This would in no way interfere with the jurisdiction of the States over the areas in question, but rather it would aid them in finding common solutions to common problems.

It should be noted that this bill will not interfere with the comprehensive development of the Missouri River Basin or the other river basins which contains parts of the Plains. What it will do, within the framework of the comprehensive river basin development, is to provide for the more effective treatn.ent of the distinctive problems of the semiarid areas comprising the Plains.

The basic approach of the bill is to provide for the preparation and execution of long range plans and programs to develop the region and its resources. The primary responsibility for the Federal aspects of this task would be vested in a five-man Great Plains Administration ("Administration") created by the bill. This Administration would work closely wth the Senate and local governments and with private groups within the region. It would also cooperate with other Federal agencies administering programs within the region, and help to coordinate their programs so that they will be adapted to the region's special requirements. Insofar as practicable, the objective would be to have the necessary Federal programs carried out through other agencies; but the Administration would be authorized to administer programs itself when necessary to accomplish the bill's objectives.

The bill also recognizes that the most pressing problems of the Great Plains arise from the terrible drought and floods which afflict it. Accordingly, the bill provides that first priority shall be given to programs of flood and drought relief and the prevention of damage from floods and drought.

DIGEST BY SECTIONS

Section 1 contains a short title and table of contents.

Section 2 defines the geograhpical boundaries of the Great Plains region.

Section 3 contains Congressional findings that the Great Plains have distinctive characteristics in respect of climate, topography, and resource use which require special plans and programs. This section also declares the policy of Congress to provide these special plans and programs on a comprehensive regional basis.

Section 4 creates the Great Plains Administration and provides that it shall be located within the region.

Section 5 provides that the Administration shall have a bipartisan Board of five Directors, with staggered 6-year terms, all of whom must be residents of the Great Plains.

Section 6 provides for full cooperation with State and local governments, and private groups, in the administration of the bill. It also provides for furnishing them with information and technical assistance to help accomplish the purposes and policies of the bill.

Section 7 provides that the Administration shall develop plans and programs for meeting the special problems of the Plains. These plans and programs will be made available to State and local governments and private persons where appropriate, and will be submitted to the President and the Congress as a basis for guiding Federal activities within the region.

Section 8 provides that the administration shall give first priority to plans and programs for flood and drought relief and protection against future damage from floods and drought.

Section 9 contains the general powers of the Administration. These include the normal powers of Government corporations and, within the limits of future Congressional appropriations, include authority to engage in projects and activities for resource development, to acquire and dispose of property, to make conservation payments, to make loans for agricultural, industrial, and commercial purposes, to hold hearings and conduct research, to make research grants, and to disseminate information. This section also authorizes the Administration to conduct its activities through or in cooperation with other Federal agencies, State and local agencies, and private groups.

Section 10 provides for full protection of existing water rights.

Section 11 provides for payments to State and local governments in lieu of taxes with respect to property held by the Administration.

Section 12 provides that the Administration shall be subject to the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act.

Section 13 contains personnel provisions which authorize the Administration to set up a personnel system for its employees on a merit basis comparable to the regular Federal civil service.

Section 14 authorizes the appropriation of $7,500,000 to carry out the purposes of the bill during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out such purposes thereafter.

Section 15 contains the regular separability provision.

Mr. CARROLL. The reason I have requested that the bill be referred to the Committee on Public Works is that it is so comprehensive it involves flood-control programs, drought-control programs, soil-conservation programs, credit programs; it involves the whole field of agriculture and public works.

As I have stated, the purpose of the bill is to provide studies and analysis and coordination of regional plans and policies in the Great Plains area. It establishes a regional agency of the Federal Government to deal with the distinctive cyclical drought problems of the Great Plains. The history of the people of the Great Plains is a repetition of devastating floods and burning droughts. Flood and drought are the works of nature, but much of the damage is the result of the shortsightedness of man. We may not be able to prevent floods and droughts, but we can do a much better job of preparing for them.

Indeed, we can and must do a much better job of utilizing the resources of the Plains in normal times, in order that we properly prepare for the periods of extreme weather conditions.

The Great Plains region consists of parts or all of 10 different States: Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Wyoming, Oklahoma, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, New Mexico, and Texas.

I have set forth in my statement a digest of the sections of the comprehensive bill, and I direct attention to section 9, which contains the general powers of administration. What the bill proposes is the appointment of a Great Plains Administration with a bipartisan board of five directors who will come from the area and who will be selected by the President of the United States. It is important to note that this Great Plains Administration will be located in the Great Plains region, will be directed by Great Plains residents and will devote itself solely to the problems growing out of the recurrent Great Plains drought.

Under section 14, the bill asks for a very small appropriation of $7½ million for the establishment and operation of the Great Plains Administration.

Mr. President, I make one more unanimous-consent request. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD the text of the bill, as well as the statement outlining its purposes, so all Senators, Representatives, staffs of universities, and people of the entire area may have access to it. At the beginning of the next session of Congress, I hope we shall be able to hold extensive hearings and bring before the committees of Congress distinguished authorities of the Great Plains area, including farmers, farm experts, educators, scientists from the universities, as well as authors and public leaders who have made extensive studies of this subject over many years.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 9 OF THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY ACT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I feel compelled to introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which, in effect, removes the $3 million authorization for the Air Force Academy Chapel previously authorized by the Senate and agreed to in conference in the consideration of H. R. 8240.

Earlier this year, the Air Force requested an additional $21,341,000 for further development of the Air Force Academy. This amount, had it been authorized, would have given the Air Force better than $147 million for its Academy. The Armed Services Committee reduced this $21 million to a sum slightly less than $10 million, but included in the amount authorized and appropriated was $3 million to construct the chapel, an edifice which, in my mind, should be more appropriately called a cathedral.

Subsequent to this action, I had occasion to see a model of the planned

chapel. As I said here on the floor yesterday, I was shocked. There can be no doubt that the Air Force must have a facility for religious services at the Academy and it must have a good one, but I cannot acquiesce to the construction of one predicated on the design contemplated.

Mr. President, this bill reduces the authorization previously recommended by the Armed Services Committee and granted by the Senate and House conferees by $3 million—the amount the Air Force says it needs to construct a chapel. It is not the intent to forever deny the Air Force authorization or funds for such a facility, but rather cause that Department to withhold action until a new design predicated on good taste can again be presented to Congress.

Religious worship is an absolute necessity in our way of life and especially at military installations, and I believe it is also true that belief and faith come first. The place of worship comes second. We shall expect the Department of the Air Force to provide the opportunity for religious worship in the various faiths and to eventually construct an edifice which will do honor to these faiths.

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

The bill (S. 2909) to amend section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act, introduced by Mr. STENNIS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PREPARATION OF COMPILATION OF EDUCATIONAL MATERIAL CONCERNING COMMUNISM

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the preparation of a compilation of educational material concerning communism, as contrasted with Americanism and for other purposes.

Our Congressional committees have produced, as is well known, a considerable body of literature in various forms dealing not only with the Communist conspiracy but also with the ideology, the objectives, and the strategy and tactics of this oldest modern form of totalitarianism.

The very profusion and total volume of Congressional productions has made it difficult for them to register in the vicinity even of a single target. The situation so far as the public mind is concerned is that the impression created is one of shots being scattered more or less at random in various directions. A carefully selected and well-edited and annotated collection of the Congressional documents bearing on the subject of communism would strengthen the hands of the Congress and enable the vast amount of time, energy, and money that various committees have expended to achieve a maximum impact in informing and educating the American people.

In addition to the need of an annotated collection from the standpoint of the general public, there is particular need of such a volume or volumes in relation to the schools of America and the growing conviction that the facts about communism and totalitarianism must be communicated to our youth as a part of the regular school curriculum. In this connection it is notable that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has already taken steps to institute such instruction throughout the school system and that the Senators from Pennsylvania have requested the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to prepare an annotated bibliography for the use of pupils and teachers in Pennsylvania.

Other States have a similar program under consideration and there is a committee of prominent educators and other representative Americans called the Committee on American Education and Communism which has undertaken to foster a program of this kind throughout our country. Prof. William Yandell Elliott, of Harvard, is the chairman of this committee and Dr. Charles Wesley Lowry, chairman and executive director of the Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order, is its secretary. A conference was held last July at the Harvard University Summer School on Teaching the Nature of Communism in the American School Curriculum. A number of superintendents of schools from various parts of the United States and several State commissioners of education were present at this conference. The headline speaker at the conference was the Honorable James B. Conant, ex-president of Harvard and former Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany.

PRECEDENTS

Two precedents which it may be useful to have in mind in connection with the project of an annotated collection of Congressional documents dealing with communism in theory and practice are (a) Documents of the Foundation of the Union—House Document No. 398, 69th Congress; and (b) the admirable and elaborate volume on our Federal Constitution, prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, under the direction of Dr. Edward S. Corwin, of Princeton University. In addition, it should be noted that an annotated collection, such as is proposed, would be a useful supplement to the bibliography which the Legislative Reference Service has already prepared and is about to make available at the request of the Senators from Pennsylvania.

BACKGROUND

Communism in its modern form made its appearance 109 years ago, with the publication of the Communist Manifesto. Leninism was born 60 years ago. On November 8, 1957, it will be 40 years since the Bolshevik counterrevolution in Russia.

This movement, communism, is much more than a specter haunting Europe or even our whole globe. It is a fearsome reality—a totalitarian empire which holds in its iron grip one-third of the world.

The strength of this ideology from the beginning has been that it concentrated first on intellectuals. It cannot go on to its strategy of getting hold of the masses unless it has first gained ardent and fanatical converts among potential leaders. These leaders must have the ability to handle ideas. An immediate example of this that is well worth noting is our neighbor to the south, British Guiana.

It is surely clear by now that the chief weapons which we have for meeting the challenge of communism, apart from necessary but essentially negative deterrent military power, are weapons of the mind and spirit. It is ideas which ultimately rule the world. In addition, there must be clear and full knowledge of the basic facts of our world as a whole, including the nature of communism in all its phases. The purpose of our educational system is to communicate to the youth of the land the facts and ideas necessary both for abundant living and for meeting the issues of life and death in today's dangerous world.

If this reasoning is sound, then it is most urgent that the American educational system tackle in earnest the task of teaching American youth to confront the reality of totalitarianism in its toughest, most militant form, which is communism, with the facts and values of our American heritage.

It was to meet this challenge and to do it in a practical and realistic way that the Committee on American Education and Communism was established in September 1956. The organization which was inspired to establish this special, autonomous committee was the now-well-known Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order, an all-faith group established in 1953 with Dr. Charles Wesley Lowry as chairman and with Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, minister of the National Presbyterian Church in Washington, as cochairman. The purpose of Frasco was and is to unite men and women of all faiths in meeting with the resources of religious faith the great issues and challenges that arise in the social and civil order. It is a nonsectarian movement practical in aim, and for this reason has been able to gain wide support among leaders of all faiths.

The objectives of the Committee on American Education and Communism, headed by Dr. William Yandell Elliott and Dr. Lowry, are more limited. They are special educational objectives. These objectives are to advise and guide on an entirely voluntary basis the superintendents, principals, teachers, and school board members of our American schools and to promote in addition a general public awareness of the need for specific instruction in the facts about communism and totalitarianism in the general framework of a comparison of social and political systems in standard courses in the American school curriculum, especially at the high school and junior high school levels. It is felt also that there is a great and crying need for specific courses which will train our teachers, both those who are now teaching but do go to summer school or could be persuaded to attend institutes and workshops for credit in approved summer sessions, and the young people now in teachers colleges and other colleges preparing to be the teachers of tomorrow.

Such is the suggestive and significant background of the annotated collection of Congressional documents proposed in this bill.

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

The bill (S. 2911) to provide for the preparation of a compilation of educational material concerning communism, as contrasted with Americanism, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of the President and Vice President. The purpose of the proposed legislation is to amend the Constitution so that the electoral college will be abolished, while retaining the present system of electoral votes and the existing allocation of such votes to each State. Furthermore, the amendment will not change the present system of counting all of the electoral votes for the candidate who received the greatest number of votes in any State.

The proposal would also prevent the election of a President and Vice President from different political parties and retain the present provision which discourages nomination of presidential and vice-presidential candidates from the same State. In the event that no candidate receives a majority of the electoral vote, the election would be decided by a joint meeting of all Senators and Representatives voting as individuals in a public rollcall.

I commend this joint resolution to the Senate for study and consideration. Last year, the Senate considered at length various proposals to change our present electoral college system of choosing the President and Vice President of the United States. At the conclusion of this debate, the Senate returned to committees for further study the proposals which had been placed before it.

The extended and incisive debate last year showed lack of agreement on the proposals, all of which would have altered the existing balance of electoral votes among the States. I believe that the Senate can agree on the following propositions:

First. The Electoral College, a confusing and potentially dangerous anachronism, should be abolished.

Second. In presidential elections where no candidate receives a majority of the electoral votes the choice should be by the Congress as a whole, and should be by open rollcall vote, and not by secret ballot.

Third. Provision should be made to preclude election of a President and Vice President from different political parties.

It is my earnest hope that this joint resolution will be the subject of complete hearings in the near future and that it may be reported out for consideration by the Senate in the next session.

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

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 132) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LOAN, GRANT, OR OTHER AID AGREEMENTS WITH CERTAIN NATIONS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2828) to authorize the President under certain conditions to permit the entering into of loan, grant, or other aid agreements with certain nations, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, on August 21, 1957.

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

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

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

By Mr. HILL:

Address delivered by him on May 27, 1957, at the dedication of the Alben W. Barkley Room, in the Mary I. King Library, at the University of Kentucky.

Address delivered by him before the Alabama Library Association, at Tuscaloosa, Ala., on April 12, 1957.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address prepared by him for delivery before the annual convention of the American Soybean Association on August 27, 1957.

By Mr. BARRETT:

Statement by him on the retirement of Lewis E. Hoffman from the Department of the Interior.

By Mr. WILEY:

Statement by him regarding the role of women in American life, together with a list of Wisconsin women in State administration.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SENATE BILL 1870, TO MAKE PERFORMANCES OF COPYRIGHTED MUSIC IN JUKEBOXES PUBLIC PERFORMANCES FOR PROFIT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to give notice with respect to Senate bill 1870—to amend section 1 (c) of title 17 of the United States Code with regard to the rendition of musical compositions on coin-operated machines, a bill now before the Congress, which amends the Copyright Act so as to make performance of copyrighted music in jukeboxes public performances for profit. A hearing will be held on the bill later in the year. The exact date of the hearing I cannot fix at the present time; but I want those who are interested in the proposed legislation—and many persons from coast to coast are interested in it—to know that the bill has not been forgotten, but that hearings will be held on it by the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar. On the Executive Calendar there are two postmaster nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

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

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John W. Loughnane to be postmaster at Belgrade, Mont.

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of R. Ray Heath to be postmaster at Stillwater, Okla.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these two nominations.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 85TH CONGRESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President later in the day, I shall have a brief statement to make on the constructive work of this 1st session of the 85th Congress. But at this time I wish to call the attention of my friends on the other side of the aisle to the fact that, at various times and upon various occasions during this session, while they have been in the minority, and with a Republican administration in the White House, the Senate has confirmed more than 44,000 nominations which have been sent to this body by the President. The Senate has just completed action on the last two nominations on the Executive Calendar.

Later in the day, I shall place in the RECORD a tabulation of the number of days the Senate has been in session, the number of hours it has been in session, the total number of measures passed,

and the total number of nominations acted upon. I believe the tabulation will be extremely revealing and enlightening even to my colleagues.

Until yesterday, the Senate had been in session 846 hours, on 142 days, had passed 1,130 bills, and had acted on a little more than 44,000 nominations.

At this session the Senate has not passed as many public laws as those which have been passed during some first sessions of the Congress; but I would remind my colleagues that dozens and dozens and dozens of bills have cleared both bodies and are awaiting reports from the departments and signature by the President. I know that action will be taken at an early date, and that none of us will be disappointed in the way the President handles his duties.

THE FISHING INDUSTRY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is the Senate still proceeding in the morning hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, one of the most pressing problems which the New England economy faces involves the present predicament of our fishing industry, particularly the groundfish industry. Through the years, the industry has experienced a steady decline in terms of employment, plant facilities, fishing fleet, and annual catch. Five reasons have been assigned for the difficulties of the industry.

First, the industry is required to build its ships in this country under existing statutes. Competitor nations enjoy construction costs greatly reduced from those our industry must pay in this country. Second, all the forms of insurance which fishing-vessel owners must carry for a variety of reasons are extremely expensive, and in many cases the cost is prohibitive. Third, our industry competes with foreign industries which in almost all cases are heavily subsidized by their own governments. Fourth, some of our mutual-aid spending for the technical and economic development of friendly allies has been used to assist their fishing industries, and thereby gives them an added advantage over our own industry. Finally, for reasons of international relations and our national security, the fishing industry has twice been denied the tariff relief which, after full investigation, the Tariff Commission felt was economically completely justified.

While in many instances it might be possible to suggest that an industry proceed on its own to seek solutions to its own problems, it is difficult for the Federal Government to overlook its responsibility to the fishing industry, in view of the governmental actions which have contributed heavily to its present economic dilemma. Its economic decline in recent months has been so sharp that possible sources of credit have dried up and chances for expansion are practically nonexistent. With heavy costs of their own and with low-cost import competition, the industry has reached a point where it must have immediate assistance.

A committee was formed in New England to aid and assist the groundfish industry. The committee has made a number of recommendations. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD the four points which have been suggested by the industry as possible means of Federal assistance.

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

FOUR RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE FISHING INDUSTRY

1. Government aid in a program aimed at equalizing the cost of vessel insurance with that of foreign competitors.

2. Long-term loan programs for shore plants for working capital, plant modernization, and expansion.

3. Government aid in a program designed to equalize cost of vessels with that of foreign competitors.

4. An equalization program designed to eliminate the differential between cost of domestic production and selling price of foreign imports in the domestic market. This program to include provision for minimum operating price to fishermen and vessel owners.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, regardless of whether these possible remedies hold the key to relief for the industry, some Congressional attention must be devoted to this problem in the early days of the next session. I have asked the Department of Interior to conduct a study during the recess of Congress, and to submit recommendations which may be offered in the form of proposed legislation at the start of the next session. It is imperative that we devote our best thinking and our most expert judgment to this problem, lest we lose an industry which has made great contributions to our national welfare and security, and has been a great and dependable source of domestic food supply.

Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts.

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to take a few minutes this morning to bring to the attention of the Senate certain developments affecting our American merchant marine.

For a good part of my life, I have been very much interested—both as a public official and as a private citizen—in the maritime industry. It has been my privilege to follow the industry—its problems and its prospects—from the vantage points of both the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee. I gained a modest knowledge of the shipbuilding industry through a close association with our Massachusetts shipyards — important segments of the economy of the Commonwealth.

I have been very much encouraged by the progress which the Maritime Administration, under the able leadership of Clarence Morse, has made, with the active cooperation of ship operators, in initiating a long-range ship-replacement program. The program is an essential one, as I see it, since so many of the vessels in our merchant fleet which were built during World War II will be obsolete in just a few years. The problem of replacement is one which had to be faced, and both the industry and the Government can be proud that they have met it head on.

Because I do not want unnecessarily to take the time of my colleagues this morning, I shall not elaborate on the essentiality of an American merchant fleet and American shipbuilding, both in peace and in war. The alternative to a strong, healthy industry is total dependence on foreign skills, foreign construction, and foreign shipping. The adoption of such an alternative would, I am sure all will agree, seriously jeopardize the American economy and seriously impair our Nation's security.

So, recognizing the indispensability of a strong American maritime industry, I wish to congratulate both the Government and the industry for going forward with plans for the replacement of our merchant fleet. Rather than wait until the total need is upon us—a course which would have imposed a tremendous demand on our shipbuilding capacity and on the National Treasury—the administration sat down with the industry and developed a phased program involving long-term contracts with the ship operators and the gradual replacement of their ships over a period of 10 or 15 years. This makes sense. It is sound business. It is economical. It is prudent. It will provide stable workloads for our shipyards, and will maintain them at the levels adequate for mobilization purposes—this in contrast to the peaks and valleys which in the past have plagued our shipbuilding industry.

All of us are cognizant of the dependence of our Nation on merchant shipping in time of emergency, but sometimes we overlook the contribution it makes to our peacetime economy. I am informed, for example, that over 300,000 employees in the State of Wisconsin depend upon American merchant ships to carry a substantial portion of their products to foreign ports. I am told that over 1 million jobs in the State of Texas depend in part on foreign trade and the need for American shipping. The automobile industry, so important to Michigan and nearby States, depends on 250 or 300 materials which must be brought in by ship from over 50 foreign countries.

We need a strong merchant marine, and it is vital that the ship-replacement program now underway be continued on a scheduled basis. Any interruption would be expensive and, in a real sense, perilous.

It is my understanding that ship-construction contracts soon to be awarded will exhaust the funds currently available for ship replacement. Those who have responsibility for the program must come to the Congress in the next session to present plans for sustained activity which will insure a satisfactory level of shipbuilding employment and—equally important—guarantee the gradual replacement of our merchant fleet in the years ahead. It cannot be done piece-

meal. The Congress must have a realistic appraisal of our needs and the costs.

I am confident that the Congress of the United States will give its careful and sympathetic attention to a well presented program for vessel replacement on a sound, stable, economical basis.

Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts.

THE COTTON TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a number of responsible persons in Massachusetts who are engaged in the cotton-textile industry have been very much concerned with the effect of our national cotton policy on the economy of New England and, indeed, on the economy of the entire country, as well.

For many years we have had a policy which supports the prices of several of our important agricultural products—among them, cotton. I certainly am not an expert on agricultural matters, but I should like to pass on to my colleagues in the Senate some of the reports I have been receiving as to the present situation of our cotton-textile industry.

Our people are concerned primarily because of the fact that, under the national policy, they are required to pay high prices for raw materials. This, in itself, places them at a serious competitive disadvantage with respect to competition from beyond our shores—competition made very much more difficult because of lower wage rates abroad. But, unfortunately, the problem does not stop there. It is compounded by the law which was passed by the Congress last year, which permits the sale of American raw cotton in foreign markets at current world prices—prices which are considerably below the supported domestic price. The inevitable result has been that competitors from other nations have an additional benefit, in that because of import restrictions they can purchase the same American cotton which our domestic textile manufacturers are compelled to buy at several cents a pound greater than the world price.

The net result is that while domestic textile manufacturers must purchase their raw materials at the higher prices, and are precluded by law from purchasing cheaper foreign cotton, their competitors are permitted to manufacture goods from raw materials, even American cotton, which they can buy at the lower world price and can fabricate at wage rates far below American standards.

The competitors from other countries, with the single exception of Japan, with whom we have a voluntary agreement, can bring unlimited quantities of cotton-textile products into American markets.

I am afraid that the entire situation is an unhealthy one, not only for the domestic manufacturer, but also for our cotton farmers. I believe that both of these groups have a common interest in a sound, stable market for finished cotton products; and I fear that the policy which we now follow is having a damaging effect on that market. I hope the Federal Government, which developed the policy, and therefore must bear the responsibility for its results, will reexamine the entire situation in the very near future.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on this, the final day of the 1st session of the 85th Congress, and before the oratory begins, which I assume will come a little later, I rise informally at this time to express my personal appreciation for the accomplishment which the leadership on both sides of the aisle have achieved this session and the courtesies they have constantly extended to all of us. I address myself to the majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], who is sitting to my left, and also the able whip on the Democratic side, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], two very dear friends of mine, for whom I have the deepest affection. I also refer, of course, to my beloved minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who is not present in the Chamber at the moment. I feel we have had a spirit of friendly cooperation. We have had differences at times, but there has been a spirit of amity which I have not experienced before in all the time I have been a Member of the Senate. I desire to record that statement publicly, and thank them very much for all they have done for us who are toiling in the vineyard.

I also wish to express my gratitude to those who have served at the front desk, in the performance of their many tasks, for the many courtesies they have extended to me.

I did not feel I could leave today without expressing my very deep appreciation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to express my gratitude to my beloved friend from New Jersey, who always has a complete understanding and a constructive approach to the many problems we face each day. I believe him to be one of the great patriots I have known, and I feel it has been a privilege and an honor to serve with him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the statement of the able majority leader, and thank the Senator from New Jersey for his kind remarks this morning. It has been a pleasure to work with him. He has always placed the interests of the country ahead of the interests of party. So long as we can operate the affairs of the country on that basis, the country is in good hands.

THE MAJORITY LEADER OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a column written by Roscoe Drummond, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of today. Mr. Drummond makes some interesting comments concerning the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

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

KEEP YOUR EYE ON LYNDON JOHNSON

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The most enhanced political figure to emerge from this 1st session of the 85th Congress is the Democratic majority leader, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas.

It is no more than stating the facts to say that Senator JOHNSON:

Increased greatly his influence in Congress.

Enhanced his standing in the country.

Expanded his control of his own party.

Rescued the two most critical parts of the President's program—the Eisenhower Middle East doctrine and foreign aid.

Shaped the right-to-vote law as it finally emerged more than any other leader of the Senate, Democratic or Republican.

Emerged as an outstanding challenger for the next Democratic presidential nomination.

That's something. It's more than something and I think I am not overstating it.

Senator JOHNSON'S political achievements during the past 8 months have been varied and decisive and substantial.

He saved the Eisenhower doctrine from debilitating delay in the Senate. He did it by biding his time and then coming forward with a revision of the Dulles draft which both improved the resolution and made Congress a participant instead of a rubber stamp. Then he marshaled most of his own party behind the result and contributed to the 72-to-19 vote which passed it—after which Mr. Eisenhower was on the telephone to express his appreciation.

That was the first significant action of this session of Congress. Its last significant action found Senator JOHNSON in the same role. The House of Representatives hacked the President's mutual security appropriations to bits. Would the Senate repair the damage? This week Mr. Eisenhower bid the Texas Senator to the White House for a private conference after which the Senate Appropriation Committee restored $500 million in mutual security funds. Whatever is ultimately salvaged will be due in large part to Mr. JOHNSON'S influence and resourcefulness.

In the right-to-vote law Senator JOHNSON played a part which the most earnest civil-rights advocates would criticize. They would say—and they are right—that more than anyone else he brought about the dilution of the bill and the ultimate compromise.

But it was also Senator JOHNSON'S generalship which averted a southern filibuster, which kept in the bill the maximum the Senate was prepared to accept, and which contributed so much to its final passage.

If you think the Senate did wrong in cutting back the civil-rights bill, much of the blame goes to JOHNSON. If you think the Senate acted responsibly and usefully in passing a compromise bill, much of the credit goes to JOHNSON.

* * * * *

The full meaning of what Senator JOHNSON did in behalf of his own party in the right-to-vote fight is widely realized.

He saved the Democratic Party from tearing itself apart over this issue.

He shaped a law which drew five southern Senators to its support.

He prevented the Republican Party from walking off the field with all the honors, held their political gains to the minimum.

He proved himself the ascendant leader of the whole Democratic Party in Congress, northern and western liberals as well as southern conservatives.

He is no longer just the leader of the Democratic Party in Congress. He is a—if not the—principal spokesman of the Democratic Party in the country.

Because he voted for and is an architect of the right-to-vote law, he is the first southern Democratic leader since the Civil War to be a serious candidate for presidential nomination and, if nominated, to have a fair chance of winning.

Senator JOHNSON may or may not want the nomination, may or may not get it. If he doesn't get it, no one will have more to say about who does get it.

TOLL AND WIRE TELEVISION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I have studied with considerable interest the remarks made in the Senate last Friday, August 23, by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] on toll or pay television. I commend the Senator from Michigan for his forthright statements on this important subject, and I agree wholeheartedly with his observations. I do not favor pay television.

The Senator from Michigan cautioned that the Federal Communications Commission should not even authorize a pilot test of toll television. I am informed that some Senators have had informal assurances from members of the Federal Communications Commission that no action will be taken without Congressional authorization. In that regard, I believe it absolutely essential that the Federal Communications Commission make no decision until Congress has had an opportunity to thoroughly and carefully consider proposed legislation; and until the American public, through their elected representatives, have had a chance to voice their opinions.

Congress should take cognizance of the reality of television as it exists today: its unprecedented growth in the span of a few short years; its social, political, and economic impact; its existence as a new dimension in America in which over 35 million families have a multi-billion-dollar investment. Television has long been regarded as a national medium—a public property that belongs to no group or individual. If this property is to be preempted, the consent of those most affected should be sought. The decision should be that which will best serve the public interest.

Another problem now appears on the horizon, equally serious and important, equally deserving of serious Congressional consideration. That is the matter of wire television. I am informed that wire television is about to come into being without so much as one iota of control by the Federal Communications Commission. There simply is no jurisdiction by which the Federal Communications Commission can regulate this medium of transmission.

This raises several questions. Should wire television be regulated, and, if so, to what extent? A second question is whether broadcasters should be permitted in the field of wire television. Clearly, legislative hearings should be held to decide these issues.

It is now clear that the Federal Communications Commission has assumed jurisdiction of toll television, in spite of the fact that considerable doubt has been expressed as to the legality of that assumption of authority. Admonitions against ill-advised action have been voiced repeatedly. If the Federal Communications Commission ignores the warnings and caution expressed in the Senate by many of my colleagues, I think it should be made abundantly clear that a pilot test—no matter where or for how long—gives no individuals or groups the right or privilege to continue, provides no foot in the door, and the voice of the people is eventually heard through its Congress.

Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska.

THE DIGNITY OF LABOR DAY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it is very fitting that next Monday, the Nation will observe Labor Day, a day set aside to honor the men and women who toil. We must never lose sight of the true significance of that day. The working people of America are in every sense, and in the finest sense, individuals, possessed of individual rights, interested in their families and in the growth and prosperity of the country. They are interested in our prized institutions, in their communities, in their churches and schools. They are fine, upright, outstanding, patriotic citizens—our very best.

I make this statement because in this day when an investigation involving labor and management relationships is in progress, the impression must never be given that we are pointing a finger at labor. No such thing is happening. It may be that certain union organizations are on trial. It very definitely is true that some union leaders are on trial, and it is very definitely true that all the major union leaders have a responsibility that they may or may not live up to.

It is also very true that perhaps the Congress has not enacted all the laws that it should have enacted for the benefit of the men and women who work, and for the protection of their rights, and for the protection and benefit of the public.

With that in mind, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "The Dignity of Labor Day," appearing in the August 1957 issue of the Labor Digest, published in Indianapolis, Ind., together with the editor's note that precedes the editorial.

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

THE DIGNITY OF LABOR DAY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—A man in his late eighties, a retired union official whose name once was well known in every American city, came into our office one day recently, carrying the Labor Digest editorial which is reprinted below. He had had it framed under glass and had taken it from the wall of his home. It was, he explained, our Labor Day editorial of 1946. He suggested that it be reprinted because, he said, it was as timely today as it was 5 years ago. Our friend was a pioneer of the labor movement. More than half a century ago he toured the country as an organizer, traveling in freight trains and day coaches, often sleeping in livery barns. "Unionism was and still is well nigh a religion with me," he said. "But I am an American first. I hate the proposal that America contains a working class and I dread the socialistic aims of present-day union leaders which would reduce free men to slavery under a supergovernment. The fathers of the labor movement recognized this evil threat and steered clear of politics.")

Twenty thousand marched in New York's first Labor Day parade held on the first Monday in September 1887. New York State had made this date a legal holiday.

A New York morning paper said: "And another good thing was that the legal holiday left many businessmen at leisure to look on, and the dignity of the parade made a good impression on them, an impression that will be remembered when discussion of the attitude of the unions comes up again."

Lots of water has gone under the bridge since that day in 1887.

Today, if a proportionate number of union members marched in a Labor Day parade, more than 800,000 would be in line. But they would not march with dignity as patriotic Americans. Many would wear sneers and carry banners attacking the Nation which has given them an incomparably better life than they knew in the lands abroad which gave many of them birth. There would be slogans demanding the destruction of American freedom and the substitution therefor of regimentation managed by roughnecks with outlandish accents and no love for the land which nourishes them. Some would shout praises of Soviet Russian dictatorship and curses on the democratic nations who are alert to Red ambitions.

BLAME FOR SHORTAGES

The public which once looked with respect and sympathy on labor's aspirations, would view the demonstration with sullen disapproval—a disapproval which will one day turn to active hostility. The public vastly outnumbers the organized and organizable workers. On the public's side are hundreds of thousands of union members who were dragooned into outfits for which they have no sympathy and at whose hands they have suffered.

We are supposed to rejoice on this holiday and eulogize the sons of toil. But usurping leaders, unaccustomed and unfit for power, have made that impossible. We will take no holiday from blasting the evils of political unionism until a balance of justice between unions and public is established.

FATHERS OF UNIONISM

We yearn for the leadership of Sam Gompers, John Mitchell, Jim Lynch, and Owen Miller—men who would fight hard but honorably for a better life for the worker while still prizing the privilege of living in a land of freedom and opportunity. They and their fellows laid the foundation of American unionism and won for it the respect that enabled its growth.

They viewed unionism as purely economic and opportunistic. They demanded fair wages, reasonable hours, decent working conditions, and respect for the rights of producers. They rejected the idea that any system which would anchor a man to his trade or economic status could increase his happiness. Gompers fought off all attempts to involve unions in partisan politics. "A man's social and philosophic views are his own," he said. He tossed aside suggestions for laws that would compel men to join unions and invented the term "voluntarism" to designate his doctrine. That is why the Labor Digest has always fought the closed shop and the union shop and fought for the principles of the right-to-work laws in the various States.

If Gompers and his like could have survived, or if their true followers had remained at the helm of labor, the growth of the movement would have been as great numerically as it has been under present-day leaders. It would also have been sound and productive instead of causing the world's greatest and richest nation to flounder in a mire of economic confusion.

We greet Labor Day, 1957, not with rejoicing but with hope—hope nourished by the belief that the patience of the public and of the Nation's statesmen with the vandalism of radical and dishonest labor leadership is nearing its limit.

When this happens all of us—unionists, enterprisers, and the public—will then find richer, happier lives.

May labor soon again march with dignity and Labor Day again take on its true significance.

EDITOR.

WASTE IN NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the United States has fallen behind Russia in development of the intercontinental ballistic missile because of this administration's policy of "false security to justify false economy."

We are properly indignant because a young warrant officer in a far northern outpost caused the waste of $33,000 of surplus equipment.

But we are comfortably complacent about the fact that in effect the present administration is directing the management of the Department of Defense to throw away $33,000 every 3 minutes, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, through waste in manpower alone.

These figures can be computed by anyone, on the back of an envelope, from the testimony of the chairman of the Defense Department's own manpower committee.

If this enormous waste caused us no sacrifice of national security it would still be outrageous. As it is, the manner in which our defense superiority has been dribbled away is nothing short of tragic; and we have no savings to show for it.

Mr. President, we have both the right and the duty to ask, What is the administration going to do about it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair.) Is the Senator from Oregon seeking recognition?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to be recognized, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

MODIFICATION OF RULE XXII

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement released today by me on behalf of myself, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], dealing with rule XXII of the Senate.

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

Recent events in the Senate have strengthened our determination to exert maximum efforts during 1958 to modify rule XXII of this body.

When debate becomes not an instrument for information or education, but merely for the purpose of obstructionism or exhibitionism, then unlimited debate has ceased to fulfill a useful function.

There has taken place on the Senate floor an episode which demonstrates that rule XXII can be used to prolong debate which serves no essential legislative function. Such events confirm our long-standing view that rule XXII is in need of drastic modification. A majority of Senators should have the opportunity to act when they are ready to act.

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
RICHARD L. NEUBERGER.
PAT MCNAMARA.
JOSEPH S. CLARK.

EFFECT ON GOVERNMENT PROJECTS AND AGENCIES OF BUDGET DIRECTIVE OF JUNE 28, 1957

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the 1st session of the 85th Congress soon will adjourn and many of us will return to our home States believing that Congress has provided adequately for carrying on essential functions of the Federal Government for the remaining months of the 1958 fiscal year. I fear, however, that a little-noted directive of the Bureau of the Budget to various departments and agencies may nullify some of this session's achievements in providing funds for programs consistent with the needs of the Nation.

I base this forecast on information I have received in response to inquiries about the first effects of a letter from Budget Bureau Director Percival Brundage to department heads of June 28, 1957, instructing them to take positive action to keep expenditures for fiscal 1958 at or below the level for the fiscal year 1957. Mr. Brundage said in his letter that this was the request of the President to all agencies.

In addition, the Budget Bureau's directive said that appropriation action in connection with appropriations for major capital outlay and development—construction, procurement, research, and so forth—should reflect the postponement of a significant part of the obligations planned in the budget for 1958. In my opinion, this instruction for postponement means that the administration may be planning to delay construction of major projects in the Pacific Northwest and elsewhere in the Nation or defer programs in defiance of congressional approval.

This directive was first brought to public attention in a story in the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 12, 1957, and some of its implications were developed at a hearing before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations, under the able interrogation of its chairman, Representative CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the Budget Bureau letter of directions for allotment of funds during 1958, which had not been a matter of public knowledge until Mr. CANNON obtained its insertion in the hearing record last month.

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., June 28, 1957.

Hon. LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. STRAUSS: The President has requested that all agencies in the executive branch keep the rates of commitments, obligations, and expenditures for fiscal year 1958 at or below the level for the fiscal year 1957, to the extent feasible, and that I inform you of the necessary procedures for achieving this purpose. This task can best be accomplished by positive action on the part of each agency head. The apportionment and allotment system offers an existing administrative channel for each agency head to accomplish these purposes. Therefore, appropriate action along these lines should be reflected in the initial request for apportionment for 1958 appropriations and in requests for subsequent revisions of apportionments, as well as in allotment action within the agency, following these guidelines:

1. As a general rule, requests for apportionment and the allotments of funds shall be based upon holding obligations to absolute minimum levels. In most cases direct obligations should not rise above the level for the fiscal year 1957. Exceptions may be made with respect to that portion of appropriations which is for cash payments not controllable by administrative action (certain grants, annuities, indemnities, insurance losses, etc.), and with respect to uncontrollable workload and new legislation specifically endorsed as a part of the President's program. In any case where special circumstances (including those referred to above) prevent the agency from operating at or below the 1957 levels, the agency head shall submit a statement of reasons therefor to accompany the apportionment requests. For all appropriations, however, there should be a critical analysis of all activities, and advantage should be taken of every possibility for reductions; apportionments in all cases should be consistent with allowable sums being used in planning the 1959 budget. The sums available in excess of minimum needs will be placed in reserves for contingencies.

2. In the case of those appropriations that are for major capital outlay and development—construction, procurement, research, etc.—the requests for apportionment and the allotments should reflect the postponement of a significant part of the obligations planned in the budget for 1958.

3. In general, separate quarterly apportionments and allotments will be made for object class "01 Personal services." Exceptions will be made on a selective basis where regular apportionments and allotments, or other administrative arrangements, will effectively control the numbers of personnel.

4. Apportionments and allotments shall be revised throughout the year to provide for additional savings. After the close of each of the first three quarters, subsequent apportionments and allotments for operating programs will be reviewed in the light of program progress and costs, and action taken wherever possible, both to reserve unobligated balances remaining from the quarter just closed and to adjust subsequent quarters' figures to take into account lower rates of obligations actually achieved in the preceding period. Also, those savings which are made a matter of record in public statements on the basis of agency claims of such savings will be specifically identified and reserved.

Sincerely yours,
PERCIVAL BRUNDAGE,
Director.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, subsequent information coming before the Senate indicates that letters of identical context were distributed generally by the Bureau of the Budget to other agencies.

The full meaning of this directive and its impact on operation of the machinery of Federal Government has not been fully recognized, in my opinion. It has

made the President's 1958 budget meaningless. Its net effect seems to be a complete circumvention of congressional directives, as represented by action on appropriations, and a direct contradiction of the administration's viewpoint, expressed earlier this year by Mr. Brundage, that there was no specific area in which the budget could be reduced. Despite the lack of information on possible avenues for reduction of the largest peacetime budget in history, the Congress subsequently reduced the allocations in many categories.

It was not until a few days ago that the first effects of Mr. Brundage's directive to reduce fund allotments to or below 1957 levels—in spite of action taken by Congress—were indicated by reports received from my home State of Oregon. The State of Oregon has few military installations, but one of these is the Ordnance Ammunition Depot in Umatilla County. I was told that the curtailment of maintenance and operation funds during the first quarter of fiscal 1958 might seriously affect employment levels at the depot. Upon inquiry to the Department of the Army, I was informed that a cut in funds had indeed been ordered. In a letter from the Department of the Army, I was advised that—

> In this case, 21 percent of the fiscal year 1959 appropriation is the limit for the first quarter. The reduction at Umatilla appears to be about $125,000 rather than $300,000 in the first quarter, fiscal year 1958.

The letter further stated:

> Reductions in the maintenance and operation funds frequently result in a requirement for the reduction in force of personnel. A reduction in force action has not yet been submitted to the Army staff by the technical service, although this does not preclude such action in the near future. The Department of the Army realizes the sensitivity of Umatilla County as a surplus labor area and will attempt to place as many personnel as possible if reduction in force does take place.

I have no doubt that similar results are being felt elsewhere in the country where military installations exist. However, the implications for the State of Oregon are particularly ominous because of business doldrums which clutch our State's economy. Total employment in Oregon in all nonagricultural lines was 511,800 in July 1956. A year later—in July 1957—it had dropped to 505,900. Further reduction in activities in business, industry, agriculture, or Government is not favorable to the State's prosperity.

As a result of this disturbing report, I have made a preliminary check with other Federal agencies operating in Oregon to determine what effect the reduction in allotments will bring. On August 22, 1957, a letter was sent to Mr. Marling Ankeny, Director of the United States Bureau of Mines, expressing concern over the indicated curtailments. The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, has devoted considerable time to a study of long-range minerals program proposals. I asked Mr. Ankeny about the curtailment of funds and whether this will result in reduction of personnel and what programs of the Bureau would be immediately affected.

Mr. Ankeny replied that the Bureau in company with all other Federal agencies, is under instruction to effect savings in current appropriations. In applying an apportionment for the first quarter of the current year, the Bureau of the Budget suggested totals that were approximately 12 percent below the current rate of expenditure within the appropriation for conservation and development of mineral resources and 6 percent in health and safety.

He added:

> Having intensified all activities in accordance with increases in appropriations for the current fiscal year, the subsequent advice on reduced apportionment required abrupt curtailment of activity at many sites. The ultimate effect of this reduction cannot be fully assessed until we are advised with regard to possible limitations of a similar nature during any of the remaining quarters of this year. As of now, we assume that we can support our programs at the fiscal year 1957 rate.
>
> We are attempting to accomplish this without reducing personnel or closing any facilities. However, rigid limitations are going to have to be applied to all operating expenditures. The new activities, for which increases were approved in the current budget, will be deferred.

It is evident that the Budget Bureau order has resulted in much confusion in program planning. Mr. Ankeny's disclosure that new activities approved by Congress will be deferred is a signal of what may be expected in other spheres of Government where Congress—recognizing the need for new undertakings—has authorized their start during the current year, not at some future date fixed by the Budget Bureau. Comparatively speaking, the Bureau of Mines is not a large Government agency, but its contribution to advancement of technology and the Nation's economy and to its defenses has certainly justified its existence. For instance, the process for manufacture of the new metal of the atomic age, zirconium, was first developed at a Bureau of Mines laboratory in Albany, Oreg. Only 12 years ago the first 90 grams of zirconium was produced at the Bureau of Mines laboratory, but in that brief span its value to our atomic energy defense program has become so great that production goals have been set at many hundreds of thousands of pounds annually. It was zirconium from the Albany Bureau of Mines plant which cloaked the atomic charge in the submarine *Nautilus* when it made its historic 60,000-mile voyage.

Can such scientific and engineering advances be achieved for our Nation on 12 percent cuts in funds? Likewise, what happens to health and safety inspection which affects men working underground in all parts of the Nation when allotments are reduced by 6 percent? And what of the contemplated deferral of new activities authorized by Congress? Economy in Government is a commendable objective, but I question its attainment at the expense of national progress.

Funds for United States Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management activities in my State also were affected by the order. This is an especially crucial matter in my home State of Oregon because more than 50 percent of the land area is federally owned, much of it in forested slopes administered by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management. Reductions in the programs of these two agencies would have serious repercussions on Oregon's economy. Lumber is our No. 1 industry, and now suffers from effects of the administration's tight-money policy. Restricting the work of the agencies would merely add to the industry's burdens. Moreover, the Federal funds expended on some Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management programs return profit to the Federal Treasury. What kind of economy is achieved by cutting funds for agency programs that more than pay for themselves and enhance Federal income?

I think the Senate may be interested in knowing the profitable financial results which have been achieved in recent years by Bureau of Land Management programs for the controverted Oregon & California Railroad lands in my State. In fiscal 1956, BLM revenues from timber sales on Oregon & California land totaled $21,605,000. Of this total, $11,909,000 was returned to county governments for their use, cost of administration was $1,584,000, reimbursement to the Treasury for access-road funds advanced was $4,295,000, leaving a sum of $3,817,000 covered to the Federal Treasury as net profit. In 1957, revenues from Oregon & California lands were $19,067,000, administrative expenses were $2,247,000, and net profit to the Treasury was $2,519,840.

In regard to Forest Service apportionments, I have been informed by Acting Secretary of Agriculture, True D. Morse, that "Forest Service items do not involve reductions which would result in serious impairment of programs planned for 1958." I hope that his belief is proven by subsequent events, although I have doubts as to how this may be done in view of the approved apportionment cutting the vital forest roads and trails program by $1,570,770 below the 1957 level. This is one phase of Forest Service activity that pays off to the Federal Treasury because the existence of access roads increases competitive bidding in Federal timber sales and results in higher prices for stumpage in the national forests. It is difficult for me to understand why a Forest Service activity which returns profit to the Federal Treasury was thus curtailed. The only possible effects will be to make it more difficult to harvest mature timber and to reduce competition in sales bidding. I hope that steps will be taken to restore these profitable activities of the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management to the full scale approved by Congress through the fiscal 1958 appropriations.

Mr. President, the possible impact of reduction in BLM allotments is detailed in a copy of a telegram to Budget Director Brundage which was sent to me by Mr. Joseph W. McCracken, executive vice president of Western Forest Industries Association. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks Mr. McCracken's telegram of August 22, 1957, which cogently explains lumber industry objections to reduction

of allotments. Other Senators will understand, I am sure, why this organization would object to curtailment of programs which are profitable to the Government and also essential to the operating ability of many timber and logging companies.

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

PORTLAND, OREG., *August 22, 1957.*

Hon. PERCIVAL BRUNDAGE,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D. C.:

Western Forest Industries Association, composed of numerous timber operators who are critically dependent upon Federal timber for their raw material, are gravely concerned at report that current quarterly apportionment of appropriation for Oregon and California forestry and road construction is below amount for last year's corresponding quarter even though both budget and appropriation were increased for current year.

This is season of year when large part of fieldwork is done preparing timber sales for next calendar year. Inadequate funds and personnel during first and second quarter will seriously curtail sale offerings next year, disrupt businesses and numerous timber operators, and deprive Government of substantial revenue.

In addition prosecution of intensive forest inventory as recommended both by the Congress and administration will be seriously hampered and completion further delayed. In turn this will delay recalculation and increase of allowable cuts and result in further loss to Government of timber values from overripe stumpage which under sound yield should be harvested now.

If Oregon and California program is to be operated on sound basis comparable to operation of private forestry lands it requires continuity and expansion of program. Money expended is quickly returned with profit to Treasury.

Failure to invest money allocated by Oregon and California counties to road construction and replanting programs constitutes no gain for Treasury. Such funds will either be expended later or ultimately returned to counties. Moreover, failure of the Government to invest county funds for such purposes constitutes loss to Government in that access to stands of deteriorating timber is not achieved and unproductive lands remain barren. There also seems moral question whether Federal Government should retain for interest-earning purposes funds contributed by Oregon and California counties for construction and acquisition of roads.

WESTERN FOREST INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION,
JOSEPH W. MCCRACKEN,
Executive Vice President.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am particularly concerned, Mr. President, with the section of the administration's directive which calls for postponement of construction on new projects. First construction funds for the 1,100,000-kilowatt John Day power, navigation, and flood-control dam on the Columbia River was provided by Congress at this session. Power from this dam is vitally needed in the Pacific Northwest States. Evidence of this is found in the fact that the Bonneville Power Administration will halt all deliveries of interruptible power at midnight on August 31, owing to continued low floods in the river. Every hour that passes without delivery of this power to industries of my region will cost the Federal Treasury money. It means loss of revenue to the Treasury because sale of interruptible power is an important factor in the revenues of the Bonneville system, and is vital to operations of some 17 industrial plants in Pacific Northwest States. Yet, if the start of construction is delayed on the John Day Dam prospects for a more adequate power supply will go glimmering.

Mr. President, other implications of the administration's curtailment of appropriations which represent unsound and unwise so-called economy could be described at length. But I think the instances which I have cited illustrate that the application of across-the-board cuts proposed by the Bureau of the Budget may have far-reaching effects on operations of the Federal Government. I hope that before the adjournment of Congress, the appropriate committees of the Senate will have an opportunity to determine the overall impact of Mr. Brundage's directive. If such committee action is possible, I am sure that one thing will be made obvious—the Bureau of the Budget directive has made a mockery out of the congressional appropriation process.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed with my remarks letters from the Bureau of Mines and from the Department of the Army, both dated August 26, 1957, describing the effects of the allotment reductions.

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

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF MINES,
Washington, D. C., August 26, 1957.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Reference is made to your letter of August 22, 1957 requesting information on a report that funds for Bureau of Mines operations had been curtailed.

The Bureau, in company with all other Federal agencies, is under instruction to effect savings in current appropriations. In applying an apportionment for the first quarter of the current year, the Bureau of the Budget suggested totals that were approximately 12 percent below the current rate of expenditure within the appropriation for conservation and development of mineral resources and 6 percent in health and safety. However, the rate proposed by the Bureau of the Budget was in no case lower than that maintained during the last fiscal year.

Having intensified all activities in accordance with increases in appropriations for the current fiscal year, the subsequent advice on reduced apportionment required abrupt curtailment of activity at many sites. The ultimate effect of this reduction cannot be fully assessed until we are advised with regard to possible limitations of a similar nature during any of the remaining quarters of this year. As of now, we assume that we can support our programs at the fiscal year 1957 rate.

We are attempting to accomplish this without reducing personnel or closing any facilities. However, rigid limitations are going to have to be applied to all operating expenditures. The new activities, for which increases were approved in the current budget, will be deferred.

We are in the process of seeking an adjustment in the apportionment figure using the events cited in your letter as justification.

Sincerely yours,
MARLING J. ANKENY,
Director.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., August 26, 1957.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: This is in reply to your recent inquiry regarding prospects at Ordnance Ammunition Depot, Ordnance (Umatilla County), Oreg. You have inquired specifically as to curtailment of maintenance and operation funds during the first quarter of fiscal year 1958, and the effect such a reduction may have on employment levels.

A cut in the maintenance and operation funds has become necessary as a result of a Secretary of Defense directive requiring limitation of expenditure ceilings. In this case, 21 percent of the fiscal year 1958 appropriation, is the limit for the first quarter. The reduction at Umatilla appears to be about $125,000 rather than $300,000 in the first quarter, fiscal year 1958.

Reductions in the maintenance and operation funds frequently result in a requirement for the reduction in force of personnel. A reduction in force action has not yet been submitted to the Army staff by the technical service, although this does not preclude such action in the near future. The Department of the Army realizes the sensitivity of Umatilla County as a surplus labor area and will attempt to place as many personnel as possible if a reduction in force does take place.

You will be advised prior to public announcement if a reduction in force occurs.

Sincerely,
DONALD T. KELLETT,
Lieutenant Colonel, GS, Office, Chief of Legislative Liaison.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF THE CONSULTATIVE SUBCOMMITTEE ON STATE DEPARTMENT ORGANIZATION AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before this session comes to a close I should like to make a brief report to the Senate on the activities of the Consultative Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Public Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I have had the honor to be chairman of this subcommittee during the 1st and 2d sessions of the 84th Congress and this 1st session of the 85th Congress. During this time the membership of the subcommittee has remained constant. The other members of the subcommittee are the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

The terms of reference of the subcommittee are as follows:

This subcommittee is concerned with the management and administration of the State Department, including the International Cooperation Administration, the formulation of policy, and the coordination of foreign policy actions within the executive branch. It is likewise concerned with the operations of the United States Information Agency and with the State Department's liaison with public organizations in the United States concerned with foreign policy.

Problems of interest to this subcommittee include such matters as Foreign Service and departmental personnel, relations between the State Department and other Government agencies, personnel security, the educational exchange program, and the overseas information program.

Problems of personnel, administration, and organization of agencies of the executive branch are usually intricate and difficult. For most people it is a time-consuming subject if one is to be a master of the necessary details. A consultative subcommittee can therefore be especially useful in this field in sifting out the major policy issues in legislation for consideration by the standing committee. A consultative subcommittee can also be useful in holding off-the-record discussions from time to time with representatives of the agencies whose responsibilities fall under the jurisdiction of the committee. These informal discussions always increase mutual understanding of the issues. Very often a consultative meeting of our subcommittee has made possible the solving of small problems before they became big problems, and has prevented misunderstandings.

The Consultative Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Public Affairs over the last 3 years has held a series of informal meetings with representatives of the Department of State and the United States Information Agency. These meetings have proved very worthwhile, certainly from the point of view of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I think, also in the opinion of the executive branch.

I should like to mention a few of the subjects which we have discussed with representatives of the executive branch. One main topic has been the reorganization of the Department of State personnel system, which has been underway since 1954. Members of this body are familiar in general with the recommendations of the so-called Wriston Committee with respect to the integration of the Foreign Service of the United States and a large portion of the employees of the departmental service. The Wriston Committee also made important recommendations with respect to training and recruitment for the Department of State. From time to time the consultative subcommittee has discussed with representatives of the Department of State the progress which has been made in improving the administration of the Department.

A second subject for discussion in the consultative subcommittee has been a series of actions to improve the Foreign Service of the United States. I am happy to say that during the period while I have been chairman of the subcommittee the organization of the Foreign Service has been improved and the benefits to which Foreign Service personnel are entitled have increased, so that the Foreign Service is now much better able to attract and hold people of high quality and dedication to the public service.

A third area of concern to the consultative subcommittee in its discussions with representatives of the executive branch has been the operation of the new United States Information Agency. Since the USIA is a relatively new agency and has expanded substantially in recent years it has had more than the usual number of growing pains and problems. Several meetings of the subcommittee have been occupied with discussions of the need for increased career opportunities for the personnel of the United States Information Agency.

I turn now, Mr. President, to several of the legislative measures to which I believe the Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Public Affairs has made a contribution. Most of these measures were formally referred to the subcommittee, but in some of them subcommittee members have taken an active interest without formal reference to the subcommittee or meetings of the subcommittee.

First, I shall mention a subject which is still active and on which no legislative conclusion has been reached. The able senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] on May 25, 1956, introduced Senate Resolution 272, which was referred to the subcommittee on June 22, 1956. This resolution called for a study to be made of recruitment and training in the Foreign Service of the United States. The able minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and I have recently introduced S. 2749, which would provide for the establishment of a United States Foreign Service Academy. This whole subject has been under study since the end of the 2d session of the 84th Congress by the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Department of State has prepared a great deal of useful material for the use of the committee. The heavy pressure of business of the Committee on Foreign Relations this year has prevented completion of the study, but I anticipate that a report will be made to the Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Public Affairs prior to the opening of the 2d session of the 85th Congress.

Perhaps the first act to which the consultative subcommittee gave consideration was Public Law 250 of the 84th Congress. This act amended the basic legislation of the Department of State by adding three additional posts of Deputy Under Secretary of State. The subject was discussed by the subcommittee early in June 1955 and a bill to carry out the new policy was introduced on June 14, 1955, and passed the Senate on June 17, 1955. The bill became law on August 3, 1955. I believe there is general agreement that the increased responsibilities of the United States in world affairs demanded this provision of additional top-level positions in the Department, and that the work of the Department has been facilitated by this strengthening of the organizational structure.

I shall next refer to Public Law 555 of the 84th Congress, which was approved on June 4, 1956. This act amended the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 to require a person who is admitted to the United States as an exchange visitor to return to his own country and live there for a period of 2 years before he can become eligible for permanent reentry into the United States. On the initiative of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] this problem was explored at a subcommittee meeting on July 20, 1955, at which it was agreed that the practice of exchange visitors obtaining authorization to remain in the United States tended to defeat a primary objective of the exchange program. This objective is the return to their own country of exchangees in order that they might impart to their friends and associates their impressions of the United States and its culture. The bill, S. 2562, to curtail this practice, was passed by the Senate on May 3, 1956.

Public Law 828 of the 84th Congress, which was approved on July 28, 1956, is an important product of the subcommittee's work. This act made a number of changes in the Foreign Service Act of 1946, which, I think, have made service in foreign posts more attractive to capable American men and women. The act increased salaries of chiefs of mission, added two new classes to the Foreign Service schedule and adjusted the salaries of all classes in the Foreign Service, and authorized improved commissary service, medical benefits, and recreational facilities for our overseas employees. The bill, S. 3481, to accomplish this purpose was introduced by the distinguished Senator Walter George on March 19, 1956 and was referred to the subcommittee the following day. After a hearing by the subcommittee, the bill was approved by the full committee and it passed the Senate on April 12, 1956. I believe the changes in the Foreign Service Act brought about by Public Law 828 of the 84th Congress have made possible a better administration of the Foreign Service and the maintenance of adequate career incentives.

I shall now mention a bill which although passed by the Senate in the last Congress and reintroduced in both Houses again this session, has not yet become law. I refer to S. 3638 of the last Congress and S. 1583 of this Congress, both of which propose amendments to the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948. The amendments relate to administrative matters, methods of operation, and requirements for reporting to the Congress affecting the United States Information Agency and the educational exchange program operated by the Department of State. These bills include the substance of two other bills, S. 631 and S. 2410 of the last Congress. The Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Public Affairs has held two extensive hearings on the subject, first on July 20, 1955 and again on April 17, 1956. The controversial portion of the bill is the authorization for the Director of the United States Information Agency to establish a career category of officers to be known as United States information officers. These officers would have substantially the same

status as Foreign Service officers with respect to pay, job security, benefits and retirement, although they would be in a separate service. This subject will, I am sure, be given further study in the 2d session of the 85th Congress.

I should like to close this report, Mr. President, by referring briefly to a topic closely related to the bills which I have just discussed; namely, the question whether the International Cooperation Administration and the United States Information Agency should be made integral parts of the Department of State, rather than being semiautonomous and separate agencies as they are today. I shall not discuss the merits of the arguments today, and I realize that there are legitimate differences of opinion on this subject. I think that I have made my own position clear from time to time, and that is that ICA and USIA should be much more closely tied in with the Department of State. In line with the recommendations of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I hope that the Committee on Foreign Relations, and its Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Public Affairs in particular, will give some special attention to this subject in the next session of the Congress.

Mr. President, I would be remiss in my duty as chairman of the Consultative Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Public Affairs if I did not in this report commend Secretary of State Dulles for his wholehearted cooperation; Mr. Loy Henderson, for the many hours he spent with the subcommittee answering questions and giving us information concerning the workings of the Department of State; and Assistant Secretary of State, I. W. Carpenter, Jr., who has been a tower of strength, and who has helped to keep the committee informed on all developments within the State Department which were within the purview of the subcommittee. These men have done a good job for the State Department. They have worked closely with Congress, and they should be given much of the credit for the improvements which have been made in the Department with which they are associated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the public laws to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

PUBLIC LAW 555, 84TH CONGRESS, CHAPTER 356, 2D SESSION

S. 2562

An act to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended

Be it enacted, etc., That section 201 of the act of January 27, 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong., 62 Stat. 6, as amended by sec. 402 (f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 66 Stat. 163) entitled "An act to promote the better understanding of the United States among the peoples of the world and to strengthen cooperative international relations" is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and by adding a new paragraph reading as follows:

"(b) No person admitted as an exchange visitor under this section or acquiring exchange visitor status after admission shall be eligible to apply for an immigrant visa, or for a nonimmigrant visa under section 101 (a) (15) (H) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, or for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, until it is established that such person has resided and been physically present in a cooperating country or countries for an aggregate of at least 2 years following departure from the United States: *Provided*, That upon request of an interested Government agency and the recommendation of the Secretary of State, the Attorney General may waive such 2-year period of residence abroad in the case of any alien whose admission to the United States is found by the Attorney General to be in the public interest: *And provided further*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall apply only to those persons acquiring exchange visitor status subsequent to the date of the enactment hereof."

Approved June 4, 1956.

PUBLIC LAW 828, 84TH CONGRESS, CHAPTER 770, 2D SESSION

S. 3481

An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Foreign Service Act Amendments of 1956."

SEC. 2. Section 411 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by striking out the second sentence of that section and substituting in lieu thereof the following: "The per annum salaries of chiefs of mission within each class shall be as follows: Class 1, $27,500 per annum; class 2, $25,000; class 3, $22,500; and class 4, $20,000."

SEC. 3. Section 412 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 412. There shall be 10 classes of Foreign Service officers, including the classes of career ambassador and of career minister. The per annum salary of a career ambassador shall be $20,000. The per annum salary of a career minister shall be $17,500. The per annum salaries of Foreign Service officers within each of the other classes shall be as follows:

Class 1	$14,600	$15,000	$15,400	$15,800	$16,200	$16,600	$17,000
Class 2	12,600	12,900	13,200	13,500	13,800	14,100	14,400
Class 3	10,600	10,900	11,200	11,500	11,800	12,100	12,400
Class 4	9,000	9,250	9,500	9,750	10,000	10,250	10,500
Class 5	7,400	7,650	7,900	8,150	8,400	8,650	8,900
Class 6	6,100	6,300	6,500	6,700	6,900	7,100	7,300
Class 7	5,100	5,250	5,400	5,550	5,700	5,850	6,000
Class 8	4,300	4,450	4,600	4,750	4,900	5,050	5,200

5,350."

SEC. 4. Section 414 (a) of such act is amended by striking out the word "six" and inserting the word "eight" in lieu thereof; and by striking out the number "6" and inserting in lieu thereof the number "8".

SEC. 5. Section 516 of such act and the heading thereto is amended by striking the words "class 6" wherever they appear therein and inserting the words "class 8" in lieu thereof.

SEC. 6. Section 517 of such act and the heading thereto is amended by striking the heading thereto and substituting in lieu thereof "Admission to classes 1 to 7, inclusive"; by striking in the aforementioned section the number "6" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof the number "8"; by striking out in the aforementioned section the number "5" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof the number "7"; and by striking out the word "forty" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "one hundred and seventy-five"; by inserting before the period at the end of the second sentence the following: "as a Foreign Service officer"; and by adding after the second sentence a new sentence which shall read as follows: "Notwithstanding the above provisions of this section, the limitation on the maximum number of appointments authorized herein shall not be applicable in the case of any person appointed or assigned by the Secretary of State as a Foreign Service Reserve officer and who thereafter has served in a position of responsibility in such capacity for the required period prior to appointment as a Foreign Service officer."

SEC. 7. Section 634 (b) of such act is amended by striking the words "classes 4 or 5", and inserting in lieu thereof the words "classes 4, 5, 6 or 7"; by striking the words "class 4" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "classes 4 or 5"; and by striking the words "class 5" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "classes 6 and 7".

SEC. 8. Section 635 of such act and the heading thereto and section 637 (a) of such Act are amended by striking the number "6" wherever it appears therein and by inserting in lieu thereof the number "8".

SEC. 9. (a) Section 821 (a) of such act is amended by striking the word "thirty" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "thirty-five", and by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: "However, the highest five years of service for which full contributions have been made to the Fund shall be used in computing the annuity of any Foreign Service officer who serves as chief of mission and whose continuity of service as such is interrupted prior to retirement by appointment or assignment to any other position determined by the Secretary to be of comparable importance."

(b) Section 821 (b) of such act is amended by striking the phrase "for the 5 years next preceding his retirement" and inserting in lieu thereof "as computed in accordance with subsection (a) of this section."

SEC. 10. Section 871 of such act is amended by striking the word "thirty" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "thirty-five."

SEC. 11. Section 902 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 902. The Secretary may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, make an allotment of funds to any post to defray the unusual expenses incident to the operation and maintenance of official residences suitable for principal representatives of the United States at that post."

SEC. 12. (a) Section 921 of such act is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 921.", (2) by striking out "and pursuant to appropriations therefor,", and (3) by amending the proviso in the second sentence to read as follows: "*Provided*, That an amount equal to the amount expended for such services shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

(b) Section 921 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) The Secretary, under such regulations as he may prescribe, may authorize and assist in the establishment, maintenance, and operation, by officers and employees of the Service, of non-Government-operated commissary and mess services and recreation facilities at posts abroad, including the furnishing of space, utilities, and properties owned or leased by the United States for use by its diplomatic and consular missions. The provisions of the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, as amended (22

U. S. C. 292-300), may be utilized by the Secretary in providing such assistance. Commissary or mess services and recreation facilities established pursuant to this subsection shall be made available, insofar as practicable, to officers and employees of other Government agencies and their dependents who are stationed abroad. Such services or facilities shall not be established in localities where another United States agency operates similar services or facilities unless the Secretary determines that such additional services or facilities are necessary.

"(c) Notwithstanding the last paragraph under the heading 'Subsistence Department' in the act of March 3, 1911 (10 U. S. C. 1253), or the provisions of any other law, charges at any post abroad by a commissary or mess service or recreation facility authorized or assisted under this section shall be at the same rate for all civilian personnel of the Government serviced thereby, and all charges for supplies furnished to such a service or facility abroad by any Government agency shall be at the same rate as that charged by the furnishing agency to its civilian commissary or mess services or recreation facilities.

"(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 5 of the act of July 16, 1914, as amended (5 U. S. C. 78), the Secretary may authorize any principal officer to approve the use of Government-owned vehicles located at his post for transportation of United States Government employees who are American citizens, and their dependents, to and from recreation facilities when public transportation is unsafe or is not available."

SEC. 13. Section 941 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 941. (a) In the event an officer or employee of the Service who is a citizen of the United States incurs an illness or injury while such person is located abroad, which requires hospitalization or similar treatment, and which is not the result of vicious habits, intemperance, or misconduct on his part, the Secretary may, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, pay for the cost of treatment of such illness or injury.

"(b) In the event a dependent of a United States citizen officer or employee of the Service who is stationed abroad, incurs an illness or injury while such dependent is located abroad, which requires hospitalization or similar treatment, and which is not the result of vicious habits, intemperance, or misconduct on his part, the Secretary may, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, pay for that portion of the cost of treatment of each such illness or injury that exceeds $35 up to a maximum limitation of 120 days of treatment for each such illness or injury, except that such maximum limitation shall not apply whenever the Secretary, on the basis of professional medical advice, shall determine that such illness or injury clearly is caused by the fact that such dependent is or has been located abroad.

"(c) After sufficient experience in the operation of the medical protection plan authorized in subsections (a) and (b) of this section has been obtained, as determined by the Secretary, and if he considers that the benefits so authorized can be provided for as well and as cheaply in other ways, the Secretary may, under such regulations, and for such persons, locations, and conditions as he may deem appropriate, and within the limits prescribed in such subsections, contract for medical care pursuant to such arrangements, insurance, medical service, or health plans as he may deem appropriate."

SEC. 14. (a) Section 942 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 942. (a) In the event an officer or employee of the Service who is a citizen of the United States or his dependents incurs an illness or injury requiring hospitalization, not the result of vicious habits, intemperance or misconduct, while stationed abroad in a locality where there does not exist a suitable hospital or clinic, the Secretary may, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, pay the travel expenses of such person by whatever means he shall deem appropriate and without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and section 10 of the act of March 3, 1933, as amended (68 Stat. 808, 5 U. S. C. 73b), to the nearest locality where a suitable hospital or clinic exists, and on his recovery pay for the travel expenses of his return from such hospital or clinic. If any such officer, employee, or dependent is too ill to travel unattended, the Secretary may also pay the round-trip travel expenses of an attendant or attendants."

(b) Section 942 (b) of such act is amended by inserting the words "a physician" and a comma immediately following the phrase "the services of"; and by inserting immediately following the words "a nurse" a comma and the phrase "or other medical personnel".

SEC. 15. Section 943 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"PHYSICAL EXAMINATIONS AND COSTS OF INOCULATIONS

"SEC. 943. The Secretary shall, under such regulations as he may prescribe, provide for physical examinations for applicants for employment and for officers and employees of the Service who are citizens of the United States, and for their dependents, including examinations necessary to establish disability or incapacity in accordance with the provisions of section 831, and shall provide for administering inoculations or vaccinations to such officers and employees and their dependents."

SEC. 16. (a) Foreign Service officers presently serving in the class of career ambassador and the class of career minister shall receive the salary prescribed for career ambassadors and for career ministers, respectively, by section 412 of such act, as amended.

(b) Foreign Service officers and Reserve officers in the other classes shall be transferred to the new classes established by section 412 of such act, as amended, as follows: Officers of class 1 to the new class 1; officers of class 2 to the new class 2; officers of class 3 to the new class 3; officers of class 4 to the new classes 4 or 5 as determined by the Secretary, in accordance with the second sentence of this subsection; officers of class 5 to the new class 6; and officers of class 6 to the new class 7. In accordance with such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe there shall be transferred to the new class 4 those officers of the present class 4 who either are receiving the sixth through the eighth step rates of the present class 4 or who were eligible and were recommended for promotion by the selection board next preceding the effective date of this act. All remaining officers in the present class 4 shall be transferred to the new class 5.

(c) Each officer transferred pursuant to paragraph (b) of this section shall, under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, receive basic salary at that one of the rates of the class to which he is transferred which shall, as nearly as possible, correspond to the salary he is receiving at the time of transfer, except that no officer shall suffer a reduction in basic salary as a result thereof.

(d) Service in a former class shall be considered as constituting service in the new class for the purposes of determining (1) eligibility for promotion, in accordance with the provisions of section 622, and (2) liability for separation, in accordance with the provisions of section 633. Officers who are transferred to new class 7 in accordance with paragraph (b) of this section shall continue to occupy probationary status pursuant to section 635.

(e) Officers transferred in accordance with the provisions of this section shall receive credit for time served in a previous class toward in-class promotion in accordance with section 625.

(f) The class and salary adjustments made pursuant to paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of this section and the salary increases for chiefs of mission authorized by section 2 of this act shall be made effective as of the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of enactment of this act or on the first day of the first pay period which begins after July 1, 1956, whichever shall be later.

SEC. 17. A new section 936 is hereby added to such act as follows:

"APPLICATION OF ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE ACT OF 1951

"SEC. 936. The Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, as amended (5 U. S. C. 2061 and the following), shall apply to career ministers and Foreign Service officers, who are not serving as chiefs of mission or who are not serving in a position in the department which requires appointment by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and to Foreign Service Reserve officers who are commissioned as diplomatic or consular officers, or both, in accordance with section 524 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, notwithstanding the provisions of section 202 (c) (1) (A) of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, as amended."

SEC. 18. Notwithstanding the provisions of this Act, existing rules, regulations of or applicable to the Foreign Service of the United States shall remain in effect until revoked or rescinded or until modified or superseded by regulations made in accordance with the provisions of this act, unless clearly inconsistent with the provisions of this act.

Approved July 28, 1956.

PUBLIC LAW 250, 84TH CONGRESS, CHAPTER 576, 1ST SESSION

S. 2237

An act to amend the act of May 26, 1949, to strengthen and improve the organization of the Department of State, and for others purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of May 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 111; 5 U. S. C. 151 (a)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"There shall be in the Department of State in addition to the Secretary of State an Under Secretary of State, three Deputy Under Secretaries of State, and 10 Assistant Secretaries of State."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary of State and the officers referred to in section 1 of this act, as amended, shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Counselor of the Department of State and the legal adviser who are required to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall rank equally with and shall receive the same salary as the Assistant Secretaries of State. Any such officer holding office at the time the provisions of this act, as amended, become effective shall not be required to be reappointed by reason of the enactment of this act, as amended. Unless otherwise provided for by law, the rate of basic compensation of the Deputy Under Secretaries of State shall be the same as that of Assistant Secretaries of State."

SEC. 3. The President may initially fill two of the Deputy Under Secretary positions established in section 1 of this act by appointing, without further advice and consent of the Senate, the two Deputy Under Secretaries of State who, on the date of the enactment of this act, held that designation pursuant to authority contained in section 2 of the act of May 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 111).

SEC. 4. Section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999), as amended (hereinafter referred to as "such act"), is amended by striking the first sentence of said section and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "There shall be eight classes of Foreign Service officers, including the classes of career ambassador and of career minister. The per annum salary of a career ambassador shall be the same as that for an Assistant Secretary of State."

SEC. 5. Section 501 (a) of such act is amended by adding the phrase "career ambassadors and" immediately following the word "including."

SEC. 6. Section 502 (a) of such act is amended by inserting the phrase "class of career ambassador and" immediately following the phrase "qualified for appointment to the", and by adding the following sentence at the end of said subsection: "No person shall be appointed into the class of career ambassador who has not (1) served for at least 15 years in a position of responsibility in a Government agency, or agencies, including at least 3 years as a career minister; (2) rendered exceptionally distinguished service to the Government; and (3) met such other requirements as the Secretary shall prescribe."

SEC. 7. Section 518 of such act is amended by inserting the words "career ambassador or" immediately following the phrase "to the class of."

SEC. 8. Section 631 of such act is amended by inserting the words "a career ambassador or" immediately after the words "who is."

SEC. 9. Section 632 of such act is amended by inserting the words "a career ambassador or" immediately following the words "who is not."

SEC. 10. (a) Section 811 (a) of such act is amended by striking out "811. (a)" and inserting "811." in lieu thereof and by striking out the phrase "of all participants" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "received by each participant."

(b) Section 811 (b) of such act is hereby repealed.

SEC. 11. Section 821 (a) of such act is amended by striking the phrase ", not exceeding $13,500 per annum," and "5 years next preceding the date of his retirement" and inserting the phrase "highest 5 consecutive years of service, for which full contributions have been made to the fund," immediately preceding the phrase "multiplied by."

Approved August 5, 1955.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, there is pending before the Committee on Public Works, Senate Joint Resolution 123, a measure for the preservation of Rock Creek Park which I introduced for myself and for Senators NEUBERGER, HUMPHREY, KUCHEL, and MALONE. This measure is similar to Senate Joint Resolution 36 of the 84th Congress on which the Interior Committee held exhaustive hearings.

It is my hope that the Public Works Committee will be able to act on this measure early in the next session of the Congress. Meanwhile, I ask that there be included as a part of my remarks the text of a press release pertinent to the subject matter of Senate Joint Resolution 123, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

COMMERCE SECRETARY AND COMMISSIONERS' PRESIDENT OPPOSE ROCK CREEK ROUTE FOR U. S. 240

Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton has received assurance of the full support of the Interior Department's position opposing the extension of United States Route 240 through Rock Creek Park from Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks and Commissioner Robert E. McLaughlin, President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Department of the Interior announced today.

In a letter addressed to Secretary Seaton, Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks states: "A top-level meeting of highway officials of Maryland and the District of Columbia was held at the Statler Hotel on Friday, July 19. Mr. Robert O. Bonnell, chairman of the Maryland State Roads Commission, Gen. Thomas A. Lane, Engineer Commissioner of the District, Mr. J. N. Robertson, Director of the District Department of Highways and members of his staff, were present. All disclaimed any thoughts of bringing United States Route 240 Interstate Highway through Rock Creek Park. I am as pleased, as I am sure you are, at these assurances for protecting the character of Rock Creek Park." The Bureau of Public Roads, which acts for the Federal Government in the planning and construction of interstate highway systems, is an agency of the Department of Commerce.

In a similar letter to Secretary Seaton, Commissioner McLaughlin emphasized his opposition to the extension of United States Route 240 through Rock Creek Park, saying: "This park is unique. Its value to the Capital City is inestimable. We should all work to save its beauty and integrity."

Secretary Seaton, who previously has stated unequivocal opposition to the use of Rock Creek Park as a location for United States Route 240, expressed his gratification at the cooperation being extended by the Federal, Maryland, and District of Columbia highway authorities in their support of the Department of the Interior's stand for the preservation of Rock Creek Park.

THE PROBLEMS OF THE FARMERS OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the final edition of the RECORD contain a statement which I am preparing on the subject of the problems facing the farmers of my State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATOR WILEY'S ACTIVITIES DURING THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 85TH CONGRESS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the final edition of the RECORD contain a statement which I am preparing with regard to the legislative measures which I have introduced, and other activities on my part during the 1st session of the 85th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FLORIDA'S TIES WITH LATIN AMERICA

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have before me the text of an address which I delivered at the annual banquet of the Miami Springs-Hialeah Chamber of Commerce on July 13, 1957, on the subject Florida's Ties With Latin America. I believe this address should be printed in the body of the RECORD, inasmuch as it relates directly to our strong ties with Latin America. It discusses the cogent reasons why we should include Latin American nations and Latin American peoples, all of whom are our friends, in the foreign-aid program.

Therefore I ask unanimous consent to have the address entitled "Florida's Ties With Latin America," which I delivered at the annual banquet of the Miami Springs-Hialeah Chamber of Commerce on Saturday, July 13, 1957, printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

FLORIDA'S TIES WITH LATIN AMERICA

From the discovery of Florida by Ponce de Leon in 1513 to the founding of St. Augustine, our Nation's oldest continuously existing city, by the Spanish in 1565, and on down through the centuries to this very day, the romantic history of our great State has been plainly marked by the Latin influence.

Throughout the length and breadth of Florida our place names reflect our Spanish background. To illustrate, the Perdido River forms our westernmost boundary—the St. Mary's the northernmost. From there down the east coast and up the west, Florida is bounded by cities, passes, bays, keys, and islands whose Latin names remind us of our Latin background—for just a few I mention Fernandina, St. Augustine, Anastasia, Boca Raton, Key Vaca, Tortugas, Marco, Punta Rassa, Boca Grande, Anna Maria, St. Marks, St. Joseph, and Santa Rosa.

The oustanding landmark of the Spanish influence in North America is, of course, our ancient city of St. Augustine whose approaching 400th anniversary in 1965 will afford to all Florida a wonderful opportunity to renew and strengthen the closeness of our historic ties with the people of Latin America and of Spain.

A glance at a map shows clearly that metropolitan Miami is near the geographic and population centers of the Western Hemisphere. It is the nearest point of contact by established transportation pattern, between the United States and Latin America. The map also shows that Miami lies due north of the Panama Canal, and that a line dropped straight south from this area will, contrary to the common conception, run west of almost all of the South American continent, which fans out south and southeasterly from Florida, while the rest of the United States and Canada lie mainly to the north and northwest of us. Therefore, we find the Miami area standing squarely in the geographic center of the great populations of the United States and Canada on the one hand, and the equally large population of Latin America on the other.

The enormous increase in airtravel in recent years has brought us and our Latin American neighbors even closer together, and has made our nearest neighbor, Cuba, only minutes away. Such rapidity of communication has brought about an unprecedented familiarity with each other's lands, customs, and people and has generated a new era of social, cultural, and commercial intercourse.

For many years, first in Key West and later in Tampa, the seat of our great cigar industry, there has been a heavy concentration of Latin American citizens—Floridians of whom we are proud. Miami, too, has its own large numbers of splendid Latin American citizens who have joined you here—many of them outstanding persons in the business world whose varied interests extend to banking, sugar, livestock, hotels, housing, sports, and many other phases of our commercial and industrial life. The same is true in lesser degree in other cities and town throughout Florida. In general,

Latin American family names are almost as frequently found as Smith or Johnson.

Furthermore, our personal ties with Latin America, aside from the historical, geographic, and commercial connections, are almost as easy and natural as are our personal ties with close neighbors, next to whom we have dwelt and grown up in the normal course of family and community life. Your goodwill missions to Latin America from this area and similar missions from Tampa have done much to cement the highly cordial social relations which now prevail—and to add materially to the development of closer business contacts which are helpful both to them and to us. I shall continue to hope for the creation right here in Miami, of the proposed Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center, as the hub around which our friendly relations of every sort with Latin America may came to an impressive focus.

All of the Americas are known as nations of people with a common zeal for freedom and independence. As we in this Nation fought for our own right to self-government, the nations of Latin America likewise, with great determination, sacrifice and suffering threw off the yoke of foreign oppression and established for themselves national lives of their own choice and direction.

Even though the United States has historically been the strongest military power in the Western Hemisphere, the people of Latin America have not the slightest cause for concern because of our nearness—no fear whatever of invasion or of being taken over by our country.

We meticulously kept our word to help Cuba obtain freedom and independence. After the Spanish-American War, and in 1907 when we were again in Cuba, many urged that we annex the island or at least establish a protectorate. President Theodore Roosevelt emphatically rejected such proposals, stating in his famous letter to his Secretary of War, William Howard Taft that, and I quote his unforgettable words:

"Our business is to establish peace and order on a satisfactory basis, start the new government, and then leave the island. I will not even consider the plan of a protectorate, on any plan which would imply our breaking our explicit promise. The good faith of the United States is a mighty valuable asset and must not be impaired."

This is ordinary decency, applied to international relations, and it has been the cardinal principle of United States foreign policy with countries and peoples over whom we may have acquired temporary control in order to keep the peace and establish stability.

In times past the United States on several occasions assumed the self-appointed role of keeper of the peace in its effort to insure the stability of the governments of a number of our southern neighbors. The ill-will which this course of action generated is only now disappearing. The sole purpose of that action was our sincere desire to help those countries to insure their own permanence and stability. I believe that fact is now well understood throughout Latin America.

For today, in the Organization of American States, to which we belong and which we support unreservedly, the hemispheric police power is vested where it should be, that is, in all of the 21 republics which make up that splendid organization. Maintaining peace in the Americas is now a joint regional responsibility, in full accord with the U. N. Charter.

The Organization of American States is the community structure within which the 21 American republics have worked to make this hemisphere a better and safer home for all our peoples. It is strongly established and has on more than one occasion in recent years demonstrated its ability to find solutions for urgent problems which the individual countries involved could not find.

The population of Latin America is expanding more rapidly than that of any other major area of the world today. We in Florida know something of the stringencies of such a situation. Such a vast upsurge in population demands the rapid development of the natural resources, industry, and commerce of those countries. To help meet this requirement we are assisting them in many practical ways.

There is nothing particularly sensational about our programs of cooperation in the development of our sister republics. The inter-American community is a close-knit organization characterized by mutual faith and partnership. That this understanding pervades our relations with Latin America may be the reason why the headlines of our newspapers are seldom concerned with these relationships. This apparent lack of editorial concern can be, and has been misconstrued sometimes as a lack of sympathy, or even as disinterest. I am sure that it is neither. It is rather that in the fast moving and turbulent world of today we in the Americas live in such an intimate and peaceful relationship as to seldom call for sensational news treatment.

In this period of their rapid growth we are making a real and useful contribution to the efforts of our sister republics to build stronger national economies, to raise the standards of living of their people. We, too, have sectors of our own people who are living on substandard levels. It is important to every one of our nations that these underprivileged groups be given an opportunity to help themselves to house, clothe, and feed themselves better, to provide better opportunity and higher health standards for their children.

The people of the United States, as investors, are playing an important part in the economic development of Latin America. We have private direct investments there totaling over $7 billion which are increasing at the rate of $500 million a year. This is of great mutual benefit. Earnings on these investments are rewarding to the investors, and they also provide payrolls for thousands of Latin American employees. Substantial sums also go to pay local taxes. These private investments will continue to increase where conditions are favorable and where stable national governments exist.

The contribution made by our private citizens is complemented by our Government through Export-Import Bank loans which in the past 4 years totaled well over $1 billion for Latin American projects; by our technical assistance programs, by emergency grant aid in three instances, and by our sale to them of surplus agricultural commodities which are paid for in the currencies of the purchasing countries.

Just 2 weeks ago the new International Finance Corporation, an offspring of the World Bank, which is supported by contributions from 50 nations, made its first loan to a West German-owned electrical equipment plant in Brazil. This will spur Brazilian power development and sustain a more rapid industrial growth. Many other projects of helpful nature will undoubtedly spring from this same source.

Members of our Florida Congressional delegation have worked diligently toward the advancement of warm, friendly relations with Latin America, and for the advancement of our programs of cooperation with our sister republics. My distinguished colleague, your own GEORGE SMATHERS, has made a specialty of this activity and his extensive contacts with and effective assistance on many Latin American problems has been outstanding in the Senate. Likewise, good work has been done in this same field by your able Congressman DANTE FASCELL, who, among many other activities, represented our Government at Managua at the recent inauguration of the younger Somoza to succeed his father as president of Nicaragua. As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee his major assignment is to the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs.

Senator SMATHERS and Congressman FASCELL were prime movers in the successful effort last year to repeal the excise tax on travel to the Caribbean area which tax had not only deterred tourism in that important nearby area but also had produced some natural resentment by those friends of ours who were adversely affected.

There are many other areas of cooperation between us and our Latin American friends which are helpful both to them and to us.

That they are productive of worthwhile results can best be shown from a brief report on some of my personal observations during the five official visits to nearby Latin American Nations which I have been privileged to make as a representative of the people of the United States.

I went to Mexico in 1951 as a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee and at the urgent invitation of the Mexican Government which was concerned over several outbreaks of violence which had occurred in the affected areas, to look into our joint campaign with that country to eradicate the foot-and-mouth disease among cattle and other livestock and to give assurance of our vital interest and our willingness to see the project to completion. I found there real appreciation of our efforts and much progress being made on that most serious problem. You know, of course, that eradication was completed, and that our own money, men and scientific know-how all made great contributions to that success.

I returned to Mexico in 1952 as a representative of the United States Congress at a special session of the Pan-American Highway Congress. On every hand I noticed the kindly feeling of the Mexicans and other Latin American participants.

On both trips to Mexico I found at our Embassy and various other places numerous evidences of our cooperation with Mexico on worthwhile objectives. For instance, Dr. Baker and Dr. Stone, who were two of the principal scientists of our Department of Agriculture in the field of Entomology, had a very valuable joint operation underway with various Mexican scientists at Mexico City and also in the field, which was doing experimental work with the blackfly and the Mexican fruitfly, both of which are pests for citrus fruit and other important fruits. Already this work has proved of great value both to Mexico and ourselves. Likewise, I heard of important cooperative work in the fields of public health and education which was underway not only in Mexico but in all the other areas of Latin America which I have visited since that time.

In 1954, I went to Caracas as an official observer to the third Pan-American Highway Congress where, as was stated so kindly by your President in his introduction, I received an award for my work on the development of the Inter-American Highway. In that beautiful Venezuelan city I observed many evidences of the tremendous boom they were enjoying from American development of their oil and mineral resources.

In 1955 I was in all of the Central American countries as a member of the United States delegation to attend the dedication of two new links on the Inter-American Highway, one on the Nicaragua-Costa Rica border, which had been closed due to the bloody fighting that had taken place there only a few months before, and the other in Guatemala, marking the completion of the first project of the then new Castilla Armas administration which had unseated the Communist, Arbenz. The first ceremony was but a few yards away from the bullet-ridden remains of the Costa Rican Customs House where nine men had been killed in the border

fighting. What a contrast it was to see the large number of cars lined up in each direction on the new highway awaiting the official opening before beginning a new era of travel and communication between the two countries. Results like this surely justify our interest in the establishment of modern communication facilities and our payment of two-thirds of the cost of the 1,600 miles of highway in Central America. The other 1,600 miles of the highway—that in Mexico—has been completed by the Mexicans at their own expense.

In Nicaragua I found the United States Corps of Army Engineers mapping by helicopter difficult and uncharted terrain. I was most happy to fly with two young officers from Jacksonville who were piloting the helicopters from which we inspected the work on the Rama road, which will give the first modern access in that country from the Caribbean to the Pacific.

In Costa Rica I found Dr. W. G. Kirk, a Floridian, director of our range cattle experiment station, on assignment from our State board of control to aid them. With him was a veterinarian to help the local livestock people, sent by the State livestock sanitary board to teach new animal husbandry practices to the Costa Ricans. Our Dr. Harold Mowrer, former head of our experiment station, was employed there as principal official adviser on agriculture in Costa Rica.

Later in 1955 I went to Panama in pursuance of my duties as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations which handles Panama Canal matters. Aside from the great benefit the Panamanians derive from the operation of the canal, we now will undertake to build a high-level bridge over the Pacific end of the canal, which we are committed to do under our latest treaty with them. This bridge will be of great value both to the Panamanians and to us, and will be the final link of the Inter-American Highway.

In each of these countries I found many other evidences of progress and real constructive help accomplished through our cooperation. Also I found the greatest possible interest on the part of the Latin American people in our country and our people. The friendliest of attitudes toward us was abundantly displayed everywhere.

The completion of the Inter-American Highway to the Panama Canal, and the improvement of travel and hotel facilities along the way will undoubtedly attract in the future a large portion of the thousands of Americans who annually travel abroad. In riding by car over a considerable portion of the highway I observed many things of interest to be seen there, active volcanoes, fascinating terrain of rugged beauty; numerous birds and animals and much colorful vegetation that are strange to North American eyes. Besides all these the natural pride of American people in the Panama Canal, one of our greatest achievements in the fields of engineering and public health, will lure many of our people there.

It is well known to all of your here that plans are underway for linking Florida with the Inter-American Highway by the existing ferry service from Key West to Cuba, the Cuban highways to a port near Cape San Antonio, and a second ferry across the 110 miles of the Yucatan Channel to Yucatan. The Mexicans are building the several hundred miles of road required to complete the junction with the Inter-American Highway. This will provide a fabulous loop for tourism.

The economic and political stability of a number of our sister Republics depends upon their continued access to United States markets for the goods they produce. The industries that produce these products are usually basic in the various countries. They represent the livelihood of thousands of people. They produce a substantial part, at times the majority of the Government tax income.

Coffee occupies a unique position in inter-American trade. It is by far the most important commodity in our trade relations with the other American Republics. It, therefore, has great significance in our relations with the coffee-producing countries and in economic, social, and political conditions within those countries.

Twice, as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, I have participated in conferences on coffee problems with representatives of Brazil, Colombia, and other Latin American countries, which resulted successfully in easing tensions and the renewal of cordial and uninterrupted trade. I found them delightful gentlemen, but well informed on every aspect of the coffee trade, and properly aggressive in the advancement of the interests of their people.

Sugar is vital to the stability of the Cuban economy. Aside from our normal commercial intercourse we have made Cuba our preferred supplier of sugar. Also we receive heavy imports of their fruits and vegetables and a large portion of their tobacco crop finds its way to Tampa, where more clear Habana cigars are manufactured than are made in Habana itself. Bananas are a major crop in several countries, particularly in Central America.

Venezuela earns 95 percent of its foreign exchange through the sale of petroleum products, about 40 percent of which are sold to us. These conditions can be extended to include the importance of copper to Chile, tin to Bolivia, lumber to Honduras, Guatemala, Mexico, and other similar examples.

The greatest opportunity for mutual benefit for the people of this hemisphere is through economic development of Latin America and the expansion of inter-American trade. In this, however, we must bear in mind that trade is always a two-way proposition. We cannot only sell our manufactured goods and other products—we must also buy, and the channels of trade must be kept reasonably open so that trade may flow in both directions. Live and let live, give and take, must be our motto and our practice.

The fields in which private enterprise and initiative can expand and develop the Latin American economic opportunities are indeed challenging and it would be difficult to overstate the importance of these economic possibilities to the people of our country and the other American Republics. While the governments of the hemisphere can make and are making many contributions toward this development, the course which our countries will follow in this mutually beneficial undertaking will be determined mainly by the attitude of the people themselves.

Sixteen years ago, in my inaugural address as Governor of Florida, I referred to Florida as "this index finger of North America which points southward to the lands whose future is so intimately linked with ours." That concept was sound then—it is just as sound today. With each passing year it becomes increasingly important that much of our time, our attention, our planning, and our sympathetic understanding shall be given to those ways and means by which this hemisphere can be developed more uniformly and on a basis which shall always be joint and mutual.

The people of Florida and of every State in the United States have reason to have faith in and friendship for our fellow Americans, our allies with whom we share this new world, as they—our Latin American neighbors—are entitled to have faith in us. United in this faith, we peoples of the Americas have an obligation to work together with each other in bringing to the rest of the world a shining example in this hemisphere of how peace, justice, material wellbeing, and spiritual progress can exist on this earth.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I desire to call to the attention of the Members of the Senate some recent developments in the unemployment picture which emphasizes again the importance of passing the area redevelopment bill, S. 964, which the eminent senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has introduced with a number of other Senators, including myself, as cosponsors.

The Bureau of Employment Security has announced that seven more areas in the United States have been added to the list of those with substantial unemployment—which is defined as over 6 percent of the labor force. Two areas have been removed from the list, making a net increase of five. One of the areas added is Erie, in my State of Pennsylvania. Two other major areas, one of them Altoona, Pa., have been added to the list of those with unemployment over 9 percent; while one has been removed.

In looking at the statistics which show that the Nation as a whole has a moderately high level of employment and a high level of production and income, we must always keep in mind the fact that our prosperity is uneven and that localized depressions can exist and have existed over long periods of time in the midst of general prosperity. These communities are doing everything they can to lift themselves up by their own bootstraps, but they have exhausted their local resources and desperately need Federal assistance.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks the following excerpts from the Area Classification Summary in the July 1957 edition of the Bimonthly Summary of Labor Market Developments in Major Areas, published by the Bureau of Employment Security, with an explanatory note, which shows that the problem of severe localized unemployment is still with us and getting worse.

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

EXCERPT A

AREAS CHANGED FROM C TO D

Detroit, Mich.: Unemployment reaches substantial levels as auto payrolls continue to edge downward during the late spring. Joblessness still below year-ago levels, however, despite recent rise. Little overall improvement expected until after changeover to 1958 models gets under way.

Erie, Pa.: Reductions in electrical, nonelectrical machinery (air conditioners), primary metals and railroad equipment boost unemployment to substantial proportions. Cutbacks in nonelectrical machinery scheduled to continue to early autumn. Joblessness likely to remain high to year end.

Knoxville, Tenn.: Employment downtrend, under way since turn of year, boosts unemployment to substantial levels. Recent losses heaviest in primary metals (aluminum), instruments; completion of Government contracts cuts apparel. Unemployment expected to remain near current levels through early autumn.

AREAS CHANGED FROM D TO E

Flint, Mich.: Sharp rise in area's already substantial labor surplus results from continuing layoffs in dominant autos and in auto-related electrical machinery and fabricated metals. Joblessness now double early spring level. Further, temporary layoffs expected during auto model changeover period.

Altoona, Pa.: Unemployment, already high in early spring, shows further rise as area's dominant railroad-equipment industry cuts local payrolls. Joblessness now about two-fifths above year-ago mark. Additional curtailments scheduled in railroad equipment, with very little improvement likely in other industries.

AREAS CHANGED FROM E TO D

Terre Haute, Ind.: Gains in electrical equipment and supplies, construction, pace recent employment uptrend. Rise in latter industry spurred by work on large new brass plant. Unemployment, although still substantial, almost one-fourth below year-ago level. Further improvement expected to early autumn, with principal gain likely in construction; some factory increases also scheduled.

SMALLER AREAS—DELETION FROM LABOR SURPLUS LIST

Lexington, Ky.: Joblessness drops to moderate proportion as new industrial growth spurs sizable payroll advances. Metals and machinery group nearly doubles its workforce over the year; construction and service also score substantial increases. Scheduled additional hires for several new manufacturing plants, pickups in construction, farm and trade presage further improvement in area situation to early autumn.

Richlands-Bluefield, Va.: Sizable expansion in key coal mining hires at new furniture plant lead over-the-year employment uptrend. Unemployment now one-third below year-ago levels. Further job gains in prospect to September; staffing of new apparel plant, increases in electrical machinery due to spearhead rise.

SMALLER AREAS—ADDITIONS TO SUBSTANTIAL LABOR SURPLUS LIST

Bay City, Mich.: Sizable cutbacks in auto parts manufacturing and shipbuilding primarily responsible for recent unemployment increases; losses in fabricated metals, foundries and machinery also contribute. Some plants operating on reduced work-week schedules. No basic improvement in area situation is expected over the next few months, although food processing, building materials, construction, and trade may rise seasonally.

Rutherfordton-Forest City, N. C.: Area's substantial unemployment due principally to long-term weakness in dominant textile industry. Construction, trade, service payrolls also down since year ago; joblessness up one-fourth since last December. Further unemployment rise averted by outmigration, out-commuting, and withdrawals from labor force. Only minor changes anticipated over next few months.

Portsmouth-Chillicothe, Ohio: Recent shutdown of large local shoe factory boosts joblessness above substantial levels. Primary metals, railroad transportoation, construction, trade and coal mining among other important industries reporting payroll losses since year ago. Light hiring in paper, atomic energy provides only partial offset to these declines. Little prospect for significant change during the next few months.

Springfield, Ill.: Sizable layoffs in important nonelectrical machinery, smaller over-the-year losses in electrical machinery, food processing cut factory employment to 7-year low; boost unemployment to substantial level. Joblessness now some 70 percent above year-ago level. Little basic improvement likely in next few months; factory employment may dip further.

EXCERPT B

AREAS OF "SUBSTANTIAL LABOR SURPLUS"—JULY 1957

Major areas

Indiana: Evansville, Terre Haute.
Massachusetts: Fall River, Lawrence, Lowell.
Michigan: Detroit, Flint, Grand Rapids, Muskegon.
New Jersey: Atlantic City.
North Carolina: Asheville, Durham.
Pennsylvania: Altoona, Erie, Johnstown.
Scranton, Wilkes-Barre—Hazleton.
Puerto Rico: Mayaguez, Ponce, San Juan.
Rhode Island: Providence.
Tennessee: Knoxville.
West Virginia: Charleston.
Wisconsin: Kenosha.

Smaller areas

Alabama: Jasper.
Connecticut: Danielson.
Illinois: Canton, Harrisburg, Herrin-Murphysboro-West Frankfort, Litchfield, Mount Carmel-Olney, Mount Vernon, Springfield.
Indiana: Michigan City-La Porte, Muncie, Richmond, Vincennes.
Kansas: Coffeyville-Independence-Parsons, Pittsburg.
Kentucky: Corbin, Frankfort, Hazard, Madisonville, Middlesboro-Harlan, Morehead-Grayson, Owensboro, Paintsville-Prestonsburg, Pikeville-Williamson.
Maine: Biddeford-Sanford.
Maryland: Cumberland.
Massachusetts: North Adams.
Michigan: Bay City, Iron Mountain, Monroe, Port Huron.
New Jersey: Bridgeton, Long Branch.
North Carolina: Fayetteville, Kinston, Mount Airy, Rocky Mount, Rutherfordton-Forest City,Shelby-Kings Mountain, Waynesville.
Ohio: Portsmouth-Chillicothe, Springfield.
Oklahoma: McAlester.
Pennsylvania: Berwick-Bloomsburg, Clearfield-Dubois, Lewistown, Lock Haven, Pottsville, Sunbury-Shamokin-Mt. Carmel, Uniontown-Connellsville.
Rhode Island: Newport.
Tennessee: LaFollette-Jellico-Tazewell.
Texas: Texarkana.
Virginia: Big Stone Gap-Appalachia, Radford-Pulaski.
West Virginia: Beckley, Fairmont, Logan, Point Pleasant-Gallipolis, Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs, Welch.

(NOTE.—Group E includes areas with unemployment from 9 to 11.9 percent; Group D from 6 to 8.9 percent; Group C from 3 to 5.9 percent. The "substantial labor surplus" list includes all areas with unemployment over 6 percent. Excerpt A shows what is happening in the areas which have been reclassified. Excerpt B lists all of the areas of substantial labor surplus in the country.)

THE FREDRIC R. MANN AUDITORIUM AT TEL AVIV, ISRAEL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on October 2, in Tel Aviv, Israel, there will be dedicated a new home for the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra. It will be called the Fredric R. Mann Auditorium.

The name it bears is that of an old friend and associate, a Philadelphia business and civic leader and patron of the arts. Its opening is the fruition of a dream born some 6 years ago in the City of Brotherly Love. Fredric R. Mann is the city representative and director of commerce of the city of Philadelphia, and president of the Robin Hood Dell. Each summer, the Friends of the Dell, headed by Mr. Mann, join with the city's Department of Recreation in presenting a free summer series of concerts featuring the Robin Hood Dell Symphony—substantially the famous Philadelphia Orchestra—and great stars of the concert world in the sylvan setting of Robin Hood Dell in Philadelphia's famed Fairmount Park. These concerts are attended annually by almost half a million Philadelphians. I am happy to note that they were made a free service to the people of Philadelphia while I was mayor of that city and while Mr. Mann was commissioner of recreation.

In 1951 the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra made a goodwill tour of the United States as a means of showing the people of this country the cultural attainments of an infant State born 3 years before. They played at the Academy of Music in Philadelphia and in their tour of that historic city visited the Robin Hood Dell. They told Mr. Mann that throughout Israel there was no concert hall adequate for performing before the music-hungry people of that country. The Israel Philharmonic is composed of the greatest musicians of Europe, most of whom were rescued from the Hitler terror that drove them from their countries and exterminated so many of their people.

This need for a concert hall fell upon the ears of a man whose love for music is almost an obsession. He is chairman of the board of the America-Israel Cultural Foundation, an agency dedicated to the cultural interchange between the two countries. Through that agency, he rallied his friends and gave generously of his own funds and raised the money to build this home which will be one of the finest music structures anywhere in the world.

On Wednesday evening, October 2, the Fredric R. Mann Auditorium will formally be given to the people of Israel with a concert featuring some of the greatest musical stars that America has to offer: Leonard Bernstein, America's great young composer-conductor; Artur Rubinstein, the distinguished pianist; Isaac Stern, the world-renowned violin virtuoso: and Gregor Piatigorsky, the world's premier cellist. Coming from all over the world will be the great names of music and government. A large delegation of Americans will be present as guests of the Prime Minister of Israel, the Honorable David Ben Gurion.

As a Pennsylvanian and a Philadelphian, I take great pride in the fact that Fredric Mann will be so singly honored in the new city in the age-old land of the Bible. His name, engraved on this hall, will stand as a reminder of the friendship between the people of the United States and the heroic people of the world's newest democracy.

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished, and I may say revered, Senator from the State of West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I am most pleased to present to the Senate a report of the activity of that committee during the 1st session of the 85th Congress.

The Committee on the District of Columbia is somewhat unique among Senate committees in that to it are brought a great variety of problems and a broad gamut of legislative proposals. It acts not only as a Senate committee on prob-

lems of national import, but in addition as the equivalent of the upper house of a State legislature and as a city council. Due to the many conflicting interests that stem from the fact that the city of Washington is the National Capital, and a voteless National Capital without representative self-government, these duties must necessarily devolve upon us. Service upon the District of Columbia Committee is, however, a most rewarding assignment in that it enables a Senator so chosen an admirable opportunity to learn at firsthand of the many pressing problems that the Capital shares with the other great metropolitan areas of our country. It serves as an excellent discipline to a Senator in the difficult art of mastering with speed and accuracy many detailed and technical aspects of modern municipal management, and it provides an insight into some of the problems faced in every State by State authorities.

These are the reasons Mr. President, which motivate those of us who are fortunate enough to be selected tc serve on the committee to attempt to carry on our assignment to the best of our ability. It is for these reasons, Mr. President, that we are proud of the record that the committee makes in the field of constructive legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report I submit herewith be printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. It consists of a summary statement of committee activity and a statistical table of committee action on matters referred to it for consideration.

In connection with this activity report, Mr. President, I should like to draw the attention of the Senate to one overall statistic. The committee had referred to it in this session 105 matters. These matters included Senate bills, House acts, resolutions from both bodies, and nominations. I submit that for the committee to have given active consideration to all but 33 of these matters is a commendable record.

I should also like to point out that 10 of the 33 matters to which no active consideration has as yet been given were received by the committee subsequent to August 1 of this year.

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

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, 85TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, AUGUST 30, 1957

The Committee on the District of Columbia received for consideration in the 85th Congress, 1st session, the following:

Senate bills	71
House bills	25
Senate resolutions	2
Senate joint resolution	1
Senate concurrent resolution	1
House concurrent resolution	1
Nominations	4
Grand total	105

Hearings were held by subcommittees on 38 Senate bills and 11 House bills. The full committee held hearings on four nominations, all of which were favorably reported by the committee.

The full committee met nine times.

Of the 23 Senate bills reported to the Senate, 18 were passed by the Senate and four were indefinitely postponed and companion House bills were considered and passed in lieu thereof. One Senate bill was recommitted and a companion House bill was reported in lieu thereof. Of the 14 House bills reported to the Senate, 13 were passed by the Senate. One House concurrent resolution has been approved by both bodies.

As of this date, one House bill is pending on the Senate Calendar.

Conference committees were appointed on two bills, and Senate conferees have been appointed on one bill. Three conference committee meetings were held. The Senate acted favorably on the three conference reports.

In addition to the foregoing, extensive hearings were conducted on the problems of hungry children in the District of Columbia, home-rule proposals for the District of Columbia, Potomac River crossings, Sibley Memorial Hospital site, and police and firemen retirement legislation. Two subcommittee field trips of an investigatory nature were made in addition to the formal hearings.

The following is a statistical summary of committee action:

Number of bills, acts, resolutions, and nominations referred to committee	105
Number of bills, acts, resolutions, and nominations reported to Senate	42
Number of bills, acts, and resolutions in process (hearings held or other action taken)	9
Number of bills, acts, and resolutions disposed of through consolidation with other Senate bills or House acts	18
Number of bills, acts, and resolutions indefinitely postponed within committee	3
Number of bills, acts, and resolutions awaiting initial action	[1] 33

[1] Of this number, six Senate and four House bills were received by the committee subsequent to Aug. 2, 1957.

The following is a list, by title and number, of all bills and acts passed by the Senate. Those that became law are indicated by the public or private law number.

S. 78, to provide for the maintenance and operation of the bridge to be constructed over the Potomac River from Jones Point, Va., to Maryland.

S. 105, to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Association of Colored Women's Clubs, Inc., in the District of Columbia.

S. 768, to designate the east 14th Street highway bridge over the Potomac River at 14 Street in the District of Columbia as the Rochambeau Memorial Bridge. Public Law 85–76.

S. 944, to amend the act of August 30, 1954, entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes."

S. 969, to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of alcohol in the blood or urine of persons tried in the District of Columbia for operating vehicles while under the influence of intoxicating liquor.

S. 1040, to amend the acts known as the "Life Insurance Act," approved June 19, 1934, and the Fire and Casualty Act, approved October 9, 1940.

S. 1264, to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States in the District of Columbia. Public Law 85–80.

S. 1269, 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.

S. 1576, to exempt the sale of materials for certain war memorials in the District of Columbia from the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act. Public Law 85–82.

S. 1586, to eliminate the financial limitation on real and personal estate holdings of the American Historical Association and to exempt from taxation certain property of such association in the District of Columbia. Public Law 85–83.

S. 1708, to amend the act entitled "An act relating to children born out of wedlock," approved January 11, 1951.

S. 1764, to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act.

S. 1841, to authorize the District of Columbia Board of Education to employ retired teachers as substitute teachers in the public schools of the District of Columbia.

S. 1842, to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925.

S. 1849, to provide for more effective administration of public assistance in the District of Columbia; to make certain relatives responsible for support of needy persons, and for other purposes.

S. 1906, authorizing the conferring of appropriate degrees by the District of Columbia Teachers College on those persons who have met the requirements for such degrees, and for other purposes.

S. 1908, to amend the District of Columbia Hospital Center Act in order to extend the time and increase the authorization for appropriations for the purposes of such act, and to provide that grants under such act may be made to certain organizations organized to construct and operate hospital facilities in the District of Columbia.

S. 2438, to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act. (At the White House.)

H. R. 192, to provide that members of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia may be removed for cause. Public Law 85–119.

H. R. 1937, to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation by the Armory Board of the District of Columbia of a stadium in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes. (At the White House.)

H. R. 2018, to permit any State of the United States or any political subdivision of any such State to purchase from the District of Columbia Reformatory at Lorton, Va., gun mountings and carriages for guns for use at historic sites and for museum display purposes. Public Law 85–45.

H. R. 3400, to provide full and fair disclosure of the character of charitable, benevolent, patriotic, or other solicitations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes. Public Law 85–87.

H. R. 4813, to extend the life of the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission, and for other purposes.

H. R. 4932, to amend the act of July 11, 1947, to increase the maximum rate of compensation which the director of the Metropolitan Police force band may be paid. Public Law 85–129.

H. R. 6258, to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937, as amended. (At the White House.)

H. R. 6306, to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two 4-lane bridges to replace the existing 14th Street or highway bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes."

H. R. 6454, to amend the act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes. Public Law 85–46.

H. R. 6508, to modify the Code of Law for the District of Columbia to provide for a uniform succession of real and personal property in case of intestacy, to abolish dower and curtesy, and to grant unto a surviving spouse a statutory share in the other's real

estate owned at time of death, and for other purposes. (At the White House.)

H. R. 6517, to provide for the retirement of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, the White House Police force, and of certain officers and members of the United States Secret Service, and for other purposes. Public Law 85–157.

H. R. 7249, to improve and extend, through reciprocal legislation, the enforcement of duties of support in the District of Columbia. Public Law 85–94.

H. R. 7467, to amend the act of March 3, 1901, with respect to the citizenship and residence qualifications of the directors or trustees of certain companies in the District of Columbia. (At the White House.)

H. R. 7825, to exempt from taxation certain property of the B'nai B'rith Henry Monsky Foundation, in the District of Columbia. (At the White House.)

H. R. 7835, to increase the authorization for appropriations for the Hospital Center and facilities in the District of Columbia and for other purposes. Public Law 85–73.

H. R. 8256, to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as amended, to exclude social security benefits and to provide additional exemptions for age and blindness, and to exempt from personal property taxation in the District of Columbia, boats used solely for pleasure purposes, and for other purposes. (At the White House.)

H. R. 8918, to further amend the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896), as amended by the act of October 25, 1951 (65 Stat. 657), to provide for the exchange of lands of the United States as a site for the new Sibley Memorial Hospital; to provide for the transfer of the property of the Hahnemann Hospital of the District of Columbia, formerly the National Homeopathic Association, a corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, to the Lucy Webb Hayes National Training School for Deaconesses and Missionaries, including Sibley Memorial Hospital, and for other purposes. (At the White House.)

The following is a list of nominations confirmed by the Senate:

Catherine B. Kelly, of Maryland, to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia for a term of 10 years, vice Nadine Lane Gallagher, term expired.

Orman W. Ketcham, of Maryland, to be judge of the juvenile court for the District of Columbia for a term of 6 years, vice Edith H. Cockrill, term expired.

Andrew Parker, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for the term expiring March 3, 1962. (Reappointment.)

John Lewis Smith, Junior, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia for the term of 10 years, vice Frank Hammett Myers, appointed to the domestic relations branch.

THE TUNGSTEN MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, many times during the past session I have called the attention of the Senate to the critical situation of the mining industry of the West. My colleagues will remember that during this session we passed a bill to provide $30 million for the American tungsten mining industry, only to see that item struck from the appropriation bill in the House of Representatives.

It seems ironical to me that we on one hand give nearly the same amount of money to assist a mining industry in a foreign nation, when we fail to consider the needs of our own mining industry. This is just one specific instance; I am sure there are many more. I sincerely hope the Congress and executive department of this Nation will awaken to the disastrous policy we are now following before it is too late.

Production of tungsten, as well as other minerals, has practically ceased in Nevada. The tungsten industry now has fewer than 100 employees in my own State. Many miners are out of work. In all fairness I ask the question: "Is it good policy to let our American miners' breadbaskets go empty while we take our tax dollars and build a mining industry in a foreign country?" An industry which will, and which does, import cheaply mined minerals to our American shores to compete with our own labor. Somewhere we must draw the line.

I should like to call attention to the last two paragraphs of an editorial which was published recently in one of Nevada's leading newspapers, the Nevada State Journal.

The editorial calls attention to the 16-page supplement inserted by the Government of Korea in the August 11 issue of the New York Times. It points out one line in this supplement which says: "Korea will spend 29.8 millions of American dollars for rebuilding Korean mining industry." Photos show that many of these are tungsten mines.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the Nevada State Journal of August 25, 1957]

WHICH SHOULD COME FIRST, THE FAR WEST OR FAR EAST?

While the tungsten, copper, and lead-zinc mines in Nevada, and throughout the West, wallow in the doldrums, the United States House of Representatives sailed along last week toward adjournment, seemingly oblivious of the plight of thousands of miners thrown out of work and the imminent danger of a complete shutdown of the industry producing these vitally needed metals.

The lower House of Congress en masse, of course, is not really unaware of the critical mining situation. It only appears to be so. WALTER S. BARING, Nevada's Representative in the House, for instance, made it plain to his colleagues that the tungsten mines would close without a Federal purchase plan. Many other Members of the lower House have done the same, and both of Nevada's Senators, too, have continually hammered the point.

But the House, composed mainly of easteners to whom the Far West is only a place "out there," are concerned not with where metals are produced, nor the "at home" economic repercussions resulting therefrom. The vast majority, if they have given the metals market any thought at all, only seek to make certain the product is on hand. Where the tungsten, lead and zinc or copper comes from does not concern them. Of if they are one whit worried about it they prefer the mining be done in Latin America or the Orient, fearing protection for this lifeblood industry of the Western United States will disrupt public relations abroad.

The United States Senate must be exempted specifically from this dereliction, having given mining more than adequate support. Other divisions of Government, however, are in the same category as the lower House of Congress, as well as some individuals whose sole reason for throttling down the industry is personal gain.

In the latter category is a man named Phillip McKenna, head of Kennemetal, Inc., the parent company of the Nevada Scheelite, which closed when the Federal tungsten purchase program was discontinued. Mr. McKenna was not worried about that development, though, because he stood to gain much more by the discontinuance than through this comparatively small Nevada industry. Representative BARING, in a letter to this newspaper last spring, said McKenna was the one man responsible for the House Appropriations Committee's turning down the tungsten subsidy.

The committee chairman relied almost solely on McKenna's testimony. And McKenna said the purchase program was unnecessary. McKenna is principally a fabricator, not a producer. When tungsten purchases were discontinued, 110,000 units were then scheduled for sale on the open market, forcing the price down under distress selling. It was estimated by the Nevada Congressman that McKenna, buying under this situation, would stand to gain about $30,000 a month. But the lower House listened, and the subsidy died.

It is all very well to harangue about free trade and open competition, but the Government is now engaged in a policy, as far as metal is concerned at least, in which money is loaned to foreign nations to put our own workers out of work and our own businessmen out of business.

An excellent illustration of the truth of such an assertion is that found in the New York Times of Sunday, August 11. Included in the issue is a 16-page advertisement inserted by the Government of Korea, which explained in the main how a generous American Government was helping rebuild that nation. Among the statistics was one sentence pointing out that Korea will spend 29.8 millions of American dollars for rebuilding Korean mining and industry. The advertisement, in itself a very costly piece of propaganda, was dotted with photos of Korean tungsten properties, all of which are being reactivated with that 29.8 million dollars—almost the exact sum which would have kept our own tungsten mines going for the fiscal year, and kept American miners employed.

Giving succor to downtrodden nations cannot be too highly commended. But if the Congressmen and others who consider themselves international philanthropists will turn their eyes, for just a little while, to the Western United States they might become persuaded that their own countrymen are in need of an even break too, at least once in a while.

CLOTURE IN THE SENATE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to read into the RECORD this morning a statement issued by six Senators, as follows:

JOINT STATEMENT

We have felt right along that the threat of a filibuster was overhanging the debate and influencing the Senate's action on the civil-rights bill. Also, we have seen a sample of what the filibuster means to civil-rights measures and how it can block the public business in such critical times. We wish to state therefore that this demonstration strengthens our determination to work for reasonable amendments to rule XXII to make it more practical to invoke cloture in appropriate situations. In this way discussion may finally be brought to a close after full and fair debate, not obstruction, and we may perform our constitutional duty to

vote on the issue. We propose to forward vigorously the efforts to attain that objective.

CLIFFORD P. CASE, *New Jersey.*
IRVING M. IVES, *New York.*
JACOB K. JAVITS, *New York.*
THOMAS H. KUCHEL, *California.*
CHARLES E. POTTER, *Michigan.*
EDWARD J. THYE, *Minnesota.*

Mr. President, for the information of the Senate I wish to state that the subcommittee on which I had the honor to serve with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] has concluded its hearings, and the proceedings are being printed. During the recess I expect that each of us will file a report. I look forward with real expectation that early in the next session of Congress some action will be taken on the subject upon which a number of resolutions are pending, and upon which we have had a very important case history made.

USED CAR DEALERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the attention of the Subcommittee on Automobile Marketing Practices has been called to what appears to be improper practices by some used-car dealers in the District of Columbia, by which they have succeeded in making collection agents of the armed services on installment sales of used automobiles to servicemen—all directly contrary to armed services regulations. I respectfully request that the Secretary of Defense make a thorough investigation of this matter, with the view of making necessary revisions in the regulations relating to allotments by servicemen.

Armed services regulations limit the purposes for which an allotment may be registered by a serviceman, but quite properly provide that allotments from their pay may be made to savings institutions. Certainly, we will all commend this method of encouraging thrift among members of the Armed Forces.

However, it now comes to the attention of the Subcommittee that these provisions of the armed services regulations are being exploited by some unscrupulous used-car dealers in the District of Columbia. These dealers have persuaded members of the armed services to arrange for monthly payments on used automobiles by allotting part of their pay to an unlicensed saving institution. The used-car dealer then arranges for the serviceman to open a joint account with the dealer—joint only in the sense that the serviceman puts the money in and the dealer promptly takes the money out.

Several examples of this practice have come to our attention.

I would like to submit for the RECORD at this point, a letter to the Pittsburgh Sun Telegraph from the mother of a 23-year-old Army private stationed at Fort Benning. This young man contracted with a District of Columbia used car dealer to pay $75 a month for a 1953 used car. His monthly pay is $80. The car payments were to be deducted by the Army from his pay as an allotment. Incidentally, the finance rate was nearly 40 percent simple interest on the unpaid balance. This soldier paid $400 down and then the car was repossessed from his mother's yard without warning although the car was left locked while the boy was on furlough in Pittsburgh.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the letter from the serviceman's mother.

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

AUGUST 14, 1957.

SUN-TELEGRAPH PAPER:

I read your paper every day especially the part where people speak their minds. I have never had an occasion to write a letter to that column but I do enjoy it, and I think I have a very good reason to write one now. It may help some soldier boy that has a little money saved up and is thinking of buying a car in Washington, D. C. Here is a racket right in your Capital that is doing a great business with our boys. Their ads in Army papers about the wonderful buys they can get—for Army personnel only—no others can buy them. They even pay the fare from any place in United States to the District of Columbia, if some poor kid happens to be in the market for a car and calls on one of the dealers when he sees their ad.

Now this is no hearsay or lies because it happened to my son who is stationed in Fort Benning, Ga. On June 28 he was one of the unlucky ones to read about the wonderful deal he could get on cars in the District of Columbia. So he called a dealer and they made a deal with him to fly to the District of Columbia, all expenses paid, and on June 29 he bought a car.

My kid is not very smart about cars as he is only 23 years old and the only thing he could see was the red upholstery and a speaker in the rear. Now this car is a 1953 Olds and he paid $1,500 for it and paid $400 cash of which he had been saving for a long time to buy a car.

He brought the car home on leave. His Dad took one look at it and knew it was worth no more than the $400 cash money he paid for it. No brakes, power steering gone, power brakes worn thin. So he got in touch with the dealer. Nothing was done. My son couldn't even drive it back to camp, he had to go by bus. He wrote after he was back in camp and told the finance company that he wouldn't pay another cent until they either changed the car or fixed this one.

By the way, the payments run the kid $75 a month which he was supposed to make out of an allotment of his pay to the finance company. He makes $80 a month.

Now this all happened on June 29. Yesterday (August 13) I was away and the car was locked when I left. I came home last night, no car. The finance company towed it away. Now he has no car and is out $400.

So do you blame me for exposing a racket like this? Are they so money hungry in the District of Columbia that our boys in the United States Army have to be made suckers out of? They only sell cars to Army kids because they know no other person would fall for a line like that. If there is any way at all I am going to get his $400 back.

Oh yes, I forgot to mention that he is stationed in Georgia and has been there since December and will be there for quite a long time but the car salesman gave him a break on his license. He had them issued from Virginia. He told my kid he would do that because there was no sales tax on licenses from there. Some joke, isn't it? Isn't there some protection of any kind to the kids in the service from a racket like this? Thank you.

P. S.—If you print this letter, sign it a mother of a soldier. I can't use my name as I am employed as a State worker.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, last month there came to my attention a similar situation in which a 19-year-old Air Force private stationed at Griffiss Air Force Base in Rome, N. Y., was lured into the clutches of a District of Columbia used-car dealer under the most shameful circumstances. This young man was promised that the expenses of his trip from his base would be deducted from the cost of the car. As finally signed the contract carried interest of more than 35 percent. The car broke down four times at a cost of $113.45 on the way home.

Responsible people tell us that these practices are creating a real problem to the Armed Forces because of the effect which it has on the morale of servicemen and their families when they fall into the hands of some of these loan companies and are subjected to the harassment to which they resort. Furthermore, the armed services are being forced to devote a great deal of time and money to maintain accounting facilities to handle these allotments, which are in fact nothing but disguised automobile payments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Military District of Washington be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

HEADQUARTERS,
MILITARY DISTRICT
OF WASHINGTON,
Washington, D. C., August 13, 1957.

Subject: Usury and fraud complaints.

1. There has been an increased number of complaints received from service personnel regarding fraudulent sales on the part of car dealers in the District of Columbia area. These normally are cases of misrepresentation and unscrupulous business dealings on the part of the car dealer which often result in economic loss to the serviceman as well as additional administrative work for the services.

2. The absence of usury or small-loan laws in the District of Columbia makes it desirable that detailed accounts of such activities or places be assembled if effective preventive and remedial measures are to be undertaken. The marshaling of complaints will permit a determination at the proper time whether the current practices of certain automobile dealers justify and require appropriate action under AR 600–10 in order to safeguard the welfare of the military personnel.

3. The Armed Services Police, the action agency for the Washington Armed Services Disciplinary Control Board, has been designated as the office of record for all service cases involving sales frauds or the unreasonable exploitation of the serviceman by elements of the civil economy. Commanders will refer all such cases coming to their attention of the armed services police for appropriate action.

For the commander:

T. M. KOBAYASHI,
Lieutenant Colonel, Adjutant General's Corps, Assistant Adjutant General.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I want to make it clear that I do not criticize the Army, Navy, or Air Force because some of our young servicemen get stung by "new-car-itis" and trapped in the web of usury. This happens to millions of civilians as well as Army people because of the total lack of any regulation on time sales except in the handful of enlightened States that have dealt with this problem and have recognized that people who buy merchandise on time need the same kind of protection as those who borrow money under small-loan laws.

Nor do I blame the services for unwittingly allowing themselves to become agents for automobile finance companies. This came about as the result of an Armed Forces regulation designed to encourage thrift by allowing servicemen to allot part of their pay to legitimate savings institutions.

As with most regulations the smart operators just figured a way around it. The automobile finance companies have the allotment made out to a local unlicensed savings institution which turns it over to the finance company.

However, now that this racket has been called to the attention of both the military departments and this subcommittee, I am today requesting that the Secretary of Defense make a thorough investigation of the methods used and the extent of this practice and report his findings to this body upon our return in January. I want to assure the Secretary of Defense that he may expect the fullest cooperation of the subcommittee members and its staff.

DEVELOPMENT OF NATION'S WATER RESOURCES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, high on the list of constructive accomplishments of this session of Congress is the action taken to develop our Nation's water resources.

We have authorized and made appropriations for the construction of flood control and water conservation projects of the utmost importance.

We have approved reclamation projects that will pay for themselves in the increased productivity they will make possible.

We have made further progress in the development of our inland waterways, which are a vastly significant factor in our economy.

We have authorized river basin surveys that will lay the foundation for the water development projects of tomorrow.

Mr. President, I am frank to say I feel a personal pride in these accomplishments. The pride is personal, because to me the water problem is deeply personal.

Nowhere does that problem loom larger than in my own State of Texas.

In Texas we are 25 years behind other States in the development of our water resources. Action taken during this session of Congress, when combined with action being taken by the State government of Texas, will take us a long way toward an adequate solution of our water problem. The groundwork has been laid for Texas to catch up with other States.

When the President signed the public works appropriation bill enacted by the Congress, he said he did so with reluctance because it contained projects not approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. President, I am glad we added those projects.

The Congress has consistently refused to give the President the item veto power. Why should we permit an executive agency, the Budget Bureau, to exercise such power?

The Congress has the clearcut responsibility for developing and carrying out an adequate water program for the Nation. We have met that responsibility during this session, and I congratulate my colleagues for their refusal to allow themselves to be bound by policies that are both restrictive and repressive.

Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas.

THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF CONGRESS DURING THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 85TH CONGRESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we are approaching the closing hours of the 1st session of the 85th Congress.

Adjournment sine die always touches off a vast wave of speculation. Some analysts pore over the record with a fine tooth comb. Others write their summaries off the nearest wall.

All this in an effort to judge the merits of the work of the Congress.

Usually, the analyses are based upon some kind of predetermined list of bills. The Congress is considered successful if it passes a high percentage of bills on the list; a failure if the percentage is low.

Personally, I have always been skeptical of the value of such judgments. It is possible to measure the percentage of bills passed on such a basis. But just how can the value of the measures on the list be determined?

It is not completely out of the question for those who make the list to pad them with legislation of a certain variety. I cannot avoid the suspicion that this is something that may be done even by Presidents—of both parties.

Sometimes recommendations are made with an air that suggests somebody's tongue is in somebody's cheek. For example, this year the President recommended tax relief for small business but did not send us a bill providing for that relief.

Members of the majority party introduced several bills along those lines. But the Secretary of the Treasury testified against each one of those Democratic bills. The result was an inability to get together, and no tax relief for small business.

It is possible to give Congress a low box score by sending it legislative recommendations made up like a laundry list. It is possible to give Congress a high box score by making the original list low and compact. Either way, the box score has little meaning.

Another way to find a standard for judgment of a Congress is to use as the basis the amount of controversy which was created. Again, I have strong doubts as to the value of this standard.

There have been many controversies, in my experience, which have generated considerable heat, but little power. Other actions of historic importance have created hardly a ripple—because there was little controversy.

Recently, a national publication scoffed at the inclusion of a poultry-inspection bill on a list of important measures passed by Congress. It is, of course, simple to succumb to the temptation to make a wisecrack about a chicken-feed bill.

But I wonder whether the housewife—who must worry about the health and welfare of her family—would consider this measure unimportant. How much does it mean to her to know that the food which her family is getting has been inspected for purity by competent Federal inspectors? And how many housewives are there in this country?

Mr. President, it seems to me that both the tests I have described previously are inadequate. It also seems to me that there are very clear tests which give a true picture of whether a Congress has performed well.

Has it met the real problems of our times?

Has it passed legislation that our people need?

Has it resolved—rather than created—controversies?

Has it rejected unwise proposals, as well as accepted wise proposals?

On the basis of those tests, the 1st session of the 85th Congress can go to the American people. And I believe its record will meet with the approval of the people.

Had this Congress passed no other measure, its passage of the voting-rights bill would entitle it to a place in history.

I realize that honorable men disagree over the merits of the measure. But no one can argue that it is meaningless. And no one can avoid the fact that it is the first such measure passed by Congress in 82 years.

During four generations, this controversy has divided our people and inflamed passions; and there was no action—just more fuel to pour on the flames of hatred.

Mr. President, no one pretends that the problem has been solved. But the mere fact of action is a long step toward an ultimate solution.

And when we have acted strongly to protect voting rights, that step is a long one indeed. The voting-rights bill means that we are passing from the stage of partisan oratory into reasonable consideration.

There is never any legitimate fear of measures which men consider in the light of reason.

There were other actions of this Congress, however, which can be considered historic, without abusing that too-much-used word.

One was the Middle East doctrine, sent to this Congress in the opening days of the session. I believe we can all be frank to admit that in its original form, it could not have been approved.

But a need existed for action. There was a vacuum to be filled. The Senate

departed from a longstanding custom of either accepting—in toto—or rejecting—in toto—an executive recommendation.

Instead, we worked with the executive department to produce a measure which bore the stamp of both branches of our Government. The result was a joint product of which all Americans can jointly be proud.

The responsibility for this doctrine—whether for good or for bad—must be shared by both branches of our Government. And since the fundamental need of our country was unity, this is far to be preferred to partisan advantage.

Another far-reaching step was the approval of the International Atomic Energy Treaty. It is perhaps unfortunate that we did not stage the debate on it in a boxing arena. Had there been blood on the floor, the Nation might have been forcefully reminded that we were taking one of the most important steps in foreign policy in many years.

This treaty promises to convert the atom from an instrument of war to an implement of peace. Furthermore, it is the only step that has been taken toward international control of the atom since atomic power was unleashed.

Mr. President, we have had speeches, plans, and debates. But the only positive step—under adequate safeguards—has been the negotiation of the treaty and its approval by the Senate.

This measure did not wind up in blazing heat, simply because careful and prudent men studied it from every angle, in advance. There was little controversy—but that was due to the fact that every aspect had been thought out in advance. The committee, under the distinguished chairmanship of the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], had done a thorough, an adequate, and a remarkable job, along with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and along with the distinguished minority leader and other Members who are interested in the problem of world relations and the future of mankind.

In the long view of history, this treaty may turn out to be a turning point in the affairs of mankind.

In the field of mutual security, another forward step was taken. The emphasis was shifted from direct grants—giveaways—to substantial and respectable loans.

I do not think the shift in emphasis was sufficient. But I recognize that the legislative process requires accommodation. We do not all get all we want. But then it is probably best for the country that no one point of view can dominate.

In the course of this debate, we found it possible to make substantial savings.

The original request from the President amounted to $4,400 million. The President voluntarily reduced the request by $500 million; and in passing the authorization bill, the Congress dropped it another $500 million.

The final appropriation was $2,768,760,000—a 37 percent reduction from the original request.

Another significant aspect of this Congress was that it met the demand of our people for economy.

At the beginning of this year, the President sent us a recordbreaking budget for peacetime—$71,800 million. That budget was accompanied by a warning from the Secretary of the Treasury that it must be cut, to avoid a hair-curling depression.

That warning stirred our people deeply. Congress went to work. We searched the budget dollar by dollar, comma by comma, line by line.

Some parts of it could not be touched. We must pay the interest on the national debt; and if it costs as much to refinance the last part of it as it did to refinance the first part of it, under this administration, the cost will ultimately be $11 billion in interest, instead of $7 billion in interest.

We must meet the solemn obligations of our Government to our veterans. We cannot repudiate contracts made in good faith.

But from the part of the budget which was subject to the control of reasonable men, we took $5,927,495,584—a reduction of 9.1 percent.

I have heard the argument that this does not represent real savings because some of it might not effect spending this year. Those arguments are not very impressive.

The reductions represent savings somewhere along the line. And no amount of debate over the technicalities of accounting can conceal that fact.

We kept the faith with our people. And we kept it without cutting down on such vital services as health research and water conservation.

The list of constructive measures approved by this Senate can be continued indefinitely. They may not all be as dramatic as some which have been cited. But they were solid, substantial achievements.

We passed an immigration bill—not one that went as far as I think we should go, but one that still provides genuine relief.

We passed an Agricultural Trade Development Act—another far-reaching step which benefits both our domestic economy and our foreign policy.

We passed the Niagara River power bill, and increased the borrowing authority of the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation.

We authorized a TVA expansion program and an Atomic Energy Commission construction program.

Mr. President, at the conclusion of these remarks, I shall place in the RECORD a list of a number of the public bills the Senate has passed at the first session of this Congress. And I shall also place in the RECORD a statistical summary of our activities, if I may have permission to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I do not believe that such a summary is an adequate basis for judging the merits of a Congress. But, Mr. President, it is a basis for determining the effort that went into a Congress.

And I assure my colleagues that the figures compare favorably with those of any other Congress in recent years.

I shall also add a complete breakdown of the bills which have been passed.

But it is not my purpose today to go into details. We have plenty of time for such an analysis in the future.

For the present, I merely wish to thank all my colleagues—on both sides of the aisle—for the cooperation and patience which made this record possible. It is one of which all of us can be proud.

There are some who will be disappointed because of the things we did not pass.

But some of the proposals were—in our collective judgment—unwise. Some could be postponed—and postponement does not mean death.

The Congress of the United States has existed for nearly 170 years. Our Union will not collapse because we do not pass upon every conceivable proposal in one session.

There will be another session and other sessions and Congresses beyond that. I expect our form of government will endure—and the Congress will endure with it.

The President need not be disappointed. He submitted 155 recommendations.

The Senate has already passed more than half of them, and others are still on the calendar.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks a table in connection with those recommendations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

EXHIBIT 1

Legislative recommendations submitted by the President, 85th Congress, 1st session, as of August 29, 1957

Total number of recommendations submitted	155
Action completed	67
Passed Senate	11
Passed House	4
Reported to calendars (Senate 7—House 6)	13
Hearings in progress or completed, still in committee	21
No legislation introduced in Senate	17
No action to date	15
Tabled by committee	1
Withdrawn	1
Rejected	5

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I seriously doubt whether the President really knows and understands how many days and how many long hours members of both parties that make up this Congress have spent in hard, arduous, and difficult work. I hope that after the Congress shall have adjourned the President will have an opportunity, in the quiet of his home, to study the actual facts of what the Congress has done. He will find the record of this session of Congress was as fine as any he can recall, and that it passed more substantial bills than were passed even in the first session of his administration.

Mr. President, this session acted responsibly. This session acted courageously. This session acted constructively. I give full and complete credit for the part they played in this action to the distinguished, able, and wise minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the

Senators who have followed his leadership on the other side of the aisle.

Of course, I am grateful to the Democrats who have participated in formulating the majority program.

We can leave it to the historians to determine the rank of this Congress in history. For the present I think it is sufficient to say it was a job well done.

Individuals may have been disappointed. But the country was not disappointed, as was demonstrated in Wisconsin earlier this week. And when the adjournment bells ring, the record of this Democratic session I think will compare with any.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF 1ST SESSION OF 85TH CONGRESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement and accompanying legislative review of the legislative record of the 1st session of the 85th Congress be printed in today's RECORD, and that the same material be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

SUMMARY OF THE LEGISLATIVE RECORD, 85TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, JANUARY 3, 1957, TO AUGUST 30, 1957

Statement by the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, United States Senator from TEXAS, together with digests of legislation passed by the Senate

DIGEST OF LEGISLATION PASSED BY THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES DURING THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 85TH CONGRESS (CONVENED JANUARY 3, 1957, ADJOURNED AUGUST 30, 1957)

Agriculture

Agricultural Trade Development Act

S. 1314:

This measure extends to June 30, 1958, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act passed in 1954 to expand international trade between the United States and friendly nations; to promote the economic stability of American agriculture; to make maximum efficient use of surplus agricultural commodities; and to facilitate the expansion of foreign trade.

This extension provided for increasing to $4 billion (from $3 billion) the authorization for sale of farm surpluses to friendly countries for their currencies; and for increasing to $800 million (from $500 million) the authorization for foreign relief grants.

Provision was also made for bartering transactions with European satellites on a selective basis, to permit us to furnish commodities quickly to distressed peoples in satellite countries under circumstances such as those existing during the Hungarian revolt. The act, however, specifically prohibits barter with Russia, Red China, or any area controlled by the Chinese Communists. It also prohibits sales of surpluses to Red satellites for the currency of those nations.

Public Law 128, approved August 13, 1957.

Drought—Deferred Grazing Program

H. R. 2367:

This act requires the Secretary of Agriculture to set up a deferred grazing program to provide aid to drought-stricken areas. It establishes a 5-year Federal program and provides payment to farmers and ranchers in designated disaster counties who withhold their livestock, either partly or completely, from grazing lands for less than 1 year, at rates equal to the fair rental value of the land during periods of adequate rainfall.

This measure is effective only in counties in which native rangeland grazing is a substantial factor in agricultural production, and then only if a limitation of grazing is necessary to reestablish or conserve grass for grazing. The program provides for limited use as well as nonuse and, in these cases, partial use will mean lower Federal payments.

Payments would not be made under the program if livestock were shifted from the deferred areas to other lands if the shift results in overgrazing in the nondeferred areas. Payment to any person for deferred grazing on land in any county, or on land in more than one county if operated as a single unit, is limited to $5,000 for any one year.

Public Law 25, approved April 25, 1957.

Poultry Inspection

S. 1747:

This measure, a Hoover Commission recommendation, provides for compulsory poultry inspection, maintenance of sanitary poultry processing and practices, and correct and informative labeling of poultry and poultry products. The act in effect extends to poultry products the same safeguards which apply to meat and meat products. The inspection provision relates to all poultry and poultry products processed for sale in interstate commerce or in designated major consuming areas. Poultry, as defined in this measure, is restricted to domesticated birds and does not include commercially produced game birds. A consuming area can be designated for regulation only if the volume of poultry or products marketed is such as to affect, burden, or obstruct the movement of inspected poultry in interstate commerce, and then only after public hearing.

Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to exempt from specific provisions of the measure poultry producers who sell directly to household consumers; retail dealers who cut up poultry products; any person where inspection is impracticable; and persons slaughtering in accordance with religious dietary laws.

Provides penalties for violations. Compulsory features effective January 1, 1959.

Public Law 172, approved August 28, 1957.

Agricultural Conservation Program—Extension

H. R. 1045:

This act extends to December 31, 1962, a democratic program established in 1936 which authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to administer as a Federal program the soil conservation payments to farmers who carry out certain specified conservation practices.

The ACP program has become established as one of the soundest elements of our agricultural program and its operation as a direct Federal program administered by the Secretary of Agriculture (rather than as a State administered program) meets with almost universal approval.

Passed House April 15, 1957.

Passed Senate July 8, 1957.

Plant Pest Eradication

S. 1442:

This measure grants to the Department of Agriculture additional authority to cooperate with the States and localities in an effort to control, eradicate, and prevent the spread of pest and plant diseases by specifically including insect pests, plant diseases, and nematodes, such as the imported fire ant, soybean cyst nematode, witchweed and others.

Public Law 36, approved May 23, 1957.

Wheat Producers—Liability

S. 959:

This measure exempts up to 30 acres from marketing penalties those who produce wheat in excess of their quotas if the entire crop is used for feed, seed, or food on the farm where grown. It covers the 1958 and future crop years.

Farmers who obtain exemptions from marketing penalties are permitted to qualify for payments under the acreage reserve and conservation reserve program.

Public Law 203, approved August 28, 1957.

Wheat Acreage Allotments

S. 606:

This measure permits a redistribution of wheat acreage lost to any Federal project or to any governmental unit having the right of eminent domain. Any farm which has a 4-year rotation system will not lose wheat acres by reason of not planting once every 3 years as is the case at present. Wheat is placed in the same position as other basic commodities by establishing that there will not be an increase in acreage history for wheat farmers who overseed their allotted acres.

Passed Senate, June 24, 1957.

Peanut Marketing Quota

H. R. 6570:

Exempts green peanuts from the acreage allotments and marketing quotas if they are marketed for consumption as boiled peanuts, which will increase the production of a commodity now in short supply.

This measure recognizes that peanuts for boiling are an entirely different commodity from other peanuts and should not be included in the programs designed to regulate the production of peanuts for conventional use.

This exemption will be effective for the 1957, 1958, and 1959 crops.

Public Law 127, approved August 13, 1957.

Tobacco—Marketing Quotas

H. R. 7259:

This measure treats Virginia fire-cured tobacco, type 21, as a separate kind of tobacco for marketing quota purposes, and limits price support for fire-cured, dark air-cured, and Virginia sun-cured tobacco to an amount not greater than the higher of the 1957 support level or 90 percent of parity.

Price supports for these tobaccos are now fixed at a percentage of the burley loan rate. This provision would eliminate any future increases in support levels for the tobacco's concerned arising out of increases in the 10-year moving average price of burley tobacco.

Public Law 92, approved July 10, 1957.

Puerto Rican Crop Insurance

H. R. 632:

This measure provides standby authority for the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to reinsure the crop insurance on Puerto Rican coffee if private insurance should become unavailable.

Public Law 111, approved July 23, 1957.

Long Staple Cotton—Stockpile

House Joint Resolution 172:

This resolution provides for the transfer to and sale by the Commodity Credit Corporation of 50,000 bales of extra long staple cotton, not in the stockpile.

Extra long staple cotton is in short supply due, in part, to Egypt's decision to sell a substantial portion of its crop to Russia. Producers of this cotton feel that a short supply will so increase the market price that textile millers and consumers will substitute other fabrics for extra long staple cotton.

Public Law 96, approved July 10, 1957.

Durum Wheat Allotments

S. 323:

As a further inducement to the durum wheat growers of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and California, this legislation extends section 334 (e) of the Agriculture Adjustment Act to the 1957 durum wheat crop. In 1954 durum wheat was in such short supply that Congress authorized additional acreage allotments to those farm-

ers of Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota who were willing to plant durum wheat. In 1956, at the time Congress extended the durum wheat program, California was added as a participant. Due to a present temporary surplus, this legislation increases the 1957 allotments by only one acre of durum (now two) for each acre of the original allotment devoted to durum, and limits the increase for any farm to 60 acres. It also limits the extent to which farmers receiving increased allotments may participate in the wheat acreage reserve. No part of the increase, nor that part of the original allotment on which the increase is based, may be put in the acreage reserve.

Public Law 13, approved April 2, 1957.

Desert Land Entries on Disconnected Tracts

S. 359:

Amends the Desert Lands Act removing the requirement that a 320-acre tract acquired by a desert-land entryman be an undivided unit. This will permit entry on disconnected tracts provided the aggregate acreage does not exceed 320 acres and provided the various tracts, when taken together, are reasonably compact in form.

This measure, in essence, will allow the development of scattered tracts too small for proper exploitation, but which are close enough to be farmed as a unit.

Passed Senate May 8, 1957.

Farm Income Data

S. 405:

Directs the Secretary of Agriculture to collect, annually, farm income data by economic class of farm. This information will supply important data on low-income farms as an aid to Congress in drafting agricultural legislation.

Passed Senate May 8, 1957.

Peanut Statistics

S. 609:

Removes a statutory requirement for reports from owners or operators of peanut picking or threshing machines. These reports were originally required from owners of threshing and picking machines for hire, in order to give a complete picture of the total amount of peanuts picked and threshed.

At present most peanut farmers own their threshing machines, and the reports of those who rent the machines are of no substantial value to the Department of Agriculture.

Public Law 105, approved July 17, 1957.

Extra Long Staple Cotton

S. 812:

This measure provides that the level of price support for 1957 and succeeding crops of extra long staple cotton be the same as for the 1956 crop which, in effect, freezes the parity price at 75 percent.

Public Law 28, approved April 25, 1957.

Experimental Work

S. 1034:

This measure authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to convey the Midwest Claypan Experiment Station in Missouri, to the University of Missouri, for joint use by the Department of Agriculture and the State of Missouri in a cooperative effort to increase agricultural experimental work.

Public Law 59, approved June 27, 1957.

Feed Grain Study

Senate Resolution 125:

As requested by Congress on May 8, 1957, the Secretary of Agriculture conducted a study of possible methods of improving the feed grain program which could be effective, as far as posible, with the 1958 crop. The Secretary made his report of the study and recommendations to the Senate on July 15, 1957.

Surplus Cotton—Sale

S. 314:

This measure is designed to assist the United States cotton textile industry in regaining its equitable share of the world market by requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to sell not less than 750,000 bales of surplus cotton to domestic textile mills annually for 5 years, beginning with the current fiscal year. Prices would be such as to enable domestic mills to return to the cotton product export level maintained between 1947 to 1952. The cotton may be used only for the manufacture of products for export.

Sale in the United States of products of cotton sold under this act would be punishable by fine of up to $5,000 and imprisonment up to 5 years.

Passed Senate August 26, 1957.

Unused Acreage Allotments

H. R. 8030:

This measure eliminates the requirement that notice of intention not to plant the full acreage allotment must be filed with the county committee in order for the farmer to receive credit for future allotment purposes under the Agricultural Adjustment Act. It does not change the provision, however, that the full allotment need not be planted in order to preserve the allotment history for the farm, but merely eliminates the requirement that the farmer must notify the county committee of his intention not to plant his whole allotment. This will relieve the county committee of handling and recording these notices.

The exemption period during which acreage not planted will still be counted for history purposes is limited to the period 1957 to 1959.

Public Law 266, approved September 2, 1957.

Appropriations

Title	Budget estimates	House passed	Senate passed	Public law	Increase or decrease
1957 APPROPRIATIONS					
SUPPLEMENTAL					
Urgent deficiency, 1957	($357,067,500)	($335,090,000)	($351,026,500)		
2d urgent deficiency, 1957	55,945,000	48,990,000	49,861,000	$49,861,000	−$6,084,000
Urgent deficiency, 1957	(352,067,500)	(335,090,000)	(344,230,840)		
Urgent deficiencies, 1957	327,000,000	320,090,000	320,090,000	320,090,000	−6,910,000
3d supplemental	181,699,320	79,840,788	142,342,045	85,669,925	−96,029,395
1958 APPROPRIATIONS					
SUPPLEMENTAL					
Post Office Supplemental, 1958	149,500,000	133,000,000	133,000,000	133,000,000	−16,500,000
Temporary, 1958					
REGULAR					
Agriculture	3,965,446,617	3,692,889,757	3,668,972,157	3,666,543,757	−298,902,860
Commerce	871,513,000	653,685,060	613,584,290	597,790,225	−273,722,775
Defense	36,128,000,000	33,562,725,000	34,534,229,000	33,759,850,000	−2,368,150,000
District of Columbia	25,504,450	22,504,450	23,004,450	22,504,450	−3,000,000
General Government	20,921,870	16,021,370	16,010,370	16,010,370	−4,911,500
Independent offices	5,923,195,000	5,385,201,700	5,378,594,800	5,373,877,800	−549,317,200
Interior	515,189,700	454,395,700	457,152,600	456,189,600	−59,000,100
Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare	2,981,277,581	2,846,831,581	2,885,290,781	2,871,182,781	−110,094,800
Legislative	108,271,443	78,370,285	104,844,660	104,844,660	−3,426,783
Mutual security	3,386,860,000	2,524,760,000	3,025,660,000	2,768,760,000	−618,100,000
Public works	876,453,000	814,813,023	884,151,323	858,094,323	−18,358,677
State, Justice, Judiciary	665,649,802	563,799,793	563,085,293	562,891,293	−102,758,509
Treasury-Post Office	3,965,291,000	3,884,927,000	3,884,927,000	3,884,927,000	−80,364,000
Additional Post Office, 1958	149,500,000	133,000,000	133,000,000	133,000,000	−16,500,000
Supplemental, 1958	1,973,767,827	1,581,590,587	1,824,001,547	1,734,011,947	−239,755,880
Atomic Energy Commission	2,491,625,000	2,299,718,500	2,323,632,500	2,323,632,500	−167,992,500
Total	64,048,466,290	58,515,233,806	60,320,140,771	59,134,110,706	−4,914,355,584

−$4,914,355,584 or 7.7 percent represents the savings made during this session of Congress for fiscal 1958. The budget requests submitted by the President totaled $64,048,466,290.

Budget Estimates—Improved Procedure

S. 434:

This measure, a Hoover Commission recommendation, provides for an improved method of submitting budget estimates to Congress by the executive branch. The objective of the proposal is that the executive agencies present their budget estimates for a fiscal year on the basis of expenditures to be made or accrued that fiscal year only. In appropriating on this basis, the appropriations committees will grant authority for each fiscal year for expenditures actually to be made or accrued during that fiscal year only—and not for expenditures to be made in future fiscal years, as is done at the present. Authority, however, is given the Appropriations Committees to permit agencies to enter into contracts in advance of appropriations for forward planning of long lead-time programs in subsequent fiscal years.

Passed Senate June 5, 1957.

Joint Committee on the Budget

S. 1585:

This measure, a Hoover Commission recommendation, creates a Joint Committee on

the Budget, composed of 7 Senate Appropriations Committee members, and 7 House Appropriations Committee members.

This commmittee will make continuing studies of the Federal budget, and of the anticipated expenditures of Federal agencies during the coming years, and will report this information to the Appropriations Committees.

It will recommend, to the appropriate standing committees of Congress, such changes in existing laws as may effect greater efficiency and economy in Government.

It will also study the original authorizations for appropriations, with a view toward eliminating those authorizations no longer considered necessary; and it will examine the amounts and nature of unused appropriated funds, and of moneys appropriated for expenditure in subsequent fiscal years.

Requires the inclusion in any authorization bill of an estimate of the first 5-year cost of the authorized program.

Passed Senate April 4, 1957.

District of Columbia

Police-Firemen Retirement

H. R. 6517:

This measure provides a new retirement system for District of Columbia Police and Firemen, for Park Police, White House Police, and certain Secret Service members.

Benefits under this act are substantially similar to those available to persons engaged in hazardous occupations under the Civil Service Retirement Act Amendments of 1956 and the Federal Employees Compensation Act.

Credit is allowed for prior Federal and District government service in computing total police or fire department service for pension eligibility. Credit is also allowed for military service unless the military service was subject to social-security deductions.

Deducts from each member's basic salary a 6½-percent contribution to be deposited to the credit of the District in the Treasury. Any member separated from his department, except for retirement, will receive a refund.

Provides for medical and hospital service for any member who becomes temporarily disabled by injury received or disease contracted in the performance of duty.

Provides non-service-connected disability benefits of 2 percent of the basic salary at the time of retirement after 5 years' service as a policeman or fireman, with a maximum limitation of 70 percent.

Provides for disability benefits for service-connected injuries or diseases from a present permissible maximum of 50 percent to a minimum of 66⅔ percent with a maximum of 70 percent. Provides that the minimum age at which a policeman or fireman may be eligible to retire after 20 years service is 50.

Provides increased survivor annuities to widows, dependent widowers, and children of members or former members.

Public Law 157, approved August 21, 1957.

Schoolteachers' Retirement

H. R. 6454:

Amends the act for the retirement of District of Columbia schoolteachers, in order to give them substantially the same benefits as are now available to employees of the Federal and District Governments under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

The effect of this measure is to increase annuities for school employees and widows about 25 percent, and for surviving children from about 50 to 100 percent. Employee's contribution rate is increased from 6 to 6½ percent.

Optional retirement at 62 is permitted after 5, rather than 15 years of service; the reduction factor for retirement before 60, is changed from 3 percent to 1 percent for each year the retiree is under 60, and to 2 percent for each year the retiree is under 55.

Annuities are to be based on the following scale: 1½ percent for the first 5 years of service, 1¾ percent for the next 5 years, and 2 percent for the remainder, multiplied by the years of service.

The benefit provisions are to be retroactive to October 1, 1956. Increased contributions from employees will take effect on the 1st day of the 2d month following enactment.

Public Law 46, approved June 4, 1957.

Solicitations

H. R. 3400:

This act provides for a system of registration in the District of persons and organizations soliciting contributions for charitable purposes.

By requiring charitable solicitors to register with the Commission, to carry identification, and by limiting the period in which contributions may be solicited, the measure seeks to provide protection for the public from unscrupulous solicitors.

The Red Cross and religious organizations are exempt from the provisions.

Public Law 87, approved July 10, 1957.

National Cultural Center—Commission

H. R. 4813:

In 1955, Congress created a Federal commission to formulate plans for construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents, and a music, fine arts, and a mass-communications center. This measure extends the life of the Commission and changes its name from the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission to a Commission for a National Cultural Center. The Commission will be continued in existence until the National Cultural Center has been completed.

In Conference.

District of Columbia Stadium

H. R. 1937:

This measure authorizes the District of Columbia Armory Board to construct and maintain a stadium with a seating capacity of 50,000.

The overall cost is not to exceed $6 million.

The Board is authorized to issue 30-year tax-exempt bonds, secured by a mortgage on the stadium. The bonds may be redeemed before maturity at not to exceed 105 percent of face value and accrued interest, or refinanced by the issue of refunding bonds.

The Secretary of the Interior is directed to acquire suitable land (total land affected is estimated to about 180 acres) in the area known as the East Capitol Street site.

Approval of this act permits the Armory Board to apply to the Housing and Home Finance Agency for an advance of $35,000 to cover the preliminary planning and survey of the proposed stadium.

Public Law 300, approved September 7, 1957.

District of Columbia Board of Education

H. R. 192:

Amends the act of June 20, 1906, to authorize judges of the District of Columbia district courts to remove any member of the District of Columbia Board of Education for adequate cause affecting his character and efficiency as a member.

Members of the Board are, under present law, appointed for terms of 3 years. There is no provision for removal for cause.

Proceedings would be initiated by a verified complaint filed by the United States attorney for the District of Columbia.

Public Law 119, approved August 2, 1957.

Property—Uniform Succession Law

H. R. 6508:

This act modifies the Code of Law for the District of Columbia to provide for the uniform succession of real and personal property in case of intestacy, to abolish dower and curtesy, and to grant to the surviving spouse a statutory share in the other's real estate owned at time of death.

A similar law is now in existence in all except three States of the Union.

Public Law 244, approved August 31, 1957.

H. R. 7249:

This measure creates a new civil remedy for the District of Columbia whereby a person entitled to receive support, who is not in the District, may bring an action in the place where he or she is, and may have the claim litigated in the District of the person owing the duty of support.

Public Law 94, approved July 10, 1957.

Hospital Center—Increased Authorization

H. R. 7835:

This measure increases the authorization for the District of Columbia Hospital Center to $36,710,000 from $35 million, and extends the period of the authorization from June 30, 1957, to June 30, 1958.

Public Law 73, approved June 29, 1957.

Hospital Center—Additional Increase

S. 1908:

This measure provides that grants under the District of Columbia Hospital Center Act may be made to certain groups organized to construct and operate hospitals in the District, including the Greater Southeast Community Hospital Foundation, Inc., organized to construct a hospital in southeast Washington.

It amends the existing ratio for participation in hospital grants by providing that the District contribute 15 percent and the Federal Government 35 percent, to be matched by private funds.

Increases the authorization for appropriations under the act by $3 million, or from $36,710,000 to $39,710,000.

Passed Senate August 8, 1957.

Substitute Teachers

S. 1841:

This measure authorizes the District of Columbia Board of Education to employ retired teachers as substitute teachers.

Difficulty has been experienced by the schools in maintaining a sufficient list of substitute teachers in the District. An average of 131 substitute teachers are used daily in the District of Columbia public schools.

The act provides that the retirement annuities of such substitute teachers will not be interrupted by becoming employed in this capacity.

Passed Senate August 5, 1957.

School Attendance

S. 1842:

Amends the act of February 4, 1925, to provide that all children below the age of 18 (and not merely those between 3 and 18) be listed in the District of Columbia school census.

Provides that a census shall be taken as often as the Superintendent of Schools and the Board of Education feel that it is desirable, instead of annually, as now required.

Passed Senate May 22, 1957.

District of Columbia Teacher's College—Degrees

S. 1906:

Authorizes the District of Columbia Board of Education to make rules and regulations for the establishment of a graduate program at the District of Columbia Teachers College, and to prescribe the terms and conditions for admission to the college and for graduation.

The graduate program is desired in order that undergraduate students may remain at the college and earn the postgraduate degrees required of teachers in the District of Columbia public school system.

Passed Senate May 22, 1957.

Alcohol Tests

S. 969:

This measure establishes certain statutory presumptions to be given to a chemical analysis of the amount of alcohol in the blood or urine of any person tried for the offense of operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of liquor.

It will permit the District of Columbia government to dispense with the service of an expert witness who, under present practice, must interpret the results of a chemical analysis on trial. There is only one such expert witness available in the District and, frequently, trials must be delayed because of his absence from the city.

Passed Senate June 26, 1957.

Passed House August 26, 1957.

Bridges—Potomac River

H. R. 6306:

Amends the act of July 16, 1946, to increase to $16 million (from $7 million) the authorized appropriations for two bridges across the Potomac River at 14th Street.

Approximately all of the $7 million has been spent on the one completed bridge, and the second bridge carrying southbound traffic and replacing the present southbound will cost $9,200,000.

Passed House April 8, 1957.

Passed Senate June 26, 1957.

Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge

S. 78:

This measure provides that a bridge authorized (in 1954) to be constructed over the Potomac River from Jones Point, Va., to Maryland, be maintained and operated by and at the expense of the States of Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. The 1954 act provided for maintenance and operation by the States of Virginia and Maryland only.

Passed Senate March 29, 1957.

Revenue Act

H. R. 6258:

Amends the District of Columbia Revenue Act to reduce the license fee for a small trailer from a minimum of $12 and a maximum of $28 to a minimum of $8 and a maximum of $12. This is designed to relieve the inequity by which a small trailer used to transport personal belongings is frequently taxed at a rate comparable to that of a small automobile.

Designates a flat fee of $5 for any ancient automobile (manufactured before 1930) owned solely as a collector's item and not used in general transportation.

Public Law 273, approved September 2, 1957.

American Historical Association

S. 1586:

Removes the $500,000 limitation on real and personal property which may be owned by the American Historical Association, and exempts from the District of Columbia property tax a lot occupied by the association. The $500,000 limitation was set in 1889 when Congress approved the charter of the association. Inflation has rendered this limitation impractical; currently the association owns stock valued at $650,000, and real estate valued at $40,000.

Public Law 83, approved July 3, 1957.

War Memorials

S. 1576:

Exempts from the District of Columbia sales tax, materials which will be permanently embodied in any war memorial to be erected on the public grounds of the United States. This affects only materials sold after Jan. 1, 1957.

Under the present law no provision is made for exemption from this tax on sales between two nonexempt parties because the transaction takes place on Government ground, or because the property involved may be located on Government ground.

Public Law 82, approved July 3, 1957.

National Trust for Historic Preservation

S. 1264:

Exempts from District of Columbia taxation Decatur House which is owned by the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States. Decatur House is an educational museum. The trust is a charitable nonprofit corporation chartered by the act of October 26, 1949.

Public Law 80, approved July 3, 1957.

National Association of Colored Women's Clubs

S. 105:

Exempts from the District of Columbia property tax the home of the National Association of Colored Women's Clubs, Inc.

The association, founded in 1896, is a charitable organization, and is dependent almost entirely upon its membership for operating funds.

Passed Senate May 22, 1957.

Rochambeau Memorial Bridge

S. 768:

This measure designates the East 14th Street highway bridge over the Potomac River from a point near 14th Street in the District of Columbia, to a point in Virginia, as the Rochambeau Memorial Bridge.

Public Law 76, approved July 1, 1957.

Potomac River Tunnel

S. 944:

This measure authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct a four-lane tunnel under the Potomac River north of Memorial Bridge and south of, or under Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Island, at a cost of approximately $25.5 million. This tunnel is in lieu of the bridge authorized by the act of August 30, 1954.

Passed Senate July 3, 1957.

U. S. S. "Enterprise"—National Shrine

Senate Joint Resolution 96:

This resolution authorizes establishment of the U. S. S. *Enterprise* in the Nation's Capital as a memorial museum.

A group of officers, headed by Fleet Adm. William F. Halsey, have raised funds and furnished assurances that there will be sufficient funds for the maintenance and administration of the vessel as a museum in the public interest.

Public Law 218, approved August 29, 1957.

B'nai B'rith Henry Monsky Foundation

H. R. 7825:

This measure exempts from taxation the national headquarters of B'nai B'rith located in the District of Columbia. This property contains a library, museum, and exhibit hall of the history of Jews and Judaism in the United States and is open daily to the public without charge.

Tax exemptons of this same nature are now granted to various veterans' organizations, American Red Cross, General Federation of Womens' Clubs, National Society of Colonial Dames, DAR's, YMCA, and YWCA.

Public Law 220, approved August 28, 1957.

District of Columbia Public Assistance

S. 1849:

This measure incorporates into 1 act all 5 of the public-assistance programs administered in the District of Columbia.

At present only three of these programs (aid to dependent children, aid to the aged, and aid to the blind) are covered by substantive legislation. The remainder (aid to the disabled and general public assistance) exist by virtue of language contained in the annual appropriation acts.

This act will provide for more uniform requirements and procedures for determining eligibility for public assistance, and the amount of assistance granted in terms of the needs of the recipient.

Passed Senate August 23, 1957.

District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act

S. 1764:

This measure authorizes payment from appropriated funds of the cost of free lunches provided for children in the District schools whose case come within any of the following circumstances:

1. Children of families receiving public assistance.

2. Children of large families of low or reduced incomes.

3. Children suffering from malnutrition who may be referred by the school nurse or by the school doctor.

Passed Senate August 23, 1957.

Income and Franchise Taxes

H. R. 8256:

This measure amends the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 and certain provisions of law pertaining to taxation of personal property in the District:

1. To exclude from gross income for individual income-tax purposes insurance benefit payments received by a taxpayer under the Social Security Act.

2. To add to the exemptions to which a taxpayer is entitled, $500 for taxpayers and their spouses when those individuals have reached 65; and $500 will be allowed to taxpayers and their spouses who are blind.

3. To change existing exemption allowed a head of a family or a married person living with husband or wife. Under present law, a husband and wife living together receive one personal exemption of $2,000 but, if they make separate returns, the personal exemption may be taken by either or divided between them. Under this measure, the exemption of $2,000 would be retained but, if the husband or wife, makes separate returns, the personal exemption of $2,000 shall be divided equally between them.

4. To exclude from gross income for individual tax purposes amounts received as a pension, annuity, or similar allowance for personal injuries or sickness resulting from active service in the armed forces of any country or in the Coast and Geodetic Survey or the Public Health Service to the extent such amounts are excluded from gross income under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

5. To increase the maximum amount allowed to taxpayers who elect to take an optional standard deduction, rather than to itemize their deductions, from the present $500 to $1,000.

6. To limit taxpayers using a tax table to persons whose income from specified sources does not exceed $5,000. Present law is $10,000.

7. To eliminate, from personal-property taxation, boats used solely for pleasure purposes.

8. To exempt from licensing tax, under certain circumstances, individuals who engage in a trade, business, or profession, but whose gross receipts during a calendar year are less than $5,000.

Public Law 281, approved September 4, 1957.

District of Columbia Study Committee

House Concurrent Resolution 172:

This resolution establishes a joint committee of six members selected from the membership of the two Committees on the District of Columbia of the Congress to make a study of any and all matters pertaining to the District of Columbia and its metropolitan area.

The study will include problems created by the tremendous growth of this area, housing conditions, taxes, traffic, water, health, and educational problems.

The committee is to report its findings by January 31, 1958.

Amending Life and Fire and Casualty Insurance Acts

S. 1040:

This measure corrects a situation arising from a recent decision of the United States court of appeals in the case of *Atlantic Insurance Agency, Inc., a Corporation, et al., v. Albert F. Jordan, Superintendent of Insurance,* and brings related sections of law applicable to the business of life insurance into conformity with corresponding sections

applicable to the business of fire and casualty insurance.

It also deals with related problems pertaining to issuing and revoking insurance licenses. It permits the Department of Insurance of the District of Columbia to continue to protect the public by issuing or revoking licenses in accordance with standards previously established by Congress.

The provisions which would be added to the insurance acts by these amendments are comparable to provisions usually found in State laws.

Provides the Superintendent with the power to act in cases where insurance companies or persons, who apply for license renewals, are found to be persons having a criminal or otherwise unsavory background; the Superintendent may in such an instance refuse to renew certain licenses.

Passed Senate August 26, 1957.

New Sibley Memorial Hospital

H. R. 8918:

This measure authorizes GSA to exchange, at fair market value, land now occupied by the Hahnemann Hospital for land on the Dalecarlia Reservoir tract (12 acres). Provides for the orderly dissolution of the Hahnemann Hospital and its merger with the Sibley Memorial Hospital. Permits the lien that was attached to the Hahnemann Hospital land to be transferred to the new Sibley Memorial Hospital which will be constructed on the Dalecarlia site and consolidated with the lien to be established as the result of this new construction.

Extends to other hospitals constructed under the Hospital Center Act the privilege of transferring to their new sites any liens in favor of the United States against the lands such hospitals formerly occupied.

Public Law 285, approved September 4, 1957.

Federal employees

Employee Training

S. 385:

This measure, in recognition of the Hoover recommendations as well as Congress' own interest, authorizes the training of Federal employees at public or private facilities. Training is an essential element in all personnel programs so Congress, for the first time, has passed legislation to—

Provide general statutory authority for employee training required to further Federal programs;

Make it possible for all agencies to use whatever facilities can best and most economically serve their training needs;

Provide the President a management tool essential to efficient operation of the departments and agencies;

Establish a central point of responsibility for and control of employee training programs; and

Consolidate a variety of existing training authorities of limited scope and applicability.

The Government departments are enthusiastic in support of the measure and have agreed that the small cost could be absorbed by each agency and department.

Passed Senate April 12, 1957.

Civil Service Retirement

S. 601:

This legislation amends Public Law 854, 84th Congress, to make prospective (from October 1, 1956) the requirement that interest be paid on a refund of retirement payments during the entire period of an employee's separation from Federal service.

Under Public Law 854, an employee who receives a refund of his retirement payments on leaving Federal service, and who later reenters Federal service, must repay the refund with interest if he is to obtain credit for his prior years of service. This interest extends for the entire period of the employee's separation from Federal service; under previous law, no interest on this period was charged. To remove any inequities, this measure provides that the law will be applicable only to separations occurring after October 1, 1956.

Public Law 65, approved June 29, 1957.

Disbursing Officer—Postal Department

S. 916:

Permits the assistant disbursing officer of the Post Office Department, or any official designated by the Postmaster General, to continue the accounts and issue checks in the name of the disbursing officer, when that officer dies, resigns, or is otherwise separated from office.

This measure would permit such authority to extend to the last day of the second month following the death, or resignation, of the disbursing officer.

The estate of the disbursing officer is protected from liability arising from the activity of the acting officer, and the acting officer is held responsible.

Passed May 22, 1957.

Lighthouse Service—Retirement Increase

S. 235:

Increases to $75 (now $50) a month the benefits payable to unremarried widows for former Lighthouse Service employees in an effort to bring their annuity more in line with the increased cost of living.

Passed Senate March 8, 1957.

Wage-Board Employees

S. 25:

This measure requires that whenever an increase in compensation is granted to wage-board employees in accordance with local prevailing rates, the increase is to become effective not later than the beginning of the first pay period beginning on or after 30 days following the date on which a wage survey was ordered.

In effect, this will make wage increases retroactive, to some extent, in order that the employees concerned will not be forced to wait several months after comparable wages have increased before receiving a similar increase.

Passed Senate August 22, 1957.

Unscheduled Overtime Duty

S. 1901:

This measure requires the payment of overtime at the usual rate of time and one-half to fire fighters and other standby employees for irregular and unscheduled overtime duty in proportion to the amount they are required to perform.

Passed Senate August 5, 1957.

Security Program

S. 1411:

This measure amends the act of August 26, 1950, which established procedure for the Federal employees security program. The act now provides that in all cases arising under it the officer or employee concerned who is accused of security violations must be suspended without pay before he may be given a hearing.

This amendment makes suspension a discretionary matter. The head of the executive agency concerned may determine that the national security does not require suspension of the employee prior to his hearing, or he may transfer the employee to a nonsensitive position.

Passed Senate August 8, 1957.

Group Life Act—Expenses

S. 1740:

Authorizes the Civil Service Commission to draw on the employees' life-insurance fund for expenses incurred in assuming the assets and liabilities of nine employees' beneficial associations.

The 1954 Employees Group Life Insurance Act was amended in 1955 to permit the Commission to assume the assets and liabilities of approximately 25 benevolent associations, which the act virtually drove out of business. This was done to assure the continuation and protection of insurance policies held by both former and present employees.

The Commission has taken over 16 associations with some 50,000 policyholders; the assets and liabilities of 9 more associations, with 90,000 policyholders, remain to be assumed.

Since the Commission under the amendment of 1955 has only until August 17, 1957, to complete the assumption of the remaining companies, and as it has no funds remaining with which to assume these companies, this bill makes available the reserve fund for the purpose of completing the assumption of the beneficial associations.

Passed Senate June 3, 1957.

Presidential Appointees

S. 1903:

This measure amends the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, which provides for the payment of transportation expenses to Federal employees and their immediate families serving abroad when they travel to and from their domestic residences on leave or prior to a new tour of duty.

The 1946 act inadvertently failed to cover certain officers or employees appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate to serve a term fixed by law. This amendment includes such persons and their immediate families among those eligible for travel benefits.

Passed Senate August 9, 1957.

Federal Highway Employees—Expenses

S. 1941:

This measure authorizes the Bureau of Public Roads to pay transportation and subsistence to temporary employees on direct Federal highway projects. It had been the Bureau's policy to pay the cost of transportation of these employees from point of hire to project location and return, as well as subsistence cost, or a per diem allowance, during the period of project assignment on the basis of an employment contract. A recent decision of the Comptroller General, however, precludes the payment of transportation and subsistence expenses to temporary employees on the basis of an employment contract and holds that such allowance should be paid as wages.

Public Law 143, approved August 14, 1957.

War-Risk Hazard—Detention Benefits

H. R. 6523:

Extends for 1 year, to July 1, 1958, compensation benefits for employees of the United States or of contractors with the United States for injury or death resulting from a war-risk hazard. Extends for the same period workmen's compensation benefits to Federal civilian employees who suffer injury or death during a period of detention by an enemy force.

Public Law 71, approved June 29, 1957.

Armed Forces—Medical Career Opportunities

H. R. 2460:

This measure is designed to make a regular military career more attractive to nurses and medical specialists of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

It raises by one grade the career expectancy of the average nurse so that over the course of a career she may expect to become a major or a lieutenant commander and to be retired in this grade. It also expands the number of allowable lieutenant colonels and authorizes a few permanent colonels to provide further incentives for a career as a nurse or a medical specialist.

Initiates a new system of compulsory retirement for nurses who complete specified years of service. This system conforms generally to the provisions covering retirement of women members of the Armed Forces who are not nurses or medical specialists and it follows principles that control compulsory retirement of male officers.

Public Law 155, approved August 21, 1957.

Marine Employees

S. 1412:

Exempts the marine employees of the Departments of the Army and Navy from the Performance Rating Act of 1950. Most of the employees concerned are with the Military Sea Transportation Service. Turnover in this Service is very high and, in most cases, employees must be rated on the strength of their performance in 15- to 45-day tours of duty. This permits no adequate assessment of their proficiency and results in unnecessary burdens being placed on their rating officers.

Public Law 101, approved July 11, 1957.

Coast Guard—Warrant Officers

S. 1489:

This measure corrects an oversight in the Warrant Officer Act of 1954. Its primary purpose is to restore to warrant officers of the Coast Guard the right, which they had prior to the 1954 act, to be retired in the highest grade in which they have satisfactorily served with corresponding retired pay.

Public Law 144, approved August 14, 1957.

Panama Canal Ship Pilots—Retirement

S. 821:

This measure authorizes the optional retirement of any ship pilot in the Panama Canal Zone who has attained the age of 55 and completed 20 years' service, 15 of which must have been as a pilot.

Passed Senate August 9, 1957.

Women's Army Auxiliary Corps

S. 2305:

This measure provides that service in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps (WAAC) shall be credited to any person who subsequently served on active duty in any of the Armed Forces.

Passed Senate August 20, 1957.

Merchant Marine Officers

S. 1728:

This measure provides assistance to State and Territorial maritime academies or colleges by:

1. Authorizing the Department of Commerce to make contracts for annual payments with each academy or college for periods up to 4 years, but keeping the actual appropriations on an annual basis.

2. Providing an increase in the level of assistance up to $75,000 a year, or $25,000 if the institution does not meet the requirement regarding admission of out-of-State students.

3. Providing subsistence allowances for cadets at a rate not in excess of $600 per academic year per student.

4. Authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to loan and keep in repair suitable vessels for training purposes.

Passed Senate August 26, 1957.

United States Commissioners—Fees

H. R. 4191:

This measure increases for the first time since 1946 the fees of United States commissioners by approximately 4.4 percent.

Public Law 276, approved September 2, 1957.

Air Force Employees

H. R. 3028:

This measure validates payments totaling about $440,000 to approximately 1,500 female members and former members of the Air Force whose husbands were also members of the uniformed services.

Public Law 272, approved September 2, 1957.

Commissioned Services—Losses in Pay

H. R. 293:

This measure authorizes settlement for certain inequitable losses in pay sustained by officers of the commissioned services under the emergency economy legislation.

These payments were denied because of the application and interpretation of section 201 of the Economy Act of 1932. The act was applied so as to bar increases in pay as a result of promotions. These officers not only failed to receive the increased pay of the higher rank to which they were promoted, but were actually compelled to continue under the pay scale of their old rank, together with a 15-percent reduction of the old pay scale.

Total number of persons affected by this measure is approximately 2,381.

Public Law 255, approved September 2, 1957.

Classified Pay Increase

H. R. 2462:

This measure provides an across-the-board increase of 11 percent, effective at the beginning of the first pay period starting after September 1, 1957, for employees in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government including court reporters for Federal district counts and for the secretaries and law clerks of Federal judges. The average increase will amount to $515 a year.

The following limitations were imposed:

1. No salary will be increased by more than $1,000 a year.

2. No salary will be increased to above $16,000 a year.

3. No increase for those presently receiving $16,000 or more a year.

Pocket veto, September 7, 1957.

Postal Pay Increase

H. R. 2474:

This measure provides an increase of $546 a year for employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, including rural carriers, and a 12-percent increase for fourth-class postmasters.

Pocket veto, September 7, 1957.

Emergency Officers' Retired Benefits

S. 1732:

This act permits persons receiving retired pay on the emergency officers' retired list, who served satisfactorily in World War II for 6 months or more as a commissioned officer of one of the Armed Forces in a higher grade than that held on the emergency officers' retired list, to be advanced to the higher grade and to have his retired pay computed on the basis of the higher grade.

Passed Senate August 20, 1957.

Hazardous Duty Pay

H. R. 7914:

This measure amends the Career Compensation Act of 1949, by adding a new category of personnel for hazardous-duty pay. This new category consists of military personnel who serve as human test subjects in thermal stress experiments. For those who qualify, the rate of pay will be $110 a month for officers and $55 a month for enlisted personnel, which is comparable to that now paid for parachute jumping, experimental diving, and low-pressure chamber observing.

The services, however, will expose only volunteer test subjects who are engaged in field test or research under laboratory supervision.

Public Law 208, approved August 28, 1957.

Naval Academy Instructors—Retirement

H. R. 5832:

Increases the retirement annuities of 25 persons (22 former civilian instructors at Annapolis and 3 widows) to the same degree as is now provided for similar retirees.

Naval Academy instructors retiring after October 1, 1956, receive the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act. This measure will include the 22 instructors and 3 widows of instructors, who retired prior to this date, under the civil service retirement program.

Public Law 40, approved May 31, 1957.

Finance, commerce, industry

Tax Extension—Excise and Corporate

H. R. 4090:

This measure provides for an extension of the present corporate income tax rate at 52 percent, and the existing rates of certain excises for 15 months, or until July 1, 1958. The rates of these taxes would otherwise have been reduced on April 1, 1957—the corporate rate to 47 percent; the excise taxes subject to reduction were those on alcoholic beverages, cigarettes, automobiles, and automobile parts and accessories.

The extension of these rates for the past 4 years has been required in order to maintain the level of defense spending necessary to insure an adequate defense.

Public Law 12, approved March 29, 1957.

Metal Scrap

H. R. 5686:

Extends to June 30, 1958, the existing suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap. Suspension applies to scrap iron and steel, aluminum, magnesium, nickel, but not to lead or zinc scrap.

Public Law 27, approved April 25, 1957.

Small Business—Loan Authority

S. 637:

Increases by $80 million, or from $150 million to $230 million, the business loan authorization of the Small Business Administration. This increase is an emergency measure designed to keep the Small Business Administration in a position to make loans at its present rate and under its present policy until the end of the fiscal year.

Public Law 4, approved February 11, 1957.

Small Business—Extension

S. 2504:

Extends the Small Business Administration from July 31, 1957, to July 31, 1958, and increases its business loan revolving fund by $75 million, or from $230 million to $305 million. This increase automatically raises the SBA's total authorization from $455 million to $530 million.

Small Business Administration, since 1953, has made some 7,000 loans, totaling approximately $350 million. These loans have been to aid small businesses, to supply technical and managerial advice to small businesses throughout the country, and to lend aid in disaster areas.

This present act is intended only as a stopgap measure to keep the Small Business Administration operating until consideration can be given to a House-passed measure providing for a permanent agency.

Public Law 120, approved August 3, 1957.

Financial Institutions Act of 1957

S. 1451:

This measure provides for a revision and modification of all the Federal laws governing banks, savings and loan associations, and credit unions.

It permits banks, upon approval by Comptroller of Currency, to issue preferred stock which, in effect, makes it easier for them to obtain necessary capital.

It simplifies and makes uniform bank reports.

It permits banks to modernize lending policies by making loans on frozen foods, dairy cattle, consumer installment paper, construction loans and working capital loans where the chief security is general credit instead of a mortgage on real property.

It strengthens conflict-of-interest provisions by authorizing agencies to regulate job acceptance by former employees with institutions supervised by them.

It requires disclosure of bank stock ownership.

It requires annual audit of the Federal Reserve Board and examination of Federal Reserve banks with reports to Banking and Currency Committees of Senate and House.

It restricts establishment of branches by Federal savings and loan associations to States where that privilege is given to State savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks.

It provides for regulation of savings and loan holding companies.

It requires annual audit of credit unions if there is evidence that such audits are needed.

It makes cumulative voting for directors of banks permissive instead of mandatory.

It provides for regulation of bank mergers by bank supervisory agencies.

It permits Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to deal with small insolvencies by acting as conservator instead of requiring that banks in this condition be placed in receivership or have their assets taken over by another bank.

Passed Senate March 21, 1957.

Securities Act—Exemption

S. 2299:

This measure increases from $300,000 to $500,000 the permissive limit for issuing securities under regulations of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Under existing law the Securities Exchange Commission may exempt any class of securities if it finds that because of the small amount involved, enforcement of the act is not necessary in the public interest and for the protection of investors.

The permissive increase in this measure, while available to any issuer, is most useful to small businesses seeking a relatively small amount of capital by floating securities.

Passed Senate June 26, 1957.

Securities Exchange—Registration

S. 2520:

This measure increases the registration fee charged against national securities exchanges, and payable to the Securities and Exchange Commission on March 15 of every year, from 2 cents per $1,000 worth of transactions to 5 cents per $1,000.

Includes over-the-counter transactions among those for which a fee is chargeable, and provides that the same 5-cents-per-$1,000 rate will be charged against covered transactions sold by a registered broker-dealer. Seven hundred eighty-five thousand two hundred and fourteen dollars was collected last year in fees from national securities exchanges, all of which goes into the Treasury's general fund.

The fee charged against over-the-counter transactions will fall when the actual transfer of ownership occurs, from the underwriter to the purchaser, unless the underwriter retains a portion of the shares unsold; then the fee would be payable on transfer from the issuer to the underwriter. Only one fee attaches to an issuer-underwriter-broker-purchaser transaction.

Passed Senate August 8, 1957.

Internal Revenue Code, Amendment

H. R. 232:

This measure provides that a taxpayer, who receives or accrues an award in a civil action for breach of contract or breach of trust duty or relationship, may spread the amount over the period during which it would have been received (excludes the breach) if this results in a lesser tax than would otherwise be the case.

It also allows all credits or deductions the taxpayer would have received had he received the income in the absence of a breach.

This act further provides that certificates for 5-year amortization can be issued after August 22, 1957, only for new or specialized defense facilities, and for research and development facilities for defense. The authority to issue rapid amortization certificates is terminated after December 31, 1959. This provision will prevent any future extension of the program to investments with only indirect defense connections or to investments of an ordinary character even though defense-connected.

Public Law 165, approved August 26, 1957.

Tanning Extracts and Coconut Oil—Duty-Free

H. R. 2842:

Provides for a suspension of duty for a 3-year period on imports of tanning material extracts and coconut oil.

Public Law 235, approved August 30, 1957.

Commercial Samples—Import

H. R. 5924:

To implement an International Convention on importing commercial samples and advertising matter ratified in 1956, this measure provides duty-free entry for catalogs, price lists, and trade notices relating to sale or rental of foreign goods or services to United States residents.

Certain samples to be used in the United States only for soliciting orders for products of foreign countries may enter duty-free. These samples, however, must be valued at less than $1 each, or have been mutilated in such a way as to leave them useful only as samples. Motion-picture advertising films will be permitted duty-free entry under bond.

Public Law 211, approved August 28, 1957.

Gifts From Servicemen—Free Import

H. R. 6304:

This measure extends to July 1, 1959, the present privilege accorded to servicemen stationed abroad to send to the United States duty free, bona fide gifts up to $50 in value.

Public Law 30, approved May 14, 1957.

Savings Bonds—Interest Rate Increase

H. R. 5520:

This measure increases to 3.26 percent (from 3 percent) the maximum annual interest rate on savings bonds and savings certificates issued on or after February 1, 1957, and held to maturity. The interest rate will be compounded semiannually.

Public Law 17, approved April 20, 1957.

Furlough Travel Tax Exemption

H. R. 7954:

Under present law a 10-percent excise tax is levied on transportation. The Congress, in 1950, voted an exemption from this tax for personnel of the United States Army, Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, including authorized cadets and midshipmen, traveling in uniform at their own expense while on official leave, furlough, or pass, if they are traveling on round-trip tickets sold to them under special tariffs providing for fares of not more than 2.025 cents per mile.

To continue the effectiveness of this exemption after July 1, 1957, this measure sets the mileage rate limit on fares eligible for the exemption at 2.5 cents per mile.

Public Law 74, approved June 29, 1957.

AEC Indemnity Act

H. R. 7383:

This measure provides for Federal indemnity against atomic reactor hazards for protection of the public. Briefly the act provides:

As a condition for a reactor license, the AEC will require the licensee to take out and maintain financial protection. Each such licensee is also required to maintain an indemnity contract with the Federal Government, by which the Government will indemnify the licensee up to $500 million, including damages and costs of investigating and settling claims. This $500 million is the maximum amount the Government will be required to pay in connection with any nuclear incident.

Both the financial protection and indemnification by the Government are to be made for the benefit of any person who might be found liable for a reactor incident, both contractors and subcontractors.

AEC is authorized to use this indemnification procedure with its own contractors and subcontractors. Should the damages in any instance exceed the amount of the financial protection, together with the $500 million sum, the Commission, or any person interested, can apply to the district court having jurisdiction in bankruptcy over the site of the nuclear incident and have the available funds prorated among all those to whom liability is owed.

The Commission is required to make full reports to the Joint Committee whenever there is a nuclear incident which might require use of this act.

The Reactor Safeguards Committee is made statutory, and is required to pass on applications for reactor licenses which, by their nature, are hazardous.

Statutory protection is provided for property of indemnified persons which may be damaged because of a runaway reactor—the property which is located away from the reactor. Up to this time, this type property has not been covered by the liability insurance policies.

Public Law 256, approved September 2, 1957.

Casein—Duty Free

H. R. 38:

This measure suspends, until March 31, 1960, the import duty on casein or lactarene and mixtures of which casein or lactarene is the component material.

Public Law 257, approved September 2, 1957.

Foreign relations

Middle East Resolution

House Joint Resolution 117:

The Congress, on March 7, 1957, completed action on the President's request of January 5, 1957, urging immediate consideration of a proposal to authorize the use of troops in the Middle East to assist any nation attacked by Communist forces requesting such aid, and to authorize the use of mutual security funds without regard to existing limitations. The urgency was based upon the critical situation in the Middle East which erupted in August of 1956 with the seizure of the Suez Canal by Egypt.

Congress, within 2 months, sent to the President House Joint Resolution 117, which differed somewhat from the proposal as originally presented. A major area of difference was that the Congress substituted, for the troop authorization, a statement that the United States is prepared to use its Armed Forces if the President deems it necessary, and if consistent with its treaty obligations and Constitution. The resolution further provides:

Authority for the President to cooperate with any nation in the Middle East desiring assistance in developing its economic strength. Authority for the President to undertake, in the Middle East, military assistance programs with any nation desiring such assistance. Authority for the President to use during the remainder of 1957, for economic and military assistance wherever he believes necessary in the Middle East, up to $200 million from funds already appropriated.

That the President should continue United Nations multilateral support in the Middle East.

That the President, twice yearly, report to Congress any actions taken under this resolution.

That the joint resolution will expire whenever the President determines the authority granted is no longer necessary, or by concurrent action of Congress.

Public Law 7, approved March 9, 1957.

International Atomic Energy Agency

Executive I:

The Senate, by a vote of 67 to 19, ratified Executive I, 85th Congress, 1st session, on June 18, 1957, the statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency signed at New York City by the United States and 79 other nations.

The purpose of this treaty is to establish an International Atomic Energy Agency

charged with responsibility for advancing the peaceful uses of atomic energy, and for developing methods for its application to industry, agriculture, and medicine for the benefit and general welfare of mankind through a cooperative effort. The treaty authorizes the Agency to assist in research, to make provision for services and materials needed for such research, to act as an intermediary to secure performance of services and the supply of material and facilities by one member to another, to foster the exchange of scientific and technical information, and to establish and administer safeguards to prevent misuse of materials for military purposes.

Activities of the Agency are to be conducted in accordance with the principles and purposes of the United Nations. Annual reports on the Agency's activities must be submitted to the General Assembly of the United Nations, to the Security Council, and to the Economic and Social Council.

A 23-member Board of Governors is established as the principal policymaking body of the Agency.

The treaty provides that a general conference, consisting of representatives of all members, meet in regular annual session, or in special sessions if convened by the Director General at the request of the Board or a majority of the members.

Members may make available to the Agency any quantity of special fissionable materials they believe advisable, and under such terms as they and the Agency agree to. The Agency, in accepting these materials, must assume responsibility for safeguards against weather hazards, unauthorized removal, damage or destruction, including sabotage, and forcible seizure.

Cost to the United States for participation in the Agency will be approximately 33⅓ percent of the administrative expenses which, in the first year, will be in the neighborhood of two to two and one-half million dollars.

The United States was the 22d nation to ratify the 80-nation "atoms for peace" Agency on July 29, 1957. This action of the United States actually brought the International Atomic Energy Agency into being. Britain and Russia had already signed, and 3 of the 5 major powers were needed before the International Atomic Energy Agency could begin operation.

International Atomic Energy Agency—United States Participation

H. R. 8992:

This act implements the International Atomic Energy Agency Treaty ratified by the Senate on June 18, 1957, by authorizing the President to appoint and the Senate to confirm representatives and deputies of the United States to the International Atomic Energy Agency. The President is required to report once a year to the Congress on the Agency's activities and on American representation.

The United States is authorized to pay its share of the annual budget which will be about one-third or approximately two to two and a half million dollars.

In order to encourage Federal employees to go with the Agency, they are given 3 years protection on civil service retirement, life insurance, and reinstatement rights in their positions.

Provides that uranium distributed abroad by the Atomic Energy Commission through the Agency must be paid for at no less than the charges established for domestic use; however, an exception is made for materials to be used in research and medical therapy.

The measure requires that the Commission obtain approval for the contribution of materials to the International Atomic Energy Agency above and beyond the President's offer of 5,000 kilograms of uranium 235.

Public Law 177, approved August 28, 1957.

Mutual Security Authorization of 1957

S. 2130:

This measure authorizes an appropriation of $3,367,083,000 for the mutual security program. This amount represents a reduction of $477,560,000 below the budget request as modified.

Authorizations are as follows:

Military assistance, $1,600,000,000 for fiscal 1958.

Defense support, $750 million for fiscal 1958.

Development loan fund, $625 million in fiscal 1959 in addition to an authorization for a current appropriation of $500 million—neither authorization is subject to fiscal year limitation and both will remain available until expended.

Technical cooperation:

Bilateral, $151,900,000 to be available until expended.

Multilateral:

United Nations, $15,500,000.

Organization of American States, $1,500,000.

Other programs:

Special assistance, $250 million.

Latin American economic development, $25 million.

Joint control area, $11,500,000.

U. N. refugee fund, $2,233,000.

Escapee program, $5,500,000.

U. N. children's fund, $11 million.

Ocean freight on voluntary relief shipments, $2,200,000.

Battle Act administration, $2,200,000.

ICA administration, $32,750,000.

Atoms for peace, $7 billion.

This measure authorizes a program of malaria eradication. It divides foreign aid into two categories—defense assistance including related economic support, and economic development assistance. The economic development assistance is placed on a repayable basis through the establishment of the development loan fund.

The development loan fund is established within the International Cooperation Administration on a loan basis. The basic purpose of the fund is to assist, on a basis of self-help and mutual cooperation, the efforts of free peoples to develop their economic resources and to increase their productive capacities.

Public Law 141, approved August 14, 1957.

Export-Import Bank Act—Extension

H. R. 4136:

Extends for a period of 5 years from June 30, 1958, to June 30, 1963, the time within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may make loans.

As a general rule, the bank extends credit to finance only purchases of materials and equipment produced or manufactured in the United States and of technical services of United States firms and individuals which carries into effect one of its chief purposes—to facilitate United States exports.

Public Law 55, approved June 17, 1957.

Hungary-U. N. Consideration

House Concurrent Resolution 204:

The Senate unanimously adopted this resolution expressing as the sense of Congress that the United States Government should take urgent steps to recommend reconvening of the United Nations General Assembly now to seek immediate consideration and adoption of the report of the United Nations Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary. In order to advance the objectives of the United Nations, the representatives should join actively in seeking the most effective way of dealing with the Soviet Union to prevent further acts of aggression and to seek practical redress of the wrongs committed in violation of the principles of the U. N.

In dealing with the broader question of other captive nations, the resolution declares the United States should implement policies in cooperation with the U. N. and the peoples of the Free World that will guarantee the freedom and independence of the captive nations so that the Hungarian tragedy should not be repeated elsewhere in the world.

Following the Hungarian revolt the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution establishing the special committee, composed of representatives of Australia, Ceylon, Denmark, Tunisia, and Uruguay. The special committee was to investigate, take testimony, collect evidence, and present a report of its findings.

The principal conclusion of the report, made public on June 20, 1957, and adopted unanimously by the Senate as the preamble of House Concurrent Resolution 204 reads: "That which took place in Hungary in the latter part of 1956 was a spontaneous national uprising caused by long-standing grievances engendered by the oppressive way of life under Communist rule and by the state of captivity of Hungary under control of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

Since the next regular meeting of the General Assembly will not take place until September, Congress adopted this resolution to urge the reconvening of the General Assembly now to seek adoption of the special committee's findings.

Anglo-American Financial Agreement

Senate Joint Resolution 72:

Approves the signature by the Secretary of the Treasury to an agreement amending the Anglo-American Financial Agreement of 1945. The amendment allows postponement until December 31, 2001, of any 7 of the annual British payments of $138.4 million toward principal and interest on loans from the United States.

The Anglo-American Financial Agreement was signed on December 6, 1945, and was approved by Congress on July 15, 1946. The agreement, authorizing the 50-year loan to the United Kingdom of $3,750 million at 2 percent interest, contained certain waiver provisions. Repayment was to be made in equal annual installments of about $119,336,250, covering both principal and interest, beginning December 31, 1951. A settlement of lend-lease and surplus-property obligations amounting to approximately $650 million on the same terms was also made in the 1945 agreement, with annual installments of about $19 million. The total annual installment of principal and interest is $138.4 million. To date the United Kingdom has paid $384.4 million in principal and $424.6 million in interest, representing payment in full of installments due in 1951–55, and the principal installment for 1956.

This amendment merely replaces the interest waiver provisions to which they were entitled under the agreement and authorizes the United Kingdom to postpone payments until the year 2001 if so desired in an effort to get their economy on a sounder footing.

Public Law 21, approved April 20, 1957.

Financial Assistance Loans

S. 747:

This measure permits the Secretary of State, with the approval of the Comptroller General, to evaluate and cancel, in whole or part, certain claims of the Government against citizens of the United States growing out of personal loans and other advances made to them in emergency situations abroad.

The United States has made loans for many years to Americans abroad, helping them to return to America, and to survive in wartime. In the latter case, gross inequities were perpetrated by enemy countries in setting artificial exchange rates on American money.

Since the beginning of this operation about 150,000 loans have been made totaling some $12 million; of this total $7.5 million has been repaid.

Passed Senate August 5, 1957.

International Labor Organizations—Contributions

Senate Joint Resolution 73:

This resolution increases the ceiling on the United States annual contribution to the International Labor Organization from $1,750,000 to $2 million.

The budget of the International Labor Organization has been gradually increasing over the years as the workload of the Organization increased, due to some extent to a shift in the emphasis of its work toward research, studies, and technical services.

Passed Senate June 27, 1957.

International Claims Settlement Act—Amendment

S. 979:

This measure amends the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 by extending the time limit for filing claims against the Governments of Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, Italy, and the U. S. S. R., until the date of enactment of this act.

It provides for the reduction of any awards, recoverable under the act, by an amount equal to the tax benefits a claimant may have obtained in a prior tax year from writing off war losses upon which his award is based; however, no award may be reduced to less than $5,000 by the tax benefit.

Passed Senate August 5, 1957.

Denmark—Ship Payment

S. 2448:

Authorizes $5,296,302 as a final settlement of the claims of Danish shipowners whose vessels were requisitioned by the United States Government in 1941. During the early days of World War II, 40 vessels of Danish ownership were lying in United States ports. With the aid of the Danish Minister the United States requisitioned these ships—24 of which were later lost at sea. Settlement for 35 of the ships was made some years ago. This serves as a compromise settlement for the remaining vessels.

Passed Senate July 3, 1957.

Interparliamentary Union—Increased Contributions

S. 2515:

This act increases the ceiling on United States contributions to the Interparliamentary Union from $15,000 to $18,000.

All member nations are contributing an amount in Swiss francs equal to 150 percent of their 1931 contribution and, making allowance for the interim devaluation of the dollar, $18,000 represents a 150 percent increase over the 1931 United States contribution.

Passed Senate August 5, 1957.

Executive Agreements—Transmission to Senate

S. 603:

This measure amends the United States Code to require the Secretary of State to transmit to the Senate the text of any international agreement, other than a treaty, to which the United States is a party as soon as practicable after such agreement has entered into force with respect to the United States but in no event later than 60 days after execution.

In cases where the President has reason to believe that public disclosure would be prejudicial to the national security, the agreement is to be transmitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations in a cloak of secrecy to be removed only by the President.

Supporters of this measure feel that it will provide the basis for keeping the Senate informed on a variety of matters dealt with by executive agreements and which have, in the past, escaped its attention.

Passed Senate June 27, 1957.

Implementing Treaty With Panama

H. R. 6709:

To implement the 1955 Treaty of Mutual Understanding and Cooperation between the United States and the Republic of Panama, this measure authorizes the Secretary of State to convey to Panama, free of cost, all title and interest held by the United States in various lands and improvements in the Canal Zone.

Public Law 223, approved August 30, 1957.

Geneva Conventions—Red Cross

S. 1779:

This measure amends title 18, United States Code, to provide criminal penalties for the violation of certain misuses of Red Cross insignia.

Provides a punishment of $250, or 6 months imprisonment, for the unlawful use of the Red Cross emblem, or any colorable emblem thereof. The use of "PW," "PG," or "IC" during wartime, in a manner recognizable from the air, and for any purpose other than to designate prisoner of war or internment camps, is prohibited.

Exception to the prohibition against use of the Red Cross emblem is provided for the Red Cross itself, for hospitals and ambulances, and for "the same purpose and for the same class of goods as was lawful on the date of enactment of this title."

Passed Senate August 5, 1957.

Metallurgical Congress

House Joint Resolution 404:

This resolution provides for Congressional and Presidential recognition and endorsement of the Second World Metallurgical Congress, to be held in Chicago, Ill., November 2 to 8, 1957, sponsored by the Metallurgical Congress and the American Society for Metals.

The Congress, which will be attended by metal scientists and engineers from all parts of the world, is primarily for an exchange of scientific and technical information directed toward improving and expanding the world's metallurgical resources.

Public Law 247, approved August 31, 1957.

Naval Vessel Transfer

H. R. 6952:

Authorizes the President to sell 3 destroyers and 1 submarine to the Government of Venezuela, and to extend the period of the loan of 2 submarines to the Government of the Netherlands. The loan of the 2 submarines to the Netherlands was authorized by the act of July 11, 1952, and would have expired early in 1958.

Public Law 220, approved August 29, 1957.

Canal Zone—Employment

S. 1850:

Implements the treaty agreed to by the United States and Panama in 1955, by providing (a) a system of classification and pay for all positions in the Canal Zone without regard to nationality; this plan will result in increased payroll costs of $1,213,000; (b) that a minimum of 2,900 out of 3,500 positions currently held by United States citizens should be reserved for the employment of United States citizens for reasons of security; (c) that United States and Panamanian employees will receive the same base rates for the same positions, with, however, the United States employee receiving a tax allowance and the usual zone differential; (d) that the general provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act shall be uniformly applicable to United States citizen and noncitizen employees in the Canal Zone. This provision brings under the act some 7,942 regular full-time employees and about 800 part-time employees, heretofore excluded.

Passed Senate August 5, 1957.

North Pacific Fisheries

S. 2212:

This measure extends Federal responsibility for fishing conservation regulations from the present southern limit of 54 degrees, 40 minutes, to as far south as 48 degrees, 30 minutes.

The authorization is necessary in order to comply with the terms of the North Pacific Fisheries Convention of 1952.

Fishing interests are concerned over the sudden expansion of salmon fisheries, on the high seas off the coasts of Washington, British Columbia, and Alaska. It was feared that if this high seas net fishing was not quickly brought under control, the Pacific salmon fisheries would be seriously endangered.

Public Law 114, approved July 24, 1957.

Spain—NATO Membership

House Concurrent Resolution 115:

This resolution, as adopted unanimously by both Houses, expresses the sense of Congress that the Department of State should continue to use its good offices toward the end of achieving participation by Spain in the North Atlantic Treaty and as a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Adopted by the House March 20, and by the Senate April 12, 1957.

United Nations Emergency Force

Senate Resolution 15:

The Senate unanimously adopted this resolution favoring the establishment of a permanent United Nations force similar in character to the United Nations emergency force in the Middle East.

The purpose of the resolution is to emphasize the need of a permanent force and to urge a continuation of work within the United States Government and in the United Nations to assist in keeping peace in the world.

Adopted August 8, 1957.

International Council of Scientific Unions

Senate Joint Resolution 85:

This resolution increases the United States contributions to the International Council of Scientific Unions and associated unions from $9,000 to $65,000.

The Council is composed of such international unions as Pure and Applied Physics, Astronomical, Geographical, Mathematical, Radio, and Biochemistry. Member nations contribute both to the Council and to the associated unions.

The objectives of the Council are scientific. It coordinates and facilitates the work of associated unions to foster international cooperation and to direct international scientific activity. The Council sponsored and organized the International Geophysical Year which began on July 1, 1957.

Passed Senate August 5, 1957.

Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Authority

House Joint Resolution 342:

Grants the consent of Congress to a compact between the State of New York and the Government of Canada, which provides for the continued existence of the Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Authority and for the operation of Peace Bridge over the Niagara River between Buffalo and Fort Erie, Ontario.

In effect the compact approved by this resolution restores the situation at Peace Bridge to its previous status before the New York State law of 1955 created the Niagara Frontier Port Authority and gave it responsibility for Peace Bridge.

Public Law 145, approved August 14, 1957.

Assistant Secretary—African Affairs

S. 1832:

This act provides for the appointment of one additional Assistant Secretary of State to be designated as the Assistant Secretary for African Affairs. This new post will enable the Department to give more attention to relations between the United States and Africa and to give appropriate recognition to the growing importance of Africa in world affairs.

Passed Senate April 12, 1957.

General Government

RFC—Abolished

Reorganization Plan No. 1:

This plan, a Hoover Commission recommendation which became effective June 30, 1957, abolished the Reconstruction Finance

Corporation and transferred its functions to other agencies.

Functions relating to those programs which provided assistance to States, municipalities, and other public agencies in financing various public projects, were transferred to Housing and Home Finance Administration.

Functions relating to liquidation matters arising from national defense, war, and reconversion activities, as well as the liquidation of Small War Plants Corporation, were transferred to General Services Administration.

The plan transfers to the Small Business Administration all of the remaining disaster loan functions and all matters arising out of financial-assistance programs to business enterprises except those relating to assistance to railroads, financial institutions, and insurance companies.

The remaining functions such as business loans with outstanding principal balances in excess of $250,000, and financial assistance to railroad companies, financial institutions, and insurance companies were transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Reorganization Plans—Extension

S. 1791:

This measure, a Hoover Commission recommendation, extends to June 1, 1959, the termination date for the submission of reorganization plans to Congress. This measure carries on an established policy of Congress, in delegating to the President authority to reorganize the executive branch of the Government. The President submits the plans to Congress which become law unless disapproved by a majority of the membership of either House within 60 calendar days following the date of submission.

Public Law 286, approved September 4, 1957.

Witnesses—Statements

S. 2377:

Amends chapter 223, entitled "Witnesses and Evidence" of title 18, United States Code, by adding a new section 3500, to be entitled "Demands for Production of Statements and Reports of Witnesses." The purpose of this amendment is to clarify the principle of law in the United States Supreme Court's decision of June 3, 1957, in the case of *Clinton E. Jencks, petitioner* v. *United States of America*, and to implement that principle by establishing an orderly procedure to regulate the demand for, and production of, statements and reports of witnesses in Government files.

This measure provides that the only statements subject to production under this section are written statements previously made by the witness which are in the possession of the United States, signed by the witness or otherwise adopted or approved by him, and any transcriptions or recordings of oral statements made by the witness to a Federal law officer, relating to the subject matter of the witness' testimony. Such statements and reports shall be produced only after the Government witness has testified on direct examination during the trial. If the entire contents of the statements or reports relate to the subject matter of the witness' testimony, the court shall order them delivered direct to the defendant for his examination and use. If, however, the United States claims that the statement or report ordered to be produced contain matter which does not relate to the subject matter of the testimony of the witness, the court shall order the United States to deliver only for the court's inspection.

Upon delivery to the court, the court is authorized to remove any portions not relating to the testimony of the witness and then deliver the statement or report direct to the defendant for his use. In the event any portion is withheld from the defendant, the entire text is to be preserved by the United States and, on appeal, it shall be made available to the appellate court for the purpose of determining the correctness of the ruling of the trial judge. Should the United States fail to comply with a court order to deliver to the defendant such statements or reports, or portions thereof, the court shall strike from the record the testimony of the witness and the trial court shall proceed, or declare a mistrial, or take such other action as the court believes appropriate.

(The issue in the Jencks case involved the procedure under which a defendant may inspect a statement of a Government witness in order to impeach the credibility of the witness. Jencks was charged with having filed in 1950 a sworn affidavit with the National Labor Relations Board declaring that he was not a member of the Communist Party. Subsequently he was indicted under title 18, United States Code, which makes the willful filing of a false statement a crime punishable by a fine of $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both. The case centered around whether it was necessary for the defendant to establish inconsistency between the testimony of the witness and the statement, before the statement was made available to the defense. The court held that numerous lower court cases, holding that inconsistency was necessary, were wrong and that statements which relate to the testimony of the witnesses must be made available to the defense without requiring the defense to establish an inconsistency.)

Public Law 269, approved September 2, 1957.

Former Presidents—Recognition

S. 607:

In recognition of the great public service given to this country by our Presidents, a service which does not cease when out of office, the Congress has enacted legislation providing former Presidents with a $25,000-a-year allowance, an office staff paid on the basis of a sum not to exceed the allotment to a Senator from the least populous State of the Union, a suitable office space in a Federal building, the franking privilege, and a pension of $10,000 a year for the widow of any former President.

Passed Senate February 4, 1957.

Land Disposal—Aliens

H. R. 8929:

This act authorizes the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, to dispose of any surplus lands to aliens as well as to citizens of the United States.

The Commission was established to carry out flood control, conservation, sanitation, and other projects on the international boundary between the United States and Mexico. Under existing law, the Secretary of State is authorized to dispose of any land acquired in connection with these projects to citizens of the United States when the land is no longer needed. Other Government agencies, such as General Services Administration and the Bureau of Reclamation, may dispose of surplus lands under authority which does not distinguish between citizens and aliens.

Public Law 210, approved August 28, 1957.

Military Public Land Withdrawals

H. R. 5538:

This measure provides for the acquisition and use of public lands for defense purposes. Except for certain public land already in use by the various branches of the military services, all withdrawals, reservations, or restrictions for defense purposes of more than 5,000 acres will require congressional approval.

The act also provides:

1. For a determination, at local level, for congressional consideration of the resources impact of the proposed withdrawal.

2. For clarification of the conflict between States, Territories, and military commanders with respect to game management and enforcement of game laws on the military reservations.

3. That the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 shall be amended to clarify operations under that act with respect to the disposition of the mineral estate in withdrawn or reserved public lands and to redefine the responsibilities of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to excess reserved or withdrawn public land.

4. For a revision of the mineral leasing laws which would clarify the laws relating to leasing mineral and oil lands withdrawn or reserved for use of defense agencies.

Passed House April 11, 1957.

Passed Senate August 20, 1957.

Roster of Senior Judges

H. R. 3818:

This act provides for the maintenance of a roster of retired judges of the United States courts to be known as the roster of senior judges and from which assignment for special judicial duty may be made by the Chief Justice of the United States.

It is provided, however, that no retired judge denominated as a senior judge may be assigned to perform judicial duties in any court except upon presenting a certificate by the chief judge of the court to which he is assigned that there is a necessity for his services.

Public Law 219, approved August 29, 1957.

Mineral Interests

S. 268:

This measure authorizes the Secretary of the Army to return, to former owners, mineral interests underlying the Arkabutla, Sardis, Enid, and Grenada Reservoir projects in Mississippi, when he determines that (a) exploration for, or exploitation of, such mineral interests will not interfere with the development and operations of the projects; and that (b) return of the mineral interests will be in the public interest.

The return is conditioned upon the payment of the fair market value of the mineral interests, as determined by the Secretary. These lands were acquired in fee simple, without consideration of mineral interests, and before the Army adopted its policy of acquiring only flowage easements, where possible, instead of fee simple title.

Former owners must apply for return of the interests within 3 years of the enactment of this act.

Public Law 245, approved August 31, 1957.

Desert-Land Entrymen—Loans

S. 1002:

This measure permits the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to desert-land entrymen, in the same way that loans are made to homestead entrymen, and prior to the issuance of a patent to a desert-land entryman.

Under present law, a desert-land entryman does not receive a patent to his land until he has made improvements on it, generally consisting of irrigation facilities. During the period before he receives his patent, his claim is virtually worthless for mortgage purposes. Consequently FHA and other Federal loan agencies have been unable to extend loans for improvement purposes.

Passed Senate April 12, 1957.

Passed House July 29, 1957.

Washington State—Federal Property

S. 1574:

This legislation provides for the disposal of certain real property in the towns of Grand Coulee and Coulee Dam, Washington.

The town of Coulee Dam is almost wholly federally owned, having been built to house workers on Grand Coulee Dam. Because its property is tax-exempt, the town has been unable to grow and has remained a substantial Federal liability. The purpose of this measure, so far as it relates to Coulee Dam,

is to turn over its development to private enterprise and to permit the town to be incorporated under the laws of the State of Washington.

The town of Grand Coulee, which is largely privately owned, has been hampered because of Federal restrictions regarding rights-of-way and public utilities. This act transfers the operation and ownership of any federally owned municipal-type property and facilities to the town of Grand Coulee.

Residential and other properties are to be sold by the Secretary of the Interior at fair market value, giving priority to occupants. The Secretary is authorized to accept a downpayment and to extend time on property purchased, if private finances and FHA loans are not available to priority purchasers. The terms will be similar to those available under the National Housing Act.

The Secretary is authorized to assist Coulee Dam in becoming an independent municipality by a grant of up to $80,000, and by a contribution to a sewage-treatment plant of up to $130,000.

Public Law 240, approved August 30, 1957.

Wyoming State Capitol Buildings

S. 1396:

Broadens the scope of the land-grant provision in the Act of Admission of the State of Wyoming, passed in 1890. This provision gave Wyoming 50 sections of unappropriated public lands to be used in financing the erection of public buildings at the State capitol.

A 1956 Wyoming Supreme Court decision held that the revenues derived from this grant could not be used for the reconstruction and renovation of the State capitol buildings, but only for the erection of such buildings.

This measure corrects the restrictive language of the 1890 act by including reconstruction, renovation, and repair among the permissible purposes for which land-grant revenues may be used.

Public Law 97, approved July 11, 1957.

Additional Judges

H. R. 110:

This measure authorizes the President, under specified conditions, to appoint an additional judge of court when an incumbent judge is unable to discharge officially all the duties of his office by reason of permanent mental or physical disability, and the appointment of an additional judge is necessary for the efficient operation of business.

Applies to all judges who are appointed to hold office during good behavior, including not only circuit and district judges but also judges of special courts such as the Court of Claims, Customs Court, the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, who are eligible to retire on account of permanent disability as well as those eligible on account of age and length of service.

Public Law 261, approved September 2, 1957.

Nevada—Industrial Development

S. 1568:

Permits the Colorado River Commission of Nevada, acting for and in behalf of the States of Nevada, to purchase 126,775 acres of land from the Federal Government. This land lies 25 miles southeast of Las Vegas and is desired by the Commission for the purpose of encouraging industrial development.

The conveyance is to be made at fair market value as determined by the Secretary of the Interior. The State is given a 5-year option to purchase the land in segments of 10,000 acres.

The Department of the Interior advised that this land was not included in any proposed plans for development by the Federal Government. Nevada plans an extensive program of development, including farming, urban and suburban construction.

Passed Senate May 8, 1957.

Census Activities

S. 1631:

This measure amends the census laws to provide greater procedural facility and accuracy.

One of the most important changes is in the agricultural census regulations. This census would be made in October of a "9" year instead of in April of an "0" year. By taking the census at the end of a harvest season, a more reasonable estimate of farm labor could be had than in the spring, when many thousands of laborers have moved to other areas.

Geographical differences are removed, so that all types of censuses may be taken during the same period in all of the United States and in the Territories and possessions.

Public Law 207, approved August 28, 1957.

Lease-Purchase Act Amendment

S. 2261:

This measure amends and extends the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act and the Post Office Department Property Act, of 1954. It extends the period for approving projects for approximately 3 years, or until June 30, 1960, and recommends changes in the funding and financial aspects of the acts to alleviate problems encountered in carrying out the program. This measure also provides greater flexibility and permits the program to proceed in a more organized manner, in order to provide the much-needed space for carrying out the many functions of the Federal Government.

Passed Senate July 3, 1957.

Altar of the Nation

House Concurrent Resolution 91:

Expresses the sense of Congress that the Altar of the Nation, a memorial built by the parents of an airman killed in World War II, has been dedicated to the glory of God as a memorial to all American war dead.

The altar is located in the Cathedral of the Pines, Rindge, N. H. It is supported by unsolicited contributions.

House adopted March 19, 1957; Senate adopted May 8, 1957.

Vinson Memorial

House Joint Resolution 279:

To memorialize the late Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson, the Congress has authorized the marshal of the Supreme Court to procure an oil portrait and marble bust of him to be placed in the United States Supreme Court Building.

Public Law 20, approved April 20, 1957.

Presidential Papers

H. R. 7813:

Provides for organizing, indexing, and microfilming the major collections of Presidential papers now in the Library of Congress.

The purpose is to preserve these invaluable papers, now in various locations in the Library and in the main unbound, by the production of a master negative and copies made from the negative.

Public Law 147, approved August 16, 1957.

Housing

Housing Act of 1957

H. R. 6659:

This measure provides for a $1.740-billion housing program with numerous liberalizing changes in an effort to ease the tight-money market which has been threatening the building industry for months. Following are the major changes:

Downpayment: Decreases the minimum downpayment under FHA-sales housing and urban-renewal-housing programs to 3 percent of first $10,000, 15 percent of next $6,000, and 30 percent of excess. In establishing the lower downpayments, the FHA Commissioner must determine they are in the public interest, taking into account the national economy and conditions in the building industry and availability of GI loans.

Elderly persons program: Increases from $8,100 to $8,400 maximum mortgage amount per family unit for FHA elevator structures for elderly persons. Makes clear that single persons as well as families are eligible for occupancy.

Rental housing: Permits the high-cost-area allowance ($1,000 per room) to be applicable without regard to the number of rooms in the unit in FHA's rental-housing program.

FNMA

Increases by $650 million FNMA's total borrowing authority under its secondary-market operations.

Increases to $2.25 billion (now $1.35 billion) the maximum amount of FNMA's secondary-market-operation obligations which the Secretary of the Treasury may acquire.

Requires FNMA to purchase special-assistance mortgages at par until August 7, 1958; limits to a maximum of 1½ percent FNMA's fees and charges on special-assistance mortgages.

Increases to $450 million (from $200 million) the amount of purchases and commitments of special-assistance mortgages subject to the discretion of the President.

Cooperative housing: Increases to $200 million (from $100 million) the special-assistance revolving funds for the purchase of FHA cooperative-housing mortgages. Reserves $50 million for consumer cooperatives. Increases the present limitation of $10 million on outstanding commitments per State to $20 million, of which $5 million is reserved for consumer cooperatives.

Urban renewal and slum clearance: Increases the present $900-million capital-grant contract authorization by $350 million; establishes an alternate formula for computing Federal capital grants—three-fourths of a reduced net project cost instead of two-thirds of present net project cost—and provides that the city may elect which formula to use. Increases from 10 percent to 12½ percent the proportion of urban-renewal capital-grant authorization that can be allocated to one State. Permits the Urban Renewal Administrator to establish maximum payments for moving expenses up to $100 without requiring proof of the actual costs by individuals and families. Increases the maximum relocation payments to business concerns from $2,000 to $2,500.

Public housing: Increases income exemptions for admission to and continued occupancy of public housing.

Military housing: Extends this program for 1 year, to June 30, 1959. Increases military-housing revolving funds to $450 million (from $200 million) and earmarks up to 7.5 percent of the fund for mortgages insured under section 809, which relates to sales housing for essential civilians at military research and development centers.

College housing: Increases the college-housing loan authorization to $925 million, which includes $25 million for loans to hospitals for housing student nurses or interns.

Voluntary home-mortgage-credit program: Extends this program to July 31, 1959.

Farm-housing research: Provides for a 2-year program of farm-housing research and authorizes $300,000 for grants in each of fiscal 1958 and 1959.

Discount control: Requires the FHA Commissioner and the VA Administrator to issue regulations relating to control of discounts on Government-supported mortgages.

Urban planning grants: Authorizes HHFA to make urban planning grants to official Government planning agencies for areas threatened with rapid urbanization by the establishment or expansion of Federal installations.

Public Law 104, approved July 12, 1957.

FNMA—Authorization Increase

House Joint Resolution 209:

This measure provides immediate assistance on an interim basis, through the sec-

ondary market operation of Federal National Mortgage Agency, in relieving the shortage of funds for home loans. The secondary market facilities of FNMA provide an essential backstop to the private secondary market for FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed home mortgage loans. FNMA's supplemental role in the secondary market for these VA and FHA loans is of particular importance during this present period when the shortage of private funds for loans is so acute.

Under this legislation, FNMA's capitalization is increased by $50 million to approximately $159 million which, in turn, raises the borrowing authority by $500 million or to $1.6 billion. The amount of FNMA secondary-market obligations which the Treasury may acquire is increased by $350 million or to a maximum of more than 10 percent of the funds available. FNMA's authorization for the purchase of cooperative mortgages is increased by $50 million or to a total of $100 million, and the per-State dollar limit on outstanding commitments is increased from $5 million to $10 million.

Public Law 10, approved March 27, 1957.

FNMA—Increased Authorization

S. 1679:

Increases by $50 million the present special assistance authorization of $200 million available to the Federal National Mortgage Association to purchase military housing mortgages and selected home mortgages. The selected home mortgages, which originated under special housing programs, are those designed to provide housing of acceptable standards at full economic costs for those who are unable to obtain adequate housing under established home financing programs.

This additional authorization was felt to be necessary as a means of retarding or stopping a decline in mortgage lending and home-building activities which threaten materially the stability of a high-level national economy.

Passed Senate March 29, 1957.

Immigration and naturalization

Immigration—liberalization

S. 2792:

This measure is designed to relieve certain hardship conditions existing in present immigration laws by:

1. Permitting for a 2-year period, through June 30, 1959, unlimited entry of alien orphans under 14 years of age, whether legitimate or illegitimate, who have been adopted by United States citizens or who are coming to the United States to be adopted; however, not more than two such special nonquota visas may be issued to orphans adopted by any one United States citizen unless it is to prevent separation of brothers and sisters.

2. Granting first preference status to the spouses and children who are "following to join" one who has been admitted under a preference quota for special skills.

3. Vesting discretionary authority in the Attorney General to waive criminal and immoral grounds of exclusion in behalf of certain spouses and children or parents of United States citizens and aliens otherwise admissible for permanent residence.

4. Permitting the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, to admit the spouses, children, or parents of United States citizens or aliens otherwise admissible for permanent residence who are afflicted with tuberculosis, however, cases must be reported to Congress and no visa shall issue after June 30, 1959.

5. Authorizing permanent status for specialists who have misrepresented their nationality or place of birth to avoid repatriation to Communist-controlled countries; also permits a similar adjustment in hardship cases of spouses, parents, or children of United States citizens or lawful resident aliens, who have procured or sought to procure visas or entry into the United States by fraud or misrepresentation.

6. Granting to the Secretary of State and Attorney General discretionary authority to waive fingerprinting requirements for aliens seeking to enter the United States temporarily as nonimmigrants.

7. Authorizing the Attorney General to adjust to that of permanent residence the status of certain highly skilled specialists who are in the United States temporarily and whose services have been determined to be urgently needed in the United States; however, the alien must have been physically present in the United States on July 1, 1957. Spouses and children of these specialists who were in the United States on July 1, 1957, may have their status similarly adjusted.

8. Removing mortgages on quotas of certain countries imposed under the Displaced Persons Act effective July 1, 1957. It is estimated that lifting these mortgages will result in approximately 8,000 quota numbers being made available each year, particularly in countries such as Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and others whose quotas were heavily mortgaged.

9. Providing for naturalization of certain adopted children of United States citizens employed abroad.

10. Permitting the adjustment of status of certain diplomats and semidiplomats who have been granted political asylum.

11. Providing that approximately 18,000 nonquota visas which were authorized under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 but which remained unused when that act expired in December of 1956 would be available to bona fide refugee-escapees who have fled because of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion. These nonquota visas would be available for refugees throughout the world, including refugees from Egypt and North Africa, those located in Spain, the NATO countries, Austria, and the Far East. Under this provision, Egyptian refugees who are in Western Europe could enter the United States.

12. Providing that a period of less than 12 months overseas residence by a child admitted for permanent residence shall not constitute a break in United States residence for purposes of naturalization.

Public Law 316, approved September 11, 1957.

National Defense

Military Construction Act of 1957

H. R. 8240:

This measure authorizes military construction projects at home and abroad, classified and unclassified, amounting to $1,232,495,000, which is a reduction of approximately 30 percent from the budget request.

New authorization granted for each military department is as follows:

Army:	
Inside continental United States	$115,624,000
Outside continental United States	34,477,000
Classified	143,002,000
Total	293,103,000
Navy:	
Inside continental United States	230,356,000
Outside continental United States	48,199,000
Classified	59,056,000
Total	337,611,000
Air Force:	
Inside continental United States	394,076,000
Outside continental United States	160,705,000
Classified	47,000,000
Total	601,781,000
Grand total	1,232,495,000

Installations provided for by this new authorization include replacement of irreparable facilities, chapels, community and recreational facilities, housing, and key-service schools.

This measure also provides that members of the Armed Forces, the Coast Guard, Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service who occupy substantial quarters (where adequate quarters are not available) on a rental basis will do so without losing their basic allowances for quarters. In other words, this personnel will receive their quarters' allowance and from it, pay the necessary rent.

Public Law 241, approved August 30, 1957.

AEC—Office Building

S. 1918:

Increases to $13,300,000 (from $10 million) the authorization for the AEC office building in the District of Columbia.

The increase will provide for the construction of an additional wing on the building for headquarters personnel as well as military and civilian personnel assigned from other agencies.

Public Law 107, approved July 17, 1957.

Atomic Power Program—Congressional Review

S. 2243:

This measure provides for more extensive congressional review of the AEC atomic power program. For some time there has been concern over the extent and scope of review which the Joint Committee and the Congress should give each year to the AEC budget, particularly as to the civilian atomic-power program.

Congress felt that all Government financed experimental reactors, except very small ones, should be authorized as facilities, and also that cooperative arrangements wherein AEC provides Government funds for assistance to industry in the development and construction of reactors, should be scrutinized more closely.

To carry out this intent, AEC is required to obtain congressional authorization before using its appropriations for Government atomic plants, other than military or small experimental reactors. AEC is also required to submit to the committee any proposed price schedule for the purchase of plutonium produced as a byproduct in atomic reactors.

Public Law 79, approved July 3, 1957.

AEC Authorization

H. R. 8996:

This measure authorizes an overall total of $352,145,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission. Of this amount $222,230,000 is for new projects under the AEC's regular plant and facility authorization. $129,915,000 is for AEC research assistance to private and public power groups for construction of atomic powerplants; with an estimated $149,915,000 upper limit for this total program which includes waiver of use charges for private projects. Of the funds included in the $129 million figure, $40 million have already been authorized as construction items which include plants and facilities relating to the production of special nuclear materials, the manufacture of atomic weapons for physical research, biology and medicine, training education and information, AEC communities and general plant projects.

$58 million of the $222 million authorization is to cover the design of 1 large prototype reactor, design and construction of 1 intermediate size prototype reactor, and 1 small experimental reactor.

Public Law 162, approved August 21, 1957.

Aliens—Enlistment

S. 2420:

This measure extends for 2 years the authority for enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army, and suspends the prohibition against peacetime enlistment of nondeclarant aliens. The suspension is retroactive to June 30, 1955.

The act of June 30, 1950 authorized the Secretary of Army to accept enlistments or reenlistments in the Regular Army for 5-year periods of not more than 12,500 unmarried male aliens between the ages of 18 and 35. This suspension has made it possible to procure valuable enlistees for the Regular Army from among the displaced alien populations in Western Europe. Their native fluency in foreign languages and their knowledge of both the geography and peoples of their homeland provide the Army with a resource of talent that is difficult to find in native Americans. High standards have been set for enlistment under this program and, accordingly, only those aliens who were regarded as having the potential to become officers and noncommissioned officers have been accepted for enlistment.

Public Law 116, approved July 24, 1957.

Atomic Energy—Cooperation With Berlin

H. R. 5866:

Includes Berlin (the United States, British, and French sectors) as an area in which the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized to undertake agreements regarding international cooperation in nonmilitary applications of atomic energy.

Under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, an agreement for cooperation relating to the construction and operation of a reactor can only be entered into with another nation. It has been found desirable as part of the international program of the United States to enter into an agreement with West Berlin so that a reactor could be built in that city; however, because of the status of West Berlin as an occupied city and because West Germany is not one of the occupying powers, an agreement for cooperation with West Germany could not be entered into without an amendment to the 1954 act.

It is believed that the erection of a United States reactor in West Berlin will do much to offset any psychological advantage that might be derived from the new research center being established in East Germany through the aid of the Soviet Union. West Berlin is providing all necessary funds for the reactor.

Public Law 14, approved April 12, 1957.

Specialists—Military Training

H. R. 6548:

Extends to July 1, 1959, the President's authority to issue special calls for physicians, dentists, and other allied specialists to meet the needs of the Armed Forces.

This measure reenacts a provision of the existing doctor draft law relating only to physicians and dentists which requires that where these persons meet the qualifications for Reserve commissions in the military departments and where there is a need for their services they will be permitted to volunteer for a period of active duty for not less than 24 months.

Provides that physicians and dentists may be appointed or promoted under Presidential regulations to a rank commensurate with their professional education and ability. Persons in the medical or dental categories may be used in a professional capacity in an enlisted grade if they refuse to accept or fail to qualify for a commission.

Public Law 62, approved June 27, 1957.

Troop Ceiling—Suspension

H. R. 7143:

This measure continues to July 1, 1959 (from July 31, 1957), the suspension of ceilings on the authorized personnel strengths of the Armed Forces.

In 1950 Congress enacted a measure establishing the authorized strength at slightly more than 2 million. In 1951, because of Korea, it was necessary to amend the 1950 act and suspend the ceiling, imposing a secondary ceiling of 5 million on the active-duty personnel strength of the Armed Forces during the period that the permanent personnel strength limitations are suspended. This secondary ceiling will remain in effect during this extension.

Public Law 63, approved June 27, 1957.

Air Force Academy

H. R. 8531:

This measure provides for an interim system of appointments to the Air Force Academy on the Military Academy system, but on an annual, rather than a cumulative basis for the 4-year period beginning with class of July 1959. It will allow one appointment each year for each Member of Congress, including Delegates and the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico. In addition, each Member will be authorized to appoint 10 alternates.

During the 4-year period only qualified alternates nominated by Members of Congress including the Territorial Delegates and the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico may be nominated for appointment.

Authorized appointments from 1959 through 1962 will be as follows:

Each United States Senator: 1 cadet a year.

Each United States Representative: 1 cadet a year.

Each Delegate in Congress: 1 cadet a year.

Puerto Rican Resident Commissioner: 1 cadet a year.

District of Columbia Commissioner: 2 cadets in 1959 and 1961, 1 in 1960 and 1962.

Governor of Canal Zone: 1 cadet each 2 years.

President of United States: 22 in 1959, 1960, and 1961; 23 in 1962.

Vice President: 1 in 1959, 1960, and 1961.

Secretary of Air Force: 10 a year from honor graduates of honor military or naval schools; 10 a year from the sons of deceased veterans; 45 cadets a year from enlisted members of Army and Air Force, 23 from Regular Army and Regular Air Force in 1959 and 1961, and 22 in 1960 and 1962; 22 from members of Reserve components of Army and Air Force in 1959 and 1961, and 23 in 1960 and 1962.

Public Law 182, approved August 28, 1957.

Missing Persons Act

H. R. 5807:

This measure makes permanent the Missing Persons Act. The original act, approved in 1942, remained in effect until 1947. It was reactivated by the Selective Service Act of 1948 and has been extended for periods of 1 year by several subsequent enactments. Instead of another 1-year extension, this measure makes the act permanent.

Because of the size of the Armed Forces, the stationing of our troops in many foreign countries, and the extensive utilization of aircraft, the Congress is making this act permanent. Under this act the heads of executive departments are authorized to continue to credit the pay accounts of persons within the scope of the statute who are missing, missing in action, interned, captured, or in a similar status. If allotments to dependents are not in effect when the person is placed in a missing category, the head of the department can initiate an allotment to provide for the dependents.

New language has been added to the original act, directing that entitlement to pay and allowances shall not be denied to any member of the Philippine Scouts who was captured in the Philippine Islands by the enemy during World War II solely on the ground that the member was paroled or permitted to return to his home prior to the termination of Japanese occupation of the Philippine Islands.

Public Law 217, approved August 29, 1957.

Reserves—Facilities

H. R. 7697:

This measure authorizes an additional $80 million for the acquisition, construction, and expansion of facilities for the several Reserve components of the Armed Forces; and clarifies existing law to specifically include bachelor-type housing for officers and enlisted men for so-called permanent party or station keepers, including necessary messing facilities for this personnel. Necessity for this type facility usually occurs at the naval aviation training stations of the Reserves.

Public Law 215, approved August 29, 1957.

National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics—Construction

H. R. 3377:

This measure authorizes construction, installation of equipment, and acquisition of land at installations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

The purpose of the committee is to assess the current stage of development of aircraft, both civil and military; to anticipate the research needs of aeronautics; to build the scientific staff and unique research facilities required for these research needs; and to acquire the needed new knowledge as rapidly as the national interest requires.

Facilities needed and authorized by this measure:

New facilities for hypersonic research:	
3.5-foot hypersonic tunnel (Ames)	$11,731,000
High-speed leg for the unitary plan tunnel (Langley)	750,000
Hypersonic physics test area (Langley)	1,987,900
Hypersonic helium blowdown tunnel (Langley)	796,600
Rocker systems research facility (Lewis)	5,700,000
Subtotal	20,965,500
Expansion of facilities for nuclear research:	
Modifications to the component research facility for nuclear propulsion (Lewis)	5,655,000
Modernization of research facilities:	
Expansion of the propulsion systems laboratory (Lewis)	5,800,000
Bypass air system for the unitary plan tunnel (Ames)	100,000
Boundary-layer removal for the 14-foot transonic tunnel (Ames)	4,435,000
Flow improvement in the unitary plan tunnel (Ames)	255,000
Modification of the 26-inch transonic tunnel (Langley)	346,400
Subtotal	10,936,400
Modernization of supporting technical facilities:	
Data reduction center (Langley)	3,067,200
Modernization of instrumentation (Wallops)	2,560,000
Improved air supply for the internal flow laboratory (Langley)	858,000
Subtotal	6,485,200
General plant and utility improvements:	
Land acquisition (Lewis)	300,000
Central heating system for the east area (Langley)	209,100
West area approach road (Langley)	148,800
Taxi strip	750,000
Subtotal	1,407,900
Total, fiscal year 1958 program	45,450,000

Public Law 253, approved September 2, 1957.

Natural resources

Hells Canyon Dam

S. 555:

This measure authorizes continuation of full comprehensive development of the Columbia River and its tributaries to prevent the wasteful underdevelopment of the greatest and most economic dam site remaining undeveloped in the United States. The major feature, the high Hells Canyon Dam, is the only method ever proposed to harness the enormous potential of the middle Snake River for maximum multipurpose use in the national interest. It also authorizes construction of the Scriver Creek power facilities of the Payette unit of the Mountain Home reclamation project in Idaho.

The dam, when completed, will provide flood control through regulation of the middle reach of the Snake River for the protection of lives and property ravaged by flood resulting from inadequate upstream storage facilities. It will benefit farmers from the

Midwest to the Pacific coast by providing the only available source of low-cost power for the production of less expensive phosphate fertilizers from the phosphate bed of southeast Idaho and Utah, which contain nearly two-thirds of the Nation's phosphate resources. It will assist the economic growth of the Pacific Northwest, including Idaho, by providing power for continuing industrial growth. It will aid the growth of irrigation in the agricultural economy of southern Idaho by providing financial aid for future irrigation projects.

The dam is to be 722 feet high; length 1,733 feet; total capacity of the reservoir will be 4,400,000 acre-feet; and ultimate power capacity will be 1,250,000 kilowatts. Total construction cost will be approximately $489,540,000. Eighty-five percent of this cost will be repaid with interest by the power users of the Pacific Northwest. The primary assistance provided by the Federal Government is the temporary use of its credit.

Passed Senate June 21, 1957 by a vote of 45 to 38.

Fryingpan-Arkansas Project, Colorado

S. 60:

This measure authorizes the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado. The project is designed to import water from the Colorado River Basin to the Arkansas River Basin and to regulate flows in the latter basin so they can be used to greater advantage than under existing operational practices. It will furnish a partial supply of water to approximately 322,000 acres of land; will supplement a number of expanding municipalities in the Arkansas River Valley; will generate approximately 470 million kilowatt-hours of salable electric energy annually; and will provide flood control, recreation, fish, and wildlife protection.

It is estimated that the construction cost will be $159,287,000; however, a total of $139,905,000 is reimbursable.

Passed Senate June 27, 1957.

Omnibus Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control

S. 497:

This measure authorizes $1,540,840,000 for river and harbor, beach-erosion control, and flood control totaling 102 projects as follows:

Rivers and harbors:		
Navigation projects (36)		$102,997,000
Beach-erosion projects (8)		5,290,000
Eradication of water-hyacinths		$5,063,000
Upper Fox River, Wis.		300,000
Calumet-Sag project, Illinois		9,884,000
Illinois and Mississippi Canal		2,000,000
Total		125,534,000
Flood control:		
New projects (46); project modifications (12)		386,261,000
Increased basin authorization (13)		633,300,000
Lower Mississippi River Basin		145,745,000
Oroville Dam, Calif.		50,000,000
Missouri River Basin, Department of Interior		200,000,000
Total		1,415,306,000
Grand total		1,540,840,000

A new feature in the bill was section 205 declaring that Congress recognizes the responsibilities of local entities in developing water supplies, and that Congress should participate and cooperate in such development. The effect of this section is (1) to permit the Federal agencies to incorporate storage in reservoirs for low-flow augmentation under certain conditions; (2) to provide for inclusion of planned storage in Federal reservoir projects; and (3) to provide for reimbursement to the United States when a contract is made for the use of water.

A similar measure was pocket vetoed August 10, 1956.

Passed Senate, March 28, 1957.

Columbia Basin Project—Modifications

S. 1482:

This measure modifies the acreage limitation in the Columbia Basin Project Act to meet the changing agricultural and economic conditions and, at the same time, to reaffirm the major objectives of the Columbia Basin reclamation project, the largest single irrigation development ever undertaken in the United States or elsewhere.

Removes the limitation that water may be delivered to only 1 farm unit in the ownership of an individual family, and permits delivery to more than 1 farm unit held by any individual, corporation, or joint-stock association provided the total irrigable area held does not exceed 160 acres.

Permits water to be delivered to more than 1 farm unit held by the members of a family provided the total irrigable area held by all members of the family does not exceed 320 acres. Thus the members of a family may not receive water for more than 320 acres through the device of placing additional units in the names of minor children as is permitted by the interpretations of the reclamation law applying to reclamation projects generally. Water may be delivered whether the units held by members of the family stand in the name of one or more of the members of the family, or whether the land is the separate property of the husband or the wife or the community property of both under the community property laws of the State of Washington.

Ultimately the Columbia Basin project is to include 1,029,000 acres of irrigable land and, at present, nearly one-third of the facilities have been constructed.

Public Law 264, approved September 2, 1957.

TVA—Bonds

S. 1869:

This measure authorizes the Tennessee Valley Authority to issue and sell revenue bonds, up to an aggregate of $750 million outstanding at any one time, to assist in financing its power program. Proceeds of these bonds may be used for construction, acquisition, enlargement, improvement, or replacement of any plant or other facility used or to be used for the generation or transmission of electric power, or in connection with lease-purchase transactions.

This legislation does not change the basic administrative premise of the TVA Act. The TVA Board will continue to be held fully responsible by the Congress for the results of its operations, and will have corresponding administrative authority in the discharge of this responsibility. The actions of the Board will be subject to annual review by the Congress.

TVA is required to apply power proceeds, during each successive 5-year period, either to reduce its capital obligations or to reinvest in power facilities in an amount not less than the amount of depreciation accruals plus net proceeds realized from the sale of any power facilities. This provision protects the investment of both the Government and the bondholders.

Passed Senate August 9, 1957.

Niagara Power Development Act of 1957

H. R. 8643:

This measure authorizes the development of hydroelectric power on the Niagara River at Niagara Falls, N. Y., by the New York Power Authority under the terms of the United States-Canadian Treaty of 1950. The multipurpose project is to be financed by the State of New York without aid from the Federal Government.

The Federal Power Commission is directed to issue a license to the power authority requiring that 50 percent of the power developed at Niagara Falls be made available at the lowest rates reasonably possible to public bodies and nonprofit organizations within economic transmission distance. If the power, subject to the preference clause, is sold to utility companies, this measure requires that flexible arrangements be made to withdraw, on reasonable notice and fair terms, enough power to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of the preference customers.

Provides also that a reasonable portion of the power subject to the preference provisions be made available to neighboring States within reasonable economic transmission distance, in an amount not to exceed 20 percent of the power subject to the preference clause.

The New York Power Authority contemplates a project with a total installed capacity of 2,190,000 kilowatts, at an estimated construction cost of $532 million.

Public Law 159, approved August 21, 1957.

Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir

Senate Joint Resolution 12:

This joint resolution provides for the transfer of right-of-way of approximately 7,000 acres of land for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir and a settlement of $5 million to the Crow Indian Tribe as an outright purchase of the land, and for Federal benefits derived therefrom.

This measure removes the one remaining obstacle to the development of this multipurpose project in Montana and Wyoming. The project is designed to provide power in an area where power demands exceed production; it will bring arid lands under irrigation; and it will provide flood control as well as recreational benefits.

Passed Senate April 16, 1957.

Natural Conservation Anniversary Commission

Senate Joint Resolution 35:

This resolution provides for the establishment of a commission to arrange for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the first conference of State governors on conservation in the United States and, generally, promote a realization among citizens of the importance of protecting and conserving our natural resources.

The Commission will include representatives of the executive and legislative branches, and is to expand itself to 35 members by the appointment of 15 representatives of groups interested in conservation and 10 citizens at large from private life.

The conference of governors called by the late President Theodore Roosevelt in 1908 was the first official Federal recognition of conservation—the protection and wise use of all our resources to achieve optimum values for all the people of the Nation—as a broad national problem involving all citizens and all levels of government.

Passed Senate February 4, 1957.

Passed House August 28, 1957.

Pecos River Basin, N. Mex. and Tex.

Senate Joint Resolution 39:

This joint resolution authorizes the construction of water-conservation projects to provide for a more adequate water supply for irrigation in the Pecos River Basin, in New Mexico and Texas.

The purpose of the projects is to salvage greatly needed irrigation-water supplies in the Pecos River for the existing reclamation project at Carlsbad, and the Red Bluffs project in Texas, as well as other irrigated lands in both States. In addition, an important feature is to alleviate salinity conditions in the Malaga Bend area in New Mexico, which will make available for irrigation purposes additional supplies of water in that section.

The principal works of the project are:

(1) A channel to convey flows of the Pecos River below Alamogordo Dam in New Mexico through the delta at the head of McMillan Reservoir of the Carlsbad reclamation project, a levee and cleared floodway through the delta, and spur drains leading from the delta;

(2) Works for the alleviation of salinity in the Malaga Bend area of the Pecos River drain in New Mexico.

Passed Senate March 29, 1957.

San Angelo Federal Reclamation Project, Tex.

S. 42:

This measure provides for the construction of the San Angelo project, a multiple-purpose water resource development in the Concho River Basin in central Texas, located in Tom Green County.

The project is to provide additional storage capacity in the Concho River system for irrigation, municipal water supply, flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife benefits.

Principal features of the project include the Twin Buttes Dam and Reservoir with a maximum capacity of 810,000 acre-feet to span both Middle and South Concho Rivers. The controlled storage will be approximately 600,000 acre-feet. Of the total capacity, 150,000 acre-feet will be allocated to conservation; 430,000 acre-feet to flood control, 214,000 to surcharge capacity, and 16,000 for other purposes. Operations of the existing San Angelo and Nasworthy Dams and Reservoirs will be coordinated with the Twin Buttes facility. The irrigation system will include a main canal, laterals and drainage works to serve 10,000 acres of highly productive land.

Cost allocations are as follows:

	Nonreimbursable	Reimbursable	Total
Municipal supply	0	$6,100,000	$6,100,000
Irrigation	0	9,900,000	9,900,000
Flood control	$10,500,000	0	10,500,000
Recreation	60,000	0	60,000
Fish and wildlife	3,440,000	0	3,440,000
Total	14,000,000	16,000,000	30,000,000

Public Law 152, approved August 16, 1957.

St. Lawrence Seaway—Increase Borrowing Authority

H. R. 5728:

This measure, to make possible the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway, increases the borrowing authority of the Seaway Development Corporation to $140 million (from $105 million) and authorizes the deferment of interest. Deferred interest is to be compounded after June 30, 1960.

Expands the powers of the corporation to include the provision of services and facilities necessary in the operation and maintenance of the seaway, and the ownership and operation of a toll bridge company in conjunction with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada, or its designee.

The increased costs provided for in this act are attributable in part to general price increases, in part to basic planning and design changes, and in part to additional construction.

Public Law 108, approved July 17, 1957.

Amendatory Repayment Contracts

H. R. 5492:

This measure extends to December 31, 1960, the discretionary authority of the Secretary of Interior to enter into amendatory repayment contracts under the Federal reclamation laws. This authority was first given the Secretary in the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. It has been extended, first by the act of March 6, 1952, and then by the act of August 31, 1954.

The Congress has given the Secretary this authority to grant relief to irrigation districts in special hardship cases. With this extension, the Secretary can adjust the original terms to permit a longer period of repayment by deferring the repayments due to the Government.

Public Law 156, approved August 21, 1957.

Phosphate Development

S. 334:

Removes the present restrictions that no individual, corporation, or association may lease more than 5,120 acres of phosphate-bearing lands on the public domain in any one State.

The measure does not affect the present provision that not more than 10,240 acres of phosphate lands on the public domain may be leased to any individual, corporation, or association; it merely removes the present restriction by which the State line serves as a barrier to the effective development of phosphate reserves.

Public Law 122, approved August 13, 1957.

Irrigation Systems

S. 413:

This measure authorizes the Secretary of Interior to transfer title to distribution systems of Federal reclamation projects to local water users' organizations provided (1) the organization representing the water users concerned requests the transfer; and (2) the Secretary determines that the water users or the organization have completed repayment of all construction and other charges, with the exception of operation and maintenance charges not yet due.

Passed Senate May 16, 1957.

Outdoor Recreation Resources—Study

S. 846:

Establishes a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to study the outdoor recreation resources of the public lands.

The Commission is to be composed of 15 members, including 8 congressional members, and will report by December 31, 1959 on outdoor recreation requirements indicated for 1976 and 2000 together with the recommendations of the Commission on meeting those requirements.

Passed Senate June 26, 1957.

Missouri River Basin

S. 977:

This measure exempts approximately 21,300 acres of farmland in the East Bench unit of the Missouri River Basin project from the 160-acre limitation per farm set by the Federal reclamation laws.

This exemption will permit establishment of irrigated farms of adequate size to provide suitable family livelihood, and to meet the costs of water service pursuant to contract with the United States. The East Bench unit is an area of moderate income-producing potential and the standard 160-acre limitation is not sufficient for a family to make a living. Irrigation farming experience in the area has demonstrated that family-type farms will be successful only with combination livestock and feed-hay production. Because of the relatively short growing season at the project elevation of over 5,000 feet, and because of soil conditions, crop yields require somewhat more than 160 acres for family-sized operations. The exemption applies solely to the East Bench unit.

Public Law 112, approved July 24, 1957.

Little Missouri River Compact

S. 1556:

This act grants the consent of Congress to the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the apportionment of the waters of the Little Missouri River and its tributaries.

The compact will undertake to apportion the waters of the Little Missouri and its tributaries in a fair and equitable manner so as to assure maximum beneficial use of the limited supply in the area.

Public Law 184, approved August 28, 1957.

Coal Development

S. 2069:

To promote the development of coal on the public domain, this act will permit individuals, associations, or corporations to hold an additional 10,240 (present limitation is 5,120) acres of public lands if the Secretary of the Interior finds that the increased acreage is necessary for an economic business operation in distressed power areas.

Passed Senate July 8, 1957.

Rio Grande Rehabilitation Project

S. 2120:

Authorizes the Secretary of Interior to proceed with the rehabilitation of the irrigation and drainage works of the Mercedes division of the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project.

This project serves about 68,000 acres of richly diversified farmland. It was constructed in 1905–21, and is in a state of deterioration owing to its age. The plan for rehabilitation, submitted by the Interior Department, involves work on pumping stations, canals, and storage basins.

The authorized cost of the plan is $10,100,000, which is entirely repayable over a 40-year period. The excess-lands provision of the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 applies to holdings of more than 160 acres, so far as interest is concerned. No water will be delivered for the production of basic agricultural commodities for a period of 10 years.

The benefit-cost ratio is 2 to 1.

Passed Senate August 9, 1957.

Virgin Islands National Park

S. 2183:

This measure amends the act establishing the Virgin Islands National Park by removing the limitations on expenditure of funds for the capital improvement of the park (now $60,000) and for annual operating expenses (now $30,000).

These limitations have placed severe and uneconomic restrictions on the development of an adequate national park in the Virgin Islands.

Passed Senate August 5, 1957.

Burns Creek Project

S. 2757:

This measure authorizes the Federal construction of a reregulating reservoir and other works at Burns Creek in the upper Snake River Valley, Idaho.

Burns Creek Dam will be located about 30 miles below Palisades and will be a rolled earth-filled dam 170 feet above stream bed. Reservoir capacity will be 234,000 acre-feet, of which 117,000 acre-feet will be inactive capacity for powerhead, recreation, and fish conservation, 100,000 acre-feet will be used as long-term holdover irrigation storage, and 17,000 acre-feet will be available for pondage.

It is estimated that the project complete with a 90,000-kilowatt powerplant will cost $44,240,000.

Passed Senate August 20, 1957.

Emergency Flood-Control Work

S. 2228:

This measure amends section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1941, to clarify the extent and nature of the work that may be done by the Corps of Engineers.

This act, in effect, is a composite, with additions, of several other laws on the books. It provides a $15 million emergency fund which may be used for preflood planning and supply, emergency repair and strengthening of flood-control works threatened by floodwaters, flood fighting and rescue, restoration of destroyed flood-control works, and removal of debris from waterways.

Passed Senate August 5, 1957.

Shoshone Project, Wyoming

House Joint Resolution 287:

This measure authorizes the Bureau of Reclamation to continue to deliver water to the Heart Mountain division, Shoshone Fed-

eral reclamation project, during the 1957 and 1958 seasons.

Federal reclamation law prohibits the delivery of water for land irrigation unless a repayment contract is executed. An exception is made for the development period which, in the Heart Mountain division, was set at 10 years (1946–56). This period having expired, this act is necessary to continue deliveries.

Public Law 33, approved May 16, 1957.

Small Reclamation Projects—Amendment

H. R. 2146:

Amends the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 to meet certain objections to the act raised by the President in his message of approval dated August 6, 1956.

The original act provided that no contract might be executed between the Secretary of the Interior and State or local agencies, by which Federal loans or grants are made to the cost of reclamation projects begun by such agencies, until the expiration of 60 days after submission of the contract to the Congress. The President felt that this provision violated the constitutional doctrine of separation of powers.

The act is amended to read that—

(a) The Secretary will transmit to the Congress his finding that a small reclamation project constitutes a reasonable risk and is financially feasible;

(b) No appropriation for financial participation in the project will be made prior to the expiration of 60 calendar days, exclusive of adjournments in excess of 3 days, following the Secretary's submission of findings; and

(c) No appropriation will be made if either the Senate or House Interior Committee disapproves the project, and so notifies the proper Appropriations Committee.

If a project is disapproved, authorization and appropriation for Federal participation will follow the ordinary processes in the Congress.

Public Law 47, approved June 5, 1957.

Chief Joseph Project—Washington

S. 1031:

This measure authorizes Federal construction of four units of the Great Wenatchee Division, Chief Joseph project, in Washington State.

The 4 units authorized are Howard Flat, Brays Landing, East and Moses Coulee, which encompasses an irrigable acreage of 8,661 acres. Approximately 1,440 of this acreage is now irrigated.

It is estimated that the cost of construction will be approximately $10,279,800, of which $10,185,000 is allocated to irrigation and reimbursable to the Federal Government over a 50-year repayment period.

Passed Senate August 10, 1957.

Mineral Lands—Alaska

H. R. 3477:

This measure amends the act of October 20, 1914, to provide that 90 percent of the net profits, bonuses, royalties, and rentals, realized from the operation of Government coal mines in Alaska, shall go to Alaska for disposition by the Territorial legislature, and that 10 percent shall go to the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts. Under present law, this money goes first to the United States to reimburse the Federal Government for railroad construction expenditures, and second to the Alaska fund for education and public relief. In practice the Alaska fund gets none of the money.

Amends the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, which determines the disposition of sales, bonuses, and royalties of minerals on the public lands, to provide that 52½ percent of the money received under that act will go to the Territory for disposition by the Territorial legislature. The Territory would continue to receive 37½ percent for the support of roads and educational institutions. The other States and Territories operate under a provision of the act which pays in 52½ percent of their public land mineral-leasing revenues to the reclamation fund. The reclamation laws have not been extended to Alaska.

Public Law 88, Approved July 10, 1957

Unpatented Mining Claims

H. R. 4748:

Extends to July 1, 1958, the time during which annual assessment work may be performed on unpatented mining claims based on the discovery of uraniferous lignite.

This extension will permit Atomic Energy Commission to continue its studies in an effort to develop an economic process for the recovery of uranium from the lignites. Extensive investigations are also being conducted by private organizations for the same purpose.

Public Law 68, approved June 29, 1957.

Merrimack River Flood-Control Compact

H. R. 6092:

Grants the consent of Congress to the Merrimack River flood-control compact entered into between the States of Massachusetts and New Hampshire, creating the Merrimack River Valley Flood Control Commission.

The compact will provide effective cooperation between the States in matters relating to flood-control and water-resources utilization in the Merrimack River Basin and have the effect of facilitating construction of many of the urgently needed flood-control projects.

Approval of the compact does not make the United States a party to it, nor does it require the appropriation of any Federal funds.

Public Law 23, approved April 23, 1957.

Bear River Compact

S. 1086:

This measure grants the consent and approval of Congress to the Bear River compact entered into by the States of Idaho, Utah, and Wyoming.

Bear River and its tributaries now supply irrigation water for approximately a half-million acres of land; however, nearly a million acre-feet of water a year still flows into Great Salt Lake where it becomes salty and evaporates.

This compact, which allocates the available water among these States, will make possible the developments of this million acre-feet for beneficial purposes in this semi-arid area.

Passed Senate August 12, 1957.

Mirage Flats Irrigation District, Nebraska

H. R. 5679:

This act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to amend the existing repayment contract with the Mirage Flats Irrigation District, Nebraska, to take care of a current deficit by extending the repayment period by an additional year.

It also permits the present schedule of required annual payments to be supplemented by applying a variable payment formula.

Public Law 160, approved August 21, 1957.

Kendrick Project, Wyoming

S. 1996:

This act authorizes an amendatory repayment contract to be executed with the Casper-Alcova Irrigation District, the water-user organization on the Kendrick project in Wyoming.

In 1935, Casper-Alcova, by contract, agreed to repay $2.8 million in 80 semiannual installments on the reimbursable irrigation portion of the Kendrick project. The remainder was to be returned to the Treasury from net power revenues.

The project was planned primarily to ease the unemployment situation in Casper in the 1930's.

Experience has shown the land will not produce sufficient for the irrigation district to repay at the rate established in the original contract.

This act extends the repayment period and lowers the repayment to approximately 4 percent of the irrigation investment cost.

Public Law 283, approved September 4, 1957.

National Science Foundation—Weather Study

S. 86:

Authorizes the National Science Foundation to undertake a study and research program in the field of weather modification, including methods of increasing rainfall, suppressing hail, windstorms and lightning.

Passed Senate August 5, 1957.

Whitney Dam and Reservoir

H. R. 2580:

This act authorizes an allocation of 50,000 acre-feet of storage capacity in the Whitney Dam and Reservoir in Texas to provide water for domestic and industrial purposes. It also authorizes the Secretary of the Army to enter into agreements with local interests for reimbursement to the Federal Government for the costs of the water supply storage and other related costs.

Public Law 230, approved August 30, 1957.

Alaska Tidelands

H. R. 6760:

This act grants to the Territory of Alaska title to certain tidelands, filled lands, and submerged lands lying offshore of townsites in the Territory. The lands to be granted are those lying to the seaward of the meander line as it was established in the past by Government survey or, if there is no such surveyed meander line, to the seaward of the present line of mean high tide; and the grant extends only to the pierhead line.

The pierhead line is a line parallel to the line of mean low tide which will enclose within the granted area all stationary man-made structures which were occupying or supported by submerged lands as of February, 1, 1957.

Retains in the United States all of the Federal rights and servitudes which apply to similar areas of the United States, and retains the Federal right of first refusal to purchase natural resources which may be required for national defense.

Public Law 303, approved September 7, 1957.

Narragansett Bay Area

S. 1726:

This act authorizes the Federal construction of Fox Point barrier on the Providence River, for protection of Providence, R. I., against hurricane tidal floods. It is estimated that the cost to the Federal Government will be approximately $16,180,000. The Fox Point barrier will provide protection for the city of Providence where 35 percent of the total hurricane damages occur.

The barrier will be approximately 1,100 feet long across the Providence River at Fox Point to a grade of about 22.5 feet above mean sea level with accessory pump, sluices, cooling-water inlet facilities, and seawalls at each end with stop-long structures.

Passed Senate August 23, 1957.

Social Welfare

Civil Rights

H. R. 6127:

The Senate, on August 7, passed a civil-rights measure, the first, in 82 years, to be acted on by both Houses.

This measure establishes a six-member bipartisan executive Commission on Civil Rights to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The Commission is authorized to investigate written allegations that citizens are being deprived of their right to vote. Any evidence or testimony which may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate a person must be received in executive session; and any person releasing such

testimony, without the consent of the Commission, will be fined up to $1,000, or imprisioned for 1 year. The Commission may not issue any subpena which would require the presence of the party subpenaed at a hearing to be held outside of the party's own State. The Commission is required to submit interim reports to the President and to Congress, and a final report of its activities not later than 2 years from date of enactment.

The President is authorized to appoint, subject to Senate confirmation, an additional Assistant Attorney General in the Department of Justice to handle civil-rights matters.

Extends the jurisdiction of the district courts to include any civil action begun to recover damages or to secure equitable or other relief under any act of Congress providing for the protection of civil rights, including the right to vote.

Repealed an 1866 reconstruction statute giving President power to use troops to enforce existing civil-rights law.

Prohibits attempts to intimidate, threaten, or coerce persons from voting in general or primary elections for Federal offices. Authorizes the Attorney General to seek an injunction if an individual is deprived or about to be deprived of his right to vote. Provides that the district courts shall have jurisdiction over such proceedings without regard to whether the party aggrieved has exhausted administrative or other remedies. Any person cited for an alleged contempt under this act shall be defended by counsel and permitted to produce witnesses.

Provides that any person, corporation, or association willfully disobeying or obstructing any order, rule, decree or command of any United States or District of Columbia court issued under this act may be prosecuted for criminal contempt, and places the fine under these proceedings at not more than $1,000 or 6 months in jail. In any criminal contempt proceedings, the judge may proceed upon his discretion with or without a jury, but if he proceeds without a jury and imposes upon conviction a sentence in excess of $300 or 45 days in prison, a new trial with a jury must be accorded upon demand. Contempts committed in the presence of the court or so near as to obstruct the administration of justice or by an officer of the court are excepted.

Retains the right of the courts to act without a jury in civil-contempt cases to secure compliance with or to prevent obstruction of a court order as distinguished from punishment for violations of an order.

Establishes uniform standards for qualifications of Federal jurors by providing that any United States citizen over 21 who has resided in the judicial district is competent to serve as a grand or petit juror unless: (1) he has been convicted of a crime and his civil rights have not been restored; (2) he is unable to read, write, speak, and understand the English language; (3) he is incapable either physically or mentally to render efficient jury service.

Public Law 315, approved September 9, 1957.

Vocational Rehabilitation Act

S. 1971:

Extends to 3 years (from 2) the time for training doctors under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. The 2-year limitation as provided for in the 1954 act has proved unrealistic as a training period for physicians in the field of physical medicine and rehabilitation. These physicians are the key people in the rehabilitation program and to become thoroughly proficient in this field a minimum of 3 years of specialized training is required, after a doctor of medicine degree has been earned.

Public Law 198, approved August 28, 1957.

National Mental Health Week

Senate Joint Resolution 70:

In recognition of the progress being made in one of the Nation's health problems—mental illness—the Congress adopted unanimously a joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim as National Mental Health Week, April 28 through May 4, 1957.

This year the slogan for Mental Health Week is: "The mentally ill can come back—help them." This appeal is made to the entire Nation and calls for participation by all citizens.

Public Law 18, approved April 20, 1957.

Aid to the Blind

H. R. 3035:

This measure continues to June 30, 1959, the authority for Federal contributions for aid to the blind in the States of Pennsylvania and Missouri pending approval of their plans by the Secretary of HEW.

Under the Social Security Amendments of 1950, it is required that all State plans for aid to the blind be approved by the Secretary of HEW and that such plans conform to certain standard requirements. All but the above two States have complied with the requirement, and this extension is merely to permit the Federal Government and the States of Pennsylvania and Missouri to negotiate.

Public Law 26, approved April 25, 1957.

Books in Braille

S. 2434:

This measure removes the present $1,125,000 limitation on the amount which may be annually appropriated for expenditure to provide Library of Congress materials for the use of the blind, and removes the $200,000 limitation on amounts which may be spent annually for books in braille.

The act provides that such sums as may be necessary may be spent for these purposes, in order to enable the Library of Congress to maintain an effective program for blind readers.

Public Law 308, approved September 7, 1957.

Medical Care—Payments

H. R. 7238:

This measure amends the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to provide for a more effective distribution of Federal funds for medical and other remedial care.

Under this act, the State has the option of continuing to receive its Federal matching vendor payments for medical care under the provisions of the 1950 act in effect prior to July 1, 1957, which established individual maximums on money payments for medical care; or the State may receive its Federal funds under the separate matching provisions of the 1956 amendments which became effective July 1, 1957.

Under the 1950 act, Federal financial participation in State expenditures for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to dependent children, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled has been available for unrestricted money payments to needy recipients and for payments made directly to suppliers of medical care on behalf of these recipients. The Federal Government has not participated, however, in that part of the total assistance to an individual, including both the money payment to the individual and any medical care vendor payments made on his behalf for any month, which exceeded a specified maximum. Under the provisions of the 1956 amendments this maximum has been $60 in all of the programs except aid to dependent children.

The 1956 amendments, effective July 1, 1957, provided for separate matching of vendor payments for medical care and excluded vendor payments for medical care from the formulas applicable with respect to unrestricted money payments made to the recipients. Under these separate matching provisions the total amount of vendor payments for medical care in which the Federal Government will participate is $6 times the number of adult recipients and $3 times the number of child recipients. The Federal Government's share within these limits is one-half; therefore, under the 1956 amendments, no State may receive in Federal funds more than an average of $3 per adult recipient and $1.50 per child recipient with respect to its vendor medical-care payments.

Under this act, the State may make its choice of formula once a year or less frequently, as it desires.

Public Law 110, approved July 17, 1957.

Social Security—Disability Applications

H. R. 6191:

Amends title II of the Social Security Act to extend for 1 year (through June 30, 1958) the time within which disabled workers may file applications permitting the period of disability to be established as early as the actual onset of their illness.

Under present law, if an application is filed after June 30, 1957, the period of disability that is established cannot begin earlier than 1 year before the application is filed.

This measure also extends, from July 1, 1957, through June 30, 1958, the time within which application may be made for a freeze of an individual's social security earnings record. Under a 1954 provision the earnings record can be frozen in the case of a disabled worker, so that his inability to work during a period of disablement does not result in a reduction in, or loss of, his old-age, survivors, and disability insurance rights. Because the provision is relatively new, many people qualified to make such an application did not do so, and this act will grant them a further opportunity to apply.

Public Law 109, approved July 17, 1957.

School Construction—Wake Island

H. R. 7540:

Extends the defense-impacted school construction provisions of Public Law 815, 81st Congress, and Public Law 949, 84th Congress, to Wake Island.

The island was not originally included within recipients of Public Law 815 aid because it had a sufficient school, however it was destroyed in a hurricane, and a new one is urgently needed.

It is estimated that a 3-room schoolhouse capable of caring for the anticipated 70 elementary school-age children will cost $110,000.

Upward of 90 percent of the island's employees are directly employed by the United States.

Public Law 161, approved August 21, 1957.

Indians—Hospital Facilities

H. R. 8053:

Authorizes the Surgeon General to grant financial assistance to public or other nonprofit agencies for the construction of community hospitals serving Indians, where he finds that this method would be more effective than direct Federal assistance to such construction.

No additional funds are authorized by the legislation, but an additional means is provided for constructing hospitals which will provide care for both Indians and non-Indians. The amount of assistance the Surgeon General may provide, in cooperation with other public funds, may not exceed the amount necessary to insure care for the Indians in the community.

Public Law 151, approved August 16, 1957.

Klamath Tribe Indians

S. 469:

Primary purpose of this measure is to delay the sales of tribal timberlands belonging to the Klamath Indians (Oregon) until Congress has had an opportunity to deter-

mine whether all or any part of the lands should be acquired by the Federal or State Government for public conservation purposes, or whether other alternative steps may be needed to protect the economy and to preserve good conservation practices in the region. Extends the final termination date from August 13, 1958, to August 13, 1960, and provides for Federal payment of the costs of termination up to a maximum of $550,000.

In addition this measure makes several technical amendments to the present law such as permitting the withdrawal of minors and incompetents from the tribe; specifies that an opportunity to elect to withdraw shall be afforded only after the apprisal of tribal assets are approved by the Secretary; gives the Indians who stay in the tribe the same rights as those who withdraw to purchase any tribal land that is offered for sale; and makes it clear that the provisions for terminating restrictions on individually owned Indian land apply both to allotted and to purchased land.

Public Law 132, approved August 14, 1957.

Navaho and Hopi Indian Lands

S. 692:

Described in the Executive order of December 16, 1892, for the Indians entitled to this acreage, and authorizes adjudication of conflicting claims of the Navaho and Hopi by a three-judge district court.

The Executive order of 1882 set aside the land for the use of the Hopi and other Indians as designated by the Secretary of Interior. At present the land is completely surrounded by Navaho territory and the Navahos claim right of entry.

The court's order will determine the part to be exclusively Hopi and the part to be exclusively Navaho. The tribal members are authorized to sell, buy, or exchange land where litigation displaced members of either tribe, the sales to be subject to approval of Secretary of Interior.

Passed Senate May 8, 1957.

Indian Lands

S. 998:

Amends the act of June 4, 1953, which authorized the Secretary of the Interior to convey lands and improvements, formerly used for Federal Indian school purposes, to local governments, when the lands and improvements are no longer needed for Indian school purposes.

Under the 1953 act the Secretary could declare a forfeiture of such conveyance if (a) the consent of the beneficial owners, the Indians, had not been obtained; or if (b) the property was not used for public purposes; or if (c) it was not made available to Indians on a nondiscriminatory basis; and if any one of these conditions had been breached for at least a year.

This amendment would grant the Indians the right to go into Federal court to demand forfeiture themselves, if the above conditions have been breached for at least a year. In effect, the amendment provides a more complete protection of Indian interests.

Public Law 31, approved May 16, 1957.

Osage Indian Tribal Government

S. 1417:

Extends the tribal government of the Osage Indians from January 1, 1959, to January 1, 1984.

The principal function of the tribal government is to participate with the Secretary of Interior in the execution of mineral leases covering the minerals that were reserved to the tribe. Those minerals are reserved and held in trust by the United States until April 8, 1983. Accordingly the life of the tribal government should be extended until that date in order for the tribe to continue to participate in leasing the minerals.

Public Law 192, approved August 28, 1957.

Colorado River Indian Reservation

S. 2161:

This measure extends to August 14, 1959, the act of August 14, 1955, which granted the Secretary of the Interior authority to lease unassigned lands in the Colorado River Indian Reservation for periods of 25 years. The Secretary was given this authority only for a 2-year period; it was thought that by the expiration of that time separate legislation would have been enacted settling the controversy over ownership of the lands. During the 2-year period, revenues received from leases on the northern reserve were to be expended for the benefit of tribal members on the northern reserve; revenues from the southern reserve were to go to the development of lands in the southern reserve.

The Indians of the reservation have not been able to agree on the ownership of the lands, and have taken the controversy to the Indian Claims Commission. No results are expected in the case by the expiration of the original period, and tribal members have requested an extension of the Secretary's authority.

Passed Senate June 26, 1957.

Bureau of Indian Affairs—Educational Leave

H. R. 3837:

This act extends to teachers in schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, in addition to annual leave, a period not in excess of 30 working days a year or 60 working days in every alternate year, for attendance at educational meetings and summer school.

Public Law 89, approved July 10, 1957.

Indians—Control of Livestock

H. R. 3836:

Section 1157 of title 18 originally prohibited the sale of livestock issued to or purchased in trust for Indians by the United States, without the consent of the superintendent or other person in charge of the tribe. The section was amended to restrict its applicability to livestock acquired with loans from a Federal revolving fund or tribal loan fund, and to livestock loans repayable in kind; it was also made inapplicable when the loan was repaid. The purchaser of Indian livestock was given the burden of determining whether it is subject to an unpaid loan.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs has in practice obtained chattel mortgages on its livestock loans, instead of relying on the trust status of the property or on section 1157. The section is, therefore, no longer needed, and it imposes an undue burden on purchasers of Indian livestock. Its repeal will permit livestock buyers to deal with Indians in the same manner as they deal with non-Indian owners.

Public Law 86, approved July 10, 1957.

Cherokee Indians—Tribal Roll

H. R. 4830:

This measure authorizes a revision of the roll of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians in North Carolina.

In an act of June 4, 1924, provision was made for the preparation of the final disposition of the affairs of the Eastern Band of Cherokees. Among the provisions of the 1924 act was one stating that no person born after that date would be entitled to enrollment. By an act of March 4, 1931, the earlier act was amended to provide that that roll should be a final roll of these Indians only for the purposes of showing the membership of the band as it existed on June 4, 1924.

During the past 24 years many of the enrolled members are deceased and many Cherokees have been born but, since the roll is closed there is no authority to remove names, nor to add those who can meet the membership requirements for enrollment. This measure will permit such enrollment.

Public Law 154, approved August 21, 1957.

Social Security Retirement System

H. R. 8755:

This measure makes applicable to all interstate instrumentalities the provision of present law which permits specified States to divide a retirement system into two parts and provide social-security coverage for the part consisting of the positions of those employees who desire coverage.

This act also provides that an agreement or modification extending OASI coverage to services performed in the employ of any State or any interstate instrumentality may be made effective as early as January 1, 1956, if the coverage agreement or modification is entered into prior to 1960.

Optional coverage is extended to policemen and firemen in the States of Alabama, Georgia, New York, and Tennessee.

Public Law 226, approved August 30, 1957.

Social Security Act Amendment

H. R. 8753:

This measure amends the Social Security Act to include the States of California, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Minnesota under the provision of present law which permits specified States to divide a retirement system into two parts and provide social-security coverage for the part consisting of those employees who desire to come under social-security coverage and the other group to be comprised of those who do not want to come into the OASI system.

In order to assure sufficient time for the four States to make arrangements for covering employees, this measure provides a 2-year extension of the time within which a retroactive coverage agreement may be entered into.

Public Law 227, approved August 30, 1957.

Social Security Coverage—State and Local Employees

H. R. 8821:

This measure amends the Social Security Act to expedite the completion of an old-age and survivors insurance coverage referendum in conjunction with the special provision of the Social Security Amendments of 1956 which permits certain specified States to divide a retirement system for purposes of extending old-age and survivors insurance coverage to those members of the system who desire coverage.

Under present law, after a retirement system in any of the specified States has been divided between those members who desire old-age and survivors insurance coverage and those who do not, a referendum must be conducted among the members who indicated a desire for coverage before their coverage could be effected. This measure permits the specified States to provide this coverage without a subsequent coverage referendum for those retirement system members desiring coverage, provided certain safeguards, similar to those applying under the existing referendum provisions, were followed in the process of dividing the system into the two parts.

Public Law 229, approved August 30, 1957.

Social Security Benefits—Alien Survivors

H. R. 1944:

This measure amends the Social Security Act to make inapplicable, in the case of the survivors of certain members of the Armed Forces, the provisions which presently prevent the payment of benefits to aliens who are outside the United States.

The existing law includes a provision which suspends the payments of old-age and survivors insurance benefits to any individual not a citizen or national of the United States who first becomes eligible for benefits after December 1956, if such person remains out of the country for 6 consecutive months. Payment of benefits will not be suspended, however, if either (1) he is a citizen of a foreign country which has in effect a social

insurance or pension system of general application which would permit benefit payments to United States citizens in the event they left the foreign country without regard to the duration of their absence; or (2) he has 40 quarters of coverage (10 years); or (3) he has resided in the United States for 10 years; or (4) he is serving outside the country in the Armed Forces of the United States; or (5) application of the provision would violate a treaty obligation of the United States.

This amendment allows the benefits to be paid to the survivors of individuals who die while on active duty or inactive duty training as members of a uniformed service, as the result of a disease or injury which the Veterans' Administration determines was incurred or aggravated in line of active duty; or an injury which was incurred or aggravated in line of duty while on inactive duty training and the individual was honorably discharged or released. This provision is retroactive to January 1, 1957.

Public Law 238, approved August 30, 1957.

Social-Security Coverage—Ministers

H. R. 8892:

This measure amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend for 2 years, through April 15, 1959, the time within which ministers, including certain members of religious orders and Christian Science practitioners, may file waiver certificates to elect coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program as self-employed persons.

Each minister who files a waiver certificate during the extended period would be covered under old-age, survivors, and disability insurance for each year, beginning with his first taxable year ending after 1955, in which he had net earnings from self-employment of $400 or more, provided some part of this amount is from his duties as a minister.

Public Law 239, approved August 30, 1957.

Condemned Imports

H. R. 6456:

This measure provides that foods, drugs, cosmetics, or devices which have been imported from foreign countries and entered through customs into the United States, if subsequently seized under domestic provisions of the law as violative of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, may, under certain conditions, be reexported.

Public Law 250, approved August 31, 1957.

Education—Mentally Retarded Children

S. 395:

This measure authorizes the Commissioner of Education to make grants to public or other nonprofit institutions of higher learning to assist them in providing training of professional personnel to conduct research in, or conduct training of teachers in, fields related to education of mentally retarded children.

These grants may be used to assist in covering the cost of training courses or study for such personnel and for establishing and maintaining fellowships.

These grants may also be made to State educational agencies to assist them in establishing and maintaining fellowships or traineeships for training personnel.

Passed Senate August 20, 1957.

Fair Labor Standards Act in Overseas Areas

H. R. 7467.

This measure excludes from any possible coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act work performed by employees in a workplace within a foreign country (such as employees on overseas military bases and establishments or in an airline or steamship ticket office in a foreign port) by limiting the coverage of the act to those who perform work within a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, outer Continental Shelf lands, American Samoa, Guam, Wake Island, and the Canal Zone.

It also eliminates the possibility of retroactive liability under the act for work performed in the past on either the overseas bases or on Guam, Wake Island, or in the Canal Zone.

Public Law 199, approved August 28, 1957.

National Junior Achievement Week

House Concurrent Resolution 73:

In recognition of junior achievers and their volunteer adult advisers, the Congress unanimously approved a resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating the week of January 27, 1957 through February 2, 1957, as National Junior Achievement Week, and urging all citizens to salute these young people by participating in ceremonies honoring this group.

Interested American youth, through Junior Achievement, Inc., are greatly assisted in setting up and operating their own small-scale business enterprises which, ultimately, better prepares them in assuming the responsibilities of community leadership.

Senate and House adopted January 17, 1957.

Jurors—Use of Certified Mail

H. R. 3367:

This measure authorizes the use of certified mail as well as registered mail for summoning jurors for service in Federal courts.

Certified mail insures delivery of a letter, furnishes proof of its delivery, and is less than one-half as expensive as registered mail.

Public Law 259, approved September 2, 1957.

Loan Service of Captioned Films for the Deaf

S. 1889:

This measure establishes in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a loan service of captioned films for the deaf and severely hard of hearing. The service is designed to bring to deaf persons understanding and appreciation of those films which play such an important part in the general and cultural advancement of hearing persons. It will provide enriched educational and cultural experiences through which deaf persons can be brought into better touch with the realities of their environment.

These captioned films will be distributed through State schools for the deaf and other agencies designated as regional centers for distribution purposes.

Passed Senate August 23, 1957.

School Construction in Federally Affected Areas

H. R. 8679:

This measure provides a 1-year extension of the programs of financial assistance in the construction of schools in areas affected by Federal activities, under the provisions of Public Law 815, 81st Congress.

Under existing law, funds may be provided to local school districts only for children living on Federal property on June 30, 1958. Because of the delay in the various housing programs and to avoid severe hardships, it is necessary to enact this 1-year extension beyond June 30, 1958.

Public Law 267, approved September 2, 1957.

Union Financial Reports

Senate Joint Resolution 94:

This measure authorizes public disclosure of financial reports and statements filed with the Secretary of Labor under section 9 (f) and (g) of the National Labor Relations Act.

Under this section information relating to the financial statements and the constitutions and bylaws of labor organizations must be filed with the Secretary of Labor, in the form prescribed by him, and kept up to date annually before those organizations can avail themselves of the procedures of the National Labor Relations Board. These reports must show all of the filing unions' receipts; assets and liabilities as of the end of the fiscal year; and disbursements made during the fiscal year.

Passed Senate August 23, 1957.

Civil Copyright Actions

H. R. 277:

This measure provides a uniform statute of limitations of 3 years for civil actions relating to copyrights.

Under existing law in copyright cases, the courts apply the law of the State in which the litigation is brought with respect to the limitation on commencement of action. This leads to a diversity of statutes of limitations. Some courts have applied the State statute of limitations pertaining to torts to civil suits brought under the copyright statutes; other courts have applied the statutes pertaining to conversions, injuries to personal rights, injuries to property rights, trover, etc.

This legislation takes effect 1 year following enactment. It applies not only to prospective claims but retrospective to prior claims, whether or not barred on the effective date by previously existing law in the State in which the Federal court is located.

Public Law 313, approved September 7, 1957.

Transportation and Communications

Airways Modernization Board

S. 1856:

This measure establishes an Airways Modernization Board of three members; a chairman, appointed by the President and approved by the Senate, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Commerce.

It will be the duty of the board to develop, test, and evaluate systems and devices to meet the need for efficient control of air traffic, except for those needs of military agencies which are peculiar to air warfare and primarily under military cognizance.

The Board will function until June 30, 1960.

Public Law 133, approved August 14, 1957.

Motor Vehicles

S. 375:

This measure amends the Interstate Commerce Act to provide that any mortgage, conditional sales agreement, or bailment of a motor vehicle to a carrier subject to ICC regulations shall, when filed in the State where the purchaser of the vehicle is domiciled, be enforceable in other States as if the mortgage or sales agreement had been filed in such other State.

The purpose is to alleviate the conditions arising out of conflicting State statutes regarding the validity of vehicle mortgages and conditional sales agreements. Since an agreement valid under the laws of one State may be invalid in another State, or the time of its validity may have expired in another State, banks and lending agencies are reluctant to finance the purchase of trucks. This act provides a kind of universal validity to the original agreement.

Passed Senate August 5, 1957.

Common Carriers—Government Contracts

S. 377:

This measures amends section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act under which the United States is allowed free or reduced rates for carriage, storage, or handling of property, and transportation of persons or property at free or reduced rates.

This amendment provides that offers, or tenders, to the Government under section 22 by carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act shall be conclusively presumed to be lawful and not subject to attack 2 years after date of acceptance by a properly authorized official of the United States. Such arrangements may be canceled or terminated only upon 90 days' written notice.

Passed Senate August 8, 1957.

Great Lakes Shipyards

S. 534:

Amends the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, to include Great Lakes shipyards among those eligible to bid for construction and remodeling of vessels under the act. The act provides that when the Secretary of Commerce finds that implementation of the national maritime policy so requires, he is authorized to have new vessels constructed, and old vessels rehabilitated, "in domestic yards, on the Atlantic Gulf and Pacific coasts." This measure amends the language to read "in shipyards of the continental United States," thereby including the Great Lakes shipyards.

Public Law 191, approved August 28, 1957.

Canadian Vessels—Alaska

S. 886:

Extends for another year (until June 30, 1958) a waiver of the statutory requirement that vessels of the United States registry be used in passenger or freight transportation between the United States and Alaska.

Permits Canadian-flag vessels to carry passengers and freight between Hyder, Alaska, and other ports in southeastern Alaska, or the continental United States, and passengers only between southeastern Alaska and foreign ports.

The waiver is necessary because the Alaska Steamship Co., an American concern, has suspended those operations described in the waiver, leaving the southeastern Alaska ports without available American transportation.

Public Law 103, approved July 11, 1957.

Common Carriers—Rates for Circuitous Routes

S. 937:

This measure allows railroads and other carriers under part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, and water carriers under part III of the act, to establish rates over circuitous routes, regardless of length, so as to meet competition of the same type over direct routes, without first filing requests for relief from the ICC.

These carriers are permitted to act without applying to the ICC because no substantial benefits to regulatory control have accrued in this area to offset the expenditure of time and money involved in the application. Regulatory control is still assured, as it is in the case of other rate establishments, by the availability of the complaint procedure before the ICC. During the year ending October 31, 1956, 1,573 applications for circuitous-route rates were made, and only 87 denied.

Public Law 99, approved July 11, 1957.

Common Carriers—Rates

S. 939:

This measure amends section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act which permits the United States Government and State or municipal governments free or reduced rates from carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act for carriage, storage, or handling property; this section also allows the United States Government transportation of persons at free or reduced rates.

This measure provides that quotations or tenders by carriers to the Government must be submitted to the ICC and be open to public inspection. If, however, such inspection might involve national security it would not be permitted.

Public Law 246, approved August 31, 1957.

Contract Motor Carriers—Rates

S. 943:

This measure requires motor vehicle contract carriers, subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, to file with the Commission the actual rates which they maintain and charge for transportation services, rather than their actual minimum rates and charges as presently required by the ICC.

The present system of filing the lowest rates and charges places the common carriers, on whom the vast majority of shippers rely, especially the small shippers, at a distinct competitive disadvantage because they are unable to determine whether the minimum rate filed is the rate charged to all shippers for the same service.

This measure, in effect, will establish quality in rate publication since a rate can be changed only upon 30 days' notice. Those carriers, however, who are not in competition with common carriers by serving only one shipper (and have served him for at least a year) are relieved from filing at all. This provides relief and also gives greater stability to contract carriers.

Public Law 124, approved August 13, 1957.

Freight Forwarder Permit

S. 1383:

This measure amends the Interstate Commerce Act to change the requirements for obtaining a freight forwarder permit.

Extends to freight forwarder applicants the present power of the Interstate Commerce Commission to deny permits solely on the ground of existing adequate facilities which now apply only to motor and water carrier applicants.

Public Law 176, approved August 28, 1957.

Contract Motor Carriers

S. 1384:

This measure revises the definition of "contract carrier" to read, "one who conducts its business other than as a common carrier and under continuing contracts with one person or a limited number of persons for the furnishing of transportation services through the assignment of motor vehicles for a continuing period for the exclusive use of each person served, or for the furnishing of transportation services designed to meet the distinct need of each individual customer."

Under the present definition contract carriers are permitted to acquire virtually unlimited contracts, and are actually performing common carrier service.

This act provides that, with certain exceptions, no person shall engage in any for-hire transportation business by motor vehicle in interstate commerce without a certificate or permit from the ICC.

Provides that, upon its own motion or upon the complaint of an interested party, the ICC may institute proceedings to determine whether or not a contract carrier is actually operating within the definition of "contract carrier"; if it is determined that he is not, the ICC may revoke his permit and issue him a common carrier certificate.

Public Law 163, approved August 22, 1957.

Contract Carriers—Antitrust Laws

S. 1385:

This measure amends section 11 of the Clayton Act to give the ICC authority under the section over contract carriers, as well as common carriers.

The effect of the act is to transfer from the Federal Trade Commission to the ICC authority to enforce compliance with sections 2, 3, 7, and 8 of the Clayton Act, in respect to contract carriers. These sections deal with the acquisition by one corporation of stock in another corporation where the effect would be to substantially lessen competition. The ICC, under section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act, presently has jurisdiction where common control is established over two or more contract carriers. This will complete ICC's jurisdiction in the contract carrier field.

Passed Senate August 5, 1957.

ICC—Power Brakes

S. 1386:

This measure provides that the rules, standards, and regulations of the Association of American Railroads, governing the inspection and maintenance of power or train brakes, shall be adopted and put into effect by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Provision is made for amendment of these rules after hearings before the ICC.

Administration of the rules by the ICC was proposed as important to better safety conditions on American railroads.

Passed Senate August 13, 1957.

CAB—Foreign Air Commerce

S. 1423:

This measure amends the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 by withdrawing from the President the power to review CAB certifications in foreign air transportation matters. In effect, this limits the President's power in overruling the Board's decisions in foreign air matters to those cases involving United States foreign policy and national defense.

This amendment will relieve the President of the burden of examining and passing upon complex economic matters which logically should be the responsibility of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Passed Senate April 4, 1957.

Common Carriers—Charter Service

S. 1459:

This measure requires future applicants, for common carrier authority to transport passengers by motor vehicle in interstate commerce, to show a need for transporting special or charter parties, instead of obtaining charter transportation rights upon showing only a need for transportation over a regular route.

At the present time the right to transport charter parties is gained as an incident to a regular route authorization. In many instances it appears that regular route authorization by the ICC is sought only as a device to perform charter service from or to points in the regular route area.

Inasmuch as the regular existing bus lines are experiencing great difficulties in maintaining their financial security, it is felt that the lucrative charter business should be preserved for those lines, and extended only where a need for charter service can be demonstrated.

Passed Senate June 27, 1957.

Motor Carriers—Operating Rights

S. 1461:

This measure amends the Interstate Commerce Act to make motor carrier operating authorities subject to suspension, change, or revocation for willful failure to comply with any rule or regulation lawfully promulgated by the Interstate Commerce Commission. It also serves to make the revocation procedure for motor carriers conform to the procedure applicable to freight forwarders.

It further provides that the Commission may, upon reasonable notice, suspend motor carrier operating authorities for failure to comply with insurance regulations issued by the Commission.

Passed Senate July 3, 1957.

Medals of Honor—Motor Vehicle Disasters

S. 1463:

Authorizes the President to issue medals of honor to persons who, by extreme daring, endanger their own lives in saving, or endeavoring to save, victims of an accident or disaster on the public roads.

Similar authority is in effect for persons performing courageous acts in connection with train wrecks.

Public Law 50, approved June 13, 1957.

Air Cargo Carriers Certification

S. 1474:

Amends the Civil Aeronautics Act to provide for permanent certification by the Civil Aeronautics Board of domestic all-cargo (including mail) services which have been operated continuously since November 15, 1956, under temporary certificates. Mail carriage under the permanent certificate will continue to be on a nonsubsidy basis.

The four carriers affected are: AAXICO, Inc. (American Air Export Import Co.); the Flying Tiger Line, Inc.; Riddle Airlines, Inc.; Slick Airways, Inc.

Two of these airlines, Slick and the Riddle Line, have been operating for 11 years on temporary certificates. This measure is designed to provide stability and permanence which will permit them to plan and develop their service.

Passed Senate May 1, 1957.

United States Vessels—High Seas

S. 1483:

This measure amends a 1954 act relating to the rights of United States vessels on the high seas and in the territorial waters of foreign countries.

The 1954 act authorizes the Secretary of State to reimburse American fishing vessels for fines paid to foreign nations which were illegally levied and contrary to international law, when they were seized on the high seas. The majority of the seizures occurred on the west coast of South America, some of them 200 miles out in the Pacific, and involved American tuna boats fishing in the South Pacific.

This amendment provides that in addition to the fines, the fishing boat owners shall be reimbursed by the Secretary of Treasury for their losses, including reasonable expenses for fishing gear, equipment, and catch resulting from such seizure, if certified by the Secretary of State. The amendment also requires the Secretary of State to take action to collect authorized claims from the foreign governments.

Passed Senate August 9, 1957.

Explosives—Transportation

S. 1491:

Amends the Transportation of Explosives Act, to bring certain provisions up to date, and to provide more careful controls of the transportation of dangerous materials.

Includes radioactive materials, and etiologic agents (live viruses, bacteria, etc.) within the purview of the act, thereby conferring on the ICC the power of regulating their shipment.

Provides the same punishment for violation of the act by private carriers as by common carriers.

Extends the ICC's regulatory authority under the act to shipments in intrastate commerce, where the carrier is engaged in interstate commerce or where his vehicles will be commingled with interstate traffic. The shipper who tenders such articles to an interstate carrier must comply with the packing and marking provisions of the act, whether or not the particular shipment is to move across State lines.

Prohibits the transportation of nitroglycerin by either common or private carriers except under such regulations as ICC may prescribe.

Changes the punitive requirements of the act, to provide that any person "being aware that the ICC has formulated regulations for the safe transportation of explosives and other dangerous materials," and who violates such regulations shall be subject to the act's penalties. Thus absolute liability is not imposed, but a higher standard of care is established than the former requirement that one must "knowledgeably violate such regulations" in order to be punished.

Passed Senate May 9, 1957.

Bankruptcy Act Amendment—Aircraft

S. 2205:

This measure places beyond the jurisdiction of the court, under certain conditions, the title of any owner to specified property relating to aircraft leased, subleased, or conditionally sold to any air carrier. It will permit holders of leases, or conditional sales contracts on such aircraft property a specific statutory protection or immunity from chapter X similar to that now accorded to rolling-stock equipment of railroads but not accorded to holders of leases or conditional sales contracts on other property.

This amendment, in brief, will make it possible for certificated air carriers, like railroads, to obtain equipment trust financing.

Passed Senate August 26, 1957.

Postal Laws—Penal Provisions

H. R. 4193:

This measure adjusts the penal provisions of the postal laws by:

1. Providing the death penalty or life imprisonment where death results from mailing nonmailable articles such as explosives.

2. Increasing the present penalty from 10 to 20 years where nonmailable matter is mailed with intent to kill or injure another or injure the mails or other property but where death does not result.

3. Reducing the penalty from 2 years to 1 year (from a felony to a misdemeanor) for mailing anything declared nonmailable.

Public Law 268, approved September 2, 1957.

Railroads—Safety Violations

S. 1492:

Increases the amount of penalty fines for violation of certain statutes administered by the ICC. The statutes involved are:

The Safety Appliance Act: This act requires the use of power brakes, automatic couplers, etc., on railroad trains. The fine is increased from $100 to $250.

The Hours of Service Act: This act prohibits railroads from keeping employees on duty for such periods of time as would cause serious impairment of their reflexes and alertness. The fine is increased from $100 to $200.

The Locomotive Inspection Act: This act requires periodic inspection of bad reports concerning operating locomotives. The fine is increased from $100 to $250.

Sections 222 (a) and 222 (c) of the Interstate Commerce Act: These sections deal with motor carrier safety regulations, and with the giving of rebates by motor carriers, and other unlawful practices. Fines are increased from $100 for the first offense and $500 for subsequent offenses, to $500 for the first offense and not more than $2,000 for subsequent offenses.

Public Law 135, approved August 14, 1957.

CAB, Members—Tenure

S. 1718:

Amends the Civil Aeronautics Act to provide that the term of office of members of the CAB will expire on March 31 instead of December 31 of each year, and that the members hold office until their successor is appointed and qualified—but not beyond a period of 120 days.

This measure will assist CAB in avoiding situations where the Board is at less than its full statutory strength during the period between the time a member's term expires and the time his successor is confirmed and takes his oath of office.

Passed Senate June 26, 1957.

Freight Vessels—Alaska-Washington

S. 1798:

This measure amends existing law to permit merchants of southeastern Alaska to form associations or groups for the purpose of acquiring vessels (not to exceed 150 gross tons) to transfer merchandise owned by any one or more of them to the following places: To or from places within the inland waters of southeastern Alaska and Prince Rupert, British Columbia; to or from places within the inland waters in the State of Washington; and from all places located within inland waters of southeastern Alaska to places within inland waters of the State of Washington via sheltered waters.

This amendment was considered necessary since most of these merchants are small-business men unable to finance shipments in large quantities; and the communities themselves are towns built on stilts over the water or on the sides of mountains, where there are no warehousing facilities or cold-storage facilities, hence these short-hauls and small tonnage will prove best for their economic situations.

Passed Senate August 5, 1957.

Vessel Inspection

S. 1866:

Postpones the effective date of Public Law 519, 84th Congress, until at least January 1, 1959. Public Law 519 requires the inspection and certification of certain vessels carrying passengers. Coast Guard regulations are to be issued relating to the design, construction, and repair of these vessels. The law responded to a series of sinkings resulting from improper construction and maintenance of passenger vessels.

The Coast Guard issued proposed regulations between June and October 1956, and shipowners and builders were invited to make comments on the regulations. A revised body of regulations was issued on March 15, 1957; comments were invited by April 15.

This extension was found to be necessary when many shipowners and builders felt they had insufficient opportunity to examine the proposed regulations, and to prepare replies, before the cutoff date.

Public Law 210, approved August 28, 1957.

Air Carriers—Private Loans

S. 2229:

The purpose of this measure is to provide loans for the purchase of suitable aircraft to replace the old DC-3's used by local, feeder, and short-haul airlines. The airlines covered are 21 local airline carriers, 2 Alaskan lines that are intra- and inter-Alaskan and United States service, 2 in the Caribbean, and 3 helicopter carriers.

Authorizes the United States to guarantee a lender against loss of principal or interest on any aircraft-purchase loan made to any 1 of the 28 eligible carriers, if the loan has CAB approval. The guaranty may not be for more than the unpaid interest and 90 percent of the unpaid principal of any loan, or for more than 90 percent of the purchase price of the aircraft, including spare parts. The guaranty may run for no more than 10 years and cannot exceed $5 million per carrier. In order to guarantee a loan, the Civil Aeronautics Board must find that the carrier is unable to obtain the necessary funds for the purchase of aircraft on reasonable terms, and the loans can be made only for the purchase of suitable-type aircraft.

This measure will enable the feeder- and short-haul-type carrier to purchase equipment that will result in an economical and profitable operation and will encourage the development of a suitable aircraft designed for that purpose.

Public Law 307, approved September 7, 1957.

Surveying Ships

S. 2250:

This measure amends the act of August 5, 1955, to increase the limit of cost for the construction of 2 surveying ships for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from $3,700,000 to $6,793,243 for each ship. The increase is needed solely to meet the increased cost of shipbuilding and adjustments of estimates.

The 1955 act authorized the construction of these two 2,500-ton vessels as part of a replacement program begun in 1938, but halted by the war after two vessels were constructed. The new vessels are to be placed in service in Alaska, where work is under way for the Defense Department.

Public Law 115, approved July 24, 1957.

Federal Services to Steamship Companies

H. R. 2797:

Authorizes the Department of Defense to furnish stevedoring and terminal services to commercial shipping companies who are carrying Department of Defense cargoes.

Under present practice the companies deposit, in advance of docking, funds for pay-

ing stevedoring services which the Department furnishes at Government piers. These services are taken as part of the company's costs in transporting Government cargoes, and are considered in arriving at rate schedules.

In some instances ships are delayed, and arrive at Navy piers during weekends, after provision has been made for weekday arrivals. Weekend work is paid at overtime rates. The advance deposit, figured at regular rates, proves insufficient to pay for the required weekend work, and further service must cease pending the opening of the steamship company's administrative office on Monday.

The bill would allow the Department to offer stevedoring services without an advance from the company, and would permit payments for such services to be reimbursed to the appropriation or fund initially charged.

Public Law 44, approved June 1, 1957.

Motor Carrier Securities

H. R. 3625:

This measure amends the Interstate Commerce Act to prevent the use, by motor carriers, of arbitrary par values in issuing capital stock as a means of evading the jurisdiction of the ICC over the issuance of such securities.

The ICC assumes regulatory control over stock issues where the par value of the securities to be issued, together with the par value of the securities then outstanding, exceeds $1 million. In the case of no-par stock, the fair market value of the stock on the date of its issue determines the amounts of the issue.

This act assigns a value to par value stock of par value, or fair market price on the date of issue.

Public Law 309, approved September 7, 1957.

Railroad Stock—Modification Plans

H. R. 2775:

This measure makes changes in the regulations by which the ICC may approve any plan of a railroad to modify or alter its shares of stock.

Presently, 75 percent of the holders of outstanding stock must assent to the modification. A proviso makes those shares held by the railroad, or by any person controlling the railroad, not outstanding shares whose holders may give their assent to the modification. This results in the necessity of obtaining 75 percent assent from the holders of the remaining outstanding shares, and hence deposits in the control of a very small minority the power to deny the modification plan.

The act provides that the holders of any class of shares, whether or not in the control of the railroad or of one who controls the railroad, may vote their assent to a stock modification.

The ICC is also permitted to prescribe rules for railroads in requesting assent; at present such requests must be filed with the ICC.

Public Law 150, approved August 16, 1957.

Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission

H. R. 4271:

The purpose of this measure is to provide that the Delegate from Alaska in the House of Representatives may be a member of the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission. The Commission was created by Congress in 1956 to study the economic and military advantages of additional highway and rail-transportation facilities between the United States and Alaska.

The earlier legislation contemplated that the Delegate from Alaska would be a member, however, since technically the Delegate is not a Member of Congress and the resolution provided that 5 Members of Congress make up a part of the 12-member Commission, this amendment is necessary.

Public Law 16, approved April 20, 1957.

Degaussing Equipment—Private Ships

H. R. 4285:

Authorizes the Navy to sell degaussing equipment (electrical and magnetic devices used to detect magnetic mines) to owners of private vessels of United States registry.

Degaussing equipment was aboard many ships purchased from the Government by private owners after the war. Several owners decided to keep the equipment in operating condition. To do this, spare parts are necessary, and can be obtained only from Navy stores.

In order to protect the existing fleet, and to have fully equipped vessels in operation in case of war, this measure would permit the Navy to sell degaussing equipment to private owners at prices which reflect their replacement cost to the Navy, the proceeds to go to the current fund concerned.

Public Law 43, approved May 31, 1957.

Air Carriers—United States and Alaska

H. R. 4520:

This measure provides for the permanent certification of three United States-Alaska carriers. To qualify, these carriers must make application to CAB within 120 days from the date of enactment of this legislation, and show that on January 1, 1957, and until the date of enactment, they were continuously operating under a temporary certificate of public convenience and necessity.

This act will enable each of the carriers to provide air service more economically, efficiently, and satisfactorily, and will aid in the development of Alaska.

Public Law 166, approved August 26, 1957.

Treaties

Pink Salmon—Protocol

Executive C:

The Senate unanimously ratified Executive C, 85th Congress, 1st session, a protocol between the United States and Canada to the 1930 convention for the protection, preservation, and extension of the sockeye salmon fisheries in the Fraser River system.

The principal purpose of the protocol is to institute a program for the conservation of pink salmon in the Fraser River system, coordinate with that which has been in effect for sockeye salmon since the 1930 convention.

The International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission, established by the 1930 convention and composed of 3 United States and 3 Canadian members, is responsible for regulating the seasons, the removal or bypassing of obstructions to the river ascent, the natural history and spawning-ground conditions, and the improvement of conditions of the area concerned with sockeye salmon. The Commission will now assume a similar responsibility for protecting pink salmon.

Ratified.

Northwest Atlantic Fisheries—Protocol

Executive F:

The Senate unanimously ratified Executive F, 85th Congress, 1st session, a protocol to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, signed at Washington under date of February 8, 1949; the protocol was signed at Washington under date of June 25, 1956, for the United States and nine other organizations.

Purpose of the protocol is to permit the Commission, established by the 1949 convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, to hold its annual meeting elsewhere than in North America, as now required by article II, paragraph 5, of the convention. Inasmuch as 8 of the 10 parties to the convention are not North American countries, attendance at the annual meeting has imposed a disproportionate burden and expense upon the other governments. Ratification of the protocol corrects the inequity.

Austrian Bonds

Executive H:

The Senate unanimously ratified Executive H, 85th Congress, 1st session, an agreement and protocol between the United States and Austria, signed in Washington on November 21, 1956.

The agreement and protocol creates a procedure under which holders of certain dollar bonds, issued by the Government of Austria prior to the Second World War, may establish the validity of their bonds. The necessity for validation arose from the fact that a great many bonds which had been acquired by the issuing authority for eventual retirement were looted by Soviet military forces after the occupation of Austria. Because of such seizures, quantities of these bonds are believed to have come into the hands of individuals who may seek either to negotiate them or to claim payment from the issuing authorities. By the terms of the bond indentures, these retired bonds could only be canceled by the trustees or paying agents in the United States. This procedure was found impracticable by the disruption of transportation facilities during the war. Since they could not be canceled as paid in Austria, they appear, on their face, as valid securities. From this arose the possibility that the issuing authority might be compelled to make a double payment on the bonds. To protect itself against this contingency, the Austrian Government published the numbers of the looted bonds, declaring them to be invalid under Austria law of December 15, 1953. No payments are being made by the issuers to any holders of bonds, including those owned by residents of the United States, pending a solution of the problem.

This agreement permits bondholders, who believe their securities to have been erroneously included on the lists published by Austria, to present their claims within a reasonable period of time to an American-Austrian tribunal sitting in New York City. Should the tribunal find against the bondholder, he may have the question considered by a United States district court. In the event of a decision by that court favorable to the bondholder, he will be given valid bonds in exchange for those erroneously listed. Entire cost of implementing the procedure will be paid by the Austrian Government. Legal expenses of holders whose bonds are validated will be reimbursed on the basis of 10 percent of the face value of the bonds.

Korea—Treaty of Friendship

Executive D:

The Senate, on August 8, 1957, ratified, by a unanimous vote, the Treaty of Friendship between the United States and Korea, together with a protocol signed at Seoul on November 28, 1956.

The objective of the treaty is to protect the personal security, rights, and property of Americans in Korea, to facilitate their travel and business activities, and emphasizes certain measures designed to promote private investment by United States citizens in Korea.

The two governments (United States and Korea) agree to provide, within its territories to citizens and corporations of the other country, treatment no less favorable than it accords to its own citizens and corporations relating to (1) entry, travel, and residence; (2) basic personal freedoms; (3) property rights guaranty; (4) conduct and control of business enterprises; (5) taxation; (6) exchange restrictions; (7) import and export of goods; and (8) navigation.

The treaty enters into force 1 month after the day of exchange of ratifications and continues in force for 10 years and indefinitely thereafter, subject to termination on 1-year's written notice by either government to the other government.

Inter-American Cultural Relations

Executive C:

The Senate, on August 8, 1957, unanimously ratified the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations, signed at Caracas March 28, 1954, by the United States and all of the American Republics except Costa Rica, which signed the instrument on June 16, 1954.

The objective of the convention is to promote the exchange of graduate students, teachers, professors, specialists, and others of equivalent qualifications among the American Republics, to foster a greater understanding of the peoples and institutions of countries belonging to the Organization of American States.

The convention contemplates awarding annual exchange fellowships by each government, and makes provision for allocating the expenses for study and travel between the host country, the nominating country, and the recipient of the award.

This convention, formulated at the 10th International Conference of American States at Caracas, is a revision of the Buenos Aires convention of 1936 and will replace that convention for the states which adopt it.

Austria, Tax Convention

Executive J:

The Senate, on August 8, 1957, unanimously ratified this convention with the Republic of Austria, signed October 25, 1956, relating to income taxes.

The purpose of the convention is to prevent American citizens, living in Austria, from being taxed by both the United States and Austria on profits made abroad. The convention is reciprocal.

This convention is similar to income-tax conventions previously ratified with Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, the Union of South Africa, and the United Kingdom.

The provisions of this convention, as to the United States, apply only to Federal income tax; they do not apply to taxes imposed by the various States, the District of Columbia, or the Territories or possessions of the United States. As to Austria, the convention applies only to national taxes, such as income tax, corporation tax, and housing reconstruction and family allowance contribution.

The convention adopts the principle of permanent establishment. Under this principle an enterprise of one of the contracting states will not be subject to tax by the other on its business profits unless it has a permanent establishment in the other state. The major differences in this convention and those with other countries are: (1) Motion picture film rentals are expressly excluded from the reciprocal exemption of royalties; in the case of film rentals, the tax is reduced to 50 percent of the statutory rate of tax on these rentals, with the maximum tax not exceeding 10 percent. Most of the other tax treaties provide a complete exemption from film rentals. (2) No prohibition against profits being attributed to a mere purchase; hence, an American enterprise making purchases in Austria and sales in the United States may still be subject to double tax. (3) Exempts salaries received by professional or business trainees from their foreign employers, if the period of training does not exceed 1 year and the annual salary does not exceed $10,000.

Convention enters into force on January 1 of the calendar year in which the exchange of instruments of ratification takes place.

Canada, Tax Convention

Executive B:

The Senate, on August 8, 1957, unanimously ratified this convention with Canada, signed on August 8, 1956, further modifying and supplementing the income-tax convention and protocol of March 4, 1942, as modified by the supplementary convention of June 12, 1950.

This modification extends the application of the double-taxation principle on a reciprocal basis to income derived from trucking, and to income from personal services received by employees of the Canadian branch of an American enterprise. The convention also reduces the tax on dividends paid by a subsidiary corporation to a parent corporation from 15 to 5 percent where certain stockownership conditions are met.

Japan, Tax Convention

Executive K:

The Senate, on August 8, 1957, unanimously ratified a protocol with Japan, signed March 23, 1957, supplementing the convention of April 16, 1954, relating to taxes on income.

This protocol supplements the convention now in effect. It contains only one substantive article which provides that the Export-Import Bank of Japan will be exempt from tax by the United States on interest on loans or investments received by the bank from sources within the United States. Reciprocally, the Export-Import Bank of Washington will be exempt from tax by Japan on interest or loans or investments received by the bank from sources within Japan.

International Sugar—Protocol

Executive L:

The Senate, on August 8, 1957, unanimously ratified a protocol to the International Sugar Agreement of 1953, dated at London December 1, 1956.

The protocol permits a revision of the quotas among exporting countries who are parties to the 1953 agreement, provides greater flexibility in their adjustment to changing market conditions, and revises the price objectives of the agreement. Under the protocol the participating countries will seek to keep the world price of sugar in a range of 3.15 to 4 cents a pound as compared to 3.25 to 4.35 cents a pound in the original agreement. World prices are presently in excess of 6 cents a pound, and the agreement is on a standby basis.

The protocol has no significant effect on the obligations which the United States assumed under the International Agreement of 1953, which is in effect until December 31, 1958. The import, distribution, and price of sugar in this country is governed by the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948. This protocol is of particular interest to countries exporting substantial amounts of sugar, such as the Caribbean area.

International Convention for Safety at Sea

Executive M:

The Senate, on August 8, 1957, unanimously ratified this amendment to the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea which entered into force November 19, 1952. The amendment was recommended by the President on July 1, 1957.

The convention of 1952 establishes uniform principles and rules for the promotion of maritime safety. The convention provides that amendments to it, proposed by any party, may be circulated to the others and, if unanimously accepted, shall become part of the convention. The United Kingdom proposed this amendment to permit the use of inflatable liferafts on vessels as an alternative to the conventional buoyant apparatus and noninflatable liferafts, the only types now permitted under the convention. Approximately 30 nations have agreed to the amendment.

North Pacific Fur Seals—Interim Convention

Executive J:

The Senate, on August 8, 1957, unanimously ratified this Interim Convention for the Conservation of North Pacific Fur Seals signed at Washington February 9, 1957, on behalf of the Governments of Canada, Japan, the Soviet Union, and the United States.

This interim convention, to be in effect for 6 years, has a dual purpose: (1) to continue the prohibition now being observed by the four signatory governments relating to pelagic sealing—which is hunting fur seals on the open seas as distinguished from taking seals on land; and (2) to provide a joint research program designed to accumulate sufficient factual data to prepare the groundwork for a permanent arrangement among the parties to conserve the valuable fur seal herds of the North Pacific Ocean.

Under the terms of the convention, the parties will establish the North Pacific Fur Seal Commission to be composed of one member from each party. The Commission will be charged with the responsibility for formulating and coordinating research programs, for studying the data obtained from the programs, and for recommending appropriate measures to the parties on the basis of the findings.

The convention will enter into force on the date of the deposit of the fourth instrument of ratification.

International Whaling Convention, Protocol

Executive E:

The Senate, on August 8, 1957, unanimously ratified a protocol to the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling signed at Washington December 2, 1946; the protocol was signed at Washington on behalf of the United States and 16 other governments November 16, 1956.

The purpose of the protocol is to vest in the International Whaling Commission additional powers so that it may effectively deal with problems not anticipated at the time of convention negotiations. The protocol provides (1) that the convention embrace the helicopter within the scope of whale-catching devices for regulation by the Commission; (2) a more effective system for enforcing whaling regulations; and (3) for an international inspection system.

The protocol will enter into force when all the parties to the 1946 convention have deposited ratifications or have given notice of adherence.

Veterans

Pensions—Non-Service-Connected Disabilities

S. 2080:

This measure excludes from computation as annual income for purposes of non-service-connected disability or death pension payments of veterans' bonus paid by a State, Territory, possession, or Commonwealth of the United States, or the District of Columbia, to persons who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States, and to their widows and children.

Prior to this act, payments of pensions for non-service-connected disability could not be paid to veterans or widows and children of deceased veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict where the annual income exceeds $1,400 if unmarried, or $2,700 if married or with minor children.

These non-service-connected disability pensions range from $66.15 to $78.75 a month. A rate of $135.45 a month is authorized for persons who need or require the regular aid and attendance of another person.

Public Law 311, approved September 7, 1957.

Service-Connected Disability

H. R. 52:

This measure provides increases in the service-connected disability compensation and dependency allowances for veterans suffering from disabilities incurred in or aggravated by service in one of the branches of the Armed Forces. It applies to all war and peacetime veterans.

In general, these increases will amount to 10 percent. The rate for total disability,

however, would be increased from $181 to $225 monthly, or approximately 24 percent.

The range is as follows: 10 percent disability, from $17 to $19; 20 percent disability, from $33 to $36; 30 percent disability, from $50 to $55; 40 percent disability, from $66 to $73; 50 percent disability, from $91 to $100; 60 percent disability, from $100 to $120; 70 percent disability, from $127 to $140; 80 percent disability, from $145 to $160; 90 percent disability, from $163 to $179; total disability, from $181 to $225.

Public Law 168, approved August 27, 1957.

Pensions

H. R. 71:

This measure provides that an individual who has been imprisoned in a Federal, State, or local penal institution for a felony or a misdemeanor, and who is receiving a non-service-connected pension under public or private laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, will be denied the pension beginning on the 61st day of imprisonment and for the balance of his incarceration.

Provision is made, however, for the Veterans' Administration to apportion and pay to the veteran's wife and children the pension which the veteran would have been eligible to receive had he not been incarcerated.

Disability compensation and retirement pay are not affected by this legislation.

Public Law 24, approved April 25, 1957.

Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957

H. R. 53:

This measure, a Hoover Commission recommendation, simplifies and makes more uniform certain laws administered by the Veterans' Administration by incorporating into a single act the subject matter of the extensive body of existing legislation authorizing and governing payment of compensation for service-connected disability or death to persons who served in the military, naval, or air force of the United States during wartime, armed conflict, or peacetime service, and to their widows, children and dependent parents.

It provides a similar consolidation of laws relating to pension, hospitalization, medical and domiciliary care, and burial benefits. It consolidates into one act all the administrative provisions relating to these benefits, as well as those common to all benefits administered by the Veterans' Administration. It incorporates the provisions of existing law relating to the ancillary benefits of financial assistance for specially adopted housing and automobiles for disabled veterans. It repeals all obsolete substance and executed matter.

Public Law 56, approved June 17, 1957.

Housing—Direct Loans

H. R. 4602:

Raises the maximum amount in which direct loans for veterans' rural housing may be made, from $10,000 to $13,500.

The VA is authorized to make these direct loans in rural or small town areas where there is a housing credit shortage—that is, where the veteran is unable to get a private loan at an interest rate not in excess of the guaranteed loan rate (4½ percent).

Interest rate on the direct loan will be 4½ percent.

Authorizes additional funds for the program of $50 million.

The expiration date of the program is moved from June 30, 1958, to July 25, 1958, to coincide with the ending of the guaranteed home loan program for World War II veterans.

Pocket veto September 2, 1957.

Prisoner of War Claims

S. 883:

Extends from August 1, 1955, to August 1, 1956, the time during which former prisoners of war may file claims for benefits.

Public Law 615 of the 83d Congress gave Korean war prisoners an opportunity to file benefit claims in the same manner as was provided for World War II prisoners. The cutoff date was August 1, 1955. Subsequent to that time upwards of 50 claims were filed. By extending the period until August 1, 1956, these claims will be in line for favorable action.

Passed Senate August 5, 1957.

Coast Guard Retirement

S. 1446:

Grants certain retirement benefits to veterans of the Coast Guard Reserve. Until 1949 members of the Coast Guard Reserve were afforded no voluntary retirement benefits; in that year they were brought under the same provisions as those governing members of the Naval Reserve.

This bill extends retirement benefits to those Coast Guard reservists who were honorably discharged from the Reserve between February 18, 1941, and January 1, 1949, and who had completed at least 30 years of service in the Armed Forces (exclusive of active duty for training) or at least 20 years of service, the last 10 of which fell within the 11-year period immediately prior to his discharge from the Reserve.

Public Law 149, approved August 16, 1956.

Lighthouse Service—Pensions

S. 236:

This legislation gives former Lighthouse Service employees the same right, as now enjoyed by many civil-service employees, to waive all or any part of their retirement pay. Under present law, lighthouse veterans with incomes of more than $2,700 yearly in retirement pay may not receive a non-service-connected pension. This measure permits these veterans to receive the pensions by waiving that portion of their pay which exceeds $2,700.

Public Law 142, approved August 14, 1957.

Missing Persons Act—Extension

S. 2449:

This law extends the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act from July 1, 1957, to April 1, 1958. The Missing Persons Act provides authority for the heads of executive departments to continue to credit the pay accounts of persons within the scope of the statute who are missing, missing in action, interned, captured, or in a similar status, and to initiate, continue, or modify allotments to dependents of persons who are in a missing status.

Public Law 121, approved August 7, 1957.

VA Benefits—Widow Eligibility

H. R. 3658:

This measure provides a new eligibility requirement for payment of non-service-connected death pensions or service-connected death compensation for widows of veterans, and is applicable to all wars. If the legal widow was not married to the veteran within the delimiting married date, under existing law, she would, nevertheless, be eligible for pension if she met one of the following requirements: (1) was married to the veterans for 5 years or more, or (2) for any period if a child was born of the marriage. Similar provisions are now in effect for widows who draw compensation for service-connected death cases.

Permits a claimant to receive a pension even though there was a legal impediment to her marriage if she entered into the marriage in good faith.

Public Law 209, approved August 28, 1957.

Veterans' Education Appeals Board—Termination

H. R. 8076:

This measure provides for the termination of the Veterans' Education Appeals Board, which was established to review certain determinations and actions of the Veterans' Administration in connection with education and training for World War II veterans.

In recent years the number of disputes that have arisen between the schools and the Veterans' Administration over the operation of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act has diminished, and it is believed that the few remaining disputes which might arise can be handled expeditiously by the courts.

The measure also provides for the transfer of the Board's records to the National Archives and Records Service of GSA.

The Board will be terminated 60 days after enactment of this measure.

Public Law 200, approved August 28, 1957.

Education Benefits—Extension

S. 166:

The purpose of this legislation is to restore educational and vocational training benefits to veterans whose rights have been denied by reason of an improper type of discharge, where the discharge is subsequently corrected or modified by competent authority. Similar relief has already been granted disabled veterans.

To remedy inequities resulting from fixed statutory delimiting dates or deadlines for commencement and completion of training, this measure creates exceptions to the delimiting dates and deadlines for the initiation of training under the programs so that veterans with corrected discharge may participate. World War II veterans, within the permitted class, would be granted an additional 4 years beyond the date of correction of discharge. Korean veterans, within the permitted class, would be allowed to initiate a program within 3 years after date of correction of discharge.

Passed Senate August 20, 1957.

Mustering-Out Payments—Time Extension

S. 1698:

This measure extends the time for Korean veterans to file claims for mustering-out pay under the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952. Title V of the act provides mustering-out payments for veterans of the Korean conflict in amounts of $100, $200, or $300, depending upon length and type of service. Under provisions of title V, applications were required to be filed within 2 years after enactment which, in effect, set July 16, 1954, as the cutoff date.

Veterans discharged before the enactment of title V have encountered problems—first, that of learning about their rights, and second, that of making formal application within the time limit. For this reason the cutoff date was extended to July 16, 1956.

It has been determined that there are approximately 1,000 outstanding claims so this measure extends the period to July 16, 1959.

Passed Senate August 20, 1957.

AUTHORIZATION FOR INSERTIONS IN RECORD FOLLOWING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD following the adjournment of Congress until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ACTIONS ON RECOMMENDATIONS BY EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have

printed at this place in the RECORD various letters I have received from chairmen of standing committees with regard to the recommendations made by the executive department, the action taken on those recommendations, and the action contemplated on those which have not yet been acted upon.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
August 26, 1957.

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The Majority Leader,
United States Senate.

DEAR LYNDON: This will acknowledge your letter of August 22, referring to the President's press conference remarks of August 21 about the record of Congress.

You enclosed a list of all Presidential recommendations in fields over which the Foreign Relations Committee has jurisdiction. There are 22 items on this list. Congress has completed favorable action on 18 of these items as follows:

1. Approve Middle East doctrine: Public Law 7; approved March 9, 1957.
2. Authorize United States participation in International Atomic Energy Agency: Ratified, June 18, 1957.
3. Extend, revise, and clarify the mutual security program: Public Law 141; approved August 14, 1957.
4. Ratify protocol to International Convention for Northwest Atlantic Fisheries: Ratified, May 13, 1957.
5. Ratify protocol between United States and Austria, double taxation: Ratified, August 8, 1957.
6. Ratify convention between United States and Canada, income tax: Ratified, August 8, 1957.
7. Ratify treaty of friendship with Korea: Ratified, August 8, 1957.
8. Ratify protocol to international whaling convention: Ratified, August 8, 1957.
9. Ratify agreement with Austria regarding Austrian bond issue: Ratified, July 2, 1957.
10. Ratify interim convention on North Pacific fur seals: Ratified, August 8, 1957.
11. Ratify treaty of friendship with Haiti: Executive H (84th Cong., 1st sess.). Withdrawn August 7, 1957.
12. Ratify convention for protection of inter-American cultural relations: Ratified, August 8, 1957.
13. Ratify protocol with Japan to avoid double taxation: Ratified, August 8, 1957.
14. Ratify protocol amending International Sugar Agreement: Ratified, August 8, 1957.
15. Ratify amendment to International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea: Ratified, August 8, 1957.
16. Avoid unfair tax duplication on business overseas: Handled by tax treaties.
17. Authorize $35 million increased borrowing authority for St. Lawrence Seaway Authority: Public Law 108, approved July 17, 1957.
18. Ratify protocol between United States and Canada to protect sockeye salmon: Ratified, June 6, 1957.

The four items which are still pending are:

The radio broadcasting agreement between the United States and Mexico: This agreement was referred on June 4 to a subcommittee consisting of Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman, and Senators MANSFIELD, MORSE, KNOWLAND, and AIKEN. The subcommitee held a public hearing July 11 but has not yet reported to the full committee.

The International Plant Protection Convention: The full committee held a public hearing on this convention March 19, 1957. The commitee was not satisfied with the case made for ratification of the convention by representatives of the executive branch and referred the matter to Senator AIKEN as a subcommittee of one to obtain additional information. Senator AIKEN has not yet reported back to the full committee.

Tax convention between the United States and Pakistan: This is erroneously shown on your list as having been ratified August 8. The convention was referred to the committee July 12, 1957. On July 30, the committee held a public hearing on the convention and ordered it favorably reported. Before the report was filed, the committee held a further public hearing August 9, and on August 13 it reconsidered its previous action and decided to postpone further consideration of the convention, pending receipt of certain additional information from the Departments of State and the Treasury. This information was requested by me in letters to the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury August 22. When it is received the committee will give further consideration to the convention.

Establishment of a career service for overseas officers of the United States Information Agency: A similar bill was passed by the Senate in the 84th Congress, but was not acted on by the House. In view of the heavy workload of the Committee on Foreign Relations, it seems more productive for the committee to devote its limited time to measures which stand some chance of passage than to pass this bill again.

To sum up the above, there were 22 cases sent to the committee. Eighteen of these have been disposed of. Only four remain, which have not been disposed of for the respective reasons stated above, and nothing would be gained by calling an extra meeting of the committee now.

I am at a loss to understand the basis of the President's statement that he was tremendously disappointed in the record of Congress.

The record plainly indicates that the recommendations of the President receive serious—and in most cases, sympathetic—consideration from the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Sincerely yours,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
August 26, 1957.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LYNDON: This is in reply to your letter of August 22, 1957, requesting a compilation of the actions of the Committee on Banking and Currency on legislative recommendations made by the President in the first session of the 85th Congress.

As noted on the list attached to your letter, of the 19 Presidential recommendations, this committee has acted upon all but No. 18—legislation concerning a program for area redevelopment. Of the recommendations acted upon (18 out of 19), the action in all but 2 was in accord with or exceeded the request of the President. The two exceptions are the actions on the President's requests to increase interest rates on college housing loans and on direct housing loans made by the Veterans' Administration.

Both the committee and the Senate expressed themselves in opposition to an increased interest rate on college housing loans. The Congress modified the interest rate on VA direct housing loans to enable this rate to automatically follow the rate established for housing loans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration. The guaranty loan program is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in the Senate, and as noted in your letter, an increase in the guaranteed loan interest rate was decisively defeated in the House of Representatives.

In the field of area redevelopment, the President's program is expressed by the bill S. 1433. Additional bills in this field are S. 104 (DIRKSEN), S. 964 (DOUGLAS), and S. 1854 (FLANDERS). These bills were referred to the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization which held extensive hearings. The subcommittee took no action on any of the bills.

Area redevelopment legislation involves substantial issues. The administration strongly opposed a number of features in S. 964, the Douglas bill, which provided additional assistance over and above the limited assistance provided in the administration bill; for example, the provision for loans to rural areas suffering from substantial unemployement, the provision for loans and grants for public facilities to redevelopment areas, and the provision for payments to persons being trained or retrained to undertake new types of employment.

Because of the extremely complex nature of these proposals and the substantial unresolved issues, the committee was unable to complete action during the 1st session of the 85th Congress and will continue its consideration of these bills in the next session.

Sincerely yours,
J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
August 27, 1957.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Office of the Democratic Leader,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LYNDON: Please let me acknowledge your letter and enclosure of August 22, 1957, addressed to the chairman of the committee, pertaining to suggestions made by the President in legislative fields over which this committee has jurisdiction.

Presidential recommendation No. 1: To establish benefits for workers temporarily disabled from nonoccupational causes.

No bill has been submitted or referred to this committee to carry out this recommendation.

Presidential recommendation No. 2: Provide home rule for District of Columbia.

Home rule legislation for the District of Columbia is a hardy legislative perennial. Bills seeking to extend home rule to the District have passed the Senate three times, in 1949, 1952, and in 1955. The House of Representatives has not seen fit to accept legislation dealing with true home rule up to this point. Two bills on the subject, S. 1289 and S. 1846, were introduced this session on February 19 and April 10, 1957, respectively. Planning sessions with District officials and authorities in the field of municipal administration were held in preparation for the 6 days of public hearings that have been held. As a result of the testimony that has been already taken, it has been deemed advisable to continue working on these proposals between the sessions and it is planned that the hearings will be concluded early in the second session. The committee is confident that, as in the past, a true home rule bill will receive the sanction of the Senate.

Presidential recommendation No. 3: Improve the unemployment insurance law.

S. 1214, to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended, is presently pending before the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety. The bill was introduced on February 14, 1957, and on February 15, 1957, the Board of Commissioners for the District of Columbia were requested to provide the committee with recommendations and suggestions.

The Commissioners, through the Corporation Counsel, have advised the committee

that it is their understanding that the Department of Labor has under current consideration a comprehensive review of the subject matter of the bill with the end in view of preparing draft legislation on the subject which will permit a model-law bill to be submitted to the Congress. Under these circumstances the Commisisoners have been reluctant to forward a report to the committee until they can include within it the draft revision as suggested by the Department of Labor.

The Committee on the District of Columbia, conscious of its responsibility to the people of the National Capital, and conscious also of the impact of District legislation when it is used as a model for the States, believe that the Commissioners are fully justified in their position and will await the conclusion of the present study before proceeding to active consideration of the bill.

You may also be interested in the attached report of activities of this committee, 85th Congress, 1st session.

Cordially,

ALAN BIBLE.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
August 27, 1957.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Office of the Democratic Leader, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: In response to your letter of August 22, 1957, I submit herewith the following report relative to the eight designated Presidential recommendations for legislative action which are set forth in the attachment to your communication as coming within the jurisdiction of this committee.

The committee has not considered bills covering recommendations Nos. 1 and 4, as covered by H. R. 8332 relating to fiscal and budgetary controls, which is pending before the House of Representatives, since no comparable bill was introduced in the Senate.

S. 931 (No. 2), to provide for the reorganization of the safety functions of the Federal Government, was reported by this committee on June 5, 1957, and is presently pending on the Senate Calendar (Order No. 415).

The committee has a number of bills authorizing payments in lieu of taxes to local governments in areas where recent Federal acquisition of commercial and industrial type properties create financial difficulties (No. 3), but, in view of opposition that has arisen on the part of some of the minority members, no final action has been taken on any of these bills. It is understood these members of the committee will consult with representatives of the Bureau of the Budget during the recess period relative to amending the committee bill, S. 967, in order to enable the committee to report a measure in the next session of Congress.

S. 434, providing for the submission of budget estimates on an annual accrued expenditure basis (No. 5), was reported by this committee and passed the Senate on June 5, 1957. The bill is presently pending before the House of Representatives.

The bill (S. 1791) to extend the reorganization act to June 1, 1959 (No. 6), passed the Senate on June 5, 1957, and was amended in the House of Representatives. The conferees of the House and Senate are scheduled to meet on Thursday morning, August 28, to consider the House amendment, which was objected to by the President.

Reorganization Plan No. 1, abolishing the RFC (No. 7), became effective on June 30, 1957, as indicated in your summary.

The bill (S. 2752) to modify and improve the procedure for submitting to the Attorney General certain proposed surplus property disposals for his advice as to whether they would be inconsistent with the antitrust laws (No. 8), was introduced in the Senate by request of the Administrator of General Services on August 10, 1957. Although there appears to be no objection to the bill, and it is pending on the active agenda of the committee, no opportunity has been afforded to give it consideration. There appears to be no particular urgency in this matter, and the committee proposes to defer action until the next session of Congress.

Trusting this information will conform to your requirements, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
August 27, 1957.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR LYNDON: In response to your letter of August 22, I enclose you a memorandum from the clerk of the Senate Finance Committee.

With kindest regards, I am

Faithfully yours,

HARRY F. BYRD.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
August 26, 1957.

SENATOR BYRD: The only Senate bills under the jurisdiction of the Senate Finance Committee on the President's recommended list for enactment are S. 150, S. 348, S. 349, S. 351, S. 352, S. 1563, and S. 1820.

S. 150, S. 348, S. 349, S. 351, and S. 352 were all proposed as amendments to the corporate and excise rate extension bill, H. R. 4090. Hearings were held on the bill and amendments.

In regard to S. 150, Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey made the following remarks on page 60 of the hearings:

"About 80 percent of small-business firms are proprietorships and partnerships and are not taxed as corporations. This amendment provides tax relief for only 15 percent of small-business concerns which are organized as corporations.

"Special tax relief of the sort contemplated by S. 150 therefore directly discriminates against the overwhelming majority of small businesses which are not conducted as corporations, and most importantly, discriminates against individual taxpayers generally.

"In view of the very high rates now in effect, it would be unfortunate to increase the relative tax burden on such a large group of taxpayers as would be done by S. 150, especially for the benefit of such a comparatively small favored few."

In regard to S. 352, Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey testified on page 60 of the hearings as follows:

"S. 352, which is Mr. Sparkman's proposal, would make the corporate tax generally progressive, starting at 5 percent on the first $5,000 of income and rising by 5 and 10 percent steps to 55 percent on income over $100,000.

"There is no justification for a progressive corporate tax. The analogy with the progressive individual income tax is not correct.

"Smaller and medium sized corporations may be, and in fact often are, owned by a few individuals each of whom has a sizable individual income, while the larger corporations are most likely to be owned by a great many individuals, large numbers of whom have quite modest incomes.

"The most recent figures on the ownership of companies listed on the New York Stock Exchange show that two-thirds of the 8,000,630-odd shareowners of listed securities have incomes of less than $7,500 a year. Almost 38 percent of all shareowners have incomes of less than $5,000 a year.

"The effect of a progressive corporate tax thus in many respects would be altogether unfair in that it would indirectly impose a disproportionately large tax burden on the small investors who buy stock in large companies."

All of these amendments were given serious consideration by the committee in a subsequent executive session. Amendments incorporating the context of S. 150 and S. 352 were rejected by the Finance Committee. Action on amendments containing the context of S. 348, S. 349, and S. 351 was referred for further study.

S. 1563 would permit a taxpayer carrying on a trade or business in the conduct of which 10 or less persons are engaged to elect to take a standard deduction, in lieu of itemized deductions, for expenses attributable to such trade or business. Departmental reports were requested from the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of the Treasury on March 19, 1957, but have not been received thus far. Under the Constitution we cannot initiate action on this tax bill.

S. 1820 would provide for deduction from taxable income of investments in depreciable assets or inventory during taxable year up to 20 percent of net income, or $30,000, whichever is lower. Applies to individuals, proprietorships, partnerships, and self-employed persons, as well as corporations. It also permits installment payment of estate taxes over a 10-year period. Departmental reports were requested from the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of the Treasury on April 9, 1957, but have not been received thus far. The committee cannot initiate action on this tax bill.

The only House-passed bill before the Finance Committee which was on the President's recommended list for enactment was H. R. 8888 which broadens the coverage under the unemployment compensation system by (1) extending the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to employees (a) of certain Federal instrumentalities neither wholly nor partially owned by the United States, now exempted by reason of a general tax exemption, (b) on American aircraft while outside the United States, (c) of organizations operated primarily for carrying on a trade or business for profit even though all the profits are payable to certain nonprofit organizations, and (2) by extending the program of unemployment compensation for Federal employees to employees of partially owned Federal instrumentalities. This bill was received too late for adequate hearings and full consideration by the committee.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
August 27, 1957.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Majority Leader, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: I am pleased to reply to your letter of the 22d regarding action by the Interior Committee on that part of the President's program coming within our jurisdiction. My pleasure derives from the fact that we have done so well.

It will be noted that of the measures listed, 80 percent have been the subject of favorable action by the committee.

The Fryingpan-Arkansas measure, S. 60, is at a stalemate in the House Interior Committee as a result of the opposition of certain Republican members to irrigation and reclamation in general, and narrow partisanship with respect to Hells Canyon in particular.

The Small Projects Act amendments are public law.

The long-range minerals policy, so-called, was not presented to the committee until June 4 of this year after a full 3 years or more of promises that its submission was imminent. It had been released to the press

several days before I was able to get a copy, despite direct appeal to the Secretary of the Interior.

What was presented was not worthy of the name "policy". It is not a program, but rather a hodge-podge of pious sentiments and wishful thinking. It had realistic suggestions for only two minerals, lead and zinc. Very intensive efforts were made to implement these recommendations before the Senate Finance Committee, since the administration declined to support them with any enthusiasm before the House Ways and Means Committee. However, even when success appeared within our grasp with the Finance Committee, the administration characteristically hedged and backed away, with the result that the measure that was reported is wholly ineffective and does not have the support of any substantial segment of the mining industry.

In the Interior Committee, we held a hearing promptly on the other parts of the minerals program, but its weakness and defects are so great that we have been unable to do anything with it in the brief time between its unveiling and the end of this session of Congress.

As to statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, the committee held extensive hearings and labored long and earnestly over the administration's proposal, new this year, for a sort of never-never land north and west of the Yukon in Alaska. We came up with workable legislative provisions, I believe. The measures were ordered reported on July 30, but at the request of the ranking minority member, we have delayed the filing of the report to give him opportunity to prepare his minority views. The new deadline for filing, with or without the minority report, is Thursday, August 29.

In summary, then, the Interior Committee has taken favorable action on a full 80 percent of that part of the President's program that was before it, and is still trying to bring meaning and realism to the remaining 20 percent.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE
AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
August 27, 1957.

LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PRESIDENT WHICH FALL WITHIN THE PURVIEW OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The recommendations, action taken thereon, and the present status of each recommendation may be summarized as follows:

1. Implementation of treaty and agreement with Panama: The requested implementing legislation was promptly introduced and considered by the committee; it passed both Houses and has been on the President's desk since August 22 awaiting his signature.

2. Establishment of an Airways Modernization Board: The requested legislation to establish this Board was introduced promptly, expeditiously considered by the committee and both Houses, and has been enacted into law (Public Law 85–133).

3. Exemption of gas producers from public-utility-type regulations: There has been no action on this recommendation for the simple reason that to date the President has not submitted a draft of legislation to carry out his recommendation.

4. Authorize Federal payments to non-Federal owners of water resources projects when Federal power developments benefit from projects: There has been no action on this recommendation for the reason that the President, so far, has failed to submit draft legislation to implement it, and the chairman of the committee is opposed to it. (Similar legislation was introduced in the Republican-controlled 83d Congress and died in committee.)

5. Strengthen transportation system by revising Federal rate-making procedures and regulatory policies: Legislation to effectuate this recommendation has been introduced (S. 1457) and referred to the Surface Transportation Subcommittee. Action has not been completed on S. 1457 for the simple reason that this proposal makes sweeping changes in our transportation regulatory laws, many of which are extremely controversial. It is vigorously opposed by the trucking industry, by substantial segments of the other modes of transportation and by the Interstate Commerce Commission itself. In addition, the committee held hearings on 26 legislative proposals submitted by the Interstate Commerce Commission and has acted upon 14 of them. These encompass much that is contained in S. 1457.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON POST
OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE,
August 27, 1957.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Office of the Democratic Leader,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LYNDON: Thank you for your letter of August 22 regarding the legislation recommended by the President which is presently pending before our committee.

I have attached a chart which shows the present status of the five measures before our committee and believe it will be of assistance to you in compiling the record of this Congress.

Sincerely yours,

OLIN D. JOHNSTON.

Post Office and Civil Service Committee

Presidential recommendations (85th, 1st)	Status	Committee comment
1. Authorize Government employees' training program outside as well as within the employing agency (B, 1956).	S. 385 passed Senate on Apr. 12.	
2. Establish system of voluntary health and medical insurance for civilian employees and their dependents (B).	S. 2339, S. 2357	Studies and hearings not completed.
3. Discontinue Postal Savings System (in accord)	S. 1394	Do.
4. Increase postal rates to place postal service on pay-as-you-go basis (B).	H. R. 5836, passed House Aug. 13.	Do.
5. Reimburse Post Office for services it is required to perform free or at reduced rates (B).	S. 2128	Do.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
August 27, 1957.

Hon. LYNDON JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: Reference is made to your letter dated August 22, 1957, relative to action on the Presidential recommendations by the Committee on Public Works.

Comments on the items listed in the enclosures to your letter are as follows:

1. S. 2623, authorize official residence for the Vice President. No action anticipated at this session.

2. S. 2688, Authorize constructior of and funds for new Executive Office for the President. No action anticipated at this session.

3. Authorize Niagara Falls power project. Public Law 85–159.

4. Authorize Oroville Reservoir as partnership project. Included in S. 497. Passed Senate, reported out by House Committee, now on House Calendar.

5. Authorize development of Bruces Eddy Reservoir as partnership project. Included in S. 497 as it passed Senate. Deleted by House Committee from S. 497 now on House Calendar.

6. Authorize sale of $750 million in revenue bonds to finance new steam-generating facilities by TVA. S. 1869 passed Senate. House Committee reported out. H. R. 4266 now on House Calendar.

7. Rivers and harbors flood control omnibus bill S. 497 passed Senate with some projects included that had not been approved by Bureau of the Budget. House deleted some projects in Senate bill and added others before reporting bill. Now on House Calendar.

8. S. 963, provide for control of outdoor advertising in areas adjacent to interstate system of highways. Reported to full committee by subcommittee, but defeated by full committee.

Sincerely,

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman.

THE WORK OF THE SESSION—EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the close of every session of Congress is always an occasion of reflection for me, as I am certain it is for all of my colleagues. With Federal legislation now touching every citizen's life and interests, the adjournment of a session turns a page in our Nation's history.

We have been in session 8 months. A sense of duty of things to be accomplished kept us on the job through a long summer. Those who know the pressing pace of a workday in Congress realize that we have labored long and hard. We have struggled with many of the Nation's problems. We are the first to concede that we have not achieved all that is expected of us.

We have acted upon some of the President's recommendations, but consideration of the greater part of his program has been postponed until next year. I feel confident, however, that we have done much spadework in this first session which should lead to a further record of accomplishment in the second half of this Congress.

It is not my purpose to discuss the achievements of this session at this time. I will today offer a detailed appraisal of our record, and it will be a Senate document available to all who are interested.

My purpose now is a more personal one. I know the entire Senate joins me in tribute to our presiding officers, the distinguished Vice President, RICHARD NIXON, and the President pro tempore, our colleague, CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona.

I take this occasion also to speak of my good friend across the aisle, the majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON, and his good right arm, MIKE MANSFIELD. Lyndon's patience, fairness, and superb skill in this session rank him among the outstanding leaders of the legislative process in our history. Although he and I differ at times, we have worked well in harness to help pull the legislative load. I am sure my colleagues agree with me that one cannot help but like LYNDON JOHNSON. His talents command our respect.

I know this session has been a trying one for the Senate staff officials and for

the Official Reporters who record our proceedings. It takes a lot of work behind the scenes to operate a session of Congress. Without the help of these officials I doubt if we Senators could carry it through.

The prayers of our Chaplain, the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, are always an inspiration. Quite often, I feel sure, they work more than a spiritual influence on what we do here. Without these influences on our minds and hearts, our good Dr. George Calver would have a tough time keeping us fit for the fray. All of us are in constant debt to these two understanding and capable men who so ideally complement each other.

This whole Chamber joins with me, I know, in paying tribute to our venerated Parliamentarian, Charley Watkins, and to his able assistant, Floyd Riddick, for their patient and impartial assistance, often under trying conditions. They are members of an able staff, headed by Secretary of the Senate Felton Johnston, and including Emery Frazier, Ed Hickey, Edward Mansur, Lewis Bailey, and a score of assistants who keep the complicated machinery of the Senate in good repair and working smoothly. In the many problems we present to them, we know we can go to them without any partisan worries whatever.

Not the least among those whose help is indispensable are Legislative Counsel John Simms, Charles Boots, and a capable corps of legal counsel. And once again I have the honor of paying tribute to James W. Murphy and his corps of able reporters who work miracles in capturing our vagrant words and rendering them respectable to posterity. We also owe a debt to Frank Brodie, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD clerk, and Fred Green, who produces the Daily Digest.

I wish also to thank, for service diligently and faithfully performed on behalf of all Senators, the superintendents of the press, radio-TV, periodical, and press photographers' galleries, Joe Wills, Bob Hough, Bill Perry, and Bill Forsythe. Another who has served us expertly and devotedly in the communications field is Bob Coar, director of the Senate recording studio.

My thanks go out, too, to our very able Sergeant at Arms, Joe Duke, and his corps of deputies, including the Capitol police, who watch over our safety and comfort while they guide hundreds of thousands of visitors from all parts of the Nation to these galleries.

I want all these officials, and those behind them—Theron Marshall and his staff in the Document Room, Dick Hupman and the staff of the Library, Bob Brenkworth and his assistants in the Disbursing Office, John (Buck) Chambers, our superintendent of the Service Department, and other aids—down to the last messenger and page boy—to know that I am grateful to them for their helpful advice and service. I know the entire Senate is grateful to them.

Most, if not all, of us soon will owe a heavy debt to our good friend, George Stewart, Architect of the Capitol, for the fine new building we hope to occupy before another session passes.

Ours is a party system, but some of my colleagues must have heard the rumor—which I cannot in good faith deny—that in California I have enjoyed the warm rays of friendship from both ends of the political spectrum. So it is in perfect propriety for me to cross the aisle in this Chamber to say that I have enjoyed the courtesy and cooperation of Robert Baker, secretary for the majority, and his assistant, Jessop McDonell, and Gerry Siegel, the able assistant of the majority leader, with whom I come in contact on numerous occasions.

At the same time I think I speak the deep appreciation of all Members on my side of the aisle for the devoted and competent service we have received from our own minority secretary, Mark Trice, and his capable assistants, Bill Reed, Bill Brownrigg, and the Republican cloakroom assistants, Russ Call, Lee Lovett, and Bill Martin. We could not carry on our work half so well without them.

I have said that my purpose on this occasion was personal. I am sure, then, I will have the indulgence of this body for a public recognition of my wise and capable personal assistant, Oliver Dompierre. Dom, as we call him, has had more than a score of years of service to Members both in the House and Senate. He first came here, I believe, with the late great Arthur Vandenberg of the State of Michigan. He later served with Homer Ferguson. I was fortunate enough to get him to be my assistant as first the majority and later the minority leader of the Senate. Any and all of these Members would gladly support me in a testimonial to his capabilities and devoted service.

In the deeply regrettable absence, because of illness, of our good friend STYLES BRIDGES, who is not only an able leader but is my close personal friend, I have had the full service of the staff of the Republican policy committee. This staff, under the cooperative direction of Senator BRIDGES and our good friend and colleague, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, chairman of the Republican conference, serves all Republican Members of the Senate. They do not need me to tell them of the valuable services they receive from this staff.

Headed by the capable and energetic Lloyd Jones, secretary and staff director of the policy committee, and his administrative assistant, Winnie Sanborn, this staff renders indispensable services on the entire range of legislative functions and interests. George H. E. Smith, who originally established these services under our late colleague, the distinguished Senator Robert A. Taft, continues to serve the committee in the capacity of consultant.

Another professional member of the staff is David Kammerman, the very able counsel of our calendar committee. I want particularly at this time to pay tribute to Dave Kammerman and to the Senators who serve on the calendar committee, for without their work this legislative body would not function as well as it does. Professional staff member Arthur Burgess, a former Associated Press correspondent, is doing a first-rate job of preparing a weekly information report for all Republican Senators. Other professional staff members, George Leighton, Thomas MacCaulty, Charles Lombard, and Zane Thurston, are each responsible for important phases of policy committee operations.

And I am glad to report that we have very capable women on this staff. Mrs. Alyce Thompson has given invaluable assistance to our colleague, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, in connection with the defense and mutual security bills. Cordelia Makarius is a versatile writer, and Attorney Peggy Kletchka is responsible for the very important digest of public laws which our policy committee, alone of all agencies in the Capitol, prepares as a Senate document. In keeping track of the progress of all bills, House and Senate, and all legislative requests of the President, Miss Jeannie Gilcrest renders constant and valuable service to all Republican Senators. The policy committee office also has a very efficient staff of secretaries, Rita Peine, Colleen Carroll, Doris Shakeshaft, and Betty Murphy.

In closing, I wish to pay a special tribute to EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican whip, whose energy and persuasive skill is attested by the high degree of harmony and unity Republican Members of the Senate have achieved on controversial issues during this session. He worked to compose our differences. He strengthened our leadership. He has been a close and able assistant to me.

My colleagues, this is our first session of Congress without benefit of the brilliant intellect, wit, and charm of our beloved friend, former Senator from Colorado, Eugene Millikin. He was compelled to retire from this body to conserve his failing health. If I may be permitted to have the word go out of this Chamber, I want Gene to know how much we miss his pungent humor and wise counsel. I want him to know that Members on both sides of the aisle have spoken of him often and in salutary terms; and we all heartily wish that he is free from pain and enjoying a well-deserved rest.

Mr. President, when we act here on matters of national and international interest we are less conscious of party lines than we are during the heat of political campaigns. Our deepest desire is to make those decisions which serve the best interests of our country. Only occasionally does bitter partisan spirit break out, but even then it is buttressed by our sincere convictions, according to our principles, of what is good for the Nation.

This is what the Founding Fathers hoped the Senate would do. Those who have studied the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention and the Federalist Papers know that the Fathers planned it this way. And so long as we serve the Nation in the spirit of what is best for all our people, America will remain strong and free.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

REPUBLICAN REVIEW OF THE 1ST SESSION, 85TH CONGRESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, customarily both the majority leader and the minority leader make statements concerning the record of Congress at the

close of each session. After insertion into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, these statements are then printed as Senate documents.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the minority statement be now printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Further, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document following adjournment this statement with necessary revisions and corrections, together with an appendix of laws and treaties of general interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

REPUBLICAN REVIEW OF THE 1ST SESSION, 85TH CONGRESS

It has been the custom for many years for the majority and minority leaders to appraise the record at the close of each session of Congress. The fact that we have two such reports instead of one stems from our two-party system. While our two parties have many similarities in the broad goals we seek, we differ considerably in the methods we propose to attain them. The system reflects these differences—particularly in Congress where each party tries to translate its beliefs and programs into specific legislation. From this it follows that our parties will hold different views about the achievements of each session of Congress.

Measures of international and national importance, proposed by President Eisenhower, were enacted in this session. The two parties in both Houses of the Congress share credit for these. However, the list of major bills—underscore major—on which action was not completed or on which there was little or no action at all is long.

The Democratic leadership will contend that this was a hard-working Congress, that it was in session for more days and hours than were some previous Congresses in a single year, and that it processed a heavy volume of legislation.

Of course, the Congress worked hard and long. Of course, the number of bills passed ran into the hundreds. These claims can be made for every Congress of modern times.

But the people do not judge a Congress on how long it labored or on the sheer volume of its output. They judge, and properly so, on the results in terms of legislation enacted which meet the needs of the Nation.

This was the first session of Congress to follow the reelection of the Republican administration of President Eisenhower by an overwhelming majority. By this expression of confidence in a Republican President and administration at the polls last November, the people had a right to expect that a substantial part of the President's recommendations to Congress would receive favorable consideration. President Eisenhower submitted some 200 proposals in this session. For the most part they were major in character, and designed to deal with problems requiring legislative action if the public interest were not to suffer.

To be sure, Congress is not expected to rubberstamp all recommendations coming from the President or the executive branch. Congress is a coordinate branch of Government, not an arm of the executive. It has functions and powers of its own. Under the Constitution it is charged with the duty of legislating according to its own judgment of what is in the best interests of the Nation.

Nevertheless, we cannot live up to our full responsibilities if we fail to act upon a substantial part of the matters laid before us by the President whose information about the Nation's needs is often broader than our own. And the record of the first session of this Congress, under Democratic control, is that it enacted only a part of the President's proposals into law, and not always in keeping with his recommendations. For that matter, the Democrats, having control of the Congress and all of the legislative committees, passed but little legislation which fulfills the platform pledges of their own party.

The President gave his own appraisal of this record at a news conference last August 21 when he said he was tremendously disappointed that so many of his recommendations had not been acted on, and not even hearings held on some.

MAJOR LEGISLATION

Legislation of significant national interest enacted in this session was as follows:

Foreign policy

In the field of foreign policy the Middle East resolution and provision for United States participation in the International Atomic Energy Agency were the most important developments of this session.

Middle East Resolution

The Middle East resolution authorizes the President to assist Middle East nations upon their request to defend themselves against armed aggression or threat of aggression from any country controlled by international communism. It also authorized the President to use up to $200 million from prior mutual security appropriations for economic and military assistance in the Middle East area.

Atoms for Peace

The statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency, a treaty signed by the United States and 79 other nations, grew out of President Eisenhower's historic atoms-for-peace proposal at the United Nations in December 1953. The Senate approved this treaty and joined with the House in passing an act for United States participation in the agency.

Anglo-American Treaty of 1945 Revised

By joint resolution, Congress also approved an amendment to the Anglo-American Financial Agreement of 1945 permitting deferred payments on the British loan.

Domestic affairs

An Economy-Minded Congress

This was an economy-minded Congress and that attitude was reflected in the appropriation bills and other legislation. The President last January submitted an expenditure budget for fiscal year 1958 of $71.8 billion. As the session advanced, however, he made revisions downward in this estimate and also in his original estimate of $73.3 billion in new obligational authority for fiscal 1958. Members of both parties joined in reducing requests for new appropriations by close to $5 billion.

Civil Rights

After prolonged consideration, Congress enacted a civil-rights measure which promises some progress in the long struggle for equality and elimination of race and color discriminations in American life.

Immigration

During the closing days of the session, Congress enacted a bill of limited scope in the field of immigration, in place of the comprehensive program of the President calling for revision of the McCarran-Walter Act, including its national origins system, and for permanent residence of Hungarian freedom fighters now in the United States.

The bill affects an estimated 60,000 aliens. It is directed principally to providing relief in hardship cases involving relatives of United States citizens or permanent United States residents, and reviving over 18,000 visas that had expired last year with the Refugee Relief Act.

Taxes—Public Works—Housing

Congress also extended existing rates on corporate income taxes and certain excise taxes until July 1, 1958. It enacted a new housing law and provided for an extensive program of public works and reclamation projects.

Small Business Administration

The Small Business Administration established in 1953 by the Republican 83d Congress was continued for another year and its lending authority increased.

Atomic Energy

An atomic energy bill was passed authorizing Federal Government participation in a number of atomic energy projects, including authority for the AEC to build reactors for five municipal power groups and rural electric cooperatives.

Niagara Power

The Federal Power Commission was authorized to permit the New York State Power Authority to develop the American share of Niagara River power under the Canadian-American Treaty of 1950.

Armed Forces

The suspension of the limits on the size of the Armed Forces, and provisions for the induction of doctors, dentists, and other specialists into the Armed Forces, were continued until July 1, 1959.

Veterans

Congress consolidated into one act the laws relating to veterans' compensation, pensions, service-connected disability, hospitalization, and burial benefits. Also, it approved a 10-percent increase in service-connected disability compensation payments.

MAJOR LEGISLATION NOT ENACTED OR POSTPONED TO 1958

Among important measures recommended by the President which failed of enactment in this session were Hawaii and Alaska statehood, legislation permitting TVA to issue and sell its own revenue bonds, an increase in postal rates, the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, emergency corn bill, appropriations for flood insurance, extension of the minimum-wage law to additional workers, amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act, Federal aid for school construction, certain efficiency-in-government proposals of the Hoover Commission submitted by the President, the program for the lease-purchase of post office and other Federal buildings, tax relief and other measures for the aid of small business, aid to economically depressed areas, provisions for United States participation in the Organization for Trade Cooperation, and regulation of lobbying and campaign funds and expenditures.

Section-by-section details on the record of Congress during this session follow:

Foreign affairs

In the period from August 1956 to August 1957, the world witnessed dramatic events in the Middle East and Hungary. Everywhere freedom was under either direct or covert assault by the insidious forces of international communism. The United States reacted boldly to fulfill her obligations under the United Nations Charter and under her treaties with friendly nations.

Middle East Doctrine

During the Middle East crisis last January, President Eisenhower asked Congress for authority to use American Armed Forces for maintaining the independence of any Middle East nation which requested help from us under threat of Communist aggression. In addition, he requested authority to use $200 million from prior mutual security appropriations for assistance in the area.

The urgently needed resolution was delayed in the Senate for almost 2 months because some Democrats insisted upon an investigation into the conduct of our Middle East policy. On March 5, the Eisenhower

doctrine finally passed the Senate by a vote of 72 to 19, with 15 Democrats and only 4 Republicans voting against it.

The President was given substantially what he asked for. With this authority he took firm action, including a rapid movement of the Sixth Fleet in support of the Jordanian Government when it was threatened by Communist aggression.

The policy investigation continued into July, but produced no committee recommendations or criticisms.

Atoms for Peace

Another significant accomplishment of this session of Congress was the approval of the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency, a treaty signed by the United States and 79 other nations. The statute grew out of President Eisenhower's historic atoms-for-peace proposal at the United Nations in December 1953.

This Agency is designed to advance peaceful uses of atomic energy and its application to industry, agriculture, and medicine.

The Agency will administer a pool of basic nuclear fuels for use in research and power reactors. It is expected to take a leading part in the exchange of information on peaceful uses of atomic energy, exchange and training of scientists and experts, and the holding of international scientific meetings.

Recommending treaty approval, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee declared this "is one of the most important instruments to be passed upon by the Senate in recent years. It is a treaty which could have far-reaching consequences for humanity, in hastening the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy for the benefit of our own Nation and for people everywhere." At the suggestion of the minority leader, WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, and Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, the following understanding was approved in the instrument of ratification: "(1) Any amendment to the statute shall be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent, as in the case of the statute itself; and (2) the United States will not remain a member of the Agency in the event of an amendment to the statute being adopted to which the Senate by a formal vote shall refuse its advice and consent."

After the Senate gave its approval to the statute, Congress subsequently passed an enabling act for the treaty which provides that the United States is not obligated to provide fissionable material for Agency projects. Our contributions will be voluntary, paid for by the Agency, and made available when the safeguard system is put in effect.

In the participation act, Senator BRICKER's amendment protecting the authority of Congress to pass upon sales of nuclear fuels to the International Agency was approved.

Congress Condemns Soviet Repression in Hungary

Senate Republicans and Democrats joined in condemning Russia for barbaric action and brutal forms of armed subjugation during the revolt of the Hungarian freedom fighters. Approving House Concurrent Resolution 35, the Congress asked that the President's representatives to the United Nations work to prevent further repressive action and to seek all practical redress of the wrong which grew out of Soviet Russia's infamous attack on Hungary.

Mutual Security

Collective security has become vital to the Free World's resistance to Communist aggression. The Congress has consistently recognized the importance of our mutual security pacts by appropriating money to provide our allies with military hardware and economic assistance. This aid has permitted anti-Communist nations to maintain armed forces which their economies would not otherwise sustain and has permitted us to reduce the size of our draft call.

The Mutual Security Act of 1957 contains two important innovations. First, economic aid, which up to now has consisted largely of gifts, is placed on a repayable basis through the creation of a development loan fund. Second, the definition of defense support has been tightened to preclude the use of these dollars for any other purpose than to help friendly countries keep a maximum amount of men under arms.

Last January, President Eisenhower transmitted a mutual security program for fiscal year 1958 of $4.4 billion. Subsequent estimates and legislation revised this figure downward, so that the President finally requested an appropriation for new funds of $3.386 billion plus a reappropriation of $614 million that had not been spent.

After the Senate and House versions of the mutual security appropriation had been reconciled, the amount finally approved was $3.435 billion, including reappropriation of $667 million.

Treaties

By joint resolution Congress approved an amendment to the Anglo-American Financial Agreement of 1945 to provide a more flexible formula for repayment of the $3.750 million loan when the United Kingdom is confronted with a financial emergency.

The Senate also gave its advice and consent to a number of treaties concerning fisheries, commerce, navigation, double taxation, and cultural affairs.

National defense

The 85th Congress devoted continuing attention to the Nation's defenses. Legislative committees held many hearings as part of their responsibility to assure the American people military strength suited to the needs of the times.

These times present difficult problems involving careful judgment while the Nation makes the changeover from conventional to nuclear defenses.

As the latest electronic and atomic weapons and equipment are brought into operational use, we must be careful not to deplete our strength-in-being to the point where it endangers our security before we have the newer, more powerful devices in hand. We must not diminish our combat strength on the mere hope of getting something that may only be on the drawing board.

In other words, because of the military threat posed by world Communism, we must continue to maintain conventional forces as we phase in advanced weapons, so that we preserve or increase our deterrent power compared with the strength of a potential enemy.

Such defense forces cannot be bought at bargain rates. New equipment entering the inventory is expensive, not only because of rising prices but also because of the very complexity of the equipment.

The Defense Department has already experienced a sharp rise in spending as a result of these factors. In the last half of fiscal year 1957, defense spending, projected on a yearly basis, was at a rate of $40 billion-plus. This is higher than the $38 billion yearly level the administration estimates the Nation can sustain over the next several years without upsetting the Government's fiscal applecart.

This situation has compelled a reassessment of the many components of our total defense strength. To bring military spending down while maintaining combat strength, the Defense Department has already taken a number of steps. Other measures are under consideration.

Headquarters personnel in Washington have been reduced. The authorized force levels of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force were lowered by 100,000 to a revised authorized total strength of 2,700,000. Part of the military manpower cutback was possible because we have been able to withdraw troops from Japan; part from a reduction of overhead personnel in Europe.

Our vast overseas base network is under review to determine whether, in light of today's military capabilities, any of them can be closed. Our military missions abroad are being reduced.

Overtime pay by military contractors has been curtailed and progress payments limited in an effort to hold down costs. Production of certain aircraft and ships has been stretched out somewhat. Operations and maintenance and other overhead activities are being tightened.

All these moves are designed to maintain adequate defense at a cost of about $38 billion a year. We must continue to find ways and means of providing for our national security within the Nation's ability to pay.

Probably the most important enactment of this Congress on defense was the military appropriations bill. To carry on the activities of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Department of Defense, this Congress approved a total of $33,759,850,000 in new funds, reappropriated $10 million and permitted transfer of $590 million from various Armed Forces stock and industrial funds to the military personnel accounts of the Army and Navy.

In addition, this Congress provided $1,475,000,000 for military construction of airplane hangars, guided missile facilities, shore installations, and other necessary facilities.

New funds granted by the Congress for the regular military departments exclusive of military construction were $2.4 billion lower than the President's January budget request of $36,128,000,000—but this statement by itself is misleading.

As a matter of fact, the administration was able to scale down its request in the subsequent months and in mid-July presented a revised Defense Department budget totaling $34,391,980,000. Congress reduced this by $632,130,000.

Other enactments by this Congress in the field of defense include a law granting the President authority to issue special draft calls for physicians, dentists, and like specialists who are otherwise liable for induction under the regular draft (Public Law 85–62); and an act suspending for another 2 years the legal ceiling of some 2 million men on United States active duty in the Armed Forces (Public Law 85–63).

Finance and Taxation

Budget

For the third consecutive year the administration presented a balanced budget to the Congress. In fiscal year 1956, the surplus totaled $1.626 billion; in 1957, $1.645 billion, and in 1958, the surplus estimated is $1.8 billion.

Surpluses actually realized were applied to the Federal debt.

In January the President presented his requests for $73.3 billion in new obligational authority and his spending plans totaling $71.8 billion for the year ending June 30, 1958. At that time, the President indicated he would welcome the help of Congress in finding ways and means to reduce the size of the budget.

The entire Republican delegation in both House and Senate responded by formally approving resolutions pledging efforts to reduce Federal spending.

Among the recommendations for economy adopted by the Senate Republican conference was a proposal that legislative committees of the Senate include in all reports on bills approved for Senate action a statement of the estimated initial and projected cost of any activity requiring Federal spending. With Republican sponsorship this proposal was introduced as a Senate resolution

and was later reported to the Senate by unanimous vote of the Rules and Administration Committee.

Meanwhile, President Eisenhower ordered all Government agencies to undertake a continuing look to see where savings could be made. From time to time, the President proposed savings in his 1958 budget which would neither hurt our defense strength nor jeopardize essential Government functions.

Congress, too, in its review of budget requests pruned various items in an effort toward economy and efficiency. Out of the total $64 billion in 1958 appropriation requests considered, Congress approved $59 billion-plus, a reduction of almost $5 billion.

The battle to hold Government spending within the limits of Government income is never ending. On the eve of the 1958 fiscal year, all agency heads were informed of the President's request that commitments, obligations, and expenditures be kept at or below the level for 1957 to the extent feasible.

Other steps to improve the budget system and to assist in controlling Government expenditures were taken in the Congress. The Senate passed a bill to provide that estimates for proposed appropriations of executive agencies, shall, where appropriate, be determined on an annual accrued expenditure basis. To provide expert staff facilities and detailed technical information for the Appropriations Committees of Congress, a bill was passed by the Senate creating a Joint Committee on the Budget. Neither bill has received House action.

Fiscal and Monetary Inquiry

In his state of the Union address, January 10, 1957, President Eisenhower called upon Congress to create a commission of able and qualified citizens to conduct a broad inquiry into the Nation's financial system.

Congress did not enact this suggestion, however, nor did it approve Republican Congressional proposals to set up a bipartisan commission composed of Members of Congress and Presidential appointees from civilian life.

Instead, the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy of the Joint Economic Committee conducted hearings in June on the economic outlook and budget developments particularly as related to fiscal years 1957 and 1958. And the Senate Finance Committee on June 18 undertook an inquiry into the financial condition of the United States.

The occasion for the study, according to the chairman, was the "existing credit and interest situation and, more important, inflation which has started again with its ominous threat to fiscal solvency, sound money, and individual welfare."

As of August 19, when the committee recessed subject to call of the Chair, the committee had heard three witnesses: George M. Humphrey, then Secretary of the Treasury; W. Randolph Burgess, Under Secretary of the Treasury; and William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System.

From the testimony it is clear the goal of the administration has been to avoid sharp ups and downs in the economy—to do whatever was prudent to curb inflation and to prevent deflation.

Administration Aims for Stability

Among the policies adopted were those ending budget deficits, applying budget surpluses to reducing the Federal debt, reducing Government spending, holding down the bank-held debt, reducing the floating debt, selling more E and H savings bonds, encouraging individual savings, and keeping the Federal Reserve independent from the Treasury.

Republican Administration's Economic Achievements

Secretary Humphrey summarized the achievements resulting from the administration's policies in his lead-off testimony:

Federal debt proportionately lower: "When we took office in 1953, the Federal debt was equal to 89 percent of our national income—in December 1956, it was 79 percent.

"For the fiscal year 1953, budget expenditures were $74.3 billion, and for the year 1957, they are estimated at $68.9 billion, and $71.8 billion for 1958."

Budget deficits ended: "For the fiscal year 1953, the budget resulted in a deficit of $9.4 billion—for 1957, it will result in a surplus."

Cost-of-living increase held to narrow margin: "From 1939 through 1952, the cost of living increased an average of 7 percent a year—for the past 4 years, the average increase has been only six-tenths of 1 percent."

Employment and wages increased: "In the past 4 years, civilian employment has risen 6 percent, average weekly earnings of production workers in manufacturing have risen 18 percent, and, after allowance for the 2.4-percent increase in consumer prices which occurred between 1952 and 1956, the gain in workers' earnings, after taxes, amounted to about $10 per week, or more than 15 percent."

Individual incomes higher: "Personal income of individuals has risen every year, from $272 billion in 1952, to $325 billon in 1956, a gain of 20 percent, and an estimated $340 billion for 1957."

Labor receives larger share of national income: "Labor income has not only risen in dollars, it has increased from 67.2 percent of national income in 1952, to 69.8 percent in 1956 (while corporate profits declined from 12.7 percent of national income, to 11.9 percent)."

More housing and home ownership: "The 5 million dwelling units that were constructed exceeded the number built in any previous 4-year period and substantially enlarged the housing stock available to the American people. * * * A growing proportion of our homes were owner-occupied—60 percent in 1956, compared with 55 percent in 1950."

Administration Employs General Fiscal and Monetary Policies Instead of Direct Wage, Price, and Other Controls

Despite clamor from some sources, the administration has refused to impose direct wage and price controls, relying instead on general fiscal and monetary restraints.

In its report of June 26, the Joint Economic Subcommittee states "public policies to cope with increases in the price level must take the form of general fiscal and monetary restraints on the expansion of total spending.

"It is recognized that the burden of such restraints may not be evenly distributed throughout the economy. The burden of inflation, however, is far more inequitably distributed.

"The alternative to general fiscal and credit controls is some form of direct Government control over wage and price determination.

"The use of this type of control would produce results as bad, if not worse, than the inflation against which it would be directed, and should be avoided."

The Federal Reserve Chairman pointed out in his testimony before the Finance Committee that in the current inflation the demand for borrowed funds is outrunning the supply of financial savings. "In such circumstances," he said, "interest rates are bound to rise."

Higher interest rates benefit savers as well as lenders and, in fact, are an incentive to save. Mr. Martin emphasized we need more savings by individuals and less Government spending to help bring the supply of money in line with demand.

Congress itself took action to raise interest rates of United States savings bonds and certificates by increasing the maximum rate to 3.26 percent, compounded semiannually (Public Law 85–17).

Export-Import Bank Lending Powers Extended 5 Years

Among other legislation enacted by the Congress in the field of finance, was the 5-year extension of lending authority of the Export-Import Bank, which serves to facilitate United States export and import trade with other countries (Public Law 85–55).

Banking Law Revision Postponed

The Senate passed a measure designed to overhaul the Nation's banking laws. Known as the Financial Institutions Act of 1957, the bill did not come to the House floor before Congress adjourned.

Taxes

The 85th Congress and the administration were agreed no general income-tax cuts should be made this year. President Eisenhower expressed himself on July 15, as follows:

"It now appears that the excess of income over disbursements in the fiscal year 1958 will be so small that no action should be taken by the Congress at this time which will involve any substantial tax reduction for anyone.

"In the economic conditions that prevail currently and can be expected during the next fiscal year, all the income which the present tax laws provide should be reserved in order to maintain the balance between income and outgo as now estimated and to make modest reductions in our national debt.

* * * * *

"I earnestly look forward to reductions in tax rates for all taxpayers as soon as that becomes possible."

To prevent a deficit of some half-billion dollars to the Treasury, Congress found it necessary to extend to July 1, 1958, the 52 percent corporate income-tax rate and existing excise taxes on such items as alcoholic beverages, cigarettes, automobiles, and auto parts and accessories (Public Law 85–12).

Tax Writeoff Law Amended

Congress also took action on the rapid tax amortization feature of Federal law. Designed to stimulate building of defense facilities, the 5-year fast writeoff has resulted in an estimated net postponement of $5 billion in Federal tax revenue over the period 1950–60, at an interest cost to the Government of about $3 billion.

First enacted during World War II, reenacted during the Korean war and continued thereafter, the law was amended by this Congress to restrict issuance of rapid tax amortization certificates to new or specialized defense facilities and to research and development facilities for defense. As enacted, the new provisions (Public Law 85–165) are similar to policies the administration had already adopted. By law, authority for the program terminates December 31, 1959.

Civil rights

This session of Congress will go down in history for its achievement in civil-rights legislation. This was the leadership furnished by Republican Members and a small band of Democrats to bring a meaningful civil-rights bill to the floor of the Senate and to keep it there until the Senate voted final passage. Without this determined effort there would have been no civil-rights bill at this session.

First Civil-Rights Bill Enacted in 82 Years

Only those who realize that not a single bill dealing with color and racial discrimination has been passed by the Congress in 82

years can appreciate the passage of a bill in this session.

If we look only at the last 25 years, the measure of our achievement is remarkable. In that period Democrats controlled Congress 21 years and Republicans 4. In that period hundreds of bills were filed to deal with problems of racial discrimination. All but a few of these bills were buried in committees. None was enacted into law.

Since 1933 the House passed civil-rights bills nine times. There were seven times when these House-passed bills reached the Senate Calendar, and there were five times when Senate bills on civil rights also reached the Senate Calendar. The Senate took up and debated four of the nine House-passed bills and one of the five Senate bills.

None of these civil-rights measures ever got to the point of Senate passage. The bills and the debates came to nothing because of threatened filibuster, or actual filibuster, or because they were left to die on the calendar at the close of the Congress.

In the light of this experience it seemed impossible to break this dismal legislative record on civil rights. The Senate Judiciary Committee in the 84th and 85th Congresses, under Democratic chairmanship, continued to be the graveyard for civil-rights measures.

Only a determined Republican effort could possibly alter the situation, and it could only succeed with some Democratic help, because Republicans were in the minority in both Houses of Congress. The effort was made and how it succeeded is a story worth telling.

House Passes Administration Bill

After many months of delay in the House where every known device was used in committees and on the floor to obstruct and cripple the bill, the House passed a civil-rights bill, H. R. 6127, by a vote of 286 to 126, and sent it to the Senate. Republicans furnished the great majority of votes, 168, for the bill as compared with only 19 against. Democrats split almost evenly with 118 for the bill and 107 against it. As passed by the House the civil-rights bill included substantially the main recommendations made by the Republican administration.

Republican Leader Assures Senate Consideration by Rare Proceeding

Aware that the House bill could be referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee and buried there, the Senate Republican leader used a rare parliamentary procedure permissible under rule XIV to carry the House bill directly to the Senate Calendar. The vote accomplishing this result was 45 to 39, with Republicans furnishing 34 of the 45 votes, while 34 Democrats and five Republicans voted against the procedure.

No heavy opposition developed to the minority leader's subsequent motion to take up the bill which carried 71 to 18. All 18 of the negative votes were cast by Democrats.

A second attempt to refer the bill to the Judiciary Committee with instructions to report back in 7 days was defeated 54 to 35, with only four Republicans voting for the motion to refer.

Historic Debate Alters Administration Bill

The debate that followed was historic and in the finest traditions of the Senate. Members who strongly held opposing convictions debated them searchingly in the spirit of sincerity, fairness, and tolerance. This had much to do with the alterations the Senate made in the House bill.

By vote of 90 to 0, the Knowland-Humphrey amendment repealed section 1989 (42 U. S. C. 1993), a provision dating back to the post-Civil War reconstruction era, which might have been construed to authorize enforcement of civil rights by Federal troops.

Restriction of Voting Rights

One of the major alterations on the bill was the elimination of a section in part III which would have extended enforcement powers beyond the protection of voting rights to a variety of civil rights. An amendment narrowing the scope of the bill to the protection of voting rights only was one of the significant compromises in the debate and was approved 52 to 38.

Jury Trial Provided

The other major alteration involved the provision of jury trial in cases of criminal contempt. Members in the Senate of both parties were deeply concerned that the injunctive proceedings permitted by the bill would result in enforcing the right to vote by a sacrifice of the right of trial by jury in cases of criminal contempt. Serious questions of constitutionality as well as denial of fundamental, historic rights were raised.

To resolve these questions an amendment was offered providing different remedies in civil and criminal contempt in all Federal cases. The power of the court, sitting without a jury, to secure compliance with its orders in cases of civil contempt was retained. But where the purpose of the court is to punish for violations of court orders, as in criminal contempt, the amendment specified a jury trial. The amendment applied these distinctions and proceedings not only to voting rights cases, but to all Federal cases involving injunctions.

Reflecting sincere differences of opinion which cut across and obliterated party lines, the amendment was adopted 51 to 42.

After making several other less important changes in the House bill, the Senate passed it 72 to 18, all 18 being Democrats.

At this point both the House and Senate had passed civil rights bills, but the House version contained no jury trial provision, while the Senate version provided for jury trials in all Federal criminal contempt cases, not just voting rights cases.

When the Senate sent its bill to the House a deadlock ensued over conflicting requests made to the House Committee on Rules, through which the bill had to clear. A Republican request asked that the House and Senate differences be reconciled through a conference committee. A Democratic request asked that jury trial provisions similar to those in the Senate bill be accepted by the House, but that they apply only in voting rights cases.

A compromise was necessary to force a meeting of the Rules Committee, whose Democratic chairman refused to act, and to bring to the floor of the House a bill that could become law.

Such a compromise was offered by the Republican leadership of the House who proposed that jury trial rights be provided in criminal contempt cases growing out of voting rights incidents only where the penalty to be imposed is a fine of more than $300 or imprisonment of more than 90 days.

A bipartisan modification of this Republican compromise offer was worked out and the civil-rights bill moved toward passage in both Houses.

The vote on final passage in the Senate was 60 to 15.

Provisions of New Civil Rights Law

What did we get and is it a step forward?

The bill as sent to the President provides for several things of great value in dealing with civil-rights cases. This is what it does:

It establishes in the executive branch a six-member bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights, with subpena powers, to investigate alleged deprivation of voting rights because of color, race, religion, or national origin; to study legal developments constituting denial of equal protection of the laws; and to appraise Federal laws and policies regarding equal protection of the laws. The Commission is directed to make a final report to the President and to Congress within 2 years.

It provides for an additional Assistant Attorney General.

It makes interference with the right to vote in Federal elections actionable at the discretion of the Attorney General under injunctive proceedings in United States district courts, which will have jurisdiction without regard to whether other lawful remedies have been exhausted.

It permits Federal judges to issue injunctions or other orders to protect the right to vote. It maintains the courts' power through civil contempt proceedings, without a jury, to secure compliance with, as distinguished from punishment for violations of, such orders.

It says that in criminal contempt cases, involving punishment for willful disobedience of court orders in voting rights cases, the defendant may be tried with or without a jury. It says that if in such a trial without a jury the judge imposes a fine greater than $300 or a jail term longer than 45 days, the defendant can demand and get a new trial before a jury.

It also sets qualifications for Federal jurors independent of State laws, stating that any 21-year-old citizen who has resided one year within the judicial district is competent to serve as a juror, unless he is illiterate, a criminal, or physically or mentally incapable.

These are substantial steps forward in protecting rights. Many people who know the difficult problems involved in civil-rights cases, would say that this is about as far as we can go at this time.

National economy

As Republicans we are proud of the continuing prosperity of the Nation, with more people working than ever before and at the highest wages in our history. The policies and operations of the Republican administration have not been perfect, but they have kept us at peace with the world in stormy times and they have greatly advanced the welfare of our people at home. Completed figures for the period 1952–56 point up the remarkable progress we have made.

The gross national product—the aggregate of goods and services produced—increased from $345.4 billion to $414.7 billion. Although some of this increase was accounted for by higher prices, it reflects a substantially enlarged national output of goods and services. Disposable personal income, which is what we have to spend after taxes, increased from $243 billion to $287.2 billion. Although this income was shared among a greater number of individuals, it shows a per capita rise from $1,548 in 1952 to $1,708 in 1956.

Industrial plant and equipment increased by an investment of $35.1 billion in 1956 compared to $26.5 billion in 1952. Over the same period our civilian labor force grew from 62 million to 67.5 million. Income from wages, salaries, and related payments increased from $195.1 billion to $241.4 billion. The longtime decline in farm income was finally checked in 1956 and began to improve.

Every year since 1952 saw well over a million housing starts which reached a peak of 1,328,900 in 1955. The number of homes owned by their occupants increased from 22,200,000 to 25,300,000. Families owning automobiles have increased from 31 million to 37 million. Life insurance protection, which is a measure of the security of our people, shows an increase in policyholders from 88 million to 106 million. In our foreign trade, merchandise exports in 1956 totaled $17.3 billion compared to $13.3 billion in 1952.

Prosperity Continues Into 1957

This remarkable peacetime prosperity continued into the first half of 1957. By the second quarter of the year, gross national product reached an annual rate of $433.5 billion. Investment in plant and equipment increased to an annual rate of $37.3 billion. Disposable personal income in 1956 prices reached an annual rate of $291.3 billion. Salaries, wages, and other compensation reached $253.6 billion. For the first half of 1957, realized net farm income was at a rate of approximately $12½ billion—2½ percent higher than in the first half of 1956. In the second quarter of 1957, consumer expenditures rose to an annual rate of $277.8 billion compared with $265 billion for the same period in 1956, and $218.3 billion in 1952. While housing starts dropped to an annual rate of 970,000 in June 1957, construction expenditures as a whole are higher than ever before, running at an annual rate of $47.3 billion.

Legislation Pertaining to Business

A few items of legislation pertaining to business were passed, and several more, some of an urgent character, were put aside. The highlights of Congressional performance or the lack thereof in this field are as follows:

Small Business Administration extended

The Small Business Administration, established in 1953 by the Republican 83d Congress to advise and assist all types of business concerns, was continued for another year to July 31, 1958. Its busines loan fund was first increased in February 1957 by $80 million to a total of $230 million, and by the extension act from $230 million to $305 million. This raised the total authorization of the agency from $455 million to $530 million. An effort to make the Small Business Administration a permanent agency did not succeed this year, but there are indications in both Houses of Congress that it will next year.

Proposed tax relief for small business

President Eisenhower asked that Congress give early consideration to changes in tax laws which would help small business but with only minimum loss of revenue. He stated that any changes involving substantial loss of revenue should be considered at a later time when a general tax reduction is possible. No action was taken in this session on the President's recommendations, which were:

That business be given the right to utilize, for purchases of used property not exceeding $50,000 in any one year, the formulas of accelerated depreciation that were made available to purchasers of new property by the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

That corporations with, say, 10 or fewer stockholders be given the option of being taxed as if they were partnerships.

That the taxpayer be given the option of paying the estate tax over a period of up to 10 years in cases where the estate consists largely of investments in closely held business concerns.

To permit an original investor in small business the right to deduct from his income, up to some maximum amount prescribed by Congress, a loss, if any, realized on a stock investment in such business.

Other small business recommendations

The Congress also took no action in this session on other recommendations by President Eisenhower to protect and foster the initiative of the small-business man. In order that small business may have a better opportunity to secure adequate financing, he proposed that issues of securities up to $500,000 be exempted from the regular registration provisions of the Securities Act of 1933. He proposed, too, that Congress enact legislation providing for notification to the Federal Government of proposed business mergers, and amend the procedural provisions of the antitrust laws to facilitate their enforcement. Another proposal was that wage reporting by employers for purposes of social security records and income tax withholding be simplified.

Patent Office Fees

A bill intended to carry out the President's request for an adjustment of Patent Office fees to make the Office more nearly self-supporting was reported by the House Judiciary Committee August 1, but was not taken up in the House.

Area Redevelopment Program

Despite continuing high levels of employment and income, pockets of unemployment persist in some communities. To provide loans and other aids to economically depressed areas, the President again this year sought legislation for an area redevelopment program. There was no action, however, in either House of Congress.

Transportation

Fulfilling a special request of the President, Congress approved the Airways Modernization Act of 1957, first legislative step toward creation of a single system of aviation facilities capable of meeting the needs of civil and military aviation.

The new law creates an interim Airways Modernization Board as a forerunner of a permanent independent Federal Aviation Agency into which will be consolidated all the essential management functions necessary to support the common needs of the military and civil aviation of the United States.

Another new measure, also in the air transportation field, deserves special mention among a number of transportation bills passed by this Congress. This bill allows the Government to guarantee loans to a limited number of small air carriers and helicopter lines to help them buy better aircraft and improve the economy of their operations. This in turn, is expected to reduce or eliminate present Government subsidy payments to these so-called feeder lines.

Agriculture

In the field of agriculture, our problems continued to be those of surplus and price, not problems of shortage and hunger.

The two most important legislative acts to lower surpluses and control production in order to protect farmers' income were extension of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and continuance of the full soil-bank program—the latter only after the Democratic-controlled House reversed its vote to kill the acreage reserve part of the program.

Trade Development and Assistance Act Continued

Congress fulfilled a Presidential request when it authorized a 1-year, $1.3 billion expansion of Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act that permits barter for strategic materials, but not sales, of surplus farm crops to Iron Curtain countries. This highly successful program was extended to June 30, 1958. Authorization for sales of American farm surpluses for foreign currencies was raised from $3 billion to $4 billion, and gifts to needy nations from $500 million to $800 million. The new provision permitting barter with European satellite countries, but not with Russia or any area dominated by Communist China, is designed to contain and minimize international communism while adding to America's supply of strategic materials. Another new provision permits up to 25 percent of the foreign currencies received in surplus sales to be loaned to American or foreign companies to promote expanded markets for American products. These and other provisions show that the act is both an effective domestic surplus disposal law and a sound foreign relations program.

Soil Bank Program Continued

Continuation of the administration's soil-bank program was provided under the Agriculture Department and Farm Credit Administration appropriations bill. For a time there appeared a serious danger that the soil-bank program, which seeks to hold production more nearly in line with consumption while protecting farmers' income and guarding future productivity of America's soil, would be severely—perhaps disastrously—curtailed. This happened when the Democratic-controlled House voted 192 to 187 to kill the acreage reserve part of the program. Of those Representatives who voted to kill the acreage reserve, 154 were Democrats and 38 were Republicans. Opposed to the ill-advised move were 141 Republicans and 46 Democrats. Fortunately for America's farmers, the House later reversed its position on the soil bank when it approved a Senate-House compromise agriculture appropriations bill.

Agriculture Appropriations

This agriculture appropriations law provides about $299 million less than the President's revised request, but puts almost three and two-thirds billion dollars into the Nation's far-reaching farm program.

Congress failed to protect the best interest of the Nation's corngrowers when Democratic majorities in both the House and the Senate defeated several Republican-sponsored bills designed to head off overproduction by setting more realistic acreage restrictions and encouraging participation in the soil bank.

Wheat and Livestock Growers Aided

On the other hand, Congress did act in the best interest of another segment of American farmers—those who plant no more than 30 acres of wheat and use all the wheat they grow right on their own farms. Fulfilling a Presidential request, Congress exempted such wheatgrowers from marketing quotas and penalties. Similarly, Congress authorized payments to livestock growers in severe drought areas for withholding their acreage from grazing until it can be restored to productivity. This new deferred grazing program fulfills another specific request of the President.

Increased acreage allotments for Durum wheatgrowers also were provided by this Congress, and an important new law providing compulsory Government inspection of poultry and poultry products was passed.

Housing

The Congress passed a number of housing bills, based on administration requests, but President Eisenhower observed when signing the omnibus housing bill on July 15 that it contained a number of serious defects.

The omnibus measure, authorizing $1.99 billion, permitted lower down payments on FHA-insured home loans as the administration requested. However, the President pointed out that the total of authorizations for all programs was nearly double that requested by the Republican administration.

The new law permits a reduction in FHA down payments on FHA-insured home mortgages by as much as $1,000 on a $16,000 home, and small wage earners now can purchase a $10,000 home for as little as $300 down.

The administration ordered the new down payment schedule soon after the law was signed, but in order to attract more construction money so more homes would be built it raised interest rates one-quarter of 1 percent.

The omnibus bill also provides authorizations for urban renewal or slum clearance grants to cities, new lending authority for a secondary market for home mortgages, and funds for certain military and cooperative housing mortgages. The measure needed no

provision for more public housing facilities as present law provides for 35,000 units in each of the next 2 years.

In other legislation, the Veterans' Administration guaranteed home mortgage program was continued and $200 million was added to the $825 million previously authorized for the VA's direct loan program in rural areas. Additional military housing was also authorized and provided for in other laws.

The Congress also appropriated $150,000 for a special study of farm housing.

Resource development—Public works

Republican policy in this session of Congress on the development of natural resources and public works continued to be based, wherever feasible, on the partnership concept—with responsibilities and costs shared among the Federal Government, the States, municipalities, and individuals.

Some Republican-supported proposals met congressional approval; others were either delayed, defeated, or postponed; but all either saved, or would have saved the money of taxpayers while improving our public works and conserving our natural resources.

Cooperative Action Saves the Money of Taxpayers

The Congress enacted a law authorizing and directing the Federal Power Commission to issue a license for construction by the State of New York of a public power project on the Niagara River near Niagara Falls. State construction will save between $500 million and $650 million of Federal Treasury funds. The Niagara project measure provides a public power preference clause, a guaranty for supply of power to a private utility destroyed by a landslide, and up to 20 percent of the preference power for nearby States.

The administration's proposal for issuance by the Tennessee Valley Authority of revenue bonds to finance additional facilities was designed to save the Treasury another $500 million while keeping TVA operations under Congressional control and within their present geographical area. Included in President Eisenhower's budget request was a recommendation for a $30 million authorization for construction of new TVA steam plant units. This was to be financed under the revenue bond plan. However, funds for these new units were included in the 1958 supplemental appropriation bill when the Congress delayed passage of the bond plan.

Fifty Million Dollars Saved in California Partnership Project

The Republican-supported $100 million Oroville Dam and Reservoir project on the Feather River was authorized by Congress to be a partnership project between the Federal Government and the State of California with a saving of about $50 million through State participation.

Congressional consideration of a big public power project in the Pacific Northwest was made unnecessary when the Federal Power Commission granted a partnership franchise for the Rocky Reach Power Dam on the Columbia River. This permitted a public power body in a Washington State county to join with an aluminum company to build the project, with a consequent saving to the United States Treasury of the $225.8 million cost of the dam.

Still another type of partnership project in another section of the Nation was approved by Congress. The San Angelo Irrigation-Municipal Water project in Texas was authorized as a partnership plan involving the Federal Government, farmers, and the residents of the city of San Angelo. The citizens voted to pay $6.7 million of the $32.3 million cost of the irrigation project in exchange for city water.

No action was taken on legislation proposed by the administration and introduced in the House for a partnership plan involving the Trinity River Dam project. The Congress appropriated $25 million for the $747 million Central Valley project. Included in this appropriation was $17 million to continue construction of the Trinity River Dam.

Taxpayers Saved an Estimated $500 Million on Hells Canyon Dam

The action of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in voting down legislation for construction of a Federal dam in Hells Canyon on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon saved taxpayers an estimated $500 million. The effect of this action also was to uphold the Federal Power Commission's granting of a license for a three-dam private development of the river's power potential in that area.

Production of power from the three, privately built dams will almost equal that of the proposed Federal dam. More important, power from the private development program will be coming on the line next year, 5 to 7 years before power could be produced by a single, higher Federal dam.

Democratic Congresses in the Past Defeated Hells Canyon Dam

Proposals for Federal construction of one big dam previously had been defeated by the Democratic-controlled Senate in 1950, by a Democratic-controlled House Committee in 1952, and in 1956 the Democratic-controlled Senate rejected the Federal plan while at the same time the Democratic-controlled House Rules Committee killed the bill.

The Federal Power Commission held the longest hearings in its history for such a project. After awarding the license to the private company the FPC was upheld by the Supreme Court when the Court declined to review a lower-court decision supporting the FPC. Federal public-power advocates had appealed the lower-court decision.

Yet, despite this background the issue was brought up again by the Democratic leadership in the Congress at this session. The Senate passed the bill by a vote of 45 to 38 for a Federal Hells Canyon Dam, but then a Democratic-controlled House subcommittee, and next the full Democratic-controlled House Interior Committee, killed not only the Senate bill but also a similar House bill.

Some Democratic Senators Noted as Changing Their Votes in Past Year

Senate passage of the Federal Hells Canyon bill was obtained when certain Democratic Senators, who in past years were recorded as voting against the measure, changed their votes in this session. Significantly related to this was the fact that shortly after, the House-approved civil-rights bill came up in the Senate.

At the time the Hells Canyon bill was being considered by the House Interior Committee, President Eisenhower said:

"It is inconceivable to me that serious consideration is being given in some quarters to stopping this [private] development, depriving the Northwest of power which is badly needed now, and throwing an additional burden on the already heavily burdened taxpayers of the Nation."

Tax Writeoff Was Subsidy Issue

A tax writeoff was a subsidiary issue of the Hells Canyon controversy. Supporters of the public power project raised a hue and cry against the granting of a tax writeoff to the private company which would have enabled the company to pay less taxes in the first 5 years but make up for it in later years. The writeoff was legally granted—under a law originally placed on the statute books by Democratic administrations. Thousands of other tax writeoffs previously had been granted to hundreds of firms throughout the country, but one for the company engaged in private development of Hells Canyon was lustily disputed by advocates of a Hells Canyon public power project. The company later rejected the writeoff and that ended the matter.

Fryingpan-Arkansas Power Project Remains in House Committee

Republicans strongly backed Congressional authorization of Federal construction of the important $155 million Fryingpan-Arkansas power and irrigation project in Colorado. This was a type of project which it was felt only the Federal Government could handle. The Republican administration did not hesitate to recommend it. The Senate approved, but no action was taken in the House.

The President proposed Congressional authorization on a partnership basis of the $44 million Bruces Eddy power and flood-control project on the Clearwater River in Idaho. It remained in committee. The Congress also did not act upon legislation which would have authorized Federal construction of the $80 million Auburn unit of the American River division of the Central Valley project, but additional engineering reports may speed action next year.

One and One-Half Billion Dollar Rivers, Harbors, and Flood Control Authorization Bill Held Up

The bill to authorize funds for possible Congresisonal appropriation for rivers and harbors was passed by the Senate but held up in the House until next year. Total authorizations ran to $1.5 billion, but strong objections were registered that full engineering surveys on some of the proposed projects had not been received. Also, it was pointed out that some $8 billion of previously authorized projects still await appropriations for either a start or completion.

Public Works Appropriations for Projects in Every State

The public works appropriation bill provided $858.9 million to carry on the conservation of our natural resources of every nature. The measure carried $449 million for 323 named locks, dams, channels, harbors, dredging and deepening of harbors, levees, reservoirs, drainage systems, dikes, bridges, breakwaters, and seawalls in every State and in Alaska and Hawaii.

Reclamation and irrigation projects received $116.7 million plus $20.1 million in carryover funds. The administration made it clear to all that its reclamation program was geared to taking areas out of a one-crop economy, permitting diversification and shifting away from crops in surplus.

Fish and Wildlife Resources

The administration was partly successful in obtaining an expansion of its program to conserve fish and wildlife resources. Expenditures were increased by Congress for fishery research to aid commercial fishermen and plant operators who face stiff competition from foreign sources of supply. The newly established Republican-sponsored fisheries loan fund received additional authorizations. Additional measures for conservation were taken, and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife received funds to aid in the administration's conservation and restoration program.

Mining and Minerals Legislation

Republicans submitted broad basic research programs designed to develop instruments, equipment, and methods for more efficient mining and substantially higher recovery of ore and coal. The recommended tariff protection for lead and zinc industries did not pass, but the administration's program for conservation and development of mineral resources received additional Congressional appropriations.

Recreational Resources Important to Growing Population

It was officially estimated this year that some 80 million visitors would be visiting our national parks each year by 1966. With this in view, legislation passed the Senate for establishment of a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. This was needed for the administration's two major 10-year development programs, called Mission 66 and Operation Outdoors, under the National Park Service and the Forest Service, respectively.

Forestry Resources Program of Immense Scope

The Government is responsible for a forestry program of a scope that is little realized, administering more than 161 million acres of forest and woodlands—all outside the National Forests which contain 46 million more acres of commercial-type forest lands and 115 million acres of noncommercial woodlands. For this the administration succeeded in obtaining an expanded reforestation program, an enlarged forest fire suppression program, and additional forest trails, roads, and other improvements.

Weather Control and Saline Water Experiments

A Republican proposal for weather modification experiments, including cloud seeding and other possible weather control methods, passed the Senate but still awaits action in the House. The Congress approved the administration's enlarged program for research and pilot-plant operations for converting saline water into fresh water for municipal, industrial, and agricultural uses.

Lease-Purchase and Flood Insurance Programs

Two important programs failed to be continued by Congress in this past session. The lease-purchase program was designed to have private firms use their own money to build needed post offices and other Federal office buildings and lease them to the Government. After a period of years, ownership of the buildings would revert to the Government. The Government pays rent for many years for many buildings without ever owning them. Construction of all needed post offices is not within budget limitations, but use of rent money for eventual ownership was considered a way to obtain more buildings. Continuance of this program was not approved although Congressional committees had approved lease-purchase contracts for 98 combined post office-courthouse-custom house structures and 48 post offices.

The Federal Flood Insurance Program, designed to help areas which might be badly damaged by hurricanes and other disasters, was authorized a year ago but money for the program was not approved although private insurance firms testified they were unable to participate alone in such a large-scale insurance program.

Atomic energy: at home and abroad

The Congress in this session dealt with nuclear energy developments of great significance.

Guidelines for United States in Atomic Matters

On a world basis, the guidelines for United States action were set forth by the President's 1953 atoms-for-peace plans. (See Foreign Affairs section.)

On a national basis, the guidelines were set forth by the Republican-sponsored revisions of 1954 in the original Atomic Energy Act. These revisions eliminated Government monopoly, except for national defense, and for the first time permitted individuals, public, and private groups to explore, develop, experiment, construct, and finance atomic facilities for the peacetime use of our citizens in the fields of power, biology, medicine, agriculture, commerce, and industry. Partnership between groups, public or private, or in partnership with the Federal Government, also was permitted.

Atomic Energy Appropriations for National Defense

The Congress provided in the 1958 Atomic Energy Appropriation bill a total of $2.32 billion, of which more than half was for the weapons and raw materials program. Funds also were provided for naval and air atomic propulsion plants, test sites, various experimental programs, and other defense projects, most of them of a classified nature.

Atomic Energy Appropriations for the Welfare of Our Citizens

The Congress provided, in the same appropriation measure, money to continue construction of the 22,000 horsepower, nuclear-powered passenger-cargo merchant ship and funds for a joint Commerce Department-Atomic Energy Commission program aimed at development of atomic powerplants for commercially competitive merchant ships.

The estimated $400 million program to stimulate production by purchase of uranium concentrate milled from raw ore was continued. This involved 12 uranium mills operating within the United States, all but one privately constructed at a total cost of nearly $75 million. Funds for purchase of the concentrate from either other mills, nearing construction at a cost to private investors of about $40 million, also were approved.

Funds were appropriated for the AEC's technical training program in colleges and universities all over the country; money also was made available for biological and medical research and experiments, and research into the use of atomic energy for conserving food without refrigeration.

Authorized Appropriations for National Defense

In the measure to authorize the Congress to make appropriations for approved projects, the Congress allowed $222.23 million for national defense purposes in addition to projects and funds authorized in previous years.

Among the new authorizations were: $8 million for an aircraft nuclear propulsion ground test plant in Idaho; funds for a naval destroyer reactor development plant; $8.5 million for a new type boiling reactor plant; $17.5 million for a liquid metal fuel reactor; $2.1 million for the start of an AEC development plant at Livermore, Calif.; $7.9 million more for the Eniwetok Proving Ground; and funds for various projects at Los Alamos, N. Mex., Sandia Base, N. Mex., Hanford, Wash., Nevada and Idaho test sites or stations, and AEC facilities extending from points in South Carolina to California.

Authorized Appropriations for the Welfare of Our Citizens

The same authorization bill also carried $149.91 million. This, for the most part, was for what the bill termed a cooperative power reactor demonstration program. Some Members of Congress declared on the Senate floor that this program, not requested by the AEC or the administration, was not a demonstration program but the beginning of a Federal atomic public-power program. The administration favored a program of partnership with local public power groups, cooperatives, or cooperatives formed by companies willing to invest large sums of money. As compromised, the bill provides for contracts between the AEC and cooperative or public bodies. Such contracts must be submitted to the Congressional Joint Atomic Energy Committee with a 45-day waiting period before becoming effective. Also, authorized appropriations "* * * shall be * * * for research and development purposes." The money authorized is only for a start of such projects. The reactors would be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Government, but steam would be sold to the cooperatives or public bodies to use in generating and then selling electricity. The bill also authorized two other types of reactors, with appropriations to be used for design work.

President Eisenhower, in signing the authorization measure August 21, indirectly warned of the economic dangers of atomic public power. He said:

"While I am not opposed to such projects as studies by the Commission I wish to make it clear that I will oppose the expenditure of public money for the construction and operation by the Government of any large-scale power reactor, or any prototype thereof, unless private enterprise has first received reasonable opportunity to bear or share the cost."

Another nuclear bill of the session, as approved by Congress, provided authorization of up to $500 million of Government insurance to private reactor builders against atomic accidents. The Government would take over insurance risks where private firms left off. This measure was designed to stimulate large-scale financing by private industry of reactor plants which industry might hesitate to undertake because of either tremendous insurance costs or lack of such insurance in the market.

Labor

In his annual budget message the President requested Congressional action in five specific areas with respect to labor. He asked for (1) extension of the minimum-wage law to additional workers; (2) clarification and strengthening of the Federal eight-hour law; (3) approval of equal pay for equal work; (4) enactment of a new program providing grants to States to promote occupation safety; and (5) statutory requirement for the Federal registration of private pension and welfare funds. None of these requests received favorable consideration this year.

In addition, there was no action on proposed changes in the Taft-Hartley Act affecting the building and construction industry recommended this year by the Eisenhower administration. This legislation, approved by both management and labor, provides that the National Labor Relations Board may certify unions in the building and construction industry as exclusive bargaining representatives without a prior election; that employers may contribute to apprenticeship and training trust funds in the building and construction industry which are jointly administered by the employer and the unions; and that multiemployer groups, such as employer associations, may engage in collective bargaining to the same extent as individual employers in the industry.

Labor Rackets Investigation

Republicans fully cooperated in setting up a Select Senate Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor and Management Field. Examination of witnesses to date has uncovered flagrant misuse of labor union funds by some labor leaders for their self-enrichment and for political purposes; instances of tieups between certain labor leaders and racketeers; the setting up of "paper" unions as a device to shake down employers; and labor boss control of unions without proper accounting to rank-and-file members and without rank-and-file members having a voice in union affairs. Corrective legislation is expected to be proposed by the select committee at the next session of Congress.

Union Reports To Be Made Public

One helpful item of legislation which did pass was recommended by the Secretary of Labor and provided affirmative authority to make public the financial reports filed by labor unions with the Department of Labor under the Taft-Hartley Act.

Health, education, and welfare

Federal Aid for School Construction

The question of Federal aid for school construction was a controversial one in this session, as before. The President proposed an emergency program providing for Federal aid over a period of 4 years at the rate of $325 million per year, with authorization of $750 million over the same period for Federal purchase of school bonds in cases where school districts could not market them at reasonable interest rates. The President's plan would have channeled aid to the neediest areas.

A compromise measure was reported from the House Education and Labor Committee. It called for $1½ billion in Federal funds for new schools over a 5-year period plus $900 million to aid in the selling of local and State bond issues. It provided that half of the Federal grant funds would be distributed on the basis of school-age population, and the other half on a need basis.

Before the House acted on the bill itself, it adopted, by a 136 to 105 teller vote, an amendment to prohibit the use of Federal funds in any school district operating segregated schools in violation of the Supreme Court's integration ruling.

The legislation was then defeated when the House, by a vote of 208 yeas to 203 nays, struck out the enactment clause.

Debate in the House cut across party lines in both instances on the basic issues involved. These included such factors as whether it has been adequately shown that the problem cannot be handled at the local or State level, having in mind (1) that State and local responsibility for education has been traditional; and (2) that relative financial ability of the States as compared with that of the Federal Government (in view of the national debt) to undertake such a program; and whether such participation can be provided with adequate safeguards against ultimate Federal control of education.

The issue was complicated, in addition, by House adoption (with strong Republican support) of the antisegregation amendment. The House rejection of this legislation, coupled with failure of the Senate to act at all, reflects the fact that there is continued and traditionally strong grassroots opposition, both Democratic and Republican, to a program of Federal aid to education, despite its support from the White House.

Federal Assistance to Schools in Special Areas Continued

Congress, however, did continue the program of Federal assistance to school districts, for school operation and construction, in areas affected by Federal activities.

An increase was voted, too, in grants for rural library services.

No Actions Taken on Other Major Proposals

In Public Law 813 of the 84th Congress, Federal funds were authorized to assist the States in establishing committees on education beyond high school, as recommended by the President's committee on this subject, but no appropriation was made. The President sought an appropriation again this year for this purpose, but no money was provided.

Little or no progress was made in this session on other major legislative proposals of President Eisenhower in the health, education, and welfare field. These included the program of Federal grants-in-aid to combat juvenile delinquency, grants for the construction of medical and dental schools for training facilities, and legislation making it possible for small insurance companies and nonprofit associations to pool their resources in order that a greater number of people in the Nation may be able to obtain the benefits of voluntary health insurance.

The Senate passed a bill to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to nonprofit institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies. This awaits House action, however.

Nothing was done except for House committee hearings on an administration request for legislation requiring advance testing of chemicals to be used in foods to assure their safety for human consumption. Another administration proposal not acted upon in this session was a bill to create a 21-member temporary Presidential study commission on problems of the blind. The study outlined by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare covers such areas as prevention of blindness and restoration of sight, utilization of limited sight, and employment opportunities for the blind.

Funds Voted To Combat Asiatic Flu

Funds were appropriated in response to a Presidential request to enable the Public Health Service to be prepared for any large-scale outbreak of Asiatic flu. Congress also authorized the transfer of $2 million of Public Health funds for use against any large epidemic of the disease which the Surgeon General has warned "is a very definite possibility."

Social Security

The extended coverage of those under social security has brought to more than 73 million the number of persons now under the system. This year saw the passing of the 10-million mark in those receiving benefits. Nine out of ten mothers and their children are protected by social security in the event the breadwinner dies. Congress, in Public Law 85–109, extended to July 1, 1958, the time for disabled persons to file applications to preserve their rights to old-age, survivors, and disability insurance. The same law permits veterans with service-connected disability to receive both social-security and veterans' benefits.

Immigration

Late in the session the Congress enacted a bobtail version of the President's immigration program which would benefit about 60,000 aliens.

Described by Senator WATKINS, Republican, of Utah, as a quarter loaf, the bill ignores such basic requests in the President's program as those for the up-dating of the census date of the national origins quota system in the McCarran-Walter Act, authority to transfer unused quotas under that system, and provision for permanent residence to over 27,000 Hungarian escapees who have been paroled into the United States under existing provisions of law.

Among other things the bill as passed would:

(a) Eliminate the mortgages which were placed on quotas under prior legislation;

(b) Revive over 18,000 visas that expired last December with the Refugee Relief Act, of which approximately 14,000 would be available to refugees from Communist territory or from the Middle East; authorize for a 2-year period the entry of an unlimited number of adopted children;

(c) Provide relief in certain hardship cases involving children, spouses, or parents of United States citizens or permanent United States residents;

(d) Give nonquota status to certain preference quota immigrants (including skilled specialists) for whom petitions have been approved by the Attorney General prior to July 1, 1957;

(e) Validate the entry of certain aliens who misrepresented the fact that they came from behind the Iron Curtain in order to avoid forcible repatriation; and

(f) Give the Government authority to waive the requirement of fingerprinting of nonimmigrant aliens on a reciprocal basis, to waive grounds of exclusion of certain aliens because they committed crimes involving moral turpitude or because they are suffering from tuberculosis, and to adjust the status of certain skilled specialists and their families.

Veterans

Veterans' Disability Allowances Increased

The only action thus far taken by the 85th Congress on major legislation directly affecting veterans—exclusive of housing benefits mentioned in another part of this report—is the passage of H. R. 52 and H. R. 53. H. R. 52 is an act which increases the basic rates of compensation for service-connected disability and allowances for dependents of disabled veterans. The increase is 10 percent where the disability ranges between 10 and 90 percent, and about 24 percent for total disability. In addition, the act provides that statutory awards for certain specific disabilities shall be increased 10 percent.

Veterans' Laws Codified

H. R. 53 consolidates into one act certain laws administered by the Veterans' Administration on compensation, pensions, administration, hospitalization, and burial benefits.

Government administration

Improvement of Government became an issue in the 1st session of the 85th Congress in the form of much needed legislation concerning the Supreme Court's Jencks case decision, Presidential disability, and enactment of the Hoover Commission's recommendations.

Jencks Case Legislation

The Supreme Court's decision in the Jencks case resulted in a number of criminal court actions being terminated because the FBI and other agencies refused to permit defendants to go on indiscriminate fishing expeditions into Government files. By dropping these cases, the Government was seeking to protect its intelligence sources, methods of operation, and the identity of informers. In subversive and narcotic cases, informers are often very important to law enforcement agencies, and their protection is therefore a necessity.

Some trial judges, whether correctly or not, began interpreting broadly the Supreme Court's decision in the Jencks case with the result that some alleged criminals went free. Congress felt that remedial legislation was needed to provide methods for safeguarding both the rights of the public and the security of Government files.

With this in mind, bills were introduced in the Senate making Federal judges responsible for deciding what information is pertinent to the defense in the impeachment of witnesses. As a guaranty against trial judge error, appellate courts under this legislation receive Government files in the event of an appeal. The higher court then decides whether or not the lower court was correct in determining what information should be granted the defense and what should be withheld on grounds of national security.

The final bill, combining features of Senate and House versions, attempts to protect both the rights of individuals and the sanctity of Government files.

Presidential Disability

Presidential disability became a much discussed issue as a result of President Eisenhower's heart attack and subsequent ileitis operation.

The Constitution provides that the Vice President shall become President when the latter is removed from office, dies, resigns, or when he is unable to discharge his duties. In the last instance, neither the Constitution nor Federal statutes provide methods or standards for determining Presidential disability. Accordingly, a situation could arise in which a President was so ill or injured that he would not be able to inform anyone that he was incapable of performing his duties. In this set of circumstances, the United

States might well find itself without a President during a moment of crisis. As a remedy, President Eisenhower last March suggested a constitutional amendment granting the Cabinet authority to determine when a President is unable to perform his duties. Several resolutions intended to cope with this problem were introduced in both Houses, but the Congress took no action.

Hoover Commission Proposals

President Eisenhower asked the Congress to enact legislation placing Government accounts on an annual accrued expenditure basis so as to eliminate carryovers of large funds and give Congress an annual look at long-range expenditures. In addition, he asked for discontinuance of the outmoded postal savings system, provisions for training Federal workers, an authorization to release the armed services from having to clear real estate transactions with the Senate and House Armed Services Committees, and finally, extension of the Reorganization Act of 1949.

Congress enacted only one of the President's efficiency-in-Government proposals, namely, an extension of the Reorganization Act of 1949.

Overcrowded Courts

The administration asked for, but did not get, an increase in the number of Federal judgeships sorely needed to cope with overcrowded dockets.

The administration also asked for, but did not get, legislation to provide voluntary retirement for judges at the age of 70, or to relieve them of certain administrative duties at that age.

Statehood and District of Columbia Home Rule

In their 1956 platforms, both the Republican and Democratic Parties went on record as advocating statehood for Alaska and Hawaii and home rule for the District of Columbia. President Eisenhower has called for enacting these three suffrage proposals into law. Despite the support of the President and the avowed remarks by each party's convention, the Democratic-controlled 85th Congress took no action giving residents of these three places the right to have a voice in the Federal Government when taxed by it.

Post Office Deficits

Several times this year President Eisenhower requested higher postal rates to offset mounting Post Office Department deficits. Expert testimony in the House and Senate proved that these deficits will increase next year unless postal rates are increased.

Legislation was passed in the House providing for rate increases so that an additional $500 million of revenue would be provided. Unfortunately, this measure, which would have put the Post Office on a more nearly pay-as-you-go basis, was not acted upon in the Senate.

Federal employee legislation

Employee Pay Bills Passed

Despite the President's position against any general pay raises for Federal employees this year on grounds of economy, Congress passed two separate measures providing pay increases for postal and classified Federal employees.

One measure provided a flat $546 increase, averaging 12½ percent, for approximately 524,000 postal employees at an estimated cost, including effect on fringe benefits, of $317,500,000 per year.

The other measure provided an 11 percent increase for about 1 million executive, departmental, judicial, and legislative employees at an estimated cost of $532 million per year, including effect on fringe benefits. Individual salary increases were limited to not over $1,000 with the present $16,000 maximum annual salary (the top figure for classified employees) being retained.

Administration opposed to pay increases now

The administration had stated on several occasions its opposition to general pay increases at this time. The President, in a letter June 14, 1957, to Representative TOM MURRAY, Democratic chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, expressed the views of the administration in this way:

"Recent actions of the Congress and the executive branch have demonstrated the Government's continuing concern for proper and just compensation for its workers and have benefited those workers in a number of ways. These include low-cost group life insurance, more liberal retirement and survivorship provisions, uniform allowances, and unemployment compensation. Administration-sponsored legislation is now pending to establish a voluntary health and medical insurance program and to authorize the training of Government employees outside as well as within the employing agencies. As all of us know, the present difficulty in harnessing the Federal budget is attributable in part to increased personnel costs. Incidentally, it was only 2 years ago that general pay increases were approved.

"In view of the tax, budgetary, and economic implications, and in view of my several appeals this year to private citizens to observe restraint in everything that could add to the inflationary pressures on our economy, I cannot at this time, in keeping this the national interest, recommend enactment of legislation for pay increases for postal workers which, as you point out, would lead to a pay increase throughout the Federal Government."

Most Congressional observers anticipate a Presidential veto of these pay bills.

Administration's Legislative Requests Fail of Enactment

Five legislative requests which were made by the administration on behalf of Government employees and an improved Federal civil service received no consideration.

The President's 1958 budget message to Congress again requested legislation to establish a system of voluntary health and medical insurance for civilian employees. Also requested in the budget message was a provision that Government employees be trained outside as well as within the employing agency; that better safety measures be provided in Federal agencies; and that each Federal agency bear the cost of accident compensation benefits paid its employees.

Although bills were introduced for each of these administration requests, none of the 4 was enacted into law in the first session of the 85th Congress. Similarly, no action was taken by the Congress with respect to the President's request, in his state of the Union message, to establish a career service for overseas foreign service officers of the United States Information Agency. The President stated this legislation was necessary so that the USIA would be better able to cope with its new and greater responsibilities throughout the world.

Administration Improvements in Civil Service

As part of the administration's continuing program to better working conditions and to increase efficiency of Federal employees, the President, in his budget message for 1957, announced that plans were to be put into effect to renovate and improve Government buildings, and to provide additional office space for overcrowded Government workers. Also, Government agencies were directed by the President to renew their efforts to hold to a minimum any increase in Government personnel.

Prudent management of Government personnel has resulted during the past 4 years in a reduction of approximately 240,000 in the civilian work force. For the month of June 1957, civilian employment of the Federal Government was 2,416,044. Although this figure represented an increase in personnel between May and June 1957 in all three branches of the Government, the increase was less than half the increase reported between May and June 1956.

Campaign funds and lobbying

Congress enacted no legislation in this session on the subjects of lobbying and Federal election campaign funds and expenditures although the urgent need for more effective laws has been pointed out by many committees over several years. Two Senate committees made extended studies in this field over the last 2 years; and although a bill was reported from the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate Rules Committee, Congress as a whole has postponed action for another year.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to my good friend, the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to pay tribute to the employees who have made it possible for the Members of the Senate to do as good a job as they have done in the past session, but we ought not forget the Capitol telephone operators. Even though at times they find us when we think we are safely hidden away somewhere, that is compensated for by the fact that they also find the people we are looking for when we do not have much of an idea where to look for them. I think the ability of the telephone operators of the Capitol to get their man equals, if it does not excel, that of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I quite agree with the distinguished Senator from Vermont. I would, of course, like to add—and I know I can speak on behalf of all Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle—that while my remarks today were directed primarily to those who operate the Senate in its entirety, or on the majority or minority side, I am sure we also would want to pay tribute to our individual staffs as Senators, because without the burdens they carry and the long hours they toil it would not be possible for any Senator to continue to perform his public duties and have the tremendous volume of work and mail and other details taken care of. It is a loyal service which we receive from each of our personal staffs.

REPORT BY THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL RELATIVE TO CHANGES IN THE CAPITOL BUILDING

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD the report rendered by Mr. J. George Stewart, Architect of the Capitol, to the Commission relative to changes in the Capitol, which report has been made available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report is as follows:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL,
Washington, D. C., August 1957.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Chairman, Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I respectfully submit herewith, report of the Architect of the

Capitol on preliminary plans and estimates of cost for the extension of the United States Capitol, authorized by Public Laws 242 and 406, 84th Congress.

For the convenience of the Commission, I have broken my report down into five parts, as follows:

Part I gives the legislative and related background of the project, detailing, for purposes of record, the authorization of the project; the scope of the project, limitation of cost, and appropriations to date: actions taken at previous meeting of the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol; directives issued by the Commission to date: actions taken by the Architect of the Capitol under directives, to date; and a financial statement of expenditures and obligations incurred to June 30, 1957.

Part II is subdivided into four sections. Section 1 gives an account of preliminary investigations, surveys and studies conducted, to date, with respect to assembling and developing of basic architectural and engineering data; topographic survey made of the Capitol Grounds; detailed measurements taken and measured drawings made of the central portion of the Capitol; detailed survey made of present space usage and present and future space requirements for functions which must operate within the Capitol in serving the Congress; structural survey and examination made of the Capitol dome; analysis made of the Aquia Creek sandstone facing the walls of the east and west central portion of the Capitol; and examination made of the foundations of the Capitol and subsoil conditions.

Section 2 of Part II presents to the Commission the changes and improvements recommended to be made in carrying out the extension of the Capitol project. This section of the report is presented in considerable detail in order that the Commission members may have before them a comprehensive picture of the changes and improvements recommended. In accordance with the Commission's instruction to the Archtect of the Capitol at meeting of March 26, 1956, the preliminary plans and estimates of cost have been developed in such a manner that each of the components parts of the proposed program is presented with its own description and own preliminary estimate of cost.

Section 3 of Part II presents a consolidated table of the estimated costs of the proposed changes and improvements.

Section 4 of Part II contains the recommendations and comments of the Architect of the Capitol, concurred in by the Associate Architects and Engineers and by the Advisory Group of Architects.

Part III of the report presents three schedules—one showing the proposed staging of the construction work; one showing the proposed schedule of obligations; and one showing the proposed schedule of expenditures.

Part IV of the report presents the views of the Associate Architects and Advisory Group of Architects with respect to the possibilities for further future expansion, after changes and improvements authroized by Public Laws 242 and 406, 84th Congress, have been accomplished. This part has been included in the record for possible future guidance.

Part V of the report is captioned "Conclusions" and presents those matters on which the Architect of the Capitol requires the direction of the Commission with respect to the proposals contained in this report.

Respectfully yours,

J. GEORGE STEWART,
Architect of the Capitol.

PART I

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION FOR EXTENSION OF THE CAPITOL PROJECT

Congress, by Act of August 5, 1955, Public Law 242, 84th Congress, as amended by Public Law 406, 84th Congress, authorized the extension of the Capitol project, as follows:

"The Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized, under the direction of a Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol, to be composed of the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the minority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the House of Representatives, and the Architect of the Capitol, to provide for the extension, reconstruction, and replacement of the central portion of the United States Capitol in substantial accordance with scheme B of the architectural plan submitted by a joint commission of Congress and reported to Congress on March 3, 1905 (House Doc. No. 385, 58th Cong.), but with such modifications and additions, including provisions for restaurant facilities, and such other facilities in the Capitol Grounds, together with utilities, equipment, approaches, and other appurtenant or necessary items, as may be approved by said Commission, and for such purposes there is hereby appropriated $5 million, to remain available until expended, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be determined by said Commission to be required for the purposes hereof: *Provided*, That the Architect of the Capitol under the direction of said Commission and without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, is authorized to enter into contracts and to make such other expenditures, including expenditures for personal and other services, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act and to obligate the additional sums herein authorized prior to the actual appropriation therof."

SECTION 2. SCOPE OF PROJECT, LIMITATION OF COST, APPROPRIATIONS TO DATE

The legislation governing this project, as indicated, provides that all work in connection with the project shall be performed under the direction of a Commission to be composed of the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the minority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the House of Representatives, and the Architect of the Capitol.

The authorizing legislation not only provides for extension of the Capitol under the direction of this Commission, but also provides for the construction of such other additions and facilities in the Capitol Grounds as may be approved by such Commission, such as an underground garage, security vaults, and underground transportation system; provides the Architect of the Capitol with the necessary contract authority to carry out any plans and construction approved by the Commission, in such total amount as the Commission may approve; permits selective competition in the performance of any part of the work deemed necessary by the Commission to be contracted in such manner, in the best interest of the Government.

The authorizing legislation provides an initial appropriation of $5 million for the project; authorizes the appropriation of such additional sums as may be determined by the Commission to be required for the project; and authorizes the obligation of such additional sums prior to the actual appropriation thereof.

In addition to the $5 million appropriated in the authorization act, an appropriation of $12 million was provided in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1957.

Under the legislation, it is therefore necessary for the Commission to determine the scope and limit of cost of the project.

SECTION 3. PREVIOUS MEETING OF COMMISSION FOR EXTENSION OF THE CAPITOL

On March 26, 1956, the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol held its first meeting. At that meeting, the Architect of the Capitol was authorized to proceed with the development of preliminary plans and estimates of cost for the project and to report back to the Commission his findings and recommendations. The Commission agreed that the preliminary plans and estimates of cost should be developed in such a manner that the Commission would be in a position to approve the program, either in whole or in part, in view of the fact that the language of the Authorization Act was broad enough to embrace not only the extension of the east front, but also such other additions and facilities as underground security vaults, underground garage and underground transportation systems.

At that meeting, the Commission selected Arthur Brown, Jr., architect of San Francisco, John F. Harbeson, architect of Philadelphia, and Henry R. Shepley, architect of Boston, as a consulting and advisory group to assist the Architect of the Capitol in determining the proper architectural treatment of the east front of the Capitol and other necessary changes to be made on the exterior and interior of the building.

The Commission also selected Roscoe DeWitt and Fred L. Hardison of Dallas, Tex.; Alfred Easton Poor and Albert Homer Swanke of New York City; and Jesse M. Shelton and Alan G. Stanford of Robert & Co. Associates, Atlanta, Ga., as the Associate Architects and Engineers for the extension of the Capitol and other improvements and changes authorized by the act of August 5, 1955, as amended.

The Architect of the Capitol was authorized to enter into contracts for these services.

The Commission agreed to issue directives to the Architect of the Capitol, from time to time during the life of the project, providing him with the necessary authority to carry out actions agreed upon at meetings of the Commission, and authorized the Speaker of the House and the minority leader of the Senate to sign the directives on behalf of the Commission.

It was further agreed that in preparing the directive covering actions approved at the March 26, 1956, meeting, the Architect of the Capitol should include therein authorization not only for the employment of architects and engineers, but also for the incurring of the necessary obligations and expenditures for such items as surveys, test borings, test pits, blueprints, personal and other services, and administrative expenses and contingencies.

SECTION 4. DIRECTIVES OF THE COMMISSION

Directive of Commission issued prior to meeting of March 26, 1956

AUGUST 5, 1955.

Mr. J. GEORGE STEWART,
Architect of the Capitol.

DEAR MR. STEWART: Pursuant to the provisions of the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, providing for the extension of the Capitol under the direction of the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol created by that act, you are hereby authorized during the adjournment of the 1st session of the 84th Congress to incur obligations and make expenditures, not to exceed $50,000, for preliminary surveys and studies, including test borings and other exploratory engineering work, for the extension of the Capitol project authorized by such act.

RICHARD NIXON,
President of the Senate.
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Minority Leader of the Senate.
SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
Minority Leader of the House of Representatives.
J. GEORGE STEWART,
Architect of the Capitol.

Directive of Commission issued pursuant to meeting of March 26, 1956

JULY 24, 1956.

Mr. J. GEORGE STEWART,
Architect of the Capitol.

DEAR MR. STEWART: Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 242, 84th Congress, as amended by Public Law 406, 84th Congress, and pursuant to action taken by the Commission for the Extension of the United States Capitol at meeting, March 26, 1956—

1. The following professional service contracts entered into by the Architect of the Capitol are hereby approved:

Contract, dated June 11, 1956, with Seelye, Stevenson, Value & Knecht, consulting engineers, of New York City, N. Y., for a complete structural engineering study and survey of the Dome of the United States Capitol Building, including a complete inspection of the existing construction, examination of available drawings and computation of stresses in the various members, with a view to determining the strength and safety of the Dome, and submission of a comprehensive report describing the exact conditions disclosed by the survey and study and including an opinion as to the safety of the construction and recommendations as to measures, if any, to improve its stability.

Contract, dated July 10, 1956, with Roscoe DeWitt and Fred L. Hardison, architects of Dallas, Tex.; Alfred Easton Poor and Albert Homer Swanke, architects of New York City, N. Y.; and Jesse M. Shelton and Alan G. Stanford, architect and engineer of Atlanta, Ga., for furnishing the necessary architectural and engineering srevices for the Extension of the Capitol and other improvements and changes authorized by Public Law 242, 84th Congress, as amended by Public Law 406, 84th Congress, except such changes and improvements as relate to landscape treatment of the Capitol grounds, soil test borings, underpinning of the United States Capitol Building, and transportation equipment.

Contract dated July 11, 1956, with John F. Harbeson, architect of Philadelphia, Pa.; Henry R. Shepley, architect of Boston, Mass.; and Arthur Brown, Jr., architect of San Francisco, Calif., for furnishing services as a consulting and advisory group to assist the Architect of the Capitol in determining the proper architectural treatment of the exterior of the United States Capitol Building and changes to be made to the interior of such building, and such other consulting and advisory services as may be required with respect to the landscape treatment of the Capitol Grounds and the development of the project as a whole.

2. Authority is granted the Architect of the Capitol to enter into additional professional service contracts, as follows:

Contract or contracts for professional services for the landscape treatment of the Capitol Grounds.

Contract for professional services for underpinning the Capitol Building.

Contract for professional services for soil test borings.

3. Authority is also granted you to enter into such other contracts, incur such other obligations, and make such other expenditures as may be necessary, preliminary to the letting of the main construction and equipment contracts, including expenditures for test borings, advertising, blueprints, surveys, personal and other services, and other miscellaneous administrative expenses, and any other necessary items; also to supplement your organization to such extent as you may deem necessary for the proper direction and administration of the extension of the Capitol project.

This directive is issued by the undersigned, pursuant to authority granted the undersigned by the Commission for the Extension of the United States Capitol at meeting, March 26, 1956, to so act on behalf of the Commission.

SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Chairman of the Commission for the Extension of the United States Capitol.

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Minority Leader of the Senate, Member of the Commission for the Extension of the United States Capitol.

SECTION 5. ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL UNDER DIRECTIVES OF COMMISSION

In accordance with instructions contained in directives of the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol, the Architect of the Capitol has entered into the following contracts and incurred the following obligations:

Contract (June 11, 1956) with Seelye, Stevenson, Value, and Knecht, consulting engineers of New York City, for a complete structural engineering study and survey of the dome of the Capitol, and submission of a comprehensive report describing the exact conditions disclosed by the survey, including an opinion as to the safety of the construction and recommendations as to measures, if any, to improve its stability.

Contract (July 10, 1956) with Roscoe DeWitt and Fred L. Hardison, architects, of Dallas, Tex.; Alfred Easton Poor and Albert Homer Swanke, architects, of New York City; Jesse M. Shelton and Alan G. Stanford, architect and engineer, of Atlanta, Ga.; for furnishing the necessary architectural and engineering services for the extension of the Capitol and other authorized changes and improvements, except such changes and improvements as relate to landscape treatment of the grounds, soil-test borings, underpinning of the United States Capitol, and transportation equipment.

Contract (July 11, 1956) with John F. Harbeson, architect, of Philadelphia, Pa.; Henry R. Shepley, architect, of Boston, Mass.; and Arthur Brown, Jr., architect, of San Francisco, for furnishing services as a consulting and advisory group to assist the Architect of the Capitol in determining the proper architectural treatment of the exterior of the United States Capitol and changes to be made to the interior of the building, and such other consulting and advisory services as may be required.

Contract (September 4, 1956) with Wheelwright, Stevenson, and Langran, landscape architects, of Philadelphia, Pa., for the landscape architectural and engineering services for the redesign of the Capitol Grounds occasioned by the extension, reconstruction, and replacement of the central portion of the Capitol.

Contract (September 5, 1956) with Moran, Proctor, Mueser, and Rutledge, consulting engineers, of New York City, for furnishing all engineering services necessary for the preparation of plans and specifications for borings and test pits required for the extension of the Capitol project; services required to make all tests necessary to determine soil-bearing values, settlement analysis, lateral earth pressures; and for furnishing and submitting to the Architect of the Capitol analyses, evaluations and results of such tests and all necessary reports and recommendations with respect to foundations for proposed structures and underpinning of existing structures.

Contract (September 12, 1956) with Gilmore D. Clarke, consulting engineer and landscape architect of New York City, for consulting landscape architectural and engineering services for the redesign of the Capitol Grounds occasioned by the extension, reconstruction and replacement of the central portion of the Capitol.

Contract (December 6, 1956) with Raymond Concrete Pile Co., for furnishing the labor, equipment and materials for making test borings and test pits in and adjacent to the Capitol in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by Moran, Proctor, Mueser & Rutledge.

Contract (July 2, 1957) with Seelye, Stevenson, Value and Knecht, consulting engineers of New York City, for the preparation of plans and specifications for repairs to improve the stability of the Dome.

Administrative Expenses and Contingencies:

SECTION 6. FINANCIAL STATEMENT

Appropriated to date $17,000,000

Expended and obligated to June 30, 1957

	Expended	Outstanding obligations
Architectural and engineering services	$95,625	$1,194,375
Consulting and advisory architectural services	15,000	105,000
Landscape architectural and engineering services	9,000	336,000
Consulting and advisory landscape architectural and engineering services	----------	40,000
Engineering services, structural survey and study of the capitol dome	22,975	----------
Engineering services, test borings and foundation analyses	50,000	20,000
Test borings and test pits	138,872	57,596
Topographic survey of Capitol Grounds	9,650	----------
Miscellaneous tests, surveys, and studies	4,197	----------
Administrative expenses and contingencies	63,136	----------
Total	408,455	1,752,971

Total expended and obligated to June 30, 1957	—$2,161,426
Unobligated balance, July 1, 1977	14,838,574

PART II

SECTION 1. PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATIONS, SURVEYS, AND STUDIES

Immediately after the adjournment of Congress in 1955, the Architect of the Capitol began assembling and developing the extensive basic data necessary for the preparation of preliminary plans for the extension of the Capitol.

All engineering and architectural data available were assembled from the files of the Architect of the Capitol, the National Archives, the Treasury Department, the War Department, and the Library of Congress.

Topographic survey of Capitol grounds

In the spring and summer of 1956, at the request of the Architect of the Capitol, a complete, coordinated, topographic survey was made of the Capitol grounds, as they exist today, by the Surveyor's Office of the District of Columbia. This information was necessary in developing studies for underground utilities, underground structures, and landscaping.

Measured drawings

Detailed measurements of the central portion of the Capitol were taken by the associate architects and engineers and measured drawings were prepared. This was necessary for the purpose of developing accurate information with respect to room sizes, wall thicknesses, elevations of floors, and other items, which information was not recorded on the drawings available in the office of the Architect of the Capitol.

Space survey

The associate architects also made a detailed survey of present space usage and present and future space requirements for functions which must operate within the Capitol in serving the Congress. This information was necessary as a criterion for the orderly development of preliminary plans in accordance with space and usage requirements.

The study made by the associate architects developed the need for 139,250 additional square feet of floor space to accommodate present needs, with some allowance for future growth. Of the 139,250 additional square feet of space required, 33,318 square feet represent additional space for restaurants. The present Senate and House restaurant facilities occupy 22,162 square feet of floor space.

The shortage of office and committee space was found to be acute, particularly in areas close to the House and Senate Chambers, as was also the shortage of space for House and Senate Document Room use.

Inspection of the dome

Before proceeding with plans for the extension of the east front, the Architect of the Capitol considered it essential to have a thorough investigation made of the physical condition and strength of the dome and its supporting structure. The last inspection of the Capitol dome had been made by Thomas W. Marshall, civil engineer, in 1933.

On June 11, 1956, a contract was entered into with Seelye, Stevenson, Value & Knecht for furnishing all engineering services necessary for a complete structural engineering study and survey of the dome of the Capitol and submitting to the Architect of the Capitol a report describing the exact conditions disclosed, including an opinion as to the safety of the structure and recommendations as to measures to improve its stability.

Before work was started under this contract, Allyn Cox, the artist who had previously completed the rotunda frieze, was requested to submit a report to the Architect of the Capitol with respect to the condition of the fresco in the canopy of the dome. Mr. Cox reported that the fresco appears to be in a good state of preservation, but that this can only be finally determined by an inspection made at close range from a scaffold.

Seelye, Stevenson, Value & Knecht, upon completion of their inspection of the Capitol dome, reported that it was basically safe, but recommended that certain repairs and improvements be made. Their report is on file in the architect's office.

Analysis of sandstone

During the summer of 1956, in order to determine the exact condition of the deteriorating sandstone in the exterior walls of the central portion of the Capitol, nine sample core borings were taken from selected spots in the walls and submitted to the National Bureau of Standards for petrographic and chemical analysis. The results of their studies revealed a wide range in the quality of the stone. Only 3 of the 9 samples could be regarded as good quality stone; the other 6 ranged from medium to poor.

Because of the general deterioration of the sandstone, the Bureau of Standards recommended either the removal of the exterior surface of the stone and a continuation of frequent painting or, preferably, since it would be less costly over a period of years, the refacing of the present walls with durable stone. Their report is on file in the Architect's office.

Examination of foundations and subsoil

There was very little information available on the foundations of the Capitol and the subsoil conditions on Capitol Hill. In view of this, in September of 1956, the Architect of the Capitol engaged the firm of Moran, Proctor, Mueser & Rutledge, consulting engineers, to conduct an investigation of subsoil conditions in the old area of the Capitol Grounds, and at the building and in the areas immediately adjacent thereto. The engineers were also asked to investigate the foundations of the building and the possibility of underpinning any part of the Capitol if it should be required in carrying out proposed extensions.

Moran, Proctor, Mueser & Rutledge reported that the bearing capacity of underlying strata was satisfactory, that the structural condition of the foundations was basically sound, and that it would be practical and safe to do any underpinning of the Capitol which might be required. Their report is on file in the Architect's office.

SECTION 2. PROPOSED CHANGES AND IMPROVEMENTS

1. Scheme B: Extension of east central front of Capitol, architectural plan, 1905, House Document 385, 58th Congress:

Extension of the east central portion of the Capitol, approximately 32 feet 6 inches, and construction of new extension in marble—in substantial accordance with scheme B of the 1905 architectural plan—authorized by Public Laws 242 and 406, 84th Congress: $10,100,000.

Congress, in enacting Public Law 242, 84th Congress, as amended by Public Law 406, 84th Congress, approved the adoption of scheme B of the architectural plan developed by Carrere and Hastings in 1904 and submitted to Congress by Joint Commission of Congress in 1905, House Document 385, 58th Congress. This scheme provides for extending the eastern central portion of the Capitol approximately 32 feet 6 inches to the east and construction of the new extension in marble to harmonize with the Senate and House wings. This scheme having been approved by Congress, it became the duty of the Architect of the Capitol, the advisory architects, and the associate architects and engineers to study the most effective way of accomplishing the proposed extension.

Scheme B, as recommended by the Architect of the Capitol, the advisory architects, and the associate architects and engineers, provides for the extension of the east central front of the Capitol approximately 32 feet 6 inches and preserves the architectural details of the building as they now exist. It is proposed to reproduce in marble, in substantially the same detail, all present architectural features of the central portion, such as cornices, pilasters, columns, bases, pedestals, and pediments. Marble will be selected of a color and texture to harmonize with the Senate and House wings. Extension of the east front of the Capitol will eliminate the necessity of removing the sandstone facing from the east walls of the Capitol and refacing the walls with marble. Granite will be used for base course and steps.

The adoption of scheme B will provide 44,930 square feet of additional primary and secondary space, not counting space used for circulation and mechanical equipment.

It provides for additional restaurant facilities seating 115 persons in the House, and a like number in the Senate, but provides no additional restaurant facilities for employees or visitors. Existing House restaurant facilities provide accommodations for 353 persons and existing Senate restaurant facilities provide accommodations for 269 persons.

If scheme B only is adopted, unbroken private circulation from end to end of the building cannot be provided for Members of Congress except on the gallery floor.

Under Scheme B, it is estimated that the following additional, or comparable, accommodations can be obtained: 54 office rooms, 8 rooms for House and Senate document room use, 2 dining rooms (1 House, 1 Senate), 9 storage rooms.

2. Refacing west front of Capitol: Architectural plan, 1905, House Document 385, 58th Congress:

Removal of sandstone facing from the west central portion of the Capitol between the House and Senate wings, and replacing the sandstone facing with marble—in substantial accordance with the 1905 architectural plan—authorized by Public Laws 242 and 406, 84th Congress, $4,065,000.

The architectural plan submitted to Congress in 1905 in House Document 385, 58th Congress, included, in addition to scheme B, the removal of the sandstone facing from the west central portion of the Capitol between the House and Senate wings and replacing of the sandstone facing with marble.

The deterioration of the sandstone on both the east and west fronts has progressed to a point where pieces of stone now drop off with the paint, as the paint scales off. The deterioration each year is becoming progressively worse.

Should the Commission decide to approve extension of the west central portion of the Capitol, as hereinafter proposed in this report, then the only portion of the west front which would have to be refaced with marble is the central section between the original north and south wings. Refacing of the original north and south wings with marble should be done only if such wings are not eventually to be extended. Because of the deteriorated condition of the sandstone on the west front, a decision with respect to its replacement is necessary.

If only the central section between the original north and south wings is refaced with marble at this time, the estimated cost of $4,065,000 would be reduced to $1,595,000.

ADDITIONS TO AND MODIFICATIONS OF 1905 ARCHITECTURAL PLAN—TO BE EFFECTED AT THE EAST SIDE OF THE CAPITOL—AUTHORIZED BY PUBLIC LAWS 242 AND 406, 84TH CONGRESS

3. Transportation terminals at the Capitol for the new Senate and House Office Buildings subway: $4,025,000.

Under funds provided for the additional Senate Office Building, a new subway and underground transportation system are about to be constructed between the Senate Office Buildings and the Capitol. This work is being performed under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission.

Under funds provided for the additional House Office Building project, new subways and underground transportation systems are to be constructed in the next several years between the three House Office Buildings and the Capitol. This work will be performed under the direction of the House Office Building Commission.

New terminals for these subways will have to be constructed in or adjacent to the Capitol and this work must be done under extension of the Capitol project funds.

The estimated cost of the proposed terminals is $4,025,000—of which, $1,900,000 are for the Senate terminal and $2,125,000 are for the House terminal.

4. Four-level, underground garage, providing parking accommodations for approximately 1,900 automobiles—to be constructed under the east plaza; also, vehicular tunnels providing entrance and exit to the garage from the north, south, and west: $41,970,000.

The serious problem of insufficient parking space and inadequate service facilities can best be solved by taking advantage of space underground. The architects recommend that the present use of the Capitol plaza as a parking lot, which mars the beauty of the eastern approach, be discontinued and that the plaza be replaced with landscaping suitable to the grandeur of the building.

There is an urgent need for adequate and modern service facilities. For more than 75 years, the Capitol has depended on two small sidewalk lifts at the east front of the Capitol for the conveyance of supplies, materials, and equipment into the building. The continued use of these service facilities is unsatisfactory from the standpoint of adequacy and efficiency.

It is recommended that a four-level underground garage, providing parking accommodations for approximately 1,900 cars be constructed under the East Plaza. It is also recommended that vehicular tunnels be provided, affording entry and exit to the garage from the north, south, and west.

With respect to the vehicular tunnels, it is proposed that a two-lane, one-way traffic tunnel enter the garage from the southwest to the second level down on the south end and exit to the northwest on the north end; that a two-lane, two-way traffic tunnel enter from D Street NE., under Delaware Avenue, to the north end of the third level down; and that a two-lane, two-way traffic tunnel, originating at D Street SE., under New Jersey Avenue SE., enter the garage at the south end of the third level down.

All three tunnels would serve as entrances and exits for automobiles of Members of Congress and their employees. Visitors' automobiles and taxi traffic would be restricted to the west tunnel, and service traffic would be restricted to the north and south tunnels.

If it should be desired by the Commission to provide an entrance and exit to the garage from the east, a two-lane, two-way tunnel can be constructed under East Capitol Street, entering the east end of the garage on the first level down, at an additional cost of $6 million.

Construction of this garage will not only eliminate parking on the Plaza and in other areas of the old Capitol grounds, but will eliminate the sidewalk lifts and provide in lieu thereof adequate modern and efficient underground service facilities.

Should it be desired not to construct the easterly portion of the garage, reducing parking accommodations from 1,900 to 1,100 cars, the estimated cost of the garage would be reduced by $8,243,000—or from $41,970,000 to $33,727,000.

5. Pedestrian tunnels connecting the Capitol with the Supreme Court Building and the Library of Congress buildings, $960,000.

It is proposed that pedestrian tunnels be constructed from the underground garage to the Supreme Court Building and the Library of Congress buildings in order to provide underground access to those buildings from the Capitol.

6. Scheme C: Includes scheme B and additions to and modifications of the 1905 architectural plan—to be effected at both the east and west sides of the Capitol.

Total, 1905 architectural plan modified to include additional improvements at the east side of the Capitol, $61,120,000.

Deduct the cost of the following work included under Item 2, 1905 Architectural Plan, not required under scheme C: Under scheme C, due to proposed extensions on the west side, the sandstone facing will not have to be removed from any part of the west central portion of the Capitol and replaced with marble, except the west wall of the portion of the central building located between the original north and south wings.

For work omitted under scheme C: Deduct $2,470,000.

Total: $58,650,000.

Extension of the basement story of the west central portion of the Capitol across the courtyards to the west terrace structure; also partial extension of the west terrace structure and relocation of west steps and approaches.

Extension of the original north and south wings of the west central portion of the Capitol and extension of the House and Senate connections—by erection of additions to these portions of the central structure, from the first floor to the attic floor, inclusive; also enlargement of the west portico—the new structures to be constructed of marble: $16,625,000.

Total, 1905 architectural plan modified to include additional improvements at both the east and west sides of the Capitol: $75,275,000.

General description, scheme C

In view of the fact that the extension of the east central front under scheme B will provide only 44,930 square feet of additional space out of a total of 139,250 square feet of additional space required, the associate architects studied the advisability of making extensions on the west side of the Capitol to provide the additional needed space.

There have been no additions to the Capitol since construction of the terraces in 1884–1892. With the vast growth that has occurred in the Nation, the National Capital, and the work of the Congress since that time, adequate relief from existing deficiencies in office, committee, and other facilities cannot be provided simply through the extension of the east front.

It is proposed to extend the basement story of the west central portion of the Capitol, across the courtyards, to the west terrace structure. It is also proposed to partially extend the west terrace structure and to relocate the west steps and approaches. It is further proposed to extend the original north and south wings of the west central portion of the Capitol, and the House and Senate connections, by erection of additions to these portions of the central structure, from the first floor to the attic floor, inclusive; also, to enlarge the west portico.

The new extensions would be constructed of marble on a base of granite, in keeping with the Senate and House wings.

As the west central section between the original north and south wings would be retained in its present location, from the first floor level up, the present sandstone facing of this portion of the building would be replaced with marble.

The proposed additions to the original north and south wings will not extend westward beyond the undisturbed central portion between the wings.

Extension of the west front will provide the following or comparable additional space: 55 office rooms and 8 committee rooms with anterooms (or in lieu thereof, 79 office rooms), 2 document rooms, 7 storage rooms, increased accommodations for the Senate Library, increased accommodations for the Senate and House restaurants.

Scheme C provides not only additional office, committee, and other related space, but also provides private unbroken circulation on each floor, from end to end of the building, for Members of Congress; more efficient underground service to the building and the kitchens; and a satisfactory solution to the problem of mechanical transportation to the floors of the House and Senate Chambers.

Under scheme C, it is proposed to install in the west side of the Capitol, 2 elevators and an ascending and descending escalator in the extended Senate connection; 2 elevators and an ascending and descending escalator in the extended House connection; and 2 elevators and an ascending and descending escalator in the central portion west of the rotunda. In addition, 2 service elevators are to be provided—1 for the House and 1 for the Senate.

Restaurant facilities, scheme C

Under scheme C, it is proposed to relocate the House and Senate restaurant facilities to the west terrace; and to provide, in lieu of present accommodations, Senate restaurant dining facilities with seating accommodations for 330 persons; House restaurant dining facilities with 440 seating accommodations; and joint restaurant facilities for 535 employees and visitors—a grand total seating accommodation for 1,305 persons. This compares with present total seating accommodations for 622 persons.

The new restaurant facilities will be provided by relocating the west central steps from their present position to a position on the axis of the House and Senate connections and by extending to the line of the relocated steps the central marble section of the terrace, already provided with windows, and relocating the restaurant in this part of the terrace structure. Relocation of the restaurant in this section of the terrace will provide diners with an outlook over the Mall.

Recapitulation, scheme C

A summary of proposed additional accommodations to be provided on the east and west sides of the Capitol under scheme C follows:

Additional accommodations	East	West	Total
Office rooms	54	55	[1] 109
Committee rooms with anterooms		8	[1] 8
Document rooms (House and Senate)	10		10
Storage rooms	9	7	16
Dining rooms:			
Senate facilities, seating accommodations for 330 persons.			
House facilities, seating accommodations for 440 persons.			
Joint facilities for employees and visitors, seating accommodations for 535 persons.			
Increased accommodations for Senate Library.			

[1] If the 8 committee rooms with anterooms are eliminated, a total of 133 office rooms can be provided.

The interior arrangements proposed are subject to further study and the subdivisions are indicated merely as a possible guide to the use of the space. The architects realize that assignment of space in the Capitol can only be accomplished by the Congress through its officers and committees. When a final scheme is decided upon, the architects would expect to work very closely with the Commission of Congress in charge of the project and the Architect of the Capitol, in order to arrive at the best subdivision of the interior space to fulfill the requirements of the Senate, the House, and the public.

ADDITIONS TO AND MODIFICATIONS OF 1905 ARCHITECTURAL PLAN—TO BE EFFECTED AT THE EAST SIDE OF THE CAPITOL—AUTHORIZED BY PUBLIC LAWS 242 AND 406, 84TH CONGRESS—FOR WHICH ESTIMATES OF COSTS ARE NOT PRESENTLY AVAILABLE

1. Communications center

Studies have been made providing for the construction of an underground vault, adjacent to the Capitol and under the east central steps extended, to serve as a communications center for Capitol Hill, with sufficient space for present and anticipated future needs. In planning the east front improvements, space has been reserved for such a vault, but plans and estimates of cost have not been sufficiently developed to submit to the Commission at this time.

This vault, if not required for use as a communications center, could be effectively used for storage purposes by the House and Senate.

2. Underpinning

The contemplated extensions of the Capitol have been so planned as to minimize the disturbance of existing foundations. The project will have to be studied further before requirements for underpinning can be ascertained. Underpinning will necessarily be affected to some extent by the staging and manner of performance of the construction work.

3. Landscape treatment of the Capitol Grounds

Since a decision with respect to a particular scheme for the landscape treatment of the grounds is not imperative at this time, it is proposed to submit to the Commission at a later date, plans for the landscape treatment of the grounds, after they have been agreed upon by the Architect of the Capitol, the landscape architects, and the advisory group of architects.

Two preliminary studies have been developed by the landscape architects for the landscape treatment of the Capitol Grounds to effect a redesign of the grounds made

necessary by the proposed extension of the east front of the Capitol. It is estimated that either of these redesigns would cost approximately $5 million.

The preliminary studies propose the construction of a large paved plaza to the east of the building, extending from the north side of the Senate wing to the south side of the House wing, with a fountain or fountains as a feature of the plaza. It is proposed that this new plaza area be restricted to pedestrian traffic. It will be so designed, however, that on emergency or other occasions, the weight of vehicular traffic may be sustained and access by fire apparatus and other emergency equipment will be possible. The plans for the new plaza provide for the preservation of the historic trees in the Capitol Grounds.

4. Repairs to Capitol dome

As a result of the survey and examination of the Capitol dome made by the engineering firm of Seelye, Stevenson, Value & Knecht, under contract of June 11, 1956, repairs to improve the stability of the Capitol dome have been recommended.

Plans and specifications for such repairs are now being prepared by Seelye, Stevenson, Value & Knecht under contract of July 2, 1957.

It is proposed to erect interior scaffolding to inspect the Brumidi fresco painting in the eye of the dome; to remove the copper covering from above the painting and to examine the condition of the plaster and iron frame structure containing the painting; and to make any repairs found necessary.

In addition to other necessary interior and exterior repairs, it is proposed to scaffold the exterior of the dome and to remove the rib covering from the upper exterior portion of the dome; to examine the ironwork beneath the rib covering and to make repairs to such ironwork as may be found necessary.

This work may cost in the neighborhood of $300,000, due largely to the costliness of the exterior and interior scaffolding of the dome required for these repairs.

This work should be coordinated with other east front improvements proposed under the extension of the Capitol project.

5. Replacement of lighting fixtures and wiring in existing Capitol Building

Under funds allowed in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955, a survey and study were made of the existing illumination of the Capitol Building, by Willard W. Thompson, lighting consultant, under contract of May 23, 1955, with a view to improving the illumination of the Capitol.

The findings made under this report should now be coordinated with the lighting and power requirements of the proposed extensions of the Capitol; also, with the plans for converting the Capitol from 25-cycle alternating and direct current to 60-cycle alternating current under the Capitol Power Plant changes and improvements projects.

It is proposed to have such further studies made under the extension of the Capitol program; and when coordinated preliminary plans and estimates of cost are completed, recommendations will be submitted to the Extension of the Capitol Commission for improving the illumination of the lighting of the Capitol through replacement of existing lighting fixtures and wiring with properly designed fixtures.

SECTION 3. CONSOLIDATED TABLE OF ESTIMATED COSTS OF PROPOSED CHANGES AND IMPROVEMENTS

1. Scheme B, extension of east central front of Capitol, architectural plan, 1905, House Document 385, 58th Congress:

Extension of the east central portion of the Capitol, approximately 32 feet 6 inches, and construction of new extension in marble—in substantial accordance with scheme B of the 1905 architectural plan—authorized by Public Laws 242 and 406, 84th Congress: $10,100,000.

2. Refacing west front of Capitol, architectural plan, 1905, House Document 385, 58th Congress:

Removal of sandstone facing from the west central portion of the Capitol between the House and Senate wings, and replacing the sandstone facing with marble—in substantial accordance with the 1905 architectural plan—authorized by Public Laws 242 and 406, 84th Congress: $4,065,000.

Total, substantial effectuation of 1905 architectural plan: $14,165,000.

ADDITIONS TO AND MODIFICATIONS OF 1905 ARCHITECTURAL PLAN—TO BE EFFECTED AT THE EAST SIDE OF THE CAPITOL—AUTHORIZED BY PUBLIC LAWS 242 AND 406, 84TH CONGRESS

3. Transportation terminals at the Capitol for the new Senate and House Office Buildings subways: $4,025,000.

Total: $18,190,000.

4. Four-level underground garage, providing parking accommodations for approximately 1,900 automobiles—to be constructed under the east plaza; also, vehicular tunnels providing entrance and exit to the garage from the north, south, and west: $41,970,000.[1] [2]

Total: $60,160,000.

5. Pedestrian tunnels connecting the Capitol with the Supreme Court Building and the Library of Congress Buildings: $960,000.

Total, 1905 architectural plan modified to include additional improvements at the east side of the Capitol: $61,120,000.[3] [4]

6. Scheme C: Includes scheme B and additions to and modifications of the 1905 architectural plan—to be effected at both the east and west sides of the Capitol.

Brought forward: Total, 1905 architectural plan modified to include additional improvements at the east side of the Capitol: $61,120,000.

Deduct the cost of the following work included under item 2—1905 architectural plan—not required under scheme C:

Under scheme C, due to proposed extensions on the west side, the sandstone facing will not have to be removed from any part of the west central portion of the Capitol and replaced with marble, except the west wall of the portion of the central building located between the original north and south wings.

For work omitted under scheme C, deduct: $2,470,000.

Total: $58,650,000.

Extension of the basement story of the west central portion of the Capitol across the courtyards to the west terrace structure; also partial extension of the west terrace structure and relocation of west steps and approaches.

Extension of the original north and south wings of the west central portion of the Capitol and extension of the House and Senate connections—by erection of additions to these portions of the central structure, from the first floor to the attic floor, inclusive; also enlargement of the west portico—the new structures to be constructed of marble: $16,625,000.

Total, 1905 architectural plan modified to include additional improvements at both the east and west sides of the Capitol: $75,275,000.[3] [4]

SECTION 4. RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENTS

The Architect of the Capitol, in submitting to the Commission the foregoing proposals of the associate architects for the accomplishment of the extension of the Capitol project, recommends the adoption of scheme C, embracing all improvements proposed for both the east and west sides of the Capitol, at an estimated cost of $75,275,000 on the basis of preliminary plans completed to date.

The Architect of the Capitol also recommends approval, as an integral part of the project, of the items of underground vault for communications center, underpinning of the Capitol, landscape treatment of the Capitol Grounds, repairs to the Capitol dome, and replacement of lighting fixtures and wiring in the existing Capitol Building, including additional fees, administrative and contingent expenses, for which preliminary plans and estimates of cost have not yet been completed—expected to bring the total estimated cost of the project to $110 million.

This recommendation is concurred in by the associate architects and by the advisory group of architects. Mr. Arthur Brown, Jr., a member of the advisory group, died July 7, 1957, but concurred in these recommendations before his death.

Thomas U. Walter, the fourth Architect of the Capitol, who designed and supervised the construction of the Senate and House Wings and the present cast iron dome, strongly urged the extension of the central portion of the Capitol eastward in 1863. Since that time, such extension has been recommended by every Architect of the Capitol who has succeeded Mr. Walter; also, by consulting architects retained to study and report upon the problem.

The present Architect of the Capitol feels that he may aptly express his opinion in these words, uttered by Speaker Joe Cannon in ad-

---

[1] If the easterly portion of the four-level underground garage is not constructed, reducing parking accommodations from 1,900 to 1,100 automobiles, deduct $8,243,000 from the $41,970,000 estimated cost of the garage and vehicular tunnels.

[2] If additional vehicular tunnel is constructed, providing entrance and exit to garage from the east, add $6,000,000 to the $41,970,000 estimated cost of the garage and vehicular tunnels.

[3] In addition to the total of $75,275,000 proposed to be obligated, an amount of $2,161,426 has already been obligated for architectural, engineering, and consulting services, administrative expenses, test borings and test pits.

[4] The total of $75,275,000 proposed to be obligated, does not include the following items for which preliminary plans and estimates of cost have not yet been fully developed, which are expected to bring the total estimated cost of the project to $110,000,000: Underground vault for communications center (alternate use: House and Senate storage); underpinning of Capitol; landscape treatment of Capitol grounds; repairs to Capitol dome; replacement of lighting fixtures and wiring in existing Capitol building; additional architectural, engineering and consultant fees, dependent upon the scope of the project approved; miscellaneous administrative expenses and contingencies until completion of project.

NOTE.—No plans and estimates of cost are presently available with respect to a large storage vault proposed to be constructed under the east plaza, in addition to the above improvements, and accordingly no amount has been included for this item in the grand total estimated project cost of $110,000,000. The most estimates used in this report are preliminary estimates, based on preliminary drawings and on such information as now available concerning existing building and site conditions and on prices as of April 1957, and are subject to further adjustment upon completion of contract drawings and specifications developed in accordance with approved scope of project and approved sequence and staging of construction work.

dessing the House of Representatives on February 10, 1903:

"The intelligent and patriotic and industrious service by every Congress for two years, well equipped from every standpoint and with every aid, would more than save the cost of the Capitol extension. * * * So it is really economy instead of extravagance."

When the Architect of the Capitol engaged the services of the advisory group of architects and of the associate architects and engineers, he emphasized that the individual thinking of each architect and engineer was needed in studying the most effective manner in which to accomplish the proposed extension of the Capitol as directed by the Congress, and that there would be no restrictions imposed on their approach in attaining such accomplishment.

The recommendations of the associate architects and engineers and of the advisory group of architects, as submitted in this report, represent the coordination, development and refinement of the thinking of the various architects and engineers, attained through collaboration, study and conference over a long period. Their recommendations represent the work of men dedicated to the preservation of the architectural dignity and majesty of the United States Capitol, while carrying out their commission to accomplish authorized changes and improvements in a manner to serve effectively the needs of the Congress, now and in the future.

The architects and engineers formulated their plans with a view to providing improvements that would directly benefit the membership of the House and the Senate with respect to their space needs, and particularly with a view to supplying space shortage needs in areas close to the House and Senate Chambers.

Perhaps the sentiment of the architects and engineers may be expressed in the words of Dr. Charles Moore, in his introduction to Glenn Brown's History of the United States Capitol:

"Historically the Capitol at Washington is the most important structure in the United States. Other buildings, such as the Old South Church in Boston and Independence Hall in Philadelphia, are connected with important episodes in the history of this country. The Capitol is unique in that it both typifies the beginning and also marks the growth of the Nation. Like the great Gothic cathedrals of Europe, its surpassing merit is not its completeness, but its aspirations. Like them, too, the Capitol is not a creation, but a growth, and its highest value lies in the fact that it never was, and it never will be, finished."

The architects and engineers have all given their time and interests, wholeheartedly, to this project; have worked as a team; and have striven through their combined efforts to attain the best possible results in the interest of the Congress and the Nation.

The Architect of the Capitol highly commends to the Commission the work of the Associate Architects and Engineers, the Advisory Group of Architects, the Landscape Architects, and of all others engaged in connection with this project; and, in expressing appreciation of their work, commends them as an outstanding group of professional men.

In recommending these improvements, the Architect of the Capitol is confident that when the proposed extensions of the Capitol are completed, the dome of the Capitol, which has for so many years served as a symbol of freedom throughout the world, will be, as it always has been, the dominant and inspiring feature of this great building.

PART III

SECTION 1.—*Proposed schedule for staging of construction work, east and west sides of Capitol*

	Propose to let contract	Propose to complete work
Marble and granite quarrying, cutting, and carving.	January 1958	January 1961.
Underground garage:		
Relocation of utilities	April 1958	November 1958.
Excavation and foundation	November 1958	November 1959.
Structure (4 levels)	December 1959	May 1961.
Vehicular tunnels:		
North and south tunnels	April 1958	April 1959.
West tunnel	May 1960	May 1961.
Transportation terminals:		
Senate subway	January 1959	January 1960.
House subways	July 1960	July 1961.
Pedestrian tunnels: Connecting Capitol with Library of Congress Buildings and Supreme Court Building.	June 1960	June 1961.
East front extension:		
Substructure	January 1959	January 1960.
Superstructure	January 1960	January 1962.
West front extension:		
Substructure	July 1959	July 1960.
Superstructure	February 1961	July 1963.
West terrace extensions and relocating west steps.	July 1959	October 1960.
Alterations within Capitol Building, including attic changes, basement level changes, House and Senate connections.	October 1961	December 1962.

NOTE.—Conversion of electrical lighting and power systems and other electrical equipment in the Capitol Building from 25-cycle alternating and direct current to 60-cycle alternating current—under Capitol Power Plant changes and improvements project—expected to start in September 1958 and to be completed in 1960.

NOTE.—Proposed schedule to be presented at a later date for those previously indicated items for which preliminary plans and estimates of cost have not yet been completed.

SECTION 2.—*Proposed schedule of obligations, construction work, east and west sides of Capitol*

Obligations	Fiscal year 1958	Fiscal year 1959	Fiscal year 1960	Fiscal year 1961	Fiscal year 1962
Marble and granite quarrying, cutting, carving	$4,967,000				
Underground garage:					
Relocation of utilities	800,000				
Excavation and foundation		$7,500,000			
Structure (4 levels)			$20,930,000		
Vehicular tunnels:					
North and south tunnels	9,290,000				
West tunnel			3,450,000		
Transportation terminals:					
Senate Subway		1,900,000			
House Subways				$2,125,000	
Pedestrian tunnels: Connecting Capitol with Library of Congress Buildings and Supreme Court Building			960,000		
East front extension:					
Substructure		$1,417,400			
Superstructure			$6,087,600		
West front extension:					
Substructure			1,449,200		
Superstructure				$7,462,000	
West terrace extensions and relocating west steps			3,652,000		
Alterations within Capitol Building (including attic changes); and basement level changes, House and Senate connections					$3,284,800
Total obligations	15,057,000	10,817,400	36,528,800	9,587,000	3,284,800
Grand total obligations, fiscal years 1958 to 1962, inclusive					75,275,000

NOTE.—Obligations are predicated on preliminary estimates of cost based on preliminary drawings completed to date and on other information now available concerning the existing building and site conditions, and on prices as of April 1957.

No obligations are included for those previously indicated items for which preliminary plans and estimates of cost have not been completed, estimated to increase the total obligations from $75,275,000 to $110,000,000.

SECTION 3.—*Proposed schedule of expenditures, construction work, east and west sides of Capitol*

	Fiscal year 1958	Fiscal year 1959	Fiscal year 1960	Fiscal year 1961	Fiscal year 1962	Fiscal year 1963	Total
Marble and granite quarrying, cutting, carving	$1,000,000	$1,250,000	$1,500,000	$1,217,000			$4,967,000
Underground garage:							
Relocation of utilities	300,000	500,000					800,000
Excavation and foundation		3,000,000	4,500,000				7,500,000
Structure (4 levels)			6,900,000	14,030,000			20,930,000
Vehicular tunnels:							
North and south tunnels	3,000,000	6,290,000					9,290,000
West tunnel				3,450,000			3,450,000

SECTION 3.—*Proposed schedule of expenditures, construction work, east and west sides of Capitol*—Continued

	Fiscal year 1958	Fiscal year 1959	Fiscal year 1960	Fiscal year 1961	Fiscal year 1962	Fiscal year 1963	Total
Transportation terminals:							
Senate subway		950,000	950,000				1,900,000
House subways				2,125,000			2,125,000
Pedestrian tunnels:							
Connecting Capitol with Library of Congress buildings and Supreme Court Building				960,000			960,000
East front extension:							
Substructure		717,400	700,000				1,417,400
Superstructure			1,500,000	2,595,900	$1,991,700		6,087,600
West front extension:							
Substructure			362,300	1,086,900			1,449,200
Superstructure				2,823,500	3,080,700	$1,557,800	7,462,000
West terrace extensions and relocating west steps			2,435,000	1,217,000			3,652,000
Alterations within Capitol Building (including attic changes); and basement level changes, House and Senate connections					1,642,400	1,642,400	3,284,800
Total	4,300,000	12,707,400	18,847,300	29,505,300	6,714,800	3,200,200	75,275,000

NOTE.—Additional expenditures required for architectural and engineering consultant services, administrative and contingent expenses.

PART IV

SECTION 1. POSSIBILITIES FOR FURTHER FUTURE EXPANSION, AFTER CHANGES AND IMPROVEMENTS AUTHORIZED BY PUBLIC LAWS 242 AND 406, 84TH CONGRESS, HAVE BEEN ACCOMPLISHED

Recognizing that in the years to come further extensions of the Capitol may be necessary to meet future needs of the Congress, the associate architects and engineers and the advisory group, at the request of the Architect of the Capitol, have planned the changes and improvements authorized by Public Law 242 and Public Law 406, 84th Congress, in such a manner as to permit such future extensions.

Just as the first Architect of the Capitol in 1793 could not foresee the growth of the Capitol that would be necessary in the next 60 years; and Thomas U. Walter, during the Civil War, could not foresee that in the next 100 years, despite the removal of the Supreme Court, the Library of Congress and the congressional offices from the Capitol, more space would be desperately needed; even so in 1957 the associate architects cannot foresee all the needs of the next 100 years. The present extensions have been planned so that future architects are not prevented from extending the Capitol in a logical manner to meet the needs of future generations and in a manner to preserve its architectural dignity.

The associate architects suggest the following as possible solutions to future needs for expansion:

1. Extension of the present Senate and House wings to the east a distance approximately equal to eastward extension of the east front.[1]

2. Wings extended north from the north portico of the Senate wing, and south from the south portico of the House wing.[1]

3. An extension north and south of the present terrace on the east side.

4. An extension northwest and southwest of the present terrace on the west side.

5. The addition of a lower level in the present terrace by changing the grade to permit windows.

The advisory group of architects strongly recommends that, when further extensions of the Capitol become necessary in the future, such extensions be accomplished by extending the Senate and House wings eastward, approximately the same distance as the east central front is extended—as such extension, in their judgment, will result in a contribution to the beauty and dignity of the Capitol.

[1] These extensions individually or in combination would make possible an enlargement of the present Senate and House Chambers and adjacent supporting space.

PART V

CONCLUSIONS

The Architect of the Capitol has now proceeded with work under the extension of the Capitol project as far as he may feasibly do so without further direction from the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol.

The Architect of the Capitol therefore respectfully requests the decision of the Commission with respect to the following:

1. Approval of program, criteria, and scope of project.

2. Approval of preliminary plans and estimates of cost.

3. Authorization for the Architect of the Capitol to direct the associate architects and Engineers to proceed with the preparation of contract drawings and specifications in substantial accordance with the preliminary plans.

4. Authorization for the Architect of the Capitol to enter into such contracts as may be necessary for the accomplishment of the construction work—such contracts to be on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis, selective bidding basis, or open competitive bidding basis—dependent upon which type of contract will best serve the interests of the Government in the performance of the particular work involved.

5. The extent to which the Commission wishes the Architect of the Capitol to confer with members of the Commission in the letting of construction contracts.

6. Approval of the staging of the work, in general, as proposed.

7. Approval of proposed obligations and expenditures.

8. Approval of use of $110 million as the present estimated total cost of the project—for purposes of the 1959 budget, which requires a total projected cost to be shown.

9. Authorization to request an additional appropriation of $5 million for the fiscal year in the 1959 budget.

10. Approval of marble to be used in the east and west extensions.

11. Disposition of the old Aquia Creek sandstone to be removed from the east and west central fronts.

12. Authorization to proceed with the work of repairs to the dome—both interior and exterior.

13. Authorization to continue with the development of preliminary plans and estimates of cost for the proposed communications center, landscape treatment of the Capitol Grounds, and replacement of lighting fixtures and other items required for the improved illumination of the Capitol.

14. Authorization to prepare a directive, or directives, for the signatures of Speaker RAYBURN and Senate Minority Leader KNOWLAND, on behalf of the Commission, as agreed to at meeting of the Commission on March 26, 1956, to carry out decisions reached with respect to present report.

15. Issuance of press releases—also, release of present report to the press.

As indicated to the Commission in this report, the estimates of cost are preliminary estimates of cost based on preliminary drawings completed to date and on such other information as now available concerning existing building and site conditions, and on prices as of April 1957, and are subject to further adjustment upon completion of contract drawings and specifications developed in accordance with the approved scope of the project and the approved sequence and staging of construction work.

In this connection, it may be stated that the improvements have been so programed as to permit the holding of the 1961 inaugural ceremonies at the west front of the Capitol, should such ceremonies be desired to be held at the Capitol for the next inauguration.

Staging of the construction work constitutes a major problem, in view of the fact that the proposed construction work must be performed while the building continues to be occupied, that functions now operating in the building must continue to operate in the Capitol, that adequate means of access to the building must be maintained at all times, that provision must be made for delivery of supplies, materials, and equipment to the building, that traffic to and from the Capitol must be regulated, and that emergency vehicles must have ready access to the building at all times.

Performance of the proposed construction work at the Capitol does not present the simple solution that exists in cases where activities and functions may be transferred, temporarily, in whole or part, to other quarters—such as in the case of the remodeling of the White House.

The staging of the work has been so planned that contracts for the construction work would be let progressively during the next 5 years as contract drawings and specifications for the various parts of the project are completed; performance of the construction work would extend over a period of the next 6 or 7 years, and expenditures for construction work would be prorated accordingly over a similar period. Appropriations would be requested, based on expenditures proposed during such 7-year period. The work, as programed, will require an additional appropriation of $5 million to be requested in the 1959 budget.

JAMES W. MURPHY AND THE CORPS OF OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES OF THE SENATE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, during the course of my official duties as chairman of the Legislative Subcommittee on Appropriations, I had occasion to examine into and learn more, in particular,

about the marvelous work of the Official Reporters of debates of the Senate. I was so greatly impressed with their very fine record of service, the volume of their work, their devoted attention to their professional duties, and their professional pride that I determined to make special note of their work and make some comments on it in the Senate.

Without going into detail, these gentlemen, headed by our esteemed Chief Reporter, Hon. James W. Murphy, render us a service which is partly unnoticed. However, it is extremely important and far reaching. Their service is of the very highest quality.

It was a special pleasure to our subcommittee to hear, from the lips of Mr. Murphy, the very fine outline which he presented relating to the work of the Official Reporters' Office. He submitted a modest request for some small increases in the salaries of the Official Reporters of debates, not including himself.

I have never seen a finer example of professional pride, professional honor, and a consuming desire to serve in his profession those by whom he is employed than was manifested in the heart-to-heart talk with Mr. Murphy.

I also know that he was reflecting the sentiments, the ideals, the responsibilities, and the oldtime sense of personal pride in their work of the other reporters on the staff.

They not only do a marvelous quality of work, but the volume of it in the course of the year is astonishing. The number of hours of service required of them is almost double the time required by the service performed by comparable officers in the House of Representatives—and they are a very fine group, indeed. Not only does their service require them to be on duty for many hours, but at times the continuity of that service is not broken for days on end. They work day and night, day after day. I wish to commend them highly.

I believe I speak the sentiments of all Senators, especially those who have come in close contact with the corps of reporters, and who have some conception of the total of the services which they render. I emphasize again their very high personal quality, their professional skill, and their effort.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR KNOWLAND, MINORITY LEADER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, some years ago a father sent a letter to the president of a girls' college in the East, making application for the enrollment of his charming daughter. In due course he forwarded the application blank. There was a line in the application blank which raised this question: "Is your daughter a good leader?"

When the father filled out the blank, he wrote: "I do not know whether my daughter is a good leader, but I know she is a good follower."

It was not very long before the father received a letter from the president of the college in which he said: "We are delighted to have your daughter as a student in this college. In going over all the applications for enrollment in the new class, we find that we are to have 299 leaders and 1 follower." [Laughter.]

I think of that anecdote often in terms of the responsibilities of the majority leader, and particularly the minority leader, who is, in truth and fact, the administration's spokesman on this floor, and the diversity of interests with which those leaders must be familiar.

It is indeed a difficult thing for the minority leader always to summon and command the maximum vote for a given administration policy. I am satisfied that in his experience there are moments of frustration. We have our individual viewpoints, our problems at home, our convictions on policies, our differences of opinion. Such moments afford a real test of leadership.

By that standard, the Senator from California has been, in every sense, one of the great leaders who have graced this body. His integrity and character have impressed themselves upon the membership of the Senate, upon the staff, and upon all those who are a part of the senatorial family. He has had a constant appreciation of the views and problems of those for whom he speaks as leader of the minority. His boundless energy has always caused me to be somewhat envious. I thought I was endowed with a reasonable amount of physical energy. However, I have never encountered his superior in the stamina and the vigor which he brings to his job. He is skilled and resourceful in the best sense of the word. He is competent and able and has the broad perspective of a true leader. The discharge of his responsibilities requires him to endure long hours of service and to make many sacrifices.

I think I speak the sentiments of all Senators on this side of the aisle, as well as all those on the other side of the aisle, when I say that we salute and pay tribute to a great and indomitable minority leader for the magnificent, able, and sturdy job he has done in carrying the flag for this administration, and for his matchless courage in asserting those deep convictions which are prompted by but one interest, and that is the present and future well-being of this Republic.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in his words of commendation of the minority leader.

I am a few years older than is the Senator from California, but I stand in awe of his wisdom and ability. He has devoted many hours to the tasks involved in serving the Republican Party in this capacity. He has devoted himself to his duty winter and summer, spring and fall. He was able to be present at the wedding of his charming daughter, but he denied himself the pleasure of attending the many receptions and parties given in her honor, in order to be present on the floor of the Senate to look after the affairs of our beloved Nation.

I commend him for the fine service he has rendered as minority leader of the Republican Party.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as the newest Member on the Republican side, I had a rare opportunity to observe our minority leader in action in connection with the consideration of the civil-rights bill, a historic development in this Chamber.

In addition to paying tribute to the minority leader, I should like to state a few facts. I have participated in many negotiating conferences; but never, in all my experience, professionally, as a State official, as a Member of Congress, and as a trial lawyer, have I seen conferences so full of drama and real tension as the Republican conferences which dealt with the particular problem of the civil-rights bill.

A man less honorable or less fully accepted as possessing complete integrity would have found every one of those conferences breaking up in complete discord and confusion. However, because of the great respect which the minority leader commands from Members on this side of the aisle, as well as those on the other side of the aisle, whether they agree with him or not, it was possible to keep the conferences together, and, what is even more remarkable, to arrive at a result. I think this is a signal achievement of the first order.

Second, the handling of the civil-rights measure on the floor of the Senate required the kind of fortitude which the minority leader showed, and the kind of stick-to-it-iveness which he exhibited in getting the bill on the calendar and finally having action upon it completed.

Often the situation seemed hopeless and frustrating. Often the minority leader took what would have been to a lesser man crushing defeats. I think our reverse in connection with part III was a very serious defeat. The fact that the bill as it passed the Senate did not contain that part, although the House version included it, would have made a lesser man quit; but not the minority leader.

The profound integrity of the minority leader and the great degree of fortitude exhibited by him command my deep respect and sincere affection.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Rochambeau's monument opposite the White House, there is engraved a quotation:

> We have been contemporaries and fellow laborers in the cause of liberty and we have lived together as brothers should do, in harmonious friendship.

There is a quotation taken from a letter written by George Washington to Rochambeau.

I was a veteran in the Senate when BILL KNOWLAND came along. Now he is a veteran, and I am a youngster. Of course he has had all the worries and fears and doubts. I remember when he came to the Senate. I can still see him: he was a little slenderer than he is now, and full of vim and energy, and radiating the sunshine of the west coast. He brought with him his delightful wife.

Through the years, sitting here as I have been, watching the interchange—the play, if you please—between these two men, the majority leader and the minority leader, I have been kept young by observing them in their efforts to forward the business of the Senate, and by noting how they get along in spite of conflict of interest at times. Yes, I agree that BILL KNOWLAND is a great

"guy," a man who has control of himself. That is probably the test of whether a man grows through the years. I have seen the blood flush to his temples and I have heard his tongue say nothing; until he cooled off, and then it was a calm voice that spoke.

I have seen him make the Republican Senators one group in furthering effective programs; I have heard him in caucus meetings, always clear. I know that the President has had the benefit of his wise judgment.

What more can be said, except that he is a good fellow? We know that up ahead there is great adventure for him, because he has the mentality that balances facts. He is not a lawyer, and yet in many respects he is a better lawyer than some of us who practice law, because he can see the issue and apply the legal principles involved.

Now, just a word about the majority leader. He has intrigued me. As I say, I have sat back and watched these two contemporaries, fellow laborers in the cause of liberty. I am glad to know that the majority leader has recovered his health. As I say, I have been intrigued by the way he can whip his group into line, and he does a grand job. I am happy that I can call both of these distinguished commoners of America my friends.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, apropos the remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin, I must admit that after one all-night session and another one running until 1 o'clock in the morning, I feel more like a contemporary of Rochambeau than of BILL KNOWLAND. [Laughter.]

Nevertheless, I still have enough energy left to say that this has been one of the most satisfactory sessions of the Senate in which I have been privileged to sit—and I believe this in my ninth Congress in which I have served. Although the length of the session has disturbed some of us, I believe its accomplishments have justified the extra weeks.

I, too, should like to say that the satisfactory results of the session have been due largely to the splendid and determined efforts of the minority leader, Senator KNOWLAND.

I have seldom seen such astute handling of legislation as has been displayed by the majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], particularly in the last major bit of legislation, the civil-rights bill. I do not know of any session of which I have been a Member when there have been fewer unkind words spoken by Members of the Senate. I hope the example we have set this year will continue not only through next year, but into the future.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues this morning with respect to the leadership of the Senate. I believe it would be improper to mention one without mentioning the other, because the leadership has been outstanding on both sides of the aisle.

I particularly wish to pay my tribute to Senator KNOWLAND, who has guided the Republican side of the Senate through a very difficult session of Congress. I am sure that all the things which a leader does are not appreciated. I am sure that they are not rewarded.

I want to say to you, Bill, that in the hearts of all your colleagues on this side of the aisle we know you have done a wonderful job, and that at least this once we want to thank you for your devotion to it.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, before I suggest the absence of a quorum, I wish to associate myself with all the wonderful things that have been said about the leadership on both sides of the aisle. I had the distinct privilege during the fall of having my State of Nevada honored by the presence of both the majority and minority leaders. In Nevada we think a great deal of both of them. The Vice President of the United States and the minority leader, both from my sister State of California, showed the rare good judgment in picking for their helpmates, their wives, two Nevada girls. That is a real tribute to their respective sagacity.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say that they both happened to have been born in the same town in Nevada.

Mr. BIBLE. That is correct. They were both born in Ely, Nev.

Mr. WILEY. And both wanted to emigrate. [Laughter.]

Mr. BIBLE. I am sure both want to come back to Nevada. After these tributes to the able leadership on both sides of the aisle—and I know it has been strong and excellent leadership—I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED INCREASE IN POSTAL RATES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding proposed postal-increase legislation recommended by the President and the Postmaster General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Is there objection?

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR COOPER

The Senate is faced with a grave responsibility and has an obligation to consider immediately the postal rate-increase legislation recommended by President Eisenhower and Postmaster General Summerfield.

I am informed that about 12 congressional committees are engaged in investigating the Post Office Department. While I am sure that their objective is to be helpful and to make suggestions for the improvement of the postal service, I submit that the greatest need of the postal service of our Nation is a modernized postal-rate structure.

Recently I have received much correspondence criticizing the so-called subsidy which is received by individuals using third-class mail. Doubtless some of this mail is desirable to maintain our economy because it encourages business. However, much of this third-class mail has been characterized as mail not used for or desired by the recipient. For the reason that third-class mailers enjoy a subsidy of about $250 million annually, I believe a reasonable postal-rate increase as proposed by the Postmaster General is not only desirable but necessary. Correspondence I have received indicates that the taxpayers do not wish to support this subsidy for the users of third-class mail, many of whom are enjoying today the greatest prosperity and the highest profits they have ever received.

A cent increase for individual mailings of third-class mail or an increase of 1 cent over a year period for bulk mailings of third-class mail is fair and reasonable. This modest increase will produce about $112 million in additional postal revenues.

THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AND THE FLOOD CRISIS IN KENTUCKY

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement of the work of the Small Business Administration during the flood crisis in Kentucky.

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

Flood waters during the period January 29–31, 1957, ravaged eastern Kentucky. There was some loss of life, and property losses ran into the millions. Government as well as private forces promptly moved to mobilize for reconstruction purposes.

The Small Business Administration moved immediately to make available, directly and in cooperation with banks, disaster loans for rehabilitation of losses sustained, whether real or personal, to business and the individual home owner. Mr. James G. Garwick, Regional Director of the Cleveland, Ohio office, James C. Daniels, Manager of the Louisville branch office, and Mr. Anton Dick, Coordinator of Disaster Loan Activities, Washington, D. C., office made a number of personal visits into the stricken areas, to ascertain the extent of needed financial assistance. Mr. John A. Pucel, Disaster Loan Specialist of the Cleveland regional office collaborating with Mr. Anton Dick, arranged all details for opening of field offices in strategic and convenient locations. Field offices were opened in Pikeville, Hazard, and Barbourville, Ky., on or about February 11, 1957. A suboffice was also opened in Prestonburg, Ky.

Mr. Garwick, Mr. Dick, and Mr. Pucel conferred with the leading bankers in Louisville and Lexington, Ky. and solicited their aid in furnishing qualified bank credit personnel, on a rotation basis, to assist in the rehabilitation program. Meetings were also held in the field with the bankers in the affected areas for the purpose of explaining in detail the disaster loan participation program from the Washington level as well as the regional office level, and with few exceptions the banks cooperated wholeheartedly. Qualified credit men were made available from the banks in Louisville and Lexington to serve in the field offices and the banks in the affected areas not only participated but also made and disbursed rehabilitation loans in most instances at a 3 percent interest rate, under the rules and regulations of Small Business Administration.

Mr. Ralph Fontaine, Secretary of the Kentucky Bankers Association, Louisville, Ky., worked closely with Mr. Dick and Mr. Pucel and he not only arranged all of the meetings with the bankers, but also participated in all such meetings, both in the Louisville area

and strategic locations in the disaster areas. American Red Cross officials attended some of these meetings. His untiring efforts substantially contributed to the success of the program in that through mutual cooperation and understanding it was possible for Small Business Administration to close the offices at Hazard and Barbourville within 60 days and the Pikeville office within 90 days, with any unfinished business to be processed through the Louisville and Cleveland offices. Mr. Dick and Mr. Pucel orientated the bank credit personnel in the processing of direct and participation loans, under the rules and regulations of Small Business Administration.

In summary, the rehabilitation of the disaster areas was effected expeditiously and with tremendous success, which could not have been possible without the full and wholehearted cooperation of the banking industry through the good offices of Mr. Fontaine of the Kentucky Bankers Association, evidenced by the fact that the banks in the disaster areas made about 464 loans or commitments for the aggregate of approximately $4 million and Small Business Administration accepted around 380 applications for direct loans involving approximately $2,500,000, making an overall total of around 844 cases involving approximately $6,500,000.

The outstanding success of the rehabilitation program conclusively presents a classic example of what can be accomplished when Government and private industry fully cooperate and join forces on the basis of mutual understanding and trust.

I particularly pay tribute to the Small Business Administration.

THE TOBACCO PRODUCTION AND PRICE PROGRAM

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I had intended to speak on the subject of tobacco production and the support and price program for tobacco, but because the session is drawing to a close I shall not do so. However, I ask unanimous consent that my prepared address on tobacco production be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

THE TOBACCO PROGRAM: WHY IT IS NEEDED—HOW IT IS WORKING

The welfare of my State, which is an agricultural State, rests very largely on the productivity and economic well-being of her farmers. Most of these farmers raise tobacco—for Kentucky is one of the great tobacco States, and supplies high-quality burley, as well as dark-fired and dark air-cured tobaccos, to the entire world. The price of tobacco is a matter of vital concern to some 200,000 rural Kentucky families, because it directly affects their income, their standard of living, and their future opportunities.

That price is determined, not alone by the well-established demand for quality cigarette tobaccos, but also by the effective operation of the production control, or marketing quota, program for tobacco—through which growers cooperate with their Department of Agriculture to maintain a balanced supply in line with that demand. The necessity of keeping supply and demand in balance, in order to avoid ruinous price fluctuations, is generally recognized—as is the function of Government in providing for farmers the legislative and administrative means to do this job.

In maintaining stable supplies through production control—when this course is chosen by two-thirds of the farmers—our tobacco program also appropriately provides for price supports in order to safeguard individual farmers against unnecessary loss. This is not a subsidy. I want to make that clear from the outset. It is not a special benefit or a giveaway. Price support is simply a tool—in the case of tobacco, it is a loan which is repaid—in our production-control kit. In this tobacco production-adjustment program, price support does two things: First, it makes possible the adjustments in the total supply, which are achieved over several crop years, by stabilizing prices during the period in which these adjustments are being made. Second, it extends equal price protection to all farmers contributing to the production-control effort.

While the tobacco price-support and production-control program is in several respects similar to our programs for the other basic commodities, it is in many respects unique, in its design, operation and results. And although the tobacco program has been an outstanding success among all our farm programs, I believe it is neither well understood nor as widely appreciated at least in areas of the United States which do not produce tobacco, as it deserves to be.

For example, it has been said on the floor of the Senate that under this program the growing of tobacco is subsidized by the Government, and by taxpayers. A number of people may be under that mistaken impression, for I have also seen it expressed in newspapers and magazines. On the other hand, I understand that officials of the Department of Agriculture have sometimes been criticized because their other price-support or production-control efforts are not as successful as the tobacco program. That may not be entirely fair either, because each commodity is different and has its own special problems; what works for one may not work at all for another. Even in the Department of Agriculture, however, the merits of the tobacco program occasionally seem to be overlooked, or may not always be fully appreciated.

I hope we can bring about a better understanding of this program, and obtain for it the broader appreciation it deserves—not only among tobaccomen, but among all who are interested in farm problems, programs, and policies. I hope that I can contribute something to that understanding by describing today some of the basic reasons why a separate and distinct program is required for tobacco, and by showing how our present program makes good use of those characteristics which set tobacco apart, in a class by itself.

Although I will discuss the program in the light of the most recent proposal to eliminate fixed 90 percent support for tobacco, the facts I expect to point out may apply with equal force to questions which may arise in the future, as they have in the past.

DISCRETIONARY PRICE SUPPORT HAS BEEN PROPOSED FOR TOBACCO

The Secretary of Agriculture recently recommended to the Congress a new approach to the farm problem. He said that production control is impractical, and that present laws governing acreage allotments and price supports are obsolete. He asked for major changes in the different price-support programs for the six basic farm commodities—corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, peanuts, and rice.

These price-support programs, of course, play a central role in our efforts to protect, stabilize, and increase farm income so that farmers may share more fully in, and contribute more effectively to, the general prosperity and economic welfare of our country. They deal, however, with a wide variety of complex problems, many of which have proved difficult to solve, and which, therefore, are the subject of continuing attention and effort by the Congress, the executive branch, and by those most concerned—the farmers themselves.

After appearing before both the Senate and the House Committees on Agriculture, Secretary Benson laid his specific legislative recommendation on this subject before the chairman of the House committee on May 28. I am expressing my views at this time on this matter, as it affects tobacco growers, because I am convinced that that proposal would, if adopted, seriously threaten or destroy our tobacco program.

The official departmental proposal is primarily a request for much greater, and discretionary, flexibility—from 0 to 90 percent, or as a second choice, from 60 to 90 percent of parity—in the price-support levels of the basic crops already under flexible support formulas. Now, I have the highest respect for the Secretary of Agriculture, in his integrity in seeking overall solutions which will be fair and helpful to farmers, and which will benefit the country as a whole. I realize that he is faced with serious problems of continuing surplus production in some of the commodities for which strict production controls may not be desirable or practical—a responsibility which Congress, and agriculture itself, shares.

Included also in the Department's request, however, was tobacco—which has a distinct program of its own, for reasons I believe I can show are sound, and which is not a flexible-support crop. As far as tobacco farmers are concerned, the idea of abandoning 90 percent support is a drastic proposal which is not justified by today's needs or by the performance record of that program.

I see no reason to compound the farm problem by opening the door to controversy over abandoning a program which has proved workable, effective, popular, economical, and fair to all segments of the industry and to the nation as a whole.

TOBACCO PROGRAM—AND TOBACCO ITSELF—IS IN A CLASS BY ITSELF

In supporting this view, I will not take time to review the history and development of the tobacco program, although that history is most enlightening and offers us many lessons which we can study with profit today. It is enough to say that our present program rests squarely on that long history—which goes back 50 years to the days of the Night Riders in Kentucky, and over 300 years to the first crop control measures in the New World, taken at a time when severe depression in the tobacco areas already walked hand-in-hand with overproduction. (In 1639 the province of Virginia enacted a tobacco production-adjustment law.)

The tobacco program is distinctive not only in its historical origins, which proved in violence the need for production and marketing controls long before such measures were adopted generally. It is also distinctive in the justifiable confidence which growers have placed in their program, and in the diligence they have exercised to keep that program sound. It is distinctive today as the one program with fixed supports, at 90 percent of parity, and established by law, and which, through effective production controls has made that support level work—to the advantage of growers, the Federal Government, and the taxpayer.

This is not to imply that tobacco has won a favored position to which it is not fully entitled, or at the expense of other commodities. That is not true. On the contrary, while billions have been spent in honest efforts to solve the problems of other commodities, and those of a lagging farm economy in general, the tobacco farmer has held the line and stuck to his program of balancing supply with demand.

Neither do I infer that this program is well suited to other commodities. They have their own characteristics and particular problems. The only question involved here is whether or not a large group of over three-quarters of a million farmers, working together, are entitled to the help and assistance of their Government in carrying out and administering the program of their choice so long as they keep that program on a reasonably sound and equitable basis. My

answer to this question is that their performance in good faith entitles tobacco growers to the continuation of their present program.

We have this distinct tobacco program today simply because the production, marketing, and consumption of tobacco itself is in many ways unique. It therefore requires a different price-support and production-control program.

I would like to discuss now those characteristics which make tobacco different—which both require a separate program for it, and make that program workable. This fact has received too little attention: that the unique nature of tobacco not only creates special problems, but has also given us the solution to those problems. This coin has two sides. When we turn over the challenge we find opportunity—an opportunity which tobacco growers seized years ago, and which must not be arbitrarily taken from them.

1. PRODUCTION DIFFERENCES

First, as to its production, tobacco is a high-labor crop. It requires some 410 man-hours of labor to raise an acre of Burley. That compares to approximately 81 man-hours for an acre of cotton, 11 man-hours for corn, and 4 for wheat—where, of course, a man may produce 100 times as many acres.

Most of this labor is hard, back-breaking toil. It takes a full year to produce an acre of Burley tobacco. In fact, because seedbeds are often burned in the fall, before the crop is sold, the tobacco farmer's year is said to be 13 months long.

The seedbed must be prepared in January or February. The young plants, so carefully nurtured under canvas, have to be transplanted when the ground warms up. In the summer months, the tobacco must be cultivated several times, wormed by hand or sprayed, topped, suckered, and perhaps primed. Then it is cut, hung in the barn, cured, stripped, sorted into grades, and tied in hands. Finally it is sold—just about in time for the farmer to go back and start to work on his next crop.

Each of these jobs is a hand operation. Each requires skilled management. Successful tobacco culture, in fact, is an art which can only be acquired through years of experience.

At every step of the way, the tobacco grower is beset by disease, pests, and capricious weather. Having learned at last how to control to some extent the additional vagaries of his markets, the tobacco farmer feels that a reasonably stable price structure is indispensable to his efforts, and is his just due.

In terms of his special need for effective price supports, this high labor requirement means that when the 4 or 5 baskets of burley produced on an acre of our tobacco land are set out for sale on the warehouse floor, a year of the farmer's toil, hope, and fears is sold at auction. Typically, tobacco is this farmer's major cash crop—his primary source of income. Our growers must depend, then, to an unusual degree on their price-support program.

The mutual dependence of growers on their tobacco program has, however, served to encourage and develop that spirit of cooperation and sense of responsibility which contribute so much to the success of this plan. In its practical operation, tobacco growers, and representatives of the trade as well, join together to resolve their problems in a way that is fair to all, and that is in the best interests of their industry and its individual members.

Second, tobacco production is not mechanized. For example, no machine has been developed to harvest the delicate tobacco leaves—which are as perishable as green garden vegetables until they are cured.

Because tobacco culture is unsuited to mechanization, we know that the second acre of tobacco costs the farmer nearly as much to raise as the first. For many crops, it may be true that production per farm worker has doubled in the last 15 years—thus creating a new dimension in farm policy in these areas. Contrary to this general trend, however, and because of increased quality requirements, raising an acre of tobacco requires more labor today than it did 15 years ago.

TABLE I.—*Labor used in production of field crops*

	1940–44	1955	Percent change
Tobacco:	*Hours*	*Hours*	
Man-hours per acre	436.0	494.0	+13
Man-hours per 100 pounds	42.0	34.0	−19
Cotton:			
Man-hours per acre	99.0	81.0	−18
Man-hours per bale	182.0	93.0	−49
Wheat:			
Man-hours per acre	7.4	4.3	−42
Man-hours per 100 bushels	43.0	22.0	−49
Corn:			
Man-hours per acre	25.6	11.4	−55
Man-hours per 100 bushels	80.0	28.0	−65

Source: Agricultural Research Service, USDA, June 1957.

The belief that the "technological revolution" in agriculture as a whole makes possible, through increased mechanization, sufficiently lower costs on added units of production to more than offset a lower market price does not fit the case of tobacco. Nearly every grower would like to increase his tobacco acreage, of course—but not when he knows that the price he receives would drop, while his hours of labor and cost of production would increase proportionately.

This basic difference in production methods, which sets tobacco apart from the trend in much of agriculture, does, however, simplify the issue as to what is a proper level of price support for this crop. There is little question about the level of prices required to assure tobacco farmers a fair return for their labor. Tobacco farmers, large and small, are generally agreed that 90 percent of parity provides them a decent minimum wage floor (although less than hourly rates for common labor), and that a lower support price would simply mean more work for less pay.

Third, tobacco is an intensive crop. For this reason, it is well-suited to our small family farms, in hilly country and on soils where other crops may do poorly, as well as on superlative soil such as we have in the Bluegrass area of Kentucky.

The average size Burley allotment in my State last year was 1.37 acres. However, that acre-and-a-third produced over a ton of high-quality cigarette tobacco—worth $1,400 to the Kentucky farmer who sold it on last December's market. That typical Kentucky patch of tobacco, in fact, produced Burley for 2 million cigarettes, or 10,000 cartons.

Only 2 percent of all Burley allotments are larger than 5 acres; 90 percent are smaller than 2 acres; and one-fourth are half an acre or less.

TABLE II.—*1957 burley tobacco allotments*

[Distribution by size, cumulative percentages]

	Kentucky	United States
	Percent	*Percent*
0.3 acre and under	9.3	12.8
0.5 acre and under	19.6	26.8
0.7 acre and under	49.6	63.6
1 acre and under	60.7	73.6
2 acres and under	82.6	90.0
5 acres and under	96.7	98.2
	Acres	*Acres*
Average allotment	1.37	1.03

Source: Tobacco Division, Commodity Stabilization Service, USDA, April 1957.

Because high value of production is associated with these small plots, however, and because our present program works, hundreds of thousands of modest family-type farms are able to depend on their tobacco allotment as a main source of their income. For example, 300,939 farmers have Burley allotments this year, of which 146,611 are in Kentucky. Including dark-fired and dark air-cured tobacco as well as Burley, there are 174,579 tobacco allotments in Kentucky.

The continued welfare of Kentucky agriculture rests, then, to a large degree, on maintaining our present tobacco price-support program. Most of the rural families in my State own small farms, and have few alternative sources of income. These farms, which must be cultivated intensively wherever possible, do not have the broad fields of level, tillable acreage suited to large-scale crop production with heavy equipment and self-propelled machinery. Tobacco is their main cash crop. In fact, at least 3 out of 4 farms in my State raise tobacco, and some 200,000 rural Kentucky families count on their tobacco crop for a substantial or major portion of their income.

I know many of these families, and have talked to hundred of these farmers. These are the men who know tobacco best—and who produce the world's finest tobacco. I do not believe they will agree that it is worth less than parity, or that their years of experience and months of toil should be sold cheaper.

In terms of workable production controls, however, this intensive land use means that tobacco can well afford the strict measurement and compliance checking we now have, the cost of which is less than one-fourth of 1 percent of the crop's value. Small allotments having a high dollar value of production make accurate measurement practical and economical. So again we find reasons in the nature of tobacco culture itself which justify a distinctive production-control and price-support program.

Fourth, tobacco is a highly specialized regional crop. Burley and flue-cured tobacco—the major cigarette types—accounted for 90 percent of last year's billion-dollar tobacco crop. Kentucky produced two-thirds (66.2 percent) of the Burley, North Carolina two-thirds (67.6 percent) of the flue-cured tobacco.

In my own State, tobacco is a quarter-billion-dollar crop, and produces 43 percent of Kentucky's cash income from farm products sold. In the great bright-leaf State of North Carolina, over half the farm income comes from tobacco. Nine States raise most of our tobacco, and within those States there are highly concentrated areas specializing in the various qualities of tobacco, of which there are 26 distinct domestic types and 1,446 grades.

TABLE III.—*Farmers' cash receipts from tobacco*

[Latest 5-year average; percentage of total for 9 leading States; percentage tobacco contributes to State's cash receipts from sales of farm products]

	Tobacco receipts	Percentage of United States	Percentage of all farm products sold
	Millions		
North Carolina	$491	42.8	52.7
Kentucky	230	20.1	42.4
South Carolina	92	8.0	26.1
Virginia	83	7.2	18.0
Tennessee	73	6.4	15.4
Georgia	66	5.8	10.3
Connecticut	23	2.0	13.4
Maryland	19	1.7	7.6
Florida	22	1.9	3.8
Other tobacco States	48	4.1	1.2
United States	1,147	100.0	3.7

Source: Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA, June 1957.

This regional concentration is a natural historical consequence of tobacco's peculiar dependence on soils and climate. Identical seed planted in adjoining counties may produce two different types of tobacco. Each year's weather may turn out a markedly different tobacco crop in the same area. Under identical weather conditions, variations in soil from farm to neighbor's farm result in noticeably different qualities. Moreover, each stalk of burley tobacco produces several grades from tips (until recently worth least) to trash (customarily worth much more)—and I have not mentioned differences resulting from cultural and curing practices.

The full array of tobacco types and qualities, which the interplay of a great many cultural, climatic, and management influences produces, is highly important to our tobacco trade and to our modern tobacco industry. It marks a difference in product and in production which makes clear, I believe, tobacco's need for a special program of its own. Local specialization makes possible this broad spectrum of products—from heavy "black" tobaccos, which are hickory-smoked like Kentucky hams, to the mild, bright golden, "Virginia" leaf.

This local specialization, moreover, contributes greatly to the effectiveness of our tobacco program. Perhaps in no other crop would rigid allotments based on historical production be more justifiable, nor could historical production patterns be continued more equitably.

I do not say that our tobacco program allows complete freedom of enterprise, but the equity of historically based production patterns is well-established and widely accepted. Tobacco producers do feel that this program, in which they join together in a cooperative effort to comply with the law of supply and demand, provides them essential freedom in the marketplace to sell their product for what it is worth.

2. MARKETING DIFFERENCES

Marketing differences which require a separate and distinct price-support and production-control program for tobacco, and which also make the present program workable, are perhaps even more significant than the production differences.

My fifth point, therefore, is that all our farmers' tobacco is channeled exclusively through central markets. None is kept on farms. Each selling season farmers must take the entire crop of cigarette tobacco to the auction warehouses—scene of the familiar "tobacco chant."

Our system of cooperative marketing for tobacco was developed after years of trial and error and travail. It works well. It seeks to provide uniform sales conditions, to insure that buyers are available for all the tobacco offered, and that farmers are protected from sharp seasonal fluctuations in price—through the option which each may exercise of selling at the price bid or else having his baskets of tobacco delivered to the "pool" under the price-support program.

This auction warehouse system, operating in conjunction with the pools, is the central mechanism around which our successful tobacco program is organized. It offers distinct advantages in the price support operations of that program. For example, it makes possible a firm floor, not only supporting the tobacco crop as a whole, but under each farmer's individual lots of tobacco.

Under this plan, it has not been necessary for the Government to purchase large surpluses, as with some other crops. The plan is also fair to the farmer, in that he is the direct beneficiary of the price-support effort—receiving immediately 90 percent of parity in cash, and a dividend on any amount over that for which the tobacco is later sold. This whole operation is so sensible, in fact, that it is handled without loss by the farmers' marketing cooperatives under contract with the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Our central marketing system also makes practical and workable the realistic production controls required for no-loss operation of 90 percent supports, because it permits accurate identification of the source of all tobacco sold. In addition, it makes conveniently available the data for accurate market reports on the amounts and prices of the various graders sold.

The sixth difference which sets tobacco apart, and requires a separate program for it, is the limited field of buyers for this crop. As I pointed out when I sponsored the amendment first establishing in law 90 percent of parity as a separate provision for tobacco, the major buyers competing for the tobacco offered by three-quarters of a million farmers can be counted on the fingers of both hands. Six companies produce 99 percent of the cigarettes, and three of these account for 73 percent.

TABLE IV.—*Cigarette output by companies, 1956*

	Billions of cigarettes	Percent of total
American Tobacco	128.9	30.1
R. J. Reynolds	113.5	26.5
Liggett & Myers	68.4	16.0
Brown & Williamson	50.0	11.7
Philip Morris	39.7	9.3
P. Lorillard	22.8	5.3
All others	5.1	1.1
Estimated output	428.4	100.0

Source: Harry M. Wooten report, Printers' Ink, Dec. 28, 1956.

This is a situation unique in agricultural marketing as far as I know. Usually less than half a dozen major buyers are represented on any auction floor. These buyers can scarcely fail to be familiar with each other's needs and practices. A farmer who trucked his crop of tobacco 50 miles to the warehouse was at the mercy of buyers before the protection offered by this fixed support floor was inaugurated.

I consider my speech on this subject, made in the Senate on June 17, 1948, still to be a correct statement. That was during the debate on the long-range agricultural program, which required a change from fixed 90 percent supports to flexible supports down to 60 percent of parity on all basic commodities, including tobacco. At that time the Senate adopted my amendment preserving 90 percent support for tobacco, it was written into the law, and this separate provision for tobacco has been retained through every change made in our farm programs since that time. I quote from that speech:

"It is my contention, and one which I believe is supported by the facts, that the unusual conditions under which tobacco is produced and marketed, when coupled with the usually limited field of buyers, operate to give a dominant bargaining position to the buyers and to deprive the producer of tobacco of a free market, in the sense that a market is enjoyed by the producers of other agricultural commodities. In this limited market, the buyer pays a price which is not necessarily or always related to the law of supply and demand, but is fixed by the maximum amount the buyers must pay to get the tobacco, which in reality is the support price. For this reason the support price should remain fixed at 90 percent of parity."

As I pointed out 9 years ago, and I quote: "The tobacco farmer must take his crop to the place where the representatives of the great tobacco manufacturers will come to buy his crop. Unless the representatives are there, the tobacco farmer cannot sell his tobacco. The farmer who has spent a year in back-breaking toil to produce a crop of tobacco, which is his cash crop and his principal source of income, knows that he must sell his tobacco to one of the few buyers, or else lose his year's labor. Can it be doubted that the buyers know that the farmer must sell or lose the work of a year?"

At that time, I offered the opinion, "which is one shared by my constituents, who know every phase of tobacco growing, buying, and selling, that the Federal Government offers through its parity and support-price program the only substantial assurance the tobacco growers have that they will receive a reasonable price for their product."

A seventh distinction, which operates to make our tobacco loan program among the most effective of farm price-support efforts, relates to the excellent storage qualities of tobacco. Cured tobacco, redried and compressed into 1,000-pound hogsheads, is virtually nonperishable, thus reducing the risk of holding loan stocks several years for improved markets. In fact, tobacco increases in value as it is aged. This enhanced value in itself often covers storage and interest charges on loan stocks held for up to 2 to 4 years.

Without a fixed level of support, on the other hand, this very storability would operate to the farmers' disadvantage—as it did for the 100 years when 1 year of good prices was followed by 2 or 3 years of starvation prices. In the absence of a strong support program, tobacco farmers are placed in double jeopardy; first, from lower prices caused by a year of unexpected abundance, and second, from reduced production or lower prices in later years as these hogsheads are moved from storage into trade. Producers of perishable crops, at least, are exposed to economic loss only once, and need make but a single adjustment.

It may be argued that flexible supports are desirable for semiperishable commodities, where old stocks must be moved or spoil, or where adjustments must reflect current consumption at all times. But in tobacco, the very possibility of lowering supports could tend to depress prices. Progressively lowered support prices would, of course, soon destroy the tobacco program, and would result in huge losses in the process.

3. CONSUMPTION DIFFERENCES

An eighth and very important consideration is that there are no alternative uses for our tobacco. Most farm products have a number of uses, and can compete in a wide variety of markets at different price levels; many in fact must take into account these changing relationships. Again it may be argued in the case of some other crops that flexible supports will enable these commodities to seek out alternative uses and markets, or will encourage industrial utilization of farm products. Tobacco has no such opportunity.

This lack of alternative uses for tobacco clearly shows the need for controlling production and supplies in line with the demand for cigarette tobaccos. Burley and flue-cured growers know that they are completely dependent on this single-use market, that at best they can profitably sell only as much tobacco as we smoke.

On the other hand, the limited use for tobacco provides a much clearer picture of the demand-supply situation than most commodities enjoy. The question of how much tobacco is needed can be argued within relatively close limits, and is understood by farmers. They can then support, and do support, a program which meets these realities, and which gives each of them a fair share of the market at a fair price. So once more a special problem in tobacco contributes to the practical workability of our present program.

My ninth point concerns the relatively inelastic consumer demand for tobacco. Agricultural economists have shown, and it is historically true, that the price farmers receive for their leaf bears little or no relation to that consumer demand. The supply

of tobacco, of course, almost wholly determines prices farmers receive, and realistic recognition of this fact has led growers to acceptance of progressively more effective production controls.

Burley consumption, in turn, may depend on a number of factors, but the price paid to the farmer is not a major one—because his percentage of the retail sales price is so small. These two facts taken together—that consumer demand plays a minor role in determining the farmer's price, and that his price scarcely affects consumption of tobacco—make an effective, stable price-support program essential if tobacco growers are to share equitably in the fruit of their labor. In addition, they remove from economic controversy the desirability of 90-percent support for this commodity.

I would like to point out here why the price farmers get for their tobacco has little or no effect on domestic sales of cigarettes. In a pound of manufactured tobacco, worth $3.45 at retail last year, Federal and State excise taxes account for $1.37, or 40 percent; manufacturing and distribution margins are $1.53 or 44 percent, and the farmers' end is 55 cents or 16 percent. For the tobacco in a 25-cent pack of cigarettes, the farmer receives about 3½ cents. Therefore, a 10 percent drop in farmers' prices would save only 3 mills on the cost of a pack of cigarettes.

I believe American consumers are willing and able to pay the farmer this very reasonable price for his tobacco. I might add that whereas farmers generally receive 40 percent of the consumer dollar—and we are concerned about such a low share—tobacco farmers receive less than half that.

As I understand the reasoning behind the Secretary's present proposals for all the basic crops, a lower support price is supposed to stimulate increased consumption and sales so that the price drop will be offset, or more than offset, by an increase in farmers' sales, and therefore an increase in their gross income or net income. This may be true in the case of other farm commodities, and I know that in manufacturing, for example, the greatly increased sales volume which may result from small reductions in price has played a very important part in our economic development.

However, because the consumer demand for tobacco is relatively inelastic in the first place, and because prices paid farmers are scarcely reflected in the retail price of cigarettes in the second place, I do not believe that the Secretary's argument would apply in the case of tobacco.

It is true that "production times price equals income," but the experience of tobacco growers is that small increases in production can cause sharp decreases in price, and in their income—and that prices continue to fall far faster than any increase in poundage sold can possibly make up.

HOW THE TOBACCO PROGRAM HAS WORKED FOR THE GOVERNMENT

A 10th difference is that, alone among our different price-support operations for nonperishable commodities, the tobacco program does not result in burdensome Government-owned stocks. As a matter of fact, the Commodity Credit Corporation does not now own a pound of tobacco—and has not had a pound of cigarette tobacco in its inventory since World War II, when it helped supply our allies. CCC neither has to buy tobacco in the open market, nor under purchase agreements—nor has it been necessary for CCC to take title to any loan tobacco in recent years. In other words, tobacco is not subsidized. The tobacco price-support program has, in fact, made several million dollars in interest profits on CCC loans.

This remarkable record must be credited to the farmers who have made the sacrifices necessary to keep their part of the bargain in this program. The Government can do no less than to keep its part of the bargain and maintain 90 percent support prices so long as growers continue to demonstrate their willingness to keep this program sound.

The distinctive machinery for this efficient and economical program is to be found in the operations and responsibilities of the tobacco "pools," or grower cooperatives, which undertake to sell loan stocks of tobacco at a profit to the farmer over the 90 percent rate, and which over the long run have succeeded in doing so. These pools may not be wholly perfect, but they are a very important part of a system which has dealt with difficult problems with outstanding success. Several of them predate our Government programs by a number of years, and their experience and influence are generally recognized.

Our tobacco loan program actually operates just as the name implies it should. It is expected that the tobacco held as the security for those loans will be advantageously merchandised at private sale, and that the money advanced will then be repaid to the Government in full. It has worked this way with conspicuous success. In the 11 years since the war, for example, CCC has loaned $1½ billion to the tobacco pools to cover the amounts advanced to farmers. Nearly a billion dollars of that has been repaid by these pools, with interest, and the remainder is secured by current stocks of tobacco. I submit that this is an outstanding record for any Government loan program, particularly on a farm commodity.

TABLE V.—*CCC postwar commodity loans*

[Net cash outlay to farmers under price-support program, fiscal years 1947 through 1957]

	Amount loaned	Amount repaid	Percentage repaid to date	Purchases
	Millions	*Millions*		*Millions*
All commodities	$19,718.1	$6,065.8	30.8	$6,179.3
Wheat	5,940.4	1,387.8	23.4	442.4
Cotton	5,410.3	1,802.3	33.3	67.7
Corn	3,644.5	653.1	17.9	534.1
Tobacco	1,526.9	945.3	61.9	1.6

Source: Commodity Credit Corporation, USDA.

I will not take time to mention here a number of less striking differences in the operation of our tobacco program and the legislation which governs it, except to say that tobacco farmers, their leaders, and their representatives in Congress, have generally resisted a number of special or fringe benefits enjoyed by other commodities. They have done so for the sole reason that they did not want in any way to jeopardize their right and claim to fixed 90 percent supports.

A final difference between tobacco and other farm commodities is that it is the only one on which excise taxes are imposed. While the operation of our price-support program for tobacco has not cost the Government anything, tobacco has brought immense revenues to local, State, and Federal Governments. This fact alone merits the continuation of a tobacco program which insures stable prices and balance supplies.

Each year Federal and State excise-tax receipts from tobacco far exceed farmers' cash receipts for tobacco, as the chart from the cover of the March Tobacco Situation shows. The Federal excise tax on tobacco returned $1,639 million dollars to the Government last year. States received $513 million from their own excise taxes. Municipalities benefited by substantial sums. In addition, import duties on tobacco amounted to $19 million last year. While not levied with a view toward aiding farmers, these considerations ought to at least obtain for tobacco farmers a sympathetic attitude toward their problems and needs.

These annual receipts of over $2 billion in Federal and State revenues from the growers' efforts are about double the return to the growers themselves. That relationship is well illustrated by the blue stamp of a rather glum DeWitt Clinton which seals every pack of cigarettes. The stamp is worth 8 cents to Uncle Sam. The grower gets 3½ cents for the tobacco within.

This high revenue-producing capacity and special contribution sets tobacco apart, in a separate class by itself. As my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Florida, stated on this floor 2 years ago: "It is a highly important matter to the Federal Government, therefore, that tobacco growers shall prosper, and that there shall be a sustained abundant level of tobacco production as free as possible from either overproduction or underproduction."

It may be pertinent to point out here that the Federal tax alone produced by tobacco since 1932 ($25 billion) would pay twice over for the entire cost to the United States of the farm price-support and farm-income stabilization programs, broadly interpreted, for all commodities, basic and nonbasic, in the last 25 years. This includes CCC nonrecourse loan, purchase and payment programs; the National Wool Act; the International Wheat Agreement; donations of commodities to other nations; Public Law 480 sales for foreign currencies; school-lunch and other welfare distribution; the Sugar Act; Federal Crop Insurance; acreage allotment payments under the ACP from 1937 to 1944; parity payments under the AA Act of 1938; and the programs under the triple A of 1933.

HOW THE TOBACCO PROGRAM HAS WORKED FOR TAXPAYERS

In commenting for a moment on how the present tobacco program has worked for taxpayers and consumers, I would like to refer to the figures accompanying the Secretary's well-known letter of May 2 to Senator ELLENDER, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture. It was the substance of this letter which Secretary Benson shortly thereafter embodied in his legislative proposals for tobacco as well as the other basic crops, and which he sent to the House Committee on Agriculture on May 28.

These figures indicate that in the last 25 years, through June 30, 1956, "the net realized cost of programs primarily for the stabilization of farm prices and farm income" was $11.8 billion. Tobacco's share of that amount was $105.3 million, according to the table on page 7—or less than 1 percent of the total, charged to the Nation's fourth largest field crop produced by 11 percent of her farms. It is a modest figure when compared to the others on that page, and in saying this I do not imply that the other commodities and other farmers do not fully deserve the help we have tried to give them.

I would like to point out, moreover, that the great bulk of this money was spent for soil conserving activities in the thirties. Only the figure 3 to the right of the decimal in this $105.3 million amount reflects CCC losses on tobacco price-support operations. That was the cumulative figure, over all the years of the tobacco programs, through June 1956. Since that time the loss has been reduced as of May 31 of this year to only $10,924—or eliminated for all practical purposes. Furthermore, interest income on CCC loans is not shown in this table—possibly because tobacco is the only commodity which produces an interest profit. Since 1948 and before, therefore, the entire tobacco price-support program has operated without loss—winning for it an especially unique place in our farm price-support operations.

I believe this analysis shows how well the tobacco program has served taxpayers as well

as farmers, and will continue to serve them in the future. All our people, in cities and towns as well as on farms, may well consider it the most successful of all our farm programs—in their own and their neighbor's interest.

One other point in the Department's May 2 statement calls for comment. That is, that about two-thirds of all producers are at the minimum (allotment for burley) and thus sealed off from any visible relationship between the level of their price support and the size of their allotment. That is not true. As I have shown, in table II, only one-fourth of the burley allotments are at the minimum of 0.5 acre or under.

Cost of farm programs

[In millions of dollars]

Commodity	Net realized cost of programs primarily for the stabilization of farm prices and farm incomes	
	Fiscal years 1932–56	Fiscal year 1956
Basic commodities:		
Corn	1,451.7	132.4
Cotton	1,692.3	89.4
Peanuts	177.0	10.5
Rice	84.2	54.9
Tobacco	105.3	3.5
Wheat	2,943.0	530 1
Total basic	6,453.5	820.8
Designated nonbasic commodities:		
Butter	746.1	264.8
Cheese	259.2	116.8
Milk [1]	518.7	167.7
Total dairy	1,524.0	549.3
Potatoes	643.4	5.0
Wool	113.0	7.3
Other	15.0	.5
Total designated nonbasic	2,295.4	562.1
Other nonbasic commodities:		
Eggs	331.5	.1
Flaxseed and linseed oil	153.8	7.7
Sugar	[2] 336.5	[2] 24.0
Remaining nonbasic commodities	2,225.9	381.2
Total nonbasic commodities	2,374.6	365.0
Total, all commodities	11,123.5	1,747.9
Unallocable costs	630.2	188.2
Realized cost	11,753.7	1,936.1

[1] Includes school-lunch and special school-milk program.
[2] Credit.

Finally, I would like to review what our tobacco program has meant to farmers.

HOW THE TOBACCO PROGRAM HAS WORKED FOR FARMERS

Perhaps the most eloquent testimony on what farmers think of their tobacco program is found in the referendum votes. In the elections held since 1948, burley and flue-cured growers have consistently cast ballots approving marketing quotas by between 95 and 98 percent. Their interest in these elections is real, because the tobacco program is vital to their welfare.

In April 1955, for example, 74 percent of the eligible burley voters came out to vote. That was the year our growers were faced with the hard decision to cut their allotments by 25 percent, reduce minimum allotments from 0.7 to 0.5 acre, increase the penalty on excess or red card tobacco from 50 percent to 75 percent, and close the door to establishing allotment history by growing penalty tobacco. The vote was in favor of the program—by 96 percent. That is quite a plurality and quite a turnout at the polls for any election. In all the history of our farm programs, I can think of no more dramatic demonstration than this of the willingness of a group of farmers to make the sacrifices which are sometimes necessary to keep their program sound.

A brief glance at the dollar-and-cent figures on farm prices and income over the years will show what this program has meant to tobacco farmers in pocketbook terms. At the turn of the century Kentucky farmers could sell their tobacco for only 4 cents a pound. Farmers were desperate—literally up in arms—but began then to organize for the long search for a solution to their problems. In 1910–14, a stable period for agriculture generally, Burley was worth 9 cents, and the crop brought farmers barely $20 million. Conditions had not improved a great deal by 1930–34, when representatives of growers began working with the Department of Agriculture on what was to evolve into the present tobacco program. Fifteen years later, 1945–49, burley prices were 3⅓ times higher—and the crop was worth 6 times as much to farmers—a quarter of a billion dollars instead of $40 million. Even in terms of constant-value dollars, burley prices had nearly doubled, and larger but controlled crops tripled farmers' purchasing power from their burley.

These gains have been maintained and improved under peacetime operation of the postwar tobacco program. Last year, the burley crop sold for the highest prices on record—averaging 63.5 cents a pound for a crop which returned $322 million to farmers. Farmers are selling their 1957 flue-cured crop in the Carolinas today, and marketing has been finished in the Georgia-Florida belt. This crop, too, is bringing record prices—a dramatic change from the situation last year when flue-cured supplies threatened to get out of hand, and which must be credited to a realistic cut in allotments, prompt measures to eliminate less desirable varieties, and participation in the soil bank. Burley growers, who cure their crop more slowly by natural air drying and maket it later in the year, are looking forward to another favorable selling season on their 1957 crop, now being housed in their big tobacco barns.

I think this record of increased crop values and better tobacco prices clearly shows what our tobacco program, using the tools of 90 percent support and production control to match, has meant, and can continue to mean, to our farmer families.

TABLE VI.—*Burley tobacco prices and crop values*

[United States season average price and value of production, 5-year averages from 1910]

	Price per pound		Crop value, millions	
	Actual	Purchasing power	Actual	Purchasing power
	Cents	*Cents*	*Millions*	*Millions*
1910–14	9.7	24.4	$20.2	$60.5
1915–19	23.5	38.1	65.7	113.4
1920–24	20.4	31.7	55.7	85.8
1925–29	21.9	33.9	57.8	89.4
1930–34	12.8	25.9	41.5	83.4
1935–39	22.2	44.3	67.0	133.3
1940–44	35.4	56.7	148.3	232.4
1945–49	43.8	47.9	247.3	271.5
1950–54	50.6	45.7	303.4	273.2
1955	58.6	52.3	275.2	245.7
1956	63.5	55.7	321.8	282.3

Source: Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA, June 1957. Cols. 3 and 5 adjusted to "real" prices and values by using 1947–49 index of prices paid by farmers for commodities, services, interest, taxes, and wage rates equals 100.

CONCLUSION

I do not say tobacco farmers have no problems today. We do have some problems in tobacco—as in all other phases of agriculture with which I am familiar. We need to maintain and increase our export sales—which account for 6 percent of the burley market, and a larger portion of the market for other tobaccos. Increasing yields per acre may make production adjustment through acreage control more difficult as new varieties and cultural methods are adopted. The shift to filter cigarettes is changing consumption patterns, and new manufacturing methods are beginning to be used.

But these are all problems which can be handled, and should be handled, within the framework of our present program—using the successful techniques already developed where these are applicable, and taking full advantage of the hard lessons of the past. In the past we have been able to meet problems at least as serious as these, within this framework. There is no need now to tear down the house built so painstakingly over many years.

I do not say that the tobacco program is perfect. Minor modifications in it have been made from time to time—without disturbing the foundation of 90 percent support on which it is erected—and may need to be made in the future. I do not say that it operates without a certain pulling and hauling at times. This is inevitable where a variety of interests are involved, and wherever earnest efforts are made to realistically limit production so that farmers may obtain fair prices without subsidies. My colleagues and my friends know that I have helped work out these problems on many occasions.

I do say that tobacco farmers have learned how to work with and through the elemental forces of supply and demand, instead of being crushed by these forces. They have shown that by controlling production to match the demand they can achieve stabilized prices at an acceptable level without Government subsidy. They have made 90 percent of parity supports work—without loss to either growers or taxpayers.

In view of the latest proposal to Congress to abandon 90 percent support for tobacco, it seemed to me appropriate and timely to lay the facts in this matter before the Senate. It may well be that the Department of Agriculture, in drawing up a general, or blanket recommendation for all the basic commodities, simply failed to take into account the special nature and particular needs of tobacco—or the specific advantages offered by the present tobacco program. If that is the case, as I believe it to be, I trust the Department will not press its recommendation as applied to tobacco. In any event, I have no fear that the Congress would adopt such a proposal—which would threaten the livelihood of three-quarters of a million farm families.

I oppose lowering supports for tobacco. I am confident that my colleagues from the tobacco States take the same position, and will join me in opposing any move to destroy the present tobacco program. Furthermore, I believe it is plain to anyone who understands the problem that our tobacco program needs to be continued.

My purpose here today was to analyze the specific nature of this problem, to set out the basic reasons which require a distinct and separate price-support and production-control program for tobacco, and to show how the unique character of tobacco production, marketing, and consumption also contributes to making our present program effective and workable. It seemed to me worthwhile to enumerate those characteristics and the consequences which must follow from them, and I hope this appraisal will prove helpful.

Thanks to the joint efforts over many years of a great many conscientious and devoted people, and to the active cooperation of tobacco farmers everywhere, the tobacco program has been conspicuously successful. I believe it is a basically sound, helpful, and essential part of our total farm program today. I believe it can continue to serve faithfully and well the burley growers of my State, the rural economy of the South, and hence the general welfare of our country—

and do so without placing an undue burden on the Federal Government or the taxpayer.

In closing, I feel I can do no better than to quote the President's Agricultural Message to the Congress of January 11, 1954. President Eisenhower said at that time that "each farm crop has its own problems, and these problems require specific treatment." And in regard to tobacco, the President stated: "Tobacco farmers have demonstrated their ability to hold production in line with demand at the supported price without loss to the Government. The relatively small acreage of tobacco and the limited areas to which it is adapted have made production control easier than for other crops. The level of support to cooperators is 90 percent of the parity price in any year in which marketing quotas are in effect. It is recommended that the tobacco program be continued in its present form."

I believe those conclusions are still valid, and that that recommendation is as sound today as it was three and a half years ago.

FOOTNOTE ON TITO

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, when the proposal was made early this year that Tito of Yugoslavia be invited to visit America, I expressed the view that such a visit would be a mistake. My feelings were stated in a telegram which I sent to the Monitor of San Francisco. I ask unanimous consent that that telegram be set forth in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

JANUARY 26, 1957.

Mr. JOHN O'CONNOR,
Managing Editor, The Monitor,
San Francisco, Calif.:

I respectfully reject the suggestion that Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia be invited to visit the United States. The good intentions of such an invitation would be lost before an avalanche of disapproval which our own people would express, and before a world-wide wondering which such a visit would evoke. The unparalleled exigencies of this era in world affairs may require us to enter into arrangements with countries, some of whose policies we abhor. But that is far, far different from extending an invitation to a dictator to visit us. After all, it was less than a year ago that Tito visited Moscow amid great professions of friendship and "shoulder to shoulder" comradeship in future war.

The people and the Government of the United States are dedicated to the cause of freedom. That is the principle on which we came into being. We oppose slavery. That is the reason we oppose with all our strength the evils of Communism, International Communism, or any other kind. If Yugoslavia is independent of Russia, all well and good. I do not believe a visit here by Tito would materially aid the fight against Communism. To the contrary, in my view, it would be misinterpreted to our detriment, both at home and abroad.

I have heretofore communicated by views to the Department of State.

Kind regards.

THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
United States Senator.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have before me two news articles issued by the Religious News Service, sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews, on this subject. They detail the indefatigable labor of a Catholic priest in a one-man crusade against a Tito visit. The priest is Rev. Father Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, pastor, educator, and writer of distinction. The article pays tribute to Father Thorning, and I ask consent that they be set forth in full.

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

A PRIEST CONDUCTS ONE-MAN CRUSADE AGAINST TITO VISIT

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 16, 1957.—A Catholic priest has been conducting a tireless, one-man crusade against the proposal that the United States of America invite President Josip Broz-Tito of Yugoslavia to make a State visit to this country.

The Reverend Father Dr. Joseph F. Thorning reported that he personally interviewed all but 2 of the 96 Members of the United States Senate and gave them material documenting the crimes of Mr. Tito and the suppression of religious liberty for all in Tito's Yugoslavia.

Father Thorning, who is also professor of international relations in the Catholic University of Chile, a pontifical institution, is pastor of three churches in Maryland: St. Joseph's on historic Carrollton Manor; St. Ignatius Loyola, Urbana; and St. James, Point of Rocks. Dr. Thorning also serves as an associate editor of the national magazine, World Affairs, a periodical published in Washington, D. C.

The "Padre of the Americas," as he is called in the United States Capitol because of the prayers he offers every year on April 14, Pan American Day, emphasized that he was protesting against the proposed visit by Mr. Tito as "a human being and an individual United States citizen," and not as a representative of any religious or secular organization.

"I think that a large body of American citizens of all religious faiths will be deeply offended, if we extend our national hospitality to an accomplice of the butchers of Budapest," Dr. Thorning declared.

A specialist on inter-American affairs, who has been invited to undertake several special diplomatic missions for the United States Government, the most recent for the inauguration of President Juscelino Kubitschek of Brazil; the "Padre of the Americas" is scheduled to leave soon for South America, where he has been invited to deliver a series of lectures on international relations at the Catholic University of Chile, Santiago de Chile. The last-mentioned invitation was extended to Father Thorning by His Excellency, The Most Reverend Alfredo Silva Santiago, archbishop of Concepcion and rector magnifico of the university.

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 4, 1957.—A Catholic foreign affairs specialist said here that indefinite postponement of a proposed visit to the United States by President Josip Broz-Tito of Yugoslavia represents a "glorious religious victory" that will encourage and hearten believers of all faiths who reside behind the Iron Curtain.

The Reverend Father Doctor Joseph F. Thorning, who is also Professor of International Relations in the Catholic University of Chile, a Pontificial institution, declared that members of all faiths in Tito's Yugoslavia would get a "moral uplift" and "new hope" as a result of the news that a cold reception would have awaited "a tyrant and the murderous persecutor of religion" in the United States Capitol.

The priest is pastor of St. Joseph's historic church Carrollton Manor, Frederick County, Md., and an associate editor of the national magazine, "World Affairs," published in Washington, D. C. Dr. Thorning conducted a one-man crusade against the visit of the Yugoslav president, interviewing every United States Senator and many Congressmen, recommending that they express their opposition to such a visit, publicly, and in the light of the national honor and interests of the United States of America.

Father Thorning pointed out that speeches and many other statements made on the floor of the United States Senate and House of Representatives made it overwhelmingly evident that a huge majority of members of all religious beliefs were expressing open, vigorous opposition to a visit that would place the United States in the position of compromising its moral and ethical principles by extending official hospitality to Mr. Tito. The indefinite postponement of the suggested visit seems to have confirmed Dr. Thorning's judgment and his actions, speeches, articles, book reviews and other public statements on this issue.

THE DOMESTIC MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I have been waiting with a great deal of apprehension to see what, if anything, might be done by this Congress to assist the domestic mining industry. Up to this closing day very little has been done.

It has always seemed incongruous to me that while we are spending millions for defense, we have neglected to keep our domestic mining industry healthy. Our defense chain is only as strong as its weakest link, and to date the weakest link has been the sad state of our domestic mining industry. With our imports cut off in time of war, as has been done in the past, and a sick mining industry to provide the needed minerals and metals for a war effort, we are defeating our own purpose.

It is high time that not only our industry leaders but our administration and legislative bodies recognize the drastic need of a strong domestic mining industry.

Something must be done to correct a condition that has been allowed to exist too long, the flooding of our markets with cheap foreign-produced minerals and metals to the detriment of our domestic industry.

The question might be asked as to why these mines are closing all over the country. The answer is simple. First let me say it is not because ore reserves have become exhausted or not because there is no need for the minerals and metals produced. These mines were closed primarily and basically because they cannot produce metal in competition with ores produced by cheap labor in foreign mines. Minerals produced in foreign countries, oftentimes under near slave labor conditions, have flooded our domestic markets to such an extent that the accompanying price drop has forced domestic producers out of business.

A recent article in the Wall Street Journal telling of the cutbacks in the production of one of the country's largest zinc producers, the New Jersey Zinc Co., gives as a reason the "uncontrolled flood of foreign imports," and further quotes company officials as saying:

The excess imports have driven the price down from 13½ to 10 cents a pound within the past 60 days. There can be no improvement in the situation and further production curtailments in the zinc mining and smelting industry are bound to occur unless the United States Government adopts some means of controlling the exploitation of the domestic market by foreign producers.

The article goes on to tell of other closings and cutbacks in the industry.

The situation is serious. When we talk of the mining industry we are not talking of the old prospector and his burro made so popular by western movies and TV classics. We are talking of investments of millions of dollars employing thousands of persons. In May of this year there were 112,200 persons employed by the metal mining industry. This does not include nonmetallic mining which employed 117,800 and is also affected to some degree by competition from foreign sources. Two hundred and thirty thousand persons in this country employed in the mining industry and that does not include those employed in smelters and refineries. The jobs of these people and the welfare of their families and the communities in which they live are in jeopardy. It is time that something was done.

This situation the American mining industry finds itself in at this time is not new. It is one that has been present for the last score of years with the exception of war created years of demand. Since the time the executive branch of our Government adopted a policy of mollifying and even aiding the production of foreign mines and metals and at the same time refusing to give some protective relief to domestic industries the mining industry has been in trouble. This situation worsened when the State Department agreed to the terms of the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade, popularly referred to as GATT, at a conference held in Geneva in 1947. This agreement, though never approved by Congress, has extended the policy allowing excessive importation of cheap foreign minerals to flood our markets, resulting in the undermining and ruination of our domestic industry.

I want to read an excerpt from a speech by the late Senator Pat McCarran. As many of my colleagues well remember, Senator McCarran was one of the greatest advocates the domestic mining industry this country ever had. This speech delivered on this floor July 8, 1949, over 8 years ago, could be given today with very few changes. I read from it:

> The metal-mining industry of the West is today in a state of distress. A great many mines are already shut down and more are going down every day. This is true in Montana, Idaho, Utah, Nevada, California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona, the zinc fields of Missouri, Oklahoma, and Kansas, and the copper country of Michigan. Present high costs of labor, materials, and other operating charges have run into a declining market with copper now at 17 cents, lead 12 cents, zinc 9 cents, and Tungsten ore and concentrates quoted today at $1.15 per pound, with no market.
>
> Already foreign metals and ores produced by low-paid labor from far richer deposits than we possess are entering the United States. Our domestic industry upon which we must depend is in a desperate condition. Our national defense stockpiles are totally insufficient for the protection of this country. Through unfortunately mistaken policies of the past we have reduced entirely too much the import duties which were designed to meet, in a measure at least, the difference between the wages and productive ability of American workmen and those of peon and coolie labor of foreign lands.

As you see, Mr. President, those words delivered 8 years ago told of a problem that existed then and exists today. The only exception being in the price quoted for copper, the prices mentioned for lead, zinc, and tungsten are remarkably close to those currently being quoted, and at the rate the price of copper is dropping, the price quoted will not be too far off.

What has happened in the intervening time to correct this problem? The statement of Mr. Otto Herres, chairman of the National Lead and Zinc Committee before a subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, sets forth in detail the steps taken by industry and Government in an attempt to correct the problem with only temporary success. Let me give a brief résumé of his statement. At the termination of the Korean war the markets of the United States were flooded with excess imports of lead and zinc at prices below the cost of American production. A national committee made up of members of the lead-zinc industry appealed to Congress for assistance in the emergency. The Ways and Means Committee approved provisions for the relief of the industry but the legislative relief was opposed by high officials of the administration who recommended relief through following the escape-clause procedure before the Tariff Commission.

The Tariff Commission investigated and determined that the domestic industry had been seriously injured by the flood of imports of lead and zinc. Recommendations were made to the President that relief be given to the mining industry, but because of State Department opposition the President, instead of following the advice of the experienced Tariff Commission, established instead a stockpile program for the lead-zinc industry. While the stockpile program gave temporary relief it did not solve the basic problem of stopping the excessive imports of cheap-produced foreign metals. I ask unanimous consent that the entire statement of Mr. Otto Herres be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

Lead and zinc—like steel, petroleum, and building materials—are basic commodities, the ample supply of which contribute to the remarkable growth of the American economy. It is not surprising, therefore, that consumption of these metals has grown.

Prior to World War II, zinc consumption averaged less than 500,000 tons. Consumption in 1956 is estimated by the Bureau of Mines at 988,000 tons. More than 40 percent of zinc consumed is used in galvanizing steel products and a like amount is consumed in die castings which are so important to the automobile and other durable goods industries.

Consumption of lead in the United States has grown in a like manner.

From an annual average of 612,000 tons in the late thirties, the use of lead has increased to 1,250,000 tons. Approximately one-third of lead consumption is accounted for by the manufacture of storage batteries. Fifteen percent is consumed in tetraethyl motor fuels. Substantial tonnages are required by the electrical, pigment, and metal products industries.

American producers have independently tried to maintain the market at a high level and have curtailed production voluntarily in an effort to balance the market. These voluntary curtailments of domestic production have not been successful because foreign producers have loaded the market with more and more low-cost materials.

From 1946 to 1955, the world production of lead increased 45 percent while domestic production increased only 10 percent. At the present time foreign producers are shipping 28 percent more lead into this country than the total production of the United States producers.

During the same period, the world production of zinc has increased 56 percent while United States production has declined 15 percent. At the present time imports of zinc are 43 percent in excess of the total United States production.

Much thought has been given by industry and Government experts as to the best answer to the problem. Many solutions have been advanced, but few have been tried. While the need of some long term or permanent plan is apparent to industry and Government experts, only stopgap measures or measures designed to give temporary relief have been used.

The fact that some long term or permanent plan is necessary to stabilize the industry is fundamental. The mining industry is big business. To make a mine produce successfully and profitably it is necessary to invest large sums of money, oftentimes millions must be spent before 1 dollar's worth of ore is produced. It only makes sense that a company will not invest millions if there is a chance they will not be able to sell their product when produced or the price will be forced so low that they are unable to produce at a profit for their investors. Past experience has shown that direct subsidy programs are unpopular and short lived, that premium-price plans or other forms of bonus plans are not satisfactory and only act as stopgap measures. What the industry wants and needs is security over a long period of time. There must be assurance that there will be adequate protection from foreign producers to insure that a market will be available 5 or 10 years after the start of large-scale operations.

Huge investments necessary to such a project will not be made if they cannot be amortized. Domestic producers will be willing to invest large sums in exploration and development so as to produce the minerals and metals so necessary to our economy, only if such a long-range plan is in effect.

Let me say at this point that domestic producers do not want something for nothing. They are perfectly willing to meet any competition as long as the ground rules of production are the same. They do not want protection or a guaranty so as to protect themselves from other domestic producers. What they do need and want is protection against the flood of competitive metals and minerals produced by low-paid labor under conditions that would not be allowed to exist in this country. Until they get this needed protection the

domestic mining industry will continue to be unstable and sick.

Nearly 3 years ago the Department of Interior, with the approval of the President, promised the Congress a remedy for the ills of the mining industry. Two years ago on August 14, 1955, the President said, in a message to Congress:

I am conscious of the desirability of developing a long-range minerals program for the United States to assure an adequate mobilization base and to preserve a sound mineral economy. The advisory committee on minerals policy so advised and the Office of Minerals Mobilization has been established in the Department of the Interior to determine and recommend such a program.

The President also said in the same document:

The interest of the domestic minerals industry will be better served by proceeding with the careful development of a long-range minerals program than by approving a stopgap measure extending substantial Government aid to only a segment of the industry.

So, 2 years ago the executive branch of our Government had determined that a long-range plan was not only advisable but necessary to the well-being of the mining industry.

No one expected the long-range plan to come into being overnight, but as time went on and the troubles of the mining industry became more and more severe, there developed a doubt if such a program would ever take place and if it was ever to be put into effect it would come too late.

Finally, on May 24 of this year, the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Seaton, announced the long-range mineral plan had been formulated. When the plan itself was revealed to Congress and explained, it was met with mixed emotions. The plan was not a plan for the entire industry and in no way could it be called a cure-all. It considered only the welfare of the lead-zinc industry and did not take into consideration the protection of the producers of other strategic and critical minerals and metals so necessary to our economy.

The plan did, and this is a point I want to emphasize, take the first step in a long time in the right direction. It has long been agreed by industry and Government experts that the only workable long-range plan must embody some method to protect domestic industry from foreign producers. Whether the method to be used be import quotas, tariffs, or a form of import taxes, was immaterial as long as it provided the needed protection.

The plan as presented by the Department of the Interior, with the consent of the administration, recommended that certain excise taxes be placed on the importation of lead and zinc. At the hearings of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, at which the plan was presented on June 4 of this year, Secretary Seaton was asked directly by members of the committee whether or not the State Department concurred with the proposed plan. Secretary Seaton replied that the plan had complete administration support.

Since that time the State Department, in a report to the Senate Finance Committee, stated directly that they favored the enactment of the legislation introduced to implement the lead-zinc excise taxes.

Mr. President, I do not have to tell you that this is the first time in many lean years that the State Department has conceded that our domestic mining industry, one of the most important segments of our economy, not only might need but deserves a little consideration over foreign producers. This I feel is a real step forward and one that might prove to be the turning point in curing the ills that have weakened this vital industry for so long.

The Nation cannot afford to swell the ranks of the unemployed with thousands of jobless miners, smeltermen, and other allied workers. Neither can it afford the severe consequences to defense and the economy resulting from the destructive effects of closing down many mines unable to operate within the present price and market structure. A mine is unlike a store. Once production halts and pumps are removed, a mine usually floods. Often it is lost to further production forever. At a minimum, it costs huge sums of money and a considerable length of time, sometimes years, before a mine can be placed back in operation. It certainly is dangerous folly to treat in this manner an industry producing strategic materials.

During the intervening months before we reconvene on January 7, I trust that further concrete headway is made before the Tariff Commission and the executive branch. Failing this, our duty is that when we return in 4 months to take the proper legislative action.

TRANSOCEAN AIRLINES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared concerning the Transocean Airlines.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KNOWLAND

I have just finished reading the brief filed by Transocean Airlines on July 31 with the Civil Aeronautics Board in the irregular carrier investigation, in which proceeding Transocean is seeking a limited certificate to permit it to provide supplemental cargo and passenger air services. There is no Government subsidy whatsoever involved in the Transocean supplemental operations.

Transocean maintains its principal offices in my home city of Oakland, Calif. Since its organization in 1946, Transocean and its affiliates have become an integral and most important part of the business, civic and social community in the San Francisco-Oakland Bay area. We in the bay area and California are proud indeed of the public interest achievements of Transocean, and its affiliates, and its more than 5,000 employees throughout the world.

Through the years, I have personally become familiar with the operations and remarkable achievements of the Transocean organization. Orvis Nelson is rightly a legend among pilots and aeronautical people the world over; his leadership of the Transocean family is a truly great saga in this newest, fastest media of transportation which is such a potentially powerful vehicle for peace and the achievement and maintenance of the fellowship of all men everywhere.

I am aware, too, of the contributions which Transocean and its affiliates have made and are making to the national interest of the United States in some of the key areas of the world. These include not only the vital Middle East areas but the Pacific area between California and the Orient which the Civil Aeronautics Board in the recently decided reopened trans-Pacific certificate renewal case characterized as being one of the strongest international routes in the world and stronger than any American flag international route outside the Pan American World Airways system.

My one disappointment in the Transocean situation has been the failure of the Civil Aeronautics Board to grant Transocean a certificate in order to provide the stability needed to formulate and properly carry through long-range operational and financial plans. I am hopeful that the Civil Aeronautics Board in the irregular carrier investigation will grant Transocean an appropriate certificate; a type and form of authorization which, in my opinion, it richly deserves and merits. Certification is a step vital to the airline at this time but it is only the first step. The CAB irregular carrier investigation appears to be limiting its attention to domestic and overseas flying and paying little or no attention to operational authority to foreign countries. It is in this area of the foreign carriage of passengers and cargo that Transocean has made its most significant contributions and toward which authority it has concentrated its efforts.

Transocean first applied to the Civil Aeronautics Board during the summer of 1946 for a certificate that would authorize nonscheduled operations on a worldwide basis. The Board never acted upon this application but finally incorporated it into the large irregular carrier investigation.

After all these years indications are that Transocean will be severely limited in the international authority it may receive, if any, from this investigation. I feel very strongly that in addition to domestic and overseas authority Transocean should be authorized to provide supplemental air service in foreign air transportation if it is to make its full contribution to the national interest.

Perhaps the introduction of appropriate legislation looking toward the legislative certification of Transocean may be necessary. There is ample precedent for such legislative relief. In fact, the domestic trunklines and Pan American World Airways were certificated under the grandfather provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. The local service carriers were permanently certificated legislatively in 1955 (Public Law 38, H. R. 2225); and the intra-Alaskan and intra-Hawaiian carriers in 1956 (Public Law 741, S. 3163). This present Congress just recently passed and forwarded to the President legislation authorizing permanent certification of the United States-Alaskan carriers (S. 1873). Unlike Transocean, all of these carriers, except the all-cargo carriers, have been the beneficiaries of substantial Government subsidies over the years.

I believe in permitting the various administrative agencies ample leeway to carry out the intent and purposes of Congress in the discharge of their delegated statutory obligations. Therefore, I have refrained up to now from introducing legislation to certificate Transocean for limited-type supplemental air services. Nonetheless I must, in good conscience, say to my colleagues that I am finding it increasingly difficult to continue to refrain from sponsoring such legislation. I hope that the Civil Aeronautics Board will issue an appropriate certificate to

Transocean in the pending irregular carrier investigation, which certificate I believe unreservedly that Transocean fully warrants, merits, and deserves.

In order that my colleagues may have some knowledge of the contributions which Transocean and its affiliates have made and are making to the national defense and of the persistent, though as yet unsuccessful efforts, which Transocean has made over the years to be certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board, I ask unanimous consent to have Appendix A and Appendix B from the brief of July 31, 1957, filed by Transocean Air Lines in the irregular carrier investigation printed immediately following my remarks.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in connection with my statement, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD also appendix A and appendix B of the brief to the Civil Aeronautics Board on behalf of Transocean Air Lines.

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

APPENDIX A

MAJOR AERONAUTICAL SERVICE ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES

1946

Air Transport Command; California-Hawaii round trips; volume, 2 per day; duration, 11 months.

1947

United States Navy and Civil Aeronautics Administration; operation landing aids experiment station, Arcata, Calif.; duration, 3 years.

United States Army; military dependents Seattle-Tokyo; volume, 750.

United States Army engineers; civilian defense workers; United States-Pacific bases; volume, 25,000 to 30,000.

1948

United States Army; military dependents Germany-United States; volume, 2,700.

United States Army; military dependents Seattle-Tokyo; volume, 700.

International Refugee Organization of United Nations; war refugees from Munich to Caracas, Venezuela; volume, 25,000.

United States Air Force; Berlin airlift support, United States-Europe; volume 100 transatlantic flights.

United States Air Force; Berlin airlift support; United States-Europe; volume, 11 Air Force bomber groups.

United States Air Force supervision; aircraft ferry, United States-China; volume, 158 C–46 aircraft.

International Refugee Organization; evacuees from Shanghai; volume, 13,000.

1949

United States Navy; cargo flights, Seattle-Adak; volume, weekly; duration: 2 years.

Military and Transport Service; cargo flights, California-Orient; volume, weekly; duration: 1 year.

1950

United States Navy; airlift and bush living in Alaska, Petroleum No. 4 project; duration, 2 years.

United States Air Force; airlift California-Tokyo (Korean airlift); volume, 25 to 35 flights per month; termination, February 1954.

1951

United States Army; movement of domestic military personnel; duration, continuing.

United States Navy and Interior Department; scheduled passenger, cargo, and mail flights in the trust territories; duration, continuing.

Military and Transport Service; en route service to military transport aircraft at Wake Island; duration, continuing.

1952

United States Navy; modification and overhaul of C–46 aircraft.

State Department; spraying and dusting activities in 21 Middle East countries; duration, continuing.

1953

United States Army; military dependents across the Pacific; volume, 360.

United States Army; transportation of military dependents Europe-United States; volume, 3,400; duration, 2 months.

1954

United States Army; transportation of military dependents Europe-United States; volume, 3,000; duration, January, February.

Completed 43 months of Korean airlift; volume, 17,750,489 aircraft miles, 92,035 aircraft hours, 13.7 hours average daily aircraft utilization.

United States Army; transportation of military dependents between Europe and United States; volume, 306 flights; duration, 6 months.

United States Air Force; miscellaneous flights between the United States and Tokyo.

1948

United States Air Force; overhaul C–54 aircraft by wholly owned subsidiary; volume, 555 aircraft; duration, 4 years by successive contracts.

1953

United States Air Force; overhaul T–33 jet trainers by wholly owned subsidiary; volume, 516 aircraft; duration, 1 year.

1954–57

Continuing large-scale operations in air transportation and overhaul and maintenance in domestic and international fields for the military departments.

Classified operations including the transportation of nuclear material and airlift to secret bases are not included in the foregoing.

APPENDIX B

LIST AND DESCRIPTION OF CAB APPLICATIONS OF TRANSOCEAN AIR LINES

Docket No. 2379: June 1946 application for special services. No action and application terminated upon institution of proceedings in Large Irregular Investigation, Docket No. 5132.

Docket No. 2537 et al.: Pacific Northwest-Hawaii Case. Application for scheduled services denied.

Docket No. 3041 et al.: Transatlantic Cargo Case. Application for transatlantic cargo service denied.

Docket No. 3041 et al.: Reopened Transatlantic Cargo Case. Application of Seaboard & Western granted, and Transocean's application denied.

Docket No. 5582 et al.: West Coast-Hawaii Case. Transocean's application denied.

Docket No. 5031 et al.: Transpacific Certificate Renewal Case. Examiner recommended temporary certificate to Transocean for carriage of persons and property only in the transpacific area; but the Board by a 3 to 2 vote did not adopt the examiner's recommendation. Thereafter, the Board, by a split of 2 to 2 vote, denied Transocean's reconsideration petition, despite a concession of error in original opinion, and without retransmitting to the President in light of such error, although one member urged that such retransmittal be made.

Docket No. 5132 et al.: Irregular Carrier Investigation. Granted supplemental authority of persons and property in domestic and overseas air transportation but denied supplemental authority for carriage of persons in foreign air transportation on a limited basis. The acquisition of the latter authority has been the 10-year quest of Transocean.

Docket No. 7300: Application for exemption for authority to engage in transportation of persons and property (charter and special services) between points in the United States and between points in the United States and overseas and foreign points. No action by CAB.

In the Transpacific Certificate Renewal Case it should be noted that the adverse decision of the CAB and the President was on the basis of an adverse 3 to 2 vote within the CAB. Two members of the Board filed a vigorous dissenting opinion urging that the Board and the President adopt the examiner's recommendation. It is of further interest that when the decision was affirmed by the President, one of the majority, Hon. Oswald Ryan, had failed of reappointment to the Board. Transocean petitioned for reconsideration of the adverse decision but was turned down by a 2 to 2 vote of the Board and without the Board sending the matter to the President, despite the fact that the two adverse members conceded in the reconsideration order that certain errors had been made in the original majority decision in which the examiner's recommendation for certification of Transocean failed of adoption by one vote.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1791) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1959.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2377) to amend chapter 223, title 18, United States Code, to provide for the production of statements and reports of witnesses.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9302) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15 to the bill, and concurred therein.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 230. An act to require the Secretary of the Army to convey to the county of Los Angeles, Calif., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain portions of a tract of land heretofore conditionally conveyed to such county;

H. R. 2075. An act for the relief of Albert Heinze;

H. R. 2654. An act for the relief of Martin Wunderlich Co.;

H. R. 2904. An act for the relief of the Knox Corporation of Thomson, Ga.;

H. R. 3370. An act to amend section 1871 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the mileage and subsistence allowances of grand and petit jurors;

H. R. 3468. An act for the relief of J. A. Ross & Co.;

H. R. 6127. An act to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States;

H. R. 7536. An act to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941;

H. R. 8256. An act to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as amended, to exclude social security benefits and to provide additional exemptions for age and blindness, and to exempt from personal property taxation in the District of Columbia boats used solely for pleasure purposes, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8508. An act to provide that there shall be two county committees elected under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for certain counties;

H. R. 8928. An act to amend the act of June 9, 1880, entitled "An Act to grant to the corporate authorities of the city of Council Bluffs, in the State of Iowa, for public uses, a certain lake or bayou situated near said city;

H. R. 8994. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to increase the salaries of certain executives of the Atomic Energy Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9406. An act to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended, to provide that telephone and telegraph services furnished Members of the House of Representatives shall be computed on a biennial rather than an annual basis; and

H. J. Res. 374. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

LEASING OF SPACE FOR FEDERAL AGENCIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The hour of 11 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill, S. 2533, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the Administrator of General Services to lease space for Federal agencies for periods not exceeding 15 years, and for other purposes.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, H. R. 6127, masquerading under the false title of an act to secure and protect civil rights, has now passed the Congress and has been messaged to the President. Its legislative history is written. It will doubtless be signed into law. Any legislation motivated by politics rather than principle is bad. Seldom has any single piece of legislation been the object of so much political bidding in the effort to gain the votes of a minority bloc group. Both political parties, as such, and numerous individual Members of both Houses of Congress worked at the auction. Several aspirants for the Presidency vied for the most conspicuous place in the picture.

I have the conviction that the great mass of the American people are sick and tired of the frauds that are sought to be perpetrated for political purposes in the sacred name of civil rights. The fact that this legislation was able to generate so much support is classic proof of an observation once made by Elihu Root that "a Member of Congress feels that an organized minority will punish where an unorganized majority will not protect." Mr. Root might well have gone further and stated that politicians in the executive branch of the Government, where this measure was conceived, are wholly sensitive to the truth of this maxim.

If it were intended to apply this law equally and fairly to all cases of coercion and intimidation in voting, to ballot stuffing and election rigging in each of the 48 States, one might find some excuse for it even though it is an unconstitutional intrusion of Federal power into matters reserved to the State by a written Constitution. It was so shot through with politics that its sponsors did not even pretend to be concerned about fraudulent elections and coercion in voting throughout the Nation. There was no pretense even that the bill was not aimed solely at the Southern States. It was undoubtedly enacted to curry favor with the National Colored People's Association and kindred groups, and largely in response to their threats of political reprisal.

This law will be administered by a politically minded Attorney General. There can be little doubt that he will be constantly pressed by the Vice President of the United States to apply the great powers of the law in the Southern States, at such places and in such time and manner as the NAACP, of which the Vice President is the most distinguished member, may demand.

The threat of this vicious legislation will be used to intimidate honest officials of State and local governments who are earnestly endeavoring to discharge their duties under their oaths of office and the laws of their respective States.

It is entirely likely that the application of this law will result in forcing the registration of a large number of Negro citizens who, in fact, cannot meet the qualifications prescribed for all electors under the laws of the State in which they live. It is a thoroughly bad bill, and places dangerous powers in the hands of those who are to administer it without much comforting proof of their responsibility and fairness.

Mr. President, several Senators among the little group of 18 who organized early in the year to fight the misnamed civil-rights bill have requested that I make a statement in regard to the criticisms leveled at southern Senators for not undertaking to filibuster H. R. 6127 to death. At the outset, I think it should be said that a number of Senate bills in this field, including one identical with the original H. R. 6127, with 39 of 96 Senators as authors, were introduced in the Senate at the beginning of this session of Congress. Those bills were the subject of extended hearings by the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate. All of them are still in that committee. Not one of them ever reached the floor of the Senate.

H. R. 6127 passed the House of Representatives on June 18, despite the valiant opposition of most of the Representatives from the Southern States, who were aided by a small number of Representatives from other sections who courageously rose above the miasma of politics to defend constitutional government. When the bill was messaged to the Senate from the House, a combination of Senators from both parties joined hands to prevent the bill from being referred to the Judiciary Committee, which was the proper course under the rules. Through a strained and devious application of the rules of the Senate they succeeded in their purpose. Our group of 18 Senators who were opposed on principle to every part of the bill—we were 18 of the entire membership of 96—were confronted with the necessity of making grave decisions in planning our opposition to the measure.

Few, if any, of the 18 were strangers to the filibuster. A majority had been through many bone-wearying legislative struggles on similar proposed legislation. We had not, however, previously been faced with such a vicious and far-reaching bill under such difficult conditions.

There is a mistaken impression, widely held, that a filibuster in the Senate is a comparatively easy method whereby a few determined men can prevent the passage of almost any proposed legislation, if they are willing to talk. Even Senators sometimes refer to the right of unlimited debate in the Senate. Unfortunately for our country, no such right has existed since 1917.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the Senate does have a previous-question rule which has been in effect for 40 years. It is a little slower in the process of strangulation than the rule in the House of Representatives, but it can be equally effective in bringing a bill to a vote.

At any time they may wish to do so, 16 Senators may file a petition to end debate in the Senate. Under our rule, a Senator who may have the floor and may be addressing the Senate, can be interrupted in the course of his remarks at any time, so that the petition may be filed. The most notable difference between the gag rule of the House of Representatives and that which obtains in the Senate lies in the fact that the Senate rule requires a two-thirds vote of all of the Senators, in order to gag the Senate, whereas in the House of Representatives a majority of those voting can cut off debate.

Several careful canvasses by our group revealed that we did not have as many as 32 Senators who would stand firmly against the application of cloture or gag rule, so as to enable us to talk the bill to death.

The 18 southern Senators were confronted with a hard choice. From a purely political point of view, it would have been the easy course for the 18 of us to have planted our feet in concrete and to have announced that we would filibuster to the death against the bill. We could have proclaimed that we had died defending the barricades, and thereby undoubtedly have won great plaudits from most of our constituents for our heroic, last-ditch resistance. But, Mr. President, there is little doubt

that this course would have resulted in having the Senate pass the vicious bill in the original form in which it came to us from the House. As sensible men experienced in the Senate, we knew that the easy course was sure to lead to defeat for us and to an unparalleled disaster to the States we strive to represent.

We are fully cognizant of the fact that our people have become accustomed to expect filibusters in circumstances such as those in which we found ourselves, and that the adoption of any other course in a desperate effort to strip the bill of its most vicious provisions was likely to be misunderstood by the unthinking. The stakes were great. They involved the preservation of the social order and way of life of several of the Southern States.

We, therefore, Mr. President, pursued a policy of appeal to reason, rather than to launch a futile talkathon. Our speeches on the motion to take up the bill were designed for a maximum of length to appeal to the sense of fair play and justice of our colleagues and, beyond them, to the masses of the fair-minded American people, and to do this without bringing on a gag which would have cut off our exposure of the vicious character of the original House bill.

The bill had been sailing under false colors. In two speeches in June on the majority procedure to bypass the Judiciary Committee, I stressed the fact that supporters of the bill were referring to it as a voting bill, while planning to use it to mix the races in the public schools of the South, even at the point of Federal bayonets. This drastic course was clearly authorized in part III.

Later, on July 2, just before the motion was made to take up the bill, I again addressed the Senate. I attempted to point out the iniquitous powers over our people vested by part III of the bill. I demonstrated—so clearly that it was never refuted—that part III of the bill was cunningly designed to use the whole power of the Federal Government to destroy the separation of the races in the South on which our way of life is based.

In opposing the bill, the members of our devoted little band did not reckon the cost in hours of sweat and toil. We used every means at our command, including television and radio appearances, to enlist public sympathy outside the South.

When it is considered that there were only 18 out of 96 Senators, all of us suspect because we were from the South, who were willing at the outset to wage an all-out fight on this bill, I think that I can, in all modesty, say for myself and my associates that the legislative history of the Senate does not reveal as great a victory by so few Senators as the one we attained.

Of course, Mr. President, it would have been manifestly impossible for our group to have made any progress whatever, in amending the bill, had it not been for the fact that brave and fairminded Senators from other areas, when the facts were presented to them, rallied to the cause of constitutional government. They rose above the political pressures to which they were subjected from day to day as they walked about this Capitol. And the performance of the Senate upon that bill, under the pressures that were being applied on the principal amendments that were adopted by the Senate, is enough to restore the faith of any doubting American anywhere in the vitality of the legislative system and of our American Government.

I will not resort, Mr. President, to the calling of names, but there are men in this body who had nothing to gain and a great deal to lose politically who, when they were convinced of the correctness of our position, took in stride the threats of political reprisal that were hurled, shook them off, and rose to vote their views as to the right course of action in the national interest.

We have heard of acts of great courage that had been displayed in this body in years gone by. We have heard of the dramatic role of Senator Ross, of Kansas, who, undertaking to preserve the division of powers, voted against the impeachment of President Andrew Johnson, when he knew that action would seal his political doom, if it did not in fact endanger his very physical life.

For years I have read the stories of old about men of courage rising in the Senate of the United States, placing the title of an office that they highly prized upon the tables of chance in order that they might do that which their consciences dictated. That spirit is not dead in the Senate. We saw it displayed during the fight on this bill time and time again here on the floor of the Senate. For my part, at the conclusion of the Senate action on this bill I was more proud of the fact that I had been permitted to serve in this body and associate with those courageous Senators than I had been at any other time in my career.

Part III, aimed at striking down the separation of the races in our hospitals, schools, in hotels, at swimming pools, and at all places of public entertainment was stricken from the bill. The Senate then proceeded to write into the bill an amendment guaranteeing the right of a jury trial for any person charged with criminal contempt in the Federal district courts.

There had been much confusion, Mr. President, as to whether or not it were appropriate to provide a jury trial in cases of criminal contempt arising under injunctive process. There were many digressions and excursions, into the realm of fancy, to divert attention from that constitutional principle, which is one of the primary rights upon which all Americans must rely for the preservation of their liberties. When the United States Senate understood that issue, the Senate rose to the occasion and declared for the right of every American to face a jury of his peers when charged with criminal contempt.

Other amendments adopted in the Senate prohibited the use of volunteer workers from the National Colored Peoples' Association and kindred groups by the Commission established under part I, and required Senate confirmation of the Executive Director of that Commission. The Director will, of course, be its principal officer. These amendments were certain to play a great part in its operations and in the making of its report.

When we had arrived at this particular stage of the proceedings in the Senate I happened to learn that a determined effort would be made to revive some of the provisions of part III that had been stricken from the bill. The new amendment appeared harmless on its face, but if it had been adopted it would have placed the stamp of Congressional approval on the erroneous, if not infamous, decision of the Supreme Court requiring the mixing of the children in the public schools without regard to the wishes of the parents of either race. We, therefore, quickly closed the bill to amendment in order to assure that none of the victories that we had gained would be snatched from us.

The bill was then returned to the House for action on the Senate amendments. I shall not indulge in any recriminations in attempting to fix the responsibility for the great weakening of the Senate jury trial amendment in that body. I am not given to criticism or questioning the motives of men who are bound by the same oath that binds me. I shall content myself by saying that if a few leaders from the Southern States in the House of Representatives had been willing to accept the Senate jury trial amendment, applied only to H. R. 6127, they could have had the Senate amendment at any time over a period of about 10 days.

The bill was returned to the Senate from the House of Representatives with two amendments, one of which greatly weakened the jury trial amendment that the Senate had adopted after exhaustive discussion.

The bill has now passed beyond the jurisdiction of the Congress, and I can now say that I and at least 16 of our original 18 lived—every second and every day that these amendments were pending in the Senate—in mortal fear of an attempt to revise some part of part III that would approve the race-mixing decision of the Supreme Court of May 1954.

If we had conducted an all-out filibuster against the House amendments, as many people not familiar with the legislative situation demanded, we would have invited ultimate disaster in the form of amendments reopening in some way part III, that we had stricken from the bill. Under the rules of the Senate, amendments to the two amendments of the House were in order and could have been offered by any Senator at any time. We simply did not have the votes to successfully protect a filibuster. We therefore had nothing to gain and everything to lose by launching one. Under the conditions we faced, if I had undertaken a filibuster for personal political aggrandizement and in response to demands that were made upon me, I would have forever reproached myself for being guilty of a form of treason against the people of the South.

Mr. President, if there is any one subject relating to the Senate and Senate procedure with which I am familiar it is the knowledge I have acquired about filibusters. It was my high privilege to serve as leader of a group of southern Senators who, week after week, fought

the effort to change the rules of the Senate in order to gag Senators from sovereign States easily and readily.

I was honored to serve in the same position in opposing several other politically motivated bills aimed directly at the Southern States, including the original FEPC bill. Many other members of our group have been in the Senate for years and participated in these historic struggles.

There was not a man among us who was not willing to speak against this iniquitous bill until he dropped in his tracks. We would have done so, but for the conviction, growing out of our knowledge of the Senate and the experience of many years in this body, that a filibuster was certain to make a bad bill infinitely worse.

We knew that it could cause us to lose all of our hard-gained victories in striking out the provisions of the bill which would have authorized the Attorney General to use every ounce of the vast power of this great Government of ours to destroy the system of the separation of the races in the South.

Our group held numerous meetings and the wisdom of launching a filibuster was often discussed. All members of the group were living with the problem from day to day, defending the things dearest to our hearts while under heavy fire. At no time did any member of our group declare in any of our meetings that it was his belief that a filibuster was advisable, much less that one could be successfully waged. The contrary view was expressed on innumerable occasions.

Part IV, the voting section, as I have said, is likely to be abused in its application. If it is, Mr. President, ways can be finally found, when the heat and political pressure of the moment have passed, to recapture control of our local governments. We will do so, and handle our elections, and we will deal fairly with all men of all races, permitting and guaranteeing the sacred right of suffrage. But, Mr. President, there is no power on earth which can restore a great civilization that has been weakened and destroyed by miscegenation and amalgamation of the blood of two different races of almost equal numbers.

When the decision in the Brown case was handed down by the Supreme Court, I immediately issued a statement denouncing the decision and charged that it could well result in the destruction of public education in several of our States. I repeated that statement on the floor of the Senate at the first opportunity.

If the bill had passed the Senate as it came to us from the House, Georgia and several other Southern States would have been presented with two of the hardest alternatives ever confronting any people. One of two things would have surely happened. Either Federal political officials with every power of the Federal Government behind them would have succeeded in mixing the races in the schools—or the public schools would have been closed. Mr. President, in other lands throughout a long period of history great peoples and great civilizations have tried the first course. Miscegenation has been the inevitable result. Under the original bill, many of our people may have gone to their death resisting Federal bayonets or have wasted away in Federal concentration camps for seeking to keep their children in schools attended only by their own kind.

I pray God that we may never be confronted with this hard choice. If my people are ever confronted with it, I hope that they will have the fortitude to close the public schools of Georgia and tell the Federal minions to do their worst. I say this fully aware of the magnitude of the disaster visited upon a people forced to close their system of public schools to educate their youth. A public school system is the most important of all of the functions of State government and I recognize that fact, but I make this statement with the knowledge gained from history that the eventual amalgamation of the races would be an even greater tragedy. We would find a way eventually to open the schools, but it would never be possible to restore the purity of either race if their blood be ever mixed.

Our southern forebears managed to live through the ordeal of the reconstruction period. Disenfranchised and helpless, they saw cunning politicians acting under color of Federal law abuse all State processes, particularly the elective process, and manipulate the vote of our Negro people. It was indeed the Tragic Era.

Most of the public offices throughout the Southern States were occupied by Negroes. These officials were in turn controlled by thieving carpetbaggers and scallywags.

The courage and genius of our forebears enabled them to survive this trying experience and to emerge from it with our social order intact, though our economy was destroyed.

I would not be honest if I did not tell the southern people that they are in for difficult times. The order of the Reconstruction Period will be completely reversed, for the employees of Mr. Brownell, who will make political forays into the South, will be directed by the political leaders of the NAACP. Instead of white carpetbaggers directing Negro officials, Negro political leaders will direct the carpetbagger attorneys of the Department of Justice.

I can only urge our people to display the same courage, devotion, and patience that enabled our forebears to survive the years of reconstruction. The great extremes of that period finally sickened the people of the United States outside the South. If the politically dictated persecution which may await us is severe it will eventually outrage the sense of decency inherent in the masses of the American people of today. There is no doubt in my mind that we will be able to find allies in the cause of constitutional government which will enable us to shake off the talons of predatory Federal politicians, if the abuses which result from political enforcement of the voting section of the law are too flagrant.

As I have said, the bill is bad, but consider how much worse it would have been if we had not been able to eliminate part III from the bill. If that vast, yea, limitless power had been vested in a political Federal appointee, he could have moved simultaneously against every school board of trustees in every Southern State. At the same time, he could have brought thousands of lawsuits at the expense of the American taxpayer and supported by the full power of the Federal Government to break down every scintilla of separation of the races in every walk of life in every public place.

If the original part III had been applied so as to bring about the social intermingling of the races from the kindergarten to the grave, southern civilization would have been destroyed beyond hope of redemption. This was the supreme tragedy we sought above all else to avert.

If permitted a personal word, Mr. President, I may say that I have been accustomed to hard work all of my life, but never have I put as much effort in any single endeavor as I exerted in seeking to strike the most vicious provisions from H. R. 6127.

There were few nights over a period of 8 or 9 weeks when I had more than 4 hours' sleep. Many midnight hours were spent in legal research and study of the bill, the numerous amendments proposed, and the deceptive statements of our adversaries. I undertook to the limit of my ability to present facts and plead the cause of the South at every opportunity. Whether on the floor of the Senate, or conferring with the President of the United States, or on radio or television, I sought to get our case before the country. The same statement could be made with respect to every other member of our group. Not a member of our group of 18 spared himself in any degree and each and every one of them made a great contribution to the victories we were able to gain.

In years gone by, it has been a source of pride to me that our group was able to defeat bills of this nature when they were forced to the consideration of the Senate. In the case of H. R. 6127, we were from the outset faced with greater odds than ever before.

I do not have the power of expression which would permit me to pay adequate tribute to those who came to our relief when abuse was heaped upon us as we presented the facts and exposed the implications of the issue.

With a few brave exceptions, we were confronted in the beginning with overwhelming numbers of both the Republican and Democratic Parties outside the South and it took courage of the highest order for many of those Senators to change positions publicly taken before they knew the facts.

It has saddened me to lose any part of the victories that we gained on the jury trial amendment, but the fact that we were able to confine the Federal invasion of the South to the field of voting and keep the withering hand of the Federal Government out of our schools and social order is to me, as I look back over the years, the sweetest victory of my 25 years as a Senator from the State of Georgia.

Most of my public life has been dedicated to the preservation of the separate systems for the races on which the life of Georgia and the South is based. If my position is misunderstood or twisted for political purposes, I would consider the

loss of my seat in the Senate as a cheap price to pay for the conviction in my heart, mind, and soul that God was kind enough to vouchsafe to me and those associated with me, the strength and the understanding to follow the wisest course in meeting the great danger posed by this legislation.

I have lived a full life and through the generosity of the people of my State have enjoyed every honor they could bestow. I like to think that I would gladly part with what remains of that life if this would guarantee the preservation of a civilization of two races of unmixed blood in the land I love.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I congratulate the Senator from Georgia upon the very fine statement he has made, and inform him publicly that it has been a great honor to serve under his leadership in the fight to preserve the rights not only of the Southern States, but of all the States, and all our people. The Senator's views reflect the almost unanimous views of southern Senators.

The question will be asked of many of us when we return home why we did not engage in a filibuster. I wish to make it clear for the RECORD that so far as the junior Senator from Louisiana is concerned, I personally raised the issue of an organized filibuster by the southern Senators, recognizing that gag rule would undoubtedly be applied to us, and that the bill would pass under a cloture rule.

When I raised the issue, the view was expressed by several Senators, including the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] that an organized filibuster would be a mistake. It was unanimously agreed that such would not be the wiser course. It was left to each Senator to make a speech of such length as he saw fit, but not to engage in an organized filibuster.

I am proud to associate myself with the collective judgment of all southern Senators who made this fight. We shall continue to do our best in the future.

I ask unanimous consent that statements made by various other Senators be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[Senator ROBERTSON of Virginia, August 23, 1957, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD]

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. If a sufficient number of Members of this body see this issue, as I do, as a matter of principle, the bill will not be accepted in its present form.

But, if a sufficient number of Members of the Senate are not willing to block passage now, I frankly doubt our ability to win a majority by forcing the Senate to remain in session for an extended period.

As a realist I recognize also the fact that if we now antagonize those allies who helped us to eliminate some of the worst features of this bill, they may not continue to stand with us against those forces which would destroy the character of the Senate as a deliberative body by limiting debate in order to obtain more prompt action on radical reform measures.

The bill before us, as I said at the outset, is an evil one, and I hope will be rejected. The record is clear that I have never wavered in my opposition to it.

[Senator ELLENDER, August 29, 1957, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD]

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this morning I was aroused to come to the Senate at 10 o'clock to make the short speech I have to deliver. I have been sitting in my place now for 11 hours and 45 minutes awaiting my opportunity. While I am on my feet I wish to compliment the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] for his great feat of endurance. I know what an ordeal he went through. I wish to say that I held title of the longest filibuster for about 2 or 3 years until another idiot, in the person of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] beat my record. [Laughter.]

But there is one record I hold which I do not believe anyone will ever exceed. It was established about a year after I became a Member of the Senate over 19 years ago, and I was successful in holding the floor for 6 successive days by unanimous consent, and speaking from 6 to 8 hours. So I know the ordeal through which my good friend from South Carolina went in the 24 hours he spoke.

* * * * *

I am going to vote against this so-called compromise, and I urge all my colleagues to do likewise. My only regret is that the pressure for adjournment is so great that those of us who seriously, conscientiously, and for good cause oppose this bill cannot obtain sufficient time to discuss it in detail—to lay its faults bare before the bar of public opinion.

I have on my desk in my office a speech covering over 1,500 pages. I had planned to make it should the necessity arise. I think the occasion for its delivery has arrived, and I am ready and willing to begin delivering it. However, I am a realist, Mr. President. I have discussed this matter with a number of my colleagues and it is obvious that proponents of the bill, as it has been compromised, are so numerous that they are able, and also willing and anxious, to choke off debate by invoking cloture at the earliest moment. Under the circumstances, it would be a futile gesture to attempt to obtain sufficient time to properly present the ugly picture of this bill to the American people.

I warn those who have been hypnotized by the legislative snake charmers who advocate this alleged compromise that they are making a bed of thorns for themselves. I urge all Senators to vote against the bill.

[Senator TALMADGE, August 29, 1957, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD]

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, H. R. 6127 was passed by the House of Representatives and reached the floor of the United States Senate without any significant change from the iniquitous version submitted to Congress by Attorney General Brownell.

As taken up initially by the Senate, it was a force bill of the rankest order. It would have conferred upon the Attorney General of the United States unlimited power to harass, intimidate, and control the thoughts and actions of all Americans in all areas of human conduct. It would have empowered the President of the United States—or the Attorney General acting for him—to use the full armed might of the Nation to force integration of the races in every facet of life, public and private, in the South. It would have repealed the constitutional right of trial by jury.

Seventeen determined southern Senators—with all odds against them—set out to do what their counterparts in the House of Representatives were unable to do: To eliminate the more vicious provisions of this monstrous legislation. The success of their skillful, courageous efforts and the effectiveness of their persuasive, dignified arguments speak for themselves.

The measure as the Senate returned it to the House of Representatives was an emaciated shadow of its former brute self.

The Senate version struck out those provisions which would have restored bayonet rule and authorized the use of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps to force racial integration in the South.

The Senate version eliminated those provisions which would have given the Attorney General dictatorial powers to regiment the thoughts and actions of the American people.

The Senate version contained an ironclad guaranty that the constitutional right of trial by jury would be respected and upheld in all cases of criminal contempt arising under it.

The success of the southern Senators in pyramiding their 17 votes to win these herculean victories for constitutional government and individual liberty was beyond their fondest original expectation. As repugnant as are the remaining provisions to constitutional principle and States rights, it nevertheless had to be admitted, even by advocates of the measure, that southern Senators gained far more than they lost.

It had been hoped that the House of Representatives would sustain the full gains made by the Senate.

Unfortunately, however—through a so-called compromise which compromises at best principle and at worst the Constitution of the United States—the jury-trial guaranty was sacrificed.

After only an hour's delay, the House returned the bill to the Senate.

The problem then confronting southern Senators was how best to protect the interests of their constituents.

Certain Members of the House of Representatives presumed to advocate that we conduct a filibuster against the bill.

I do not know why these men arrogated unto themselves greater wisdom than the combined intellect of 16 southern Senators. It could not possibly be because they were more successful in eliminating the more vicious and iniquitous provisions of the bill.

To be sure, the fact that a grandstand of long-winded speeches would be immediately popular with our constituents—who, like us, are unalterably opposed to this bill in any form—was not lost upon us.

But reason dictated that, in determining our course of action, we should measure the gains we had made against the potential losses.

The facts we had to face were these:

First. It would be impossible for 17 Senators to conduct a filibuster until the convening of the 86th Congress in January 1959. Debate in the Senate can be limited by 64 votes, and with 79 Members of the Senate favoring a civil-rights bill, there exist 15 votes more than the number necessary to impose gag rule at will.

Second. There is pending in a subcommittee of the Rules Committee of which I am chairman seven different resolutions—Senate Resolutions 17, 19, 21, 28, 29, 30, and 32—to liberalize the provisions of Senate rule XXII, under which debate in the Senate can be limited. Those resolutions contain an aggregate of 54 signatures—5 more than necessary to pass any one of them.

As chairman of that subcommittee, I have been successful in my insistence upon full hearings on, and thorough study of, these resolutions before any action is taken on them. Because of the present complexion of the Rules Committee, it is well known that any filibuster attempt would result in the reporting of one or more of these pending resolutions and the imposition of a much stronger cloture rule, which would further limit the ability of individual Senators to protect their constituents.

Third. The majority of the Members of the Senate—by at least 3 to 1—favors a stronger bill than the one presently under consideration. This is evidenced by the fact that, in voting on amendments to parts III and IV of the bill, 12 to 15 Senators voted with the South on one amendment, only to vote against it on the other.

There is considerable sentiment on the part of the President and the majority of the Members of both Houses of Congress to add a new section III to this bill which would empower the Attorney General, without jury trial, to force complete integration of our society. During the course of prolonged debate, such action still could be taken.

Fourth. Next year is a Congressional election year. Both the Democratic and Republican Parties—aided and abetted by the White House and the Vice President—undoubtedly will demand next January that this same Congress pass a much stronger civil-rights bill, probably with FEPC provisions. These efforts will again require determined opposition on the part of southern Senators, and our success will depend in large measure upon the good will of Senators from other areas of our country.

Should we destroy what good will remains among independent Senators of this Congress, the passage of new, radical civil-rights legislation, with FEPC provisions, will be a foregone conclusion.

For these reasons, it was the unanimous opinion of the 16 dedicated southern Senators that no organized filibuster against the Brownell bill be conducted on the floor of the Senate.

Speaking for myself, Mr. President, I have represented, and will continue to represent, my constituents and our beloved State of Georgia to the best of my ability and according to the dictates of my conscience.

I have never compromised principle, and I never will.

But I declare to this Senate, the Nation, and the world, Mr. President, that neither will I allow those who are uninformed as to the facts and circumstances to stampede me into acts which I am convinced would, in the long run, wreak unspeakable havoc upon my people.

And it is to them, Mr. President, that I leave the judgment of my decision and action.

Mr. LONG. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the Republican leader of the Senate be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, during the course of this debate, I have differed on numerous occasions with the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE]. He has thought that this approach to the pending bill was wrong, and I have thought that it was right. I respect him for his opinions, and I believe he respects me and those who have differed with him for our opinions.

Anyone who knows the Senate of the United States is aware of the fact that the overwhelming majority of the Senate desires to pass a voting rights bill. There can be no question that had the majority desired to do so, cloture could have been invoked to pass the bill in its present form, with votes to spare.

As one who has served in the Senate for over 12 years, I honor the Senate of the United States and its great tradition. One of these traditions is that of free debate.

During the entire debate up until yesterday, the discussion was both germane and helpful. Up until then, the debate had contributed to the working out of amendments and modification of the bill, some very substantial in character.

Because of the high standard of the general debate, the majority properly decided neither to circulate a cloture petition nor to attempt to invoke cloture. Had the Senate been blocked by dilatory tactics and obstructionism in debate, we would have had no other choice. That this condition did not come about is due to the restraint and the statesmanship of the opponents of the proposed legislation and to the reasonableness and the moderation of the proponents.

It has been a hard fight. I hope it leaves no scars that cannot be quickly healed.

We honor and we respect our colleagues from the South who have made an honorable and a determined fight against heavy odds. Their fight resulted in substantial amendments to the bill as it came to the Senate from the House of Representatives. I hope and believe that the Commission that will be appointed by the President of the United States under this bill will be a fair and moderate one in its approach to the great problems involved.

I make this final plea tonight particularly addressed to our colleagues from the South. Let no gulf divide us. Let us close ranks as Americans and try for just solutions to our common problems.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to express my profound thanks, as a fellow Senator and as an American, to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] for his fine, unselfish leadership in the handling of this particular piece of legislation. I pay special tribute to his skill, patience, and foresight. The qualities which he has exemplified constitute highlights among senatorial records of all time.

He discharged his responsibilities with the greatest of distinction. The fine prestige which he enjoys among every one of his colleagues and throughout the Nation lent great weight to the cause for which he spoke. He is an able constitutional lawyer, with a highly trained mind. He is an experienced legislator and parliamentarian. All those qualities added weight to his efforts. He has rendered a great service not only to the South but to the Nation. I am sure we all feel a great debt of gratitude to him, above all, for his devoted selflessness, his magnificent courage, his wise counsel, and his great knowledge. He has been a source of strength to all of us—not merely those of us from the South. He has lent strength to this body and to the Nation. My people are among those who are his grateful and everlasting debtors. It is my privilege and honor to speak for them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the kind words of the Senator from Mississippi. I know better than anyone else that I do not deserve the measure of credit he accords to me. This was a joint effort. I served as chairman of the group, but the leadership was joint. The group was so small that we could all be leaders.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I followed the well chosen words of the Senator from Mississippi very carefully as he uttered them. I do not know that I have ever heard a more accurate or more beautiful tribute paid to any colleague in the Senate. I could spend days and nights attempting to emulate the Senator from Mississippi and yet not be able to do it. Therefore I should like the RECORD to show that the sentiments he has expressed are entertained by the senior Senator from Texas. They are expressive of the very high regard and the very great respect and affection that so many people, including the President of the United States, have expressed for the senior Senator from Georgia. But for him, there would have been passed by the Senate a far-reaching, a vicious, and an unworkable piece of legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say that I am very much overwhelmed by these expressions. It would be impossible for me to have my affection for the Senator from Texas to be increased. I enjoy our relationship as one of the things that I prize most highly in this life. The Senator from Texas knows better than anyone else that I am not in fact entitled to the statement he has made.

Without the brilliant leadership displayed by the senior Senator from Texas, it would have been impossible to secure adoption of the jury trial amendment.

I am always somewhat uncomfortable when I am being praised for something I do not deserve. I say to the Senator from Texas, in the words, I believe, of Horace: "It is sweet to be praised by those who are themselves praised."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] for the very able, wise, devoted, and inspiring leadership which he gave to our southern group of Senators. The action of our group was the action that came out of conferences in which members of the group sat around the table together and talked over and weighed the different situations, and exchanged their thoughts and ideas most carefully, and canvassed and surveyed all the different possibilities.

We acted after we had made the most painstaking, careful, and thorough examination of the facts and of the practical polical situation which confronted us.

The people of the South could not have had a leader with greater fidelity to them than the Senator from Georgia.

The Senator from Georgia, with great personal sacrifice, tireless effort, and inexhaustible work, rendered a consecrated service to the cause of the people of the South, and a consecrated service to the cause of the entire Nation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say that every word that has been spoken so eloquently by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and by the distinguished Senators from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and Alabama [Mr. HILL] strikes a completely responsive chord in my heart.

Not only the South, but the whole Nation is greatly indebted to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia. I have never been prouder to be numbered among his close friends and associates than I am right now.

In following his leadership, gladly and devotedly, and in cooperating with others who felt the same way about following that leadership in the long debate, we found him, as a leader, brilliant, resourceful, courageous, indefatigable, selfless, and and always inspiring. I

shall always be proud to have marched under his leadership.

Mr. President, in addition to that I wish to say two other things. I have never felt in any previous debates which we have had on somewhat similar subjects as this a greater conviction that Senators from other parts of the Nation have an understanding of our peculiar problems, and sympathy for them, and a willingness to go just as far as their great consciences would permit them to go in helping us to meet what are really no small problems in the Southland.

I believe they have shown a clear understanding of the nature of those problems, and a great sympathy and patience with the necessarily slow pace of the solution of some of those problems, and the finest patriotic willingness to join, even to the extent of casting votes which for them were very difficult, in seeing that fairness and justice and kind solutions be employed to meet those problems.

There is one more comment that I believe is due. I believe this is the first time since I have been in the Senate that the press, radio, and the various other channels of communication and information have been so fair and so just, both in depicting what transpired on the floor of the Senate and in seeking to analyze and understand the problems which have heretofore not been understood well in other parts of our Nation.

Mr. President, when such a spirit as that prevails not only on the floor of the Senate but in the press and kindred bodies, and, as my correspondence shows me, generally throughout the Nation in the hearts of good people, I feel that we are getting closer and closer to sane and sound solutions, which are just and which are lawful and which still preserve some of the finest values which I believe prevail in all of America—values in southern life—which not only are held dear by us, but I think are held dear by citizens throughout our great Nation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I find it very difficult to say more than the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has said about the senior Senator from Georgia. I cannot refrain, however, from saying that while it is true many Senators participated in the conferences, I believe the final decision, in which real wisdom and judgment was involved, was made by the senior Senator from Georgia. I cannot emphasize that statement too strongly.

When I look back, I know that the senior Senator from Georgia has made a decision which will mean a great deal, not only to the South, but to the Nation as a whole. Therefore I cannot endorse too strongly what has been said about him. He has evidenced the highest form of statesmanship through the handling of this troublesome and controversial subject.

I cannot refrain from paying tribute also to the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] for his statement last evening before the Senate voted on the bill. I was extremely pleased and encouraged by his statement, and I feel that the whole performance bodes well for the future.

I have a feeling that the passage of the legislation, displeasing as it is to me, for many reasons which I will not repeat now, has aroused an understanding in other parts of the country, and it may possibly be the beginning of a new era of understanding, and a lessening of the bitter controversy that has plagued us in the Senate ever since I have been a Member of it.

When I look back and consider how much time Senators, with great talents and energy, such as possessed by the Senator from Georgia and other Senators, have devoted to this matter, and how much could have been accomplished if all of it had been devoted to much more constructive efforts, I feel sad indeed.

However, that is the other side of the coin. While I dislike the bill which has been passed, on the other hand, I believe it may free some of our best minds to follow other lines which may be more profitable and valuable for the Nation as a whole.

I believe that, perhaps, out of this fight on what is in a sense a compromise, a spirit of understanding and cooperation may come, which will be most beneficial to the whole country, and I certainly think both the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Texas deserve the greatest praise and the gratitude of the country.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to join in the well-deserved tribute to the distinguished Senator from Georgia. He has made a great contribution not only to the South, but to the entire Nation in the handling of the civil-rights legislation. I shudder. to think what would have been the result had the Senate passed the civil-rights bill that came to us from the House. It is true that probably under limitation of debate the Senate could have passed on that legislation in 2 days, as the House did. We chose to take 2 months, and we chose to retain the right of unlimited speech here in the Senate. I think the history of the enactment of this legislation has proved that retention of freedom of speech is of overriding importance. We can enact fair and just legislation and still retain freedom of speech. I have always believed in the freedom of speech in the Senate, with no limitation of time, and I shall never vote for cloture. I believe the history of the enactment of this legislation has proved the correctness of that position.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with what has been said by my colleagues in the Senate with respect to the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. He has served only a few months longer than I have in the United States Senate. I have observed his great contributions during this long period for the good of our country; but in the last few months he has rendered outstanding service to the South and to the entire United States in his leadership by determining what was best to be done with respect to one of the most vexatious problems which has ever confronted the Senate. He has given brilliant and wise leadership.

I wish to express my complete confidence in him as the leader of the southern Senators, and I am in full agreement with all he has done. While the bill which was passed last night does not meet with my approval, I think we could have gotten a far worse bill had it not been for the outstanding leadership which was displayed.

I believe title III would have been destructive of the most fundamental principles of our Government. It would have deprived us of the right of trial by jury. It would have made a modern Ceasar of the Attorney General of the United States, as I said in a speech to the Senate. He could have injected himself into legal matters throughout the country. I wish to express my deep appreciation to both the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] for the capacity for leadership they have shown in meeting the problem that confronted us.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the statements made by my colleague [Mr. STENNIS] and the other southern Senators relative to the distinguished senior Senator from the State of Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I have been honored to serve under his leadership, and I do not believe any group at any time has had an abler, more resourceful, more responsible leadership than the Senator from Georgia has given the southern people.

Mr. President, I do not believe the people of the South and the people of the country for generations will be indebted to any man more than they are indebted to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia for the outstanding work he has performed in their behalf. All the American people are indebted to him because he has upheld and protected the Constitution of the United States and our system of government. The distinguished Senator from Georgia has my complete confidence, and I certainly wish the RECORD to show that I am in complete agreement with every decision he has made. I know it has been for the best interest of our country and for the best interest of the southern people.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to say a word at this time as one who is in somewhat of an objective position. I do not add my words with respect to the work of the senior Senator from Georgia as one who knew intimately or was concerned directly with the problems which confront our friends from the Southern States. I speak as one who lives at some distance from the South in a section which is without some of the problems which we know face the South. I add my words of tribute to the senior Senator from Georgia as one who believes he made a contribution to the country as a whole in helping us to arrive at legislation which does not carry any vindictiveness and which does not contain any language which would give an opportunity for extreme demonstration. I am sure it was not really the intent of those sponsoring the legislation to enact a statute that would hold opportunities for revenge or vindictiveness.

I believe that by the modification of part III of the bill and by the adoption

of an amendment which provides for jury trial in aggravated cases of criminal contempt a real contribution was made to sound legislation. The Senator from Georgia made a distinct contribution in that regard. I voted with him on two occasions, which was an expression of my sentiments.

I feel that the total result is a tribute to the legislative process. As I said last night, without the iron will of the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senate never would have considered the bill. Without the restraint exercised by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], we would perhaps still be debating the bill, and goodness knows for how long. As it is, we have good legislation and I think it is a credit to all who had a part in its enactment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I desire to join my colleagues who have expressed appreciation for the leadership of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I have been privileged to serve in this distinguished body with three grand men from Georgia—Walter George, RICHARD RUSSELL, and HERMAN TALMADGE. The late Senator George has gone to his last reward, leaving his name written high on the famous eternal scroll, and the two present Senators from Georgia are carrying on in the same high tradition.

Last night the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] made one of the best speeches of the session—short but effective—explaining why the southern Senators had decided not to conduct a filibuster against a bill which was distasteful to them. Those who were present or those who read the RECORD this morning will recall that following the speech, the distinguished minority leader, who is not given to boasting, said that if a filibuster had been undertaken, cloture could have been invoked.

The senior Senator from Georgia, with whom I have been privileged to serve now for more than 10 years, and whom I have had the privilege of knowing for more than 25 years, knows the high esteem in which I hold him and the warm affection I have for him. He knows I campaigned for his nomination for the Presidency in 1952, and would gladly do so again.

At this moment we are particularly grateful for the high type of leadership he gave us on one of the most difficult, one of the most controversial bills which has been before the Senate in modern years.

Many things could be said at this time, but we know the time for adjournment is pressing upon us. Therefore, I desired merely to add my voice to the voices of the other southern Senators, in order that everyone in the United States may know that we have appreciated the leadership of the senior Senator from Georgia and that we were behind him 100 percent in the decisions he made during that period, in which we won some notable victories in changing the bill as to the form in which it came from the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the possession of friends is the greatest asset that a man can have, and the statements which have been made reveal such friendship, then I must be richer than Croesus. I can only think that my friends look at me through glasses of friendship. It makes me very humble to hear the undeserved words that have been spoken about me. There is no superlative in the English language for saying "Thank you," so, in all humility, all I can say to each and every one of my colleagues is "Thank you."

NOMINATION OF ARNOLD R. JONES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on this, the terminal day of this session, there is certain unfinished business in the United States Senate, some of it extremely important. One such matter I want to mention specifically to the Senate at this time.

The Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee has been holding extensive hearings on the nomination of Arnold R. Jones to be a Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Yesterday, at the close of the seventh day of the hearings, it was announced that another witness would be heard at 10 o'clock this morning. I am now advised that the acting chairman of the subcommittee has indefinitely postponed the hearing, this without giving the nominee any opportunity to answer the many unsupported charges made against him and without action by the subcommittee or the full committee on the nomination.

It is my understanding that for several days the committee has been ready to vote favorably on this nomination, but that a small group has been prolonging the hearings to avoid a vote. Now this cancellation of hearings without action on this last day of the session leaves the Tennessee Valley without a legally functioning Board of Directors and leaves the record of hearings filled with unsupported and misleading allegations.

Mr. President, no Member of this body more earnestly believes in adequate deliberation on matters of public policy than I do. Nor do I yield to any Senator in insisting more than I on holding adequate and thorough inquiries by the duly constituted committees of the Senate into the fitness of nominations for high governmental positions.

In this instance, however, I submit to the Senate that the processes of the Senate committee system has been used in order to frustrate the will of the majority of a committee, and, I believe, a majority of the Senate. This is playing politically fast and loose with one of the major instrumentalities of the United States Government.

No charge levelled against Mr. Jones has been supported in fact.

Mr. Jones has not failed to answer honestly and forthrightly any question asked of him.

No evidence has been submitted to justify any charge that, if his nomination is confirmed, Mr. Jones would fail to discharge the public trust properly and in keeping with the letter and intent of the law, as a Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

There is evidence, on the other hand, that, for reasons which transcend Mr. Jones, and which do not pertain to his fitness for this office in any way, the opportunity to confirm his nomination is being withheld from the Senate.

Mr. President, as one Member of the Senate, speaking personally, and as minority leader of the Senate, speaking officially, I raise my voice in protest and in deep regret that this type of procedure should have been permitted by the majority of the Senate to proceed for as long as it has, and with the unfortunate impact on the public interest which it is bound to have.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, as the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, of the Committee on Public Works—that subcommitte conducted these hearings—I wish to say that I believe the words of the distinguished minority leader are well justified.

The vacancy in the directorship of the Tennessee Valley Authority Board came on May 17. The President of the United States did not act hastily. The nomination is an important one; and he sent the nomination of Mr. Jones tc the Senate on the 1st day of July—within 6 weeks of the development of the vacancy, during which period there had to be investigations of possible appointees.

That nomination rested with the committee from the 1st day of July until a little more than a week ago, when hearings on it were commenced. That is to say, the nomination was before the committee for almost 2 months, before hearings were held.

In the interim, on the 7th of August, a second vacancy occurred on the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority, by reason of the death of Mr. Paty.

The result was that the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority was left with only one member.

The basic Tennessee Valley Authority Act provides that the action of the Board shall not be impaired, provided there are 2 members of the Board; and the act provides that 2 members shall constitute a quorum.

The net result is that today the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority has only one member; so today there is not a quorum of the Board.

The validity of any contract entered into by the Tennessee Valley Authority while there is only one member of its Board would be subject to question. If the House had acted on the bill the Senate passed—I refer to the bill to give the TVA authority to issue bonds—the validity of the bonds certainly could be questioned if they were issued by the Board when it had only one member.

The tactics which have been followed were, I believe, a disservice to the Tennessee Valley Authority. I believe that the people of the Tennessee Valley have been misled by certain groups who took it upon themselves to try to sandbag the nomination of an outstanding man.

Mr. Arnold R. Jones, who was nominated by the President, is a man of great experience in fiscal analysis and in governmental policy; and, of course, his entire life has been spent in that type of activity. In my judgment, he would make the best qualified man the Tennessee Valley Authority Board has ever had

in the field of fiscal management, as applied to a Government activity. His record at Kansas State College and his record in the Bureau of the Budget have been records of competency and honesty.

I do not know what course may now be followed, either by Mr. Jones or by the President, with respect to an interim appointment.

But, Mr. President, in any event, I personally deplore the tactics which were pursued, and which were encouraged, I believe, by groups who have betrayed the people of the Tennessee Valley, who are entitled to have a competent man, such as Mr. Jones, named to the Board, so it may function properly.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I wish to say that I commend the minority leader and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] for their remarks.

It so happens that Mr. Jones is from my State of Kansas. I have had the privilege of serving with Mr. Jones in official positions in my State for a number of years. It has been my good fortune to know him over a period of almost 20 years or more.

I know he is a competent man. I know he is a fair man. I know he is an eminently qualified man for this responsible position.

I regret exceedingly the situation and the position in which we find ourselves at this time, namely, that the committee and the Senate were deprived of the opportunity to vote on the confirmation of his nomination as director of TVA.

I am not a member of the committee, and I respect committee procedures, committee activities, and committee considerations, but I feel that if this nomination had been submitted to the committee a majority of the members would have voted favorably for him.

I have attended practically all the meetings of the committee at which Mr. Jones was called on to testify and at which he was present; and I believe that in fairness to the Tennessee Valley and certainly in fairness to the nominee, Mr. Arnold Jones, who is from my State, he deserved at least the consideration by the committee of passing on his nomination before this session of Congress closed.

But, Mr. President, I wish to say that those who are interested in the Tennessee Valley, those who are interested in governmental procedures in a responsible way, I am sure have misjudged Mr. Arnold Jones; and by this type of procedure they are delaying the carrying out of some very useful lawful procedures which should have been carried out.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the administration of the Tennessee Valley Authority is lodged in a three-man Board of Directors. The statute is clear. A majority of two members of the Board of Directors is necessary in order to have the Board of Directors determine the policy to be followed, and to carry out the multitudinous responsibilities of that great American governmental enterprise.

The failure of the Senate to have an opportunity to sit in judgment on the nomination made by the President of the United States effectively frustrates the administration of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I have been a Member of the Senate Committee on Public Works. I have sat through all the hearings held on the President's nomination of Arnold Jones. What my colleagues have said unquestionably is true: A bipartisan majority of that committee was ready, days ago, to vote to approve and report the nomination of Mr. Jones, so it might be considered by the Senate.

It is regrettable that that was not done; and it is regrettable from the standpoint of the best interests of the TVA.

I have tried to help the Tennessee Valley Authority. I have done it as a United States Senator, as a member of the committee which has had to do with the problems of that agency. I am glad to say to you, Mr. President, that I helped draft, in committee, the proposed legislation which the Senate passed, a few days ago, giving new bond-issuing authority to the agency. So I speak as a Republican who has been interested in the TVA.

I can only repeat what my senior colleague [Mr. KNOWLAND] has said, namely, that it is regrettable that the Senate of the United States has not had an opportunity to have before it what unquestionably would have come before it, if the Committee on Public Works had been given an opportunity to vote on it, namely, a recommendation on the part of the committee that the Senate concur in the nomination made by the President.

I can make other comments. I shall not, in the interest of time. I merely wish to say I associate myself with what the Senator from California has said.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, as another member of the Committee on Public Works, I wish to take a moment to add a word to the statements which have been made by my colleagues, senior members of that committee. It became increasingly clear, as the hearings continued in the Public Works Committee, that time was going to be consumed in hearing many witnesses and in long examinations of Mr. Jones until it would be too late in this session for the committee to act. It became increasingly clear that if the committee were permitted to act without hearing witnesses, important witnesses who had a right to appear and deserved the courtesy, the committee would have been definitely in favor of the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Jones as a Director of TVA.

I say this because I have lived with TVA for many years in the other body of Congress as a member of the Appropriations Committee. I have spoken on the floor very recently in connection with amendments limiting TVA geographically. I want to make it specifically clear here, as I did in committee, as one member of the committee, that I listened with the greatest care to the examination of Mr. Jones. Even though I do not live in that area of the country, and sometimes have favored limiting TVA, I would not be a party to moving in a Trojan horse on TVA or voting to confirm the nomination, on the floor of the Senate or in committee, of any man who would not conscientiously work for the welfare of the Tennessee Valley Authority and who could not conscientiously take the oath.

After days of interrogation, Mr. Jones came out of that hearing foursquare, and I think there was no member of the committee who was not honestly convinced of Mr. Jones' complete integrity and of his devotion to public service, as shown through the years of service in his office. He was candid, frank, and truthful. He leaned over backwards to give the members of the committee and other distinguished Members of this body who interrogated him completely frank and fair answers.

I think the RECORD should show that the majority of the Committee on Public Works, if given an opportunity this minute, would recommend the confirmation of the nomination. I wanted to add that word to what other Senators have said.

THE UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE VERSUS ASIATIC INFLUENZA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] on a matter dealing with the United States Public Health Service.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR POTTER

Before this session of Congress adjourns, I should like to direct the attention of the Senate to efforts of the Public Health Service to protect Americans against an epidemic of influenza. A new lype of flu, sweeping across vast areas of the world, is making its appearance in the United States.

The manner in which the Surgeon General Leroy E. Burney and his staff are coping with a mammoth threat is distinguished by initiative, speed, and imagination. It is a symbol of dynamic leadership in guarding the health of each and every one of our people, as exemplified by the Eisenhower administration.

My own special responsibilities in the fields of health, education, and welfare, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, provide an opportunity to observe closely the record of the Public Health Service since the first inkling of a threatened flu epidemic reached it.

Just 4 months ago the Service learned that a flu outbreak in Hong Kong had spread through Cambodia, Laos, Pakistan, Vietnam, and India, leaping across the Pacific to the Philippines and Indonesia.

With airplanes and ships bringing exposed individuals into United States ports every day, the Public Health Service immediately realized the implications of contagion.

A technical team sped to Hong Kong to isolate and analyze the new strain of influenza virus. It was discovered to be a type against which the American people have no immunity. Worse yet, no protective vaccines had previously been developed.

The story of what could happen in the United States, as projected by the medical staff at Public Health Service, is gloomy: As many as 33 million people in this country could come down with the disease, resulting in approximately 66,000 deaths. While the

Asiatic type of flu is not serious, it does produce casualties, and Public Health experts are keenly aware that if the virulence increases, mortalities will zoom.

The effect on groups and communities could be quite serious. Here is what Surgeon General Burney has to say:

"Entire groups could be incapacitated for perhaps a week at a time, with tremendous consequences on health services, on vital channels of transportation and communication, on other necessary local services, and on the local economy. It is important, therefore, that consideration be given to early vaccination of key groups."

By late May—roughly a month after it had received word of the epidemics abroad—the Public Health Service had initiated the development of experimental vaccines at six licensed pharmaceutical houses.

As of today, a scientific miracle is efficiently under way. Hundreds of thousands of cc's of protective vaccine are in production with a goal of 60 million cc's by next February. Distribution plans are being worked out. A vast public-education program is in process.

The Public Health Service, in short, takes the position that while it is impossible at this time to predict the size, extent, or severity of an influenza epidemic, it is their responsibility to develop a program of maximum possible protection.

I was proud, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, to be instrumental in granting $800,000 in supplemental funds for this great work and to approve a contingent transfer of $2 million from the President's disaster-relief funds, to be used only if needed.

We are indeed fortunate that the physical well-being of our citizens—the most precious asset this Nation has—is in the custody of a magnificent team of professionals in the Public Health Service.

FREEDOM SHRINE

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a few nights ago, on August 28, an editorial appeared in the Washington Star with respect to the freedom shrine, which contained some very inaccurate statements that should be corrected. Inasmuch as the editorial uses the name of the senior Senator from Colorado, I feel compelled to discuss it, to talk about it, and to correct the record before the Congress adjourns. I do not intend to engage in any calumny or anything of that sort, because the concept of the freedom shrine is so great and so magnificent and so inspirational that any words of that sort would only detract from the great dignity and respect to which this whole movement is entitled.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the editorial may be printed in its entirety at this point in my remarks, in order that the RECORD may be clear.

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

SECOND LOOK ADVISABLE

Speaker RAYBURN was right in his stand against any last-minute effort to railroad the controversial "freedom wall" bill through the House. And Representative SHEPPARD of California was right in contending that Congress should know more about the proposed shrine before authorizing its construction near Arlington Cemetery. A careful second look at this legislation should be taken before final action.

The belated move to stampede Congress into approving legislation for the 500-foot-long, 250-foot-wide, 90-foot-high shrine to American freedoms has left the public with little detailed information about the project. The Senate and House Interior Committees reported the bill favorably without holding any public hearings, although the legislation will affect long-time plans for the development of the Washington area. And the Senate, before voting in favor of the bill last week, was misinformed as to actions taken by the National Capital Planning Commission and the Fine Arts Commission on the Freedom Wall design. Senator ALLOTT, a member of the sponsoring group, in urging approval, said: "After lengthy considerations running into 3 years, the Fine Arts Commission formally approved the freedom shrine plan which we have selected. It was also approved by the National Capital Planning Commission, after extensive studies and hearings." Senator ALLOTT was mistaken as to what the two Commissions approved, however. Spokesmen for both agencies say that approval was given only to the general concept of a freedom shrine—not to any particular design, including the wall plan. It was the understanding of both Commissions, officials have advised the Star, that specific designs would be presented later for approval.

The whole history of the freedom monument project has been a curious one. Apparently originated by the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge, Pa., the shrine idea was pushed through Congress in 1954 without benefit of advice from either the Planning Commission or the Fine Arts Commission. Neither Commission, we learn, was consulted about the proposal to put the monument on the so-called Nevius tract, acquired by the Federal Government to prevent private development there. Congress, ignoring the basic McMillan plan for keeping that area clear of structures, in deference to the neighboring national cemetery, presented both Commissions with a mandate to abandon that plan in favor of the freedom monument. It is understood that at that time the Fine Arts Commission protested to the Budget Bureau the bypassing of the Commission by Congress—which created the agency to advise it on such matters.

But, favored with the blessing of President Eisenhower, who contributed the first dime toward a $23.9 million private subscription fund to finance the project, and by the cooperation of Gen. Omar Bradley, chairman of the fund-raising committee, the sponsors of the undertaking have had remarkable success in obtaining Congressional and Executive support. However, we do not think that an impressive list of backers, headed by the President, is any justification for approving a proposal of such magnitude without careful study and competent advice. We hope the freedom wall project will be the subject of adequate public hearings at the next session of Congress, at which there will be full disclosure of detailed plans for the shrine and full discussion of its effects, good or bad, on the long-range development of the National Capital.

Mr. ALLOTT. This matter involves the freedom shrine, the National Monument Commission, and the Freedom Foundation of Valley Forge.

The National Monument Commission was created by Public Law 742 of the 83d Congress. Pursuant to that law, the Vice President of the United States appointed the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] and me to serve upon the Commission. We have continued to serve upon the Commission to this date.

One of the provisions of that law, which set aside what is known as the Nevius tract, directly west of the Lincoln Memorial, for the purposes of establishing a freedom shrine, was that the Commission should perfect designs and concepts of such a shrine and submit them for approval to the Department of the Interior, to the National Capital Planning Commission, and to the Commission of Fine Arts.

When that was completed, a bill was offered, in June of this year, to authorize the construction of this great concept of freedom. The concept itself is to have, in one place in America, spelled out in simple statements and simple language, the great ideas of freedom which have been created in this country, so that we will have an edifice which truly represents and would truly be a shrine of freedom.

This idea did not originate in Congress. It did not originate with the Freedom Foundation of Valley Forge, as the editorial says. The idea originated with a group of Georgia people about 7 years ago. Those people raised $275,000 to promote the idea of the creation of a freedom shrine in Georgia. They found that the idea met with such great approval and such great response that it had to be expanded from its original concept.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I first wish to say that I certainly want to compliment the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado, not only for his specific interest in this project, but for his service on the National Monument Commission, which oversees these various historic shrines that perpetuate the great traditions of our country.

Since the Senator has mentioned the public-spirited attitude of the people in Georgia, I wonder if I can assist in clarifying a point, which perhaps the Senator had in mind bringing out. Is it not true that the people in Georgia have made a great sacrifice, because they recognize that great and historic though their own State is, it perhaps might not be quite as appropriate a place for this great edifice perpetuating our historic legacy of freedom as would be the vicinity of the National Capital of the United States?

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is completely correct on that point.

Mr. NEUBERGER. And they also recognized that even though Georgia is on a great many arteries of travel, the National Capital of our country draws still more people from all over the United States and all over the world.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Therefore, they felt that they were honoring the area of the District of Columbia by voluntarily agreeing or voluntarily deciding that the great freedom shrine, which they had originated in the form of an idea, should not be placed in Georgia, but should be situated in the area of the National Capital.

To a degree some of the people in the area of the National Capital to say the least have not been too hospitable, when they themselves are honored by having this locality chosen as the site for this great shrine.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think the remarks of the Senator are completely accurate.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I have one further question I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado.

Is it not true that this freedom shrine or this temple of democracy or Parthenon of democracy, however we want to describe it, would be the work of people from all over the United States? The school children would contribute their pennies. Public-spirited citizens of an eleemosynary nature would perhaps leave larger legacies, and so on. The shrine would represent the sum total of the interest and generosity of the people all the way from the Puget Sound to the State of Maine, so far as contributions are concerned.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct. I intended to go into that little matter a little later, but that is the concept. This will be a shrine contributed by the schoolchildren and by the people of America, and not built from the appropriations provided by Congress.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In conclusion, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Colorado in answering the misleading editorial of the Washington Star and in defending and upholding this very worthwhile undertaking.

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate very much the contribution and help which my good friend, the Senator from Oregon, has given in this matter.

People in Georgia had raised $275,000 and utilized that money to develop the drawings, designs, and concepts for the Monument to Freedom. They found, as the Senator from Oregon has said, that it was simply too large a concept to be located in any single area, and that the logical location was the National Capital. That accounts for their getting together with the Freedom Foundation of Valley Forge and joining forces with them. They contributed all their work, labor, and effort to a joint undertaking which was then carried on under the Freedom Foundation of Valley Forge, and which resulted in Public Law 742 of the 83d Congress, setting out the site and creating the National Monument Commission to develop the monument.

I do not want to quarrel with the writer of this editorial about the words he uses. I think he uses words which are intended to inflame the reader, or to slant the article against the national monument. For instance, not only in this editorial but in the two articles which appear in that same paper the term "freedom wall" has been used. It is not a wall. Whoever used that term did so inadvisedly, and apparently in an attempt to cast some reflection upon the greatness of the design which has been created.

A great many of the most prominent historians in this country have participated in this project, as have some 200 judges of the State supreme courts.

This project grew out of the effort of a great many people. It is not the product of the efforts of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] or myself. Our part in it is a very, very minor one.

When the bill was introduced—and I want to make the record particularly clear on this matter—it went to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affair, of which both the Senator from Oregon and I are members. It was put on the calendar of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the regular way. I wish to make the record completely clear and keep it straight on that point. There was no particular publicity about the matter, but the bill was put on the calendar exactly as hundreds of other bills are put on the calendar for consideration by the committee.

Reports of the Department of Interior were requested and received.

On the day the committee considered it, I requested Dr. Kenneth Wells, of the Freedom Foundation, at Valley Forge, and Mr. Harry Thompson, who is secretary of the Commission, and also an official of the National Capital Parks Service of the Department of the Interior, to appear, and to bring with him the pictures, plans, and plats of the entire concept, for the edification of the committee.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. As I recall, the drawings, plans, maps, and landscape charts to which the Senator from Colorado has referred were placed on the wall and on stands around the meeting room of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, so that members of the committee could have a graphic understanding of just what was contemplated.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct. They were placed mostly at the north end of the room.

The committee did not choose to hear Dr. Wells or Mr. Thompson. I made a statement that morning, and I believe the Senator from Oregon also made a statement. The committee having received a favorable report from the Department of the Interior, reported the bill favorably to the Senate, where it was unanimously approved.

Now, I should like to return briefly to the editorial, from which I read:

> And the Senate, before voting in favor of the bill last week, was misinformed as to actions taken by the National Capital Planning Commission and the Fine Arts Commission on the freedom wall design. Senator ALLOTT, a member of the sponsoring group, in urging approval, said:
>
> "After lengthy considerations running into 3 years, the Fine Arts Commission formally approved the freedom shrine plan which we have selected."

I can construe this editorial in only one way, and that is that the writer of the editorial intended to convey the idea that I was misleading the Senate and the people of Washington. To this I must take definite exception.

I wish to read, as a denial of the editorial, the official action of the National Capital Planning Commission, taken from its own minutes. I read from the minutes of the National Capital Planning Commission for April 5, 1957:

> The motion unanimously carried approving the concepts, design and location of the Freedoms Shrine Monument as developed by the National Monument Commission in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 742 with the understanding that the site plan, when further developed, shall be referred to the Planning Commission for approval.

In a conversation with Mr. John Nolen, Jr., Director of the National Capital Planning Commission, he said that the action taken was specifically with the intent of giving the required clearance for the National Monument Commission to proceed to obtain Congressional authorization, and that, so far as the Commission was concerned, the project was cleared for construction. He stated that the Planning Commission had approved the general nature and design of the monument.

Yesterday I spoke to Mr. Wilson, of the Fine Arts Commission. I hold in my hand a transcript of that conversation, which was taken down with his knowledge and consent. Let me read it to the Senate:

> Senator ALLOTT. This was brought up by an act of Congress to meet your approval. Does it, or does it not? If not, you should have appeared before the Interior Committee when the bills were introduced and we could have——
>
> Mr. WILSON. That was a long time ago—before I was here.
>
> Senator ALLOTT. I am referring to the meetings held last summer
>
> Mr. WILSON. We did approve the general conception of the design.
>
> Senator ALLOTT. You feel that you gave the approval necessary under the act of Congress?
>
> Mr. WILSON. Yes. We gave all the approval that was necessary for the work to proceed.

Mr. Elliot, of my staff, said:

> Have you seen the statement the Senator made?
>
> Mr. WILSON. I saw what was quoted in the editorial here.
>
> Mr. ELLIOT. Do you feel the Senator misled the committee?
>
> Mr. WILSON. I would say the Senator's statement and the action taken by the Commission on Fine Arts were identical.
>
> Senator ALLOTT. Thank you very much, Mr. Wilson. That takes care of it for us. I just wanted to get the matter cleared up for all of our sakes. It is important for the integrity of the Fine Arts Commission as well as for the National Capital Planning Commission.

Mr. President, I have only a few remarks in closing. This is a great and worthy concept, and a great and worthy movement. I hope that those who, for their own reasons—whatever they may be—oppose this project will realize that this movement has been the joint work of hundreds of people up to this time. I hope they will realize that this has one of the most lofty ideals behind it that the human mind could conceive. The proposal is to place in one spot, near our National Capital, this monument to the essentials of our freedom, together with the instruments in history showing how those freedoms were created in the United States.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I commend the Senator from Colorado for clarifying the record with respect to this great undertaking. I think we have some example of the unselfish attitude of the people engaged in this movement when we realize that Dr. Kenneth D. Wells, to whom the Senator from Colorado has referred, worked on this project vigorously in the Capitol Building with many of us during the week when he suffered a minor heart attack. He did so against the advice and counsel of his own physician. This is only one example of the type of selfless service which has entered into the undertaking.

The Senator from Colorado quoted from the editorial in the Evening Star, which referred rather slurringly to this project as "The Wall."

It seems to me this is an example of the absurd arguments which have been raised. After all, every great temple of government in our country, whether it be the Lincoln Memorial, the Jefferson Memorial, or any of the great halls of Government, including that of the Treasury Department, the Interior Department, or the Agriculture Department could be called the wall by someone who wished to ridicule one of those buildings.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Colorado has set the record straight with respect to this undertaking. It is my hope that the House of Representatives will pass the bill authorizing this great patriotic project, and that it will go to the President.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his great contribution.

In conclusion, I invite the attention of Senators to the list of names of a few men who have unselfishly contributed of their time and money for years in furthering this project. The board of governors of the National Freedom Shrine Foundation, under the chairmanship of Spencer T. Olin, includes Vice Chairman Charles F. Palmer of Atlanta, Ga., and Don Belding of Los Angeles, Calif. Dr. Kenneth D. Wells has accepted the presidency of the National Freedom Shrine Foundation. A remarkable staff of distinguished citizens, withdrawn from their usual duties to serve the Nation, are immediately prepared to start this task. The national board of commissioners and governors will be drawn from such people as Gen. Lucius D. Clay, Dr. John Krout, provost of Columbia University; the Very Reverend Theodore Hesburg, president of the University of Notre Dame; Dr. Fred Fagg, president of the University of Southern California; Arthur Hays Sulzberger, Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, Mr. Y. Frank Freeman, Mr. John L. Lewis, Mr. Fred Maytag II; Mr. Robert V. Fleming, Mr. Sid Richardson, Dr. Horace Mann Bond, Chief Justice Carl V. Weygandt, past chairman of the Association of Chief Justices of State Supreme Courts; Mr. George Meany, Mr. Paul Manship, Mr. Horace Albright, Dr. Raymond Allen, chancellor of U. C. L. A.; our own Senate Chaplain, Frederick Brown Harris, the recently retired chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm. Arthur W. Radford, and great numbers of others who have put their interest and time and support behind this great concept.

Therefore, this is not the work of any small group of people. I believe more than anyone else Judge Learned Hand expressed the hopes of all of us when he said:

> We hope by a fitting portrayal of outstanding instances in which those who have gone before us staked all upon the eventual justification of that belief, that we shall fortify our own acceptance of the risks at which they did not flinch. For, make no mistake, the battle is not won, nor will it ever be won. Each generation must decide how far it will seek refuge in eternal and immutable verities rather than grope its way through the tangle of human passions and human credulity. It is our hope that these walls by their beauty and splendor will reaffirm in those who visit them the faith of their predecessors, and inspire them with a resolve not to prove truant to their example.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Public Law 742 of the 83d Congress and the text of S. 2363 may be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, as well as a letter dated August 29, 1957 from Mr. Harry T. Thompson, assistant to the Director of the National Capital Parks Service dealing with this matter.

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

[Public Law 742, 83d Cong., ch. 1160, 2d sess.]

H. R. 6455

An act to create a National Monument Commission, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby created a National Monument Commission. Said Commission shall be composed of four Senators from the Senate of the United States to be appointed by the Vice President of the United States, four Representatives of the House of Representatives of the United States to be appointed by the Speaker of that House, and four eminent citizens of the United States to be appointed by the President of the United States. The Commission shall be bipartisan and the terms of the first Commissioners shall be for one, two, three, and four years and subsequently shall be four years. Vacancies in the Commission shall be filled by the respective designator who appointed the original member. Members shall serve until their respective successors are appointed. The President shall, at the time of appointment, designate one of the members appointed by him to serve as Chairman.

SEC. 2. It shall be the function of said Commission to secure plans and designs for a useful monument to the Nation symbolizing to the United States and the world, the ideals of a democracy as embodied in the five freedoms, speech, religion, press, assembly, and petition, sanctified by the Bill of Rights adopted by Congress in 1789 and later ratified by the States. Such plans shall be approved by the Secretary of the Interior, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the Commission of Fine Arts, and thereafter submitted to Congress for legislative authorization.

SEC. 3. Said monument shall be located on federally owned land within the George Washington Memorial Parkway adjoining the north boundary of Arlington National Cemetery west of Arlington Ridge Road and south of Arlington Boulevard on the heights overlooking the Potomac River. The monument, upon its completion, shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

SEC. 4. Said monument shall serve as an international shrine and a continuing memorial to the principles of the five freedoms and to all peoples and nations who have contributed to the establishment, promotion, and defense of those principles in the preservation of democracy throughout the world. It may include an appropriate structure or structures to house cultural displays and exhibits or symbolic features of national and international significance designed to accomplish the objectives of section 2 of this act.

SEC. 5. (a) Said Commission may establish rules and regulations governing its actions in carrying out the purposes of this act.

(b) The Commission members appointed from the Congress shall serve without additional compensation. Commission members appointed from private life shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of Commission duties. All Commission members shall receive reimbursement for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred by them in the performance of Commission duties.

(c) The Commission is authorized to accept and utilize services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and to pay any such personnel necessary traveling and subsistence expenses when engaged in the work of the Commission.

(d) Within the limits of its appropriations, the Commission is authorized to appoint such personnel, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as, in its discretion, it deems necessary.

(e) The Commission is authorized to request and secure the advice or assistance of any Federal agency. Any Federal agency furnishing advice or assistance to the Commission may expend its own funds for this purpose, with or without reimbursement from the Commission as may be agreed upon between the Commission and the agency.

(f) The Commission shall report annually to the President and Congress its progress and recommendations pertaining to such a memorial. Upon the conclusion of its work, the Commission shall promptly submit a final report.

(g) Thirty days after the submission of its final report the Commission shall cease to exist.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the expenses of the Commission.

[Approved August 31, 1954.]

[S. 2363, 85th Cong., 1st sess.]

A bill to authorize the erection of a national monument symbolizing the ideals of democracy

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to grant authority to the National Freedom Shrine Foundation, a corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, to erect a national monument as contemplated by the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1029), in accordance with plans and designs approved by the National Monument Commission, the National Capital Planning Commission, the Secretary of the Interior, and the National Commission of Fine Arts, and in accordance with all the provisions of such act. The United States shall bear no expense with respect to the erection of such monument.

(b) In the event the construction of such monument has not begun within 5 years from the date of the enactment of this act, the authority granted herein shall terminate and be of no further force or effect.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., August 29, 1957.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: I have just had an opportunity to check a transcript of the hearings held before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on August 22, 1957, at which time consideration was given to S. 2363, a bill to authorize the erection of a national monument symbolizing the ideals of democracy. I have also reviewed an editorial appearing in the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, August 28, in which an attempt is made to mislead the public into believing that statements which you made before the committee are not entirely factual.

Since I was present at meetings of both the National Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission earlier this year, I wish you to know that your statement before the committee was entirely correct when you indicated that, "After lengthy considerations running into 3 years, the Fine Arts Commission formally approved the freedom shrine plan which we have selected. It was also approved by the National Capital Planning Commission, after extensive studies and hearings." The following is an exact quotation from the minutes of the National Capital Planning Commission of April 5, 1957, appearing as item 14 on page 12 of the minutes of that meeting:

"Mr. Thompson informed the Commission that since its last meeting the National Monument Commission had met and approved the concept and design of the proposed monument and had made a full presentation to the Commission of the Fine Arts. He presented a preliminary plan for the Arlington Ridge Road site (NCPC plan file No. 1.9–382). After further discussion, the Commission took the following action:

"Motion unanimously carried approving the concept, design, and location of the Freedoms Shrine Monument, as developed by the National Monument Commission in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 742 with the understanding that the site plan, when further developed, shall be referred to the National Capital Planning Commission for approval."

Having served as a member of the Coordinating Committee of the Planning Commission and as an alternate member of the National Capital Planning Commission, there is no question whatsoever in my mind that the plans presented by the National Monument Commission to that agency were approved in the full sense; that the concept, the general design, and the location as indicated by Public Law 742 were approved by the National Capital Planning Commission. Furthermore, I have consulted directly with officials of the National Commission of Fine Arts subsequent to the hearings and the publication of the editorial above referred to. I have been repeatedly assured that your statement before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee was entirely correct. I have also been repeatedly assured that the National Commission of Fine Arts did approve the concept and design of the national monument which was developed and presented by numerous drawings, elevation sketches, and perspective drawings by the National Monument Commission. I understand that this action will be confirmed to you by the National Commission of Fine Arts.

There can be no doubt that the National Monument Commission, the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Commission of Fine Arts, and the Secretary of the Interior all have approved the concept, the design, and the general location for the proposed national monument referred to in S. 2363.

Sincerely yours,
HARRY T. THOMPSON,
Assistant to the Director.

EXECUTIVE SESSION—CONFIRMATION OF POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have some nominations from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service dealing with three postmasters. I ask that those nominations be now considered. I therefore move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nominations.

The Chief Clerk read the nominations of Victor Wray Irby, Hoyt G. Whitney, and Burl J. Faulkner, to be postmasters.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and agreed to en bloc.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1582) for the relief of Helen Demouchikous, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on the mutual-security program for the fiscal year 1958 for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations; and

S. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of part 1 and subsequent parts of hearings entitled "Investigation of the Financial Condition of the United States," held by the Committee on Finance during the 85th Congress, 1st session.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 229. Concurrent resolution providing that the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Friday, August 30, 1957, sine die; and

H. Con. Res. 230. Concurrent resolution authorizing the signatures on enrolled bills notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 9302) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to appeal as strongly and persuasively as I can to all Senators to permit the Senate have a call of the measures on the calendar which must be sent to the House in the hope that the House can take some action on them.

With respect to explanations and discussions and conversations, I should like to say that we will be in session for some time today, and we will be able to accommodate every Senator. The first thing that we would like to do is to try to act on the noncontroversial bills on the calendar. If Senators will reserve their discussion until we have completed the call of the calendar, in the interest of orderly procedure, I shall be very grateful to them for their cooperation.

MEASURES PASSED OVER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Without objection, the calendar will be called. The clerk will state the first measure of the calendar.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all calendar numbers prior to calendar No. 415 go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, all calendar numbers prior to No. 415 will be passed over.

The bills and resolutions passed over are as follows:

Calendar No. 11, Senate Concurrent Resolution 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;

Calendar No. 69, Senate Resolution 24, to amend rule XIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate;

Calendar No. 131, Senate Concurrent Resolution 20, authorizing an investigation by the Federal Trade Commission into the activities and practices of companies engaged in the production, distribution, or sale of newsprint in interstate commerce;

Calendar No. 192, S. 495, to authorize the acquisition of the remaining property in square 725 in the District of Columbia and the construction thereon of addi-

tional facilities for the United States Senate;

Calendar No. 193, S. 728, to authorize the acquisition of the remaining property in squares 725 and 724 in the District of Columbia for the purpose of extension of the site of the additional office building for the United States Senate;

Calendar No. 249, S. 1164, 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; and

Calendar No. 264, S. 1639, to provide for the suspension of the vesting of alien property and the liquidation of vested property, under the Trading With the Enemy Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next measure in order.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 931) to provide for the reorganization of the safety functions of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PURTELL. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all calendar numbers from 441 to 780, both inclusive, be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bills and resolutions passed over are as follows:

Calendar No. 441, Senate Concurrent Resolution 28, to print a compilation of materials relating to the development of the water resources of the Columbia River and its tributaries.

Calendar No. 482, S. 98, to provide for the establishment and operation of a mining and metallurgical research establishment in the State of Minnesota.

Calendar No. 585, S. 2150, to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 706, S. 1356, to amend the antitrust laws by vesting in the Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction to prevent monopolistic acts by certain persons engaged in commerce in meat and meat products, and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 709, S. 2127, to amend section 3 (d) of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 relating to the reduction in amounts of insurance of persons over the age of 65.

Calendar No. 716, S. 27, to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department.

Calendar No. 722, S. 1168, to amend the Securities and Exchange Act, as amended.

Calendar No. 726, Senate Resolution 118, to amend rule XXVI so as to require committee reports proposing legislation or ratification of treaties, involving expenditure of public funds, to show the estimated costs thereof.

Calendar No. 727, S. 72, to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 740, S. 734, to revise the basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 780, H. R. 6282, for the relief of the former shareholders and debenture note holders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation.

APPOINTMENT OF DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

The bill (S. 264) to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Kansas was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an additional district judge for the district of Kansas. In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the change made by this act in the number of judgeships for the district of Kansas, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to such district:

"Districts	Judges
* * * * *	
"Kansas	3
* * * * *."	

APPOINTMENT OF DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

The bill (S. 697) to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Maryland was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an additional district judge for the district of Maryland. In order that the table contained in section 133 of table 28 of the United States Code will reflect the change made by this act in the number of judgeships for the district of Maryland, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to such district:

"Districts	Judges
* * * * *	
"Maryland	3
* * * * *."	

APPOINTMENT OF DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN, MIDDLE, AND WESTERN DISTRICTS OF NORTH CAROLINA

The bill (S. 2700) to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the eastern, middle, and western districts of North Carolina was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the eastern, middle, and western districts of North Carolina. In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the changes made by this act in the number of judgeships for the eastern, middle, and western districts of North Carolina, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to such districts:

"Districts	Judges
* * * * *	
"North Carolina:	
* * * * *	
"Eastern, middle, and western	1
* * * * *."	

APPOINTMENT OF DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI

The bill (S. 2701) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Mississippi was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate an additional district judge for the southern district of Mississippi. In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the change made by this act in the number of judgeships for the southern district of Mississippi, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to such district:

"Districts	Judges
* * * * *	
Mississippi:	
* * * * *	
Southern	2
* * * * *."	

PERMANENT JUDGESHIP FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH

The bill (S. 2702) to make permanent the temporary judgeship for the district of Utah was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the existing district judgeship for the district of Utah, created by paragraph (6) of section 2 (b) of the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes," approved February 10, 1954 (68 Stat. 1011), shall be a permanent judgeship, and the present incumbent of said judgeship shall henceforth hold his office under section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code as amended by this act. Paragraph (6) of section 2 (b) of the act approved February 10, 1954, is hereby repealed. In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the changes made by this act in the number of permanent district judgeships for the district of Utah, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to such district:

"Districts	Judges
* * * * *	
Utah	2
* * * * *."	

REDISTRICTING OF THE JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF NORTH DAKOTA

The bill (S. 2703) to provide for the redistricting of the judicial district of North Dakota, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to be engrossed

for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 114 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 114. North Dakota

"North Dakota is divided into two judicial districts, to be known as the eastern and western districts of North Dakota.

"EASTERN DISTRICT

"(a) The eastern district comprises two divisions.

"(1) The northern division comprises the counties of Benson, Bottineau, Cavalier, Grand Forks, McHenry, Nelson, Pembina, Pierce, Ramsey, Rolette, Towner, Traill, and Walsh.

"Court for the northern division shall be held at Devils Lake and Grand Forks.

"(2) The southern division comprises the counties of Barnes, Cass, Dickey, Eddy, Foster, Griggs, La Moure, Ransom, Richland, Sargent, Sheridan, Steele, Stutsman, and Wells.

"Court for the southern division shall be held at Fargo and Jamestown.

"WESTERN DISTRICT

"(b) The western district comprises two divisions.

"(1) The northern division comprises the counties of Burke, Divide, McKenzie, Mountrail, Renville, Ward, and Williams.

"Court for the northern division shall be held at Minot and Williston.

"(2) The southern division comprises the counties of Adams, Billings, Bowman, Burleigh, Dunn, Emmons, Golden Valley, Grant, Hettinger, Kidder, Logan, McIntosh, McLean, Mercer, Morton, Oliver, Sioux, Slope, and Stark.

"Court for the southern division shall be held at Bismarck and Dickinson."

(b) One of the district judges for the district of North Dakota holding office immediately prior to the effective date of this section shall, on and after such date, be the district judge for the eastern district of North Dakota, and the other district judge for the district of North Dakota holding office immediately prior to the effective date of this section shall, on and after such date, be the district judge for the western district of North Dakota. The assignment of such judges to the respective districts shall be made by the Judicial Council of the Eighth Circuit upon the basis of an agreement between such judges or, in the event of their failure to reach such agreement, upon such other basis as may be determined by the Judicial Council of the Eighth Circuit. The district attorney for the district of North Dakota holding office immediately prior to the effective date of this act shall, during the remainder of his present term of office, be district attorney for the western district of North Dakota. The marshal for the district of North Dakota holding office immediately prior to the effective date of this act shall, during the remainder of his present term of office, be the United States marshal for the eastern district of North Dakota.

APPOINTMENT OF CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE SEVENTH DISTRICT AND DISTRICT JUDGES FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 116) to provide for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the seventh circuit, and for the appointment of additional district judges for the northern district of Illinois which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two additional district judges for the northern district of Illinois. In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the change made by this act in the number of judgeships for the northern district of Illinois, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to such district:

"Districts	Judges
* * * * *	
Illinois:	
* * * * *	
Northern	10
* * * * *".	

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the northern district of Illinois."

APPOINTMENT OF DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 430) to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the middle district of Tennessee, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, 1 additional district judge for the eastern district of Tennessee, 1 additional district judge for the middle district of Tenneessee, and 1 additional district judge for the western district of Tennessee. In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the change made by this act in the number of judgeships for the eastern district of Tennessee, the middle district of Tennessee, and the western district of Tennessee, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to such districts:

"Districts	Judges
* * * * *	
Tennessee:	
Eastern	3
Middle	2
Western	2
* * * * *".	

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the eastern district of Tennessee, the middle district of Tennessee, and the western district of Tennessee."

RIGHTS OF VESSELS OF THE UNITED STATES IN TERRITORIAL WATERS OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES

The bill (S. 1483) to amend the act of August 27, 1954, relating to the rights of vessels of the United States on the high seas and in the territorial waters of foreign countries was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CLARK. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

TARIFF TREATMENT OF ISTLE OR TAMPICO FIBER

The bill (H. R. 7096) to amend paragraph 1684 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to istle or Tampico fiber was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, over by request.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for the moment?

Mr. TALMADGE. I do.

Mr. BEALL. I understood that the objections had been withdrawn.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I am now informed by the junior Senator from Texas that he has withdrawn his objection. If so, I have no objection.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wonder whether, in the interest of accommodating the distinguished minority leader it would be agreeable to the Senator from Maryland to let the bill go to the foot of the calendar. I see a note to call my distinguished colleague when the bill is called up.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I am informed that the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has withdrawn his objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of Calendar No. 882, H. R. 7096.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, does the Chair refer to Calendar No. 882?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. BEALL. That is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment on page 1, after line 8, to insert:

SEC 2. The amendments made by the first section of this act shall apply only in the case of articles entered for consumption, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, during the three-year period beginning on the day following the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 3. (a) Except as provided in section 4 of this act, no tariff or customs duty shall apply with respect to a beta-ray spectrometer, complete, consisting of a magnet unit, motor-generator set, and control rack, which is entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption by Stanford University, Stanford, California, for use at such university in connection with research for the Office of Naval Research and the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, Inc., New York, N. Y.

(b) Subsection (a) shall apply whether such beta-ray spectrometer is entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this act. If the liquidation of such entry or withdrawal has become final, such entry or withdrawal may be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty may be made.

SEC. 4. Section 3 of this act shall apply only so long as title to the beta-ray spectrometer entered or withdrawn free of duty under such section is vested in Stanford University. In the event that title to such spectrometer becomes vested in any other person after such entry or withdrawal, such spectrometer shall become subject to all duties imposed thereon by the revenue laws in force on the date on which such title becomes so vested. Such duties shall be assessed according to the appraised value on the date on which such title becomes so vested, with due allowance made for depreciation from handling and use.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 5. (a) Section 201 of the Tariff Act of 1930 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Par. 1822. Yarns, wholly or in chief value of wool, dyed and cut into uniform lengths not exceeding 3 inches, in immediate packages or containers not exceeding 6 ounces in weight, including the weight of the immediate package or container."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall apply only in the case of articles entered for consumption, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on and after the day following the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to say that the amendment has been considered by the Committee on Finance, and the committee has approved it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend paragraph 1684 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to istle or Tampico fiber, to admit free of duty a beta-ray spectrometer for use at Stanford University, Stanford, Calif., and for other purposes."

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

The bill (S. 324) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Florida was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an additional district judge for the southern district of Florida. In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the change made by this act in the number of judgeships for the southern district of Florida, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to such district:

"Districts	Judges
* * * * *	
"Florida:	
* * * * *	
"Southern	5
* * * * *."	

APPOINTMENT OF TWO ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGES, DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

The bill (S. 472) to provide for the appointment of two additional district judges for the district of Connecticut was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two additional district judges for the district of Connecticut. In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the change made by this act in the number of judgeships for the district of Connecticut, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to such district:

"Districts	Judges
* * * * *	
"Connecticut	4
* * * * *."	

APPOINTMENT OF DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF COLORADO

The bill (S. 1060) to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the District of Colorado was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an additional district judge for the district of Colorado. In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the change made by this act in the number of judgeships for the district of Colorado, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to such district:

"Districts	Judges
* * * * *	
"Colorado	3
* * * * *".	

APPOINTMENT OF DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF NEVADA

The bill (S. 2714) to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Nevada was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an additional district judge for the district of Nevada. In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the change made by this act in the number of judgeships for the district of Nevada, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to such district:

"Districts	Judges
* * * * *	
"Nevada	2
* * * * *".	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before the Senate proceeds to the next measure on the calendar, the Presiding Officer, without objection, will insert at the conclusion of the passage of Calendar No. 1001, S. 2714, a statement concerning the bill.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BIBLE

I am most gratified at the action of this body in passing the bill which my colleague [Mr. MALONE] and I introduced (S. 2714), to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the district of Nevada. I wish at this time to express my appreciation both to the members of the Committee on the Judiciary for their expeditious action and to the Members of this body for their favorable consideration of this legislation to grant to my State this greatly needed district judgeship. I also wish to thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judiciary Machinery of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina] for his courteous reception when I testified in behalf of this measure at the hearings on the omnibus judgeship bill. The subcommittee chairman did a masterful job and because of the thorough hearings conducted by him and the careful consideration given this matter, the full committee was able to act promptly on the bill. The able chairman of the committee [Mr. EASTLAND] is to be commended for his splendid work in connection with the consideration of the various judgeship measures as well as other matters reported from that committee.

The merits of this legislation cannot be questioned. Ample justification for this district judgeship appear in previous reports of the Judiciary Committee and in the hearings on S. 420 of the 85th Congress. A brief resume of the legislative history and the pressing need for a second district judgeship for the State of Nevada is as follows:

The district of Nevada has been the subject of hearings during the 84th and 85th Congresses. By Public Law 294 of the 83d Congress, a temporary judgeship was authorized, so that when this temporary judgeship was filled, the district of Nevada had two district judges until the retirement of one of the judges early in 1957. When the Committee on the Judiciary reported favorably on S. 1256 of the 84th Congress, there was included a provision to make permanent the then existing temporary judgeship for the district of Nevada, but since the retirement of one of the judges in that district, this can no longer be accomplished.

In its report on S. 1256 of the 84th Congress, the Judiciary Committee reaffirmed its position as set forth in the report on S. 2910 of the 83d Congress that each State having only one judge should be provided with an additional judge.

The hearings in the 85th Congress indicate the necessity for the restoration of a second judgeship in the district of Nevada. As stated by the committee in its report on this bill, the creation of this judgeship is amply justified.

I intend to press for the passage of this legislation by the House of Representatives, and it is my fervent hope that I will be able to secure for the people of my State a second United States district judge in the next session of the Congress.

APPOINTMENT OF TWO ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGES, EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

The bill (S. 2747) to provide for the appointment of two additional district judges for the eastern district of Pennsylvania was considered, ordered to be

engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two additional district judges for the eastern district of Pennsylvania. In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the change made by this act in the number of judgeships for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to such district:

"Districts	Judges
* * * * *	
"Pennsylvania:	
"Eastern	10
* * * * *".	

APPOINTMENT OF DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN AND WESTERN DISTRICTS, SOUTH CAROLINA

The bill (S. 2773) to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the eastern and western districts of South Carolina was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of South Carolina. In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the change made by this act in the number of judgeships for the eastern and western districts of South Carolina, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to such districts:

"Districts	Judges
* * * * *	
"South Carolina:	
* * * * *	
Eastern and western	2
* * * * *"	

APPOINTMENT OF TEMPORARY CIRCUIT JUDGE AND A DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN AND SOUTHERN DISTRICTS OF IOWA

The bill (S. 2799) to provide for a temporary circuit judgeship for the eighth circuit, and for the appointment of a district judge for the northern and southern districts of Iowa, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional circuit judge for the eighth circuit. The first vacancy occurring in the office of circuit judge in said circuit shall not be filled.

SEC. 2. The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an additional district judge for the northern and southern districts of Iowa. In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the change made by this act in the number of judgeships for the district of Iowa, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to such district:

"Districts	Judges
"Iowa:	
* * * * *	
"Northern and southern	1
* * * * *	

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2486) to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to grant relief with respect to claims arising out of deliveries of eligible surplus feed grains on ineligible dates in connection with purchase orders under its emergency feed program was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 984) conferring jurisdiction on the court of claims to make certain findings with respect to the amount of compensation to which certain independent ore producers are equitably entitled for uranium supplied by them to the United States during the period May 1, 1943, to August 5, 1945, and to provide for payment of the amounts so determined, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALMADGE. Over by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

UNMANUFACTURED MICA FILMS AND SPLITTINGS

The bill (H. R. 6894) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 as it relates to unmanufactured mica films and splittings, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CLARK. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CONTRIBUTION BY STATE GOVERNMENTS TO COST OF FEED OR SEED FURNISHED FARMERS IN DISASTER AREAS

The bill (S. 304) to provide for a specific contribution by State governments to the cost of feed or seed furnished to farmers, ranchers, or stockmen in disaster areas, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, no feed for livestock or seed for planting shall be furnished to farmers, ranchers, or stockmen pursuant to Public Law 875, 81st Congress (42 U. S. C. 1955 and the following); Public Law 115, 83d Congress, 1st session; Public Law 357, 83d Congress, 2d session; Public Law 480, 83d Congress, 2d session; or pursuant to any other law as a disaster relief measure, unless, in addition to such administrative costs as may be assumed by the State, the State in which such feed or seed is furnished agrees to contribute such percentage, not less than 25 nor more than 50, as the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine to be equitable of that part of the cost, including transportation, of such feed or seed which is not paid for by the recipients thereof.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE CHARLOTTE RUDLAND DANSIE ASSOCIATION

The bill (S. 2230) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the Charlotte Rudland Dansie Association was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, over by request.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment? I understand the objection has been withdrawn.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection. I thank the Senator from Utah for calling my attention to that fact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to convey by patent, without monetary consideration therefor, the south half northeast quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter, section 21, township 27 north, range 102 west, sixth principal meridian, Wyoming, to the Charlotte Rudland Dansie Association for maintenance as a memorial grave site.

SEC. 2. The patent issued pursuant to section 1 of this act shall contain a reservation to the United States of all mineral deposits in the lands and of the right to mine and remove the same under applicable laws, regulations to be established by the Secretary, and terms and conditions which shall not be inconsistent with the use of the lands as a memorial grave site.

SEC. 3. If at any time after issuance of patent under section 1 of this act the Charlotte Rudland Dansie Association or its successor attempts to transfer title to or control over the lands to another without the consent of the Secretary or the lands are devoted to a use other than as a grave-site memorial to Charlotte Rudland Dansie or the association or its successor shall after due notice from the Secretary, fail to maintain the site in a manner which the Secretary deems fitting and proper, title to the lands shall revert to the United States.

Mr. WATKINS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the staff of the Senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] be printed at the time of the consideration of Calendar No. 1087, S. 2230.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 2230

This bill has an excellent objective—the preservation of the memory of a great pioneer, Charlotte Rudland Dansie, who made one of the early journeys west with the Mormons to settle in the Salt Lake Valley.

This bill would authorize the conveyance of 1¼ acres of land surrounding the grave of this pioneer woman.

When the bill first came up on the call of the calendar, I sought information from the report which would clear up any problem concerning the applicability of the so-called Morse formula. The report did not supply the requisite information.

Since that time, my good friend, the senior Senator from Utah, has supplied me with further information, and I have checked with the Department of the Interior and have ascertained that the property has a value of approximately $20.

The case is one that calls for payment of fair appraised market value, but the diffi-

culty is that the Government would spend more in determining that value through appraisal than would be realized through payment of fair market value.

Under those circumstances and in view of the purpose of the bill, I find no objection under the Morse formula.

INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE UNITED STATES

The resolution (S. Res. 191) amending Senate Resolution 52, 85th Congress, authorizing an investigation of juvenile delinquency in the United States, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That section 4 of Senate Resolution 52, 85th Congress, 1st session, authorizing an investigation of juvenile delinquency in the United States, agreed to on January 30, 1957, is amended by striking out "$50,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$60,000."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 7785) to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

COMMISSION TO COMMEMORATE THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CIVIL WAR

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 253) to establish a Commission to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Civil War, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 2, line 7, after the word "of", to strike out "eighteen" and insert "twenty-five"; in line 12, after the numeral "(2)", to strike out "Six" and insert "Four", and on page 3, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "(a)" and insert "(6)".

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, before action is taken on that joint resolution, I ask that a statement prepared by the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] be printed in the RECORD.

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

CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL COMMISSION TO CELEBRATE THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CIVIL WAR—STATEMENT BY SENATOR EASTLAND

Mr. President, at its meeting of August 20, 1957, the Committee on the Judiciary ordered reported House Joint Resolution 253, to establish a Commission to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Civil War. When the committee took this action, there were pending before the committee two Senate resolutions which would establish similar Civil War centennial commissions—Senate Joint Resolution 46, sponsored by Mr. BRICKER, of Ohio, Mr. ROBERTSON, of Virginia, Mr. MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, and Mr. THURMOND, of South Carolina, and Senate Joint Resolution 83, to establish a Commission to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the Civil War, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, Mr. GOLDWATER, of Arizona, and myself.

The committee acted on the House resolution, rather than acting on a similar Senate resolution, due to the fact that the House resolution had just been received from the other body, and, in order to expedite action and to facilitate the establishment of the Commission, the committee deemed it proper to report House Joint Resolution 253. I do want the record to show, however, that the Members of the Senate who sponsored these two Senate resolutions were most actively interested in assuring that there be established a Civil War centennial commission in order that there may be a proper observance of this period of our history. They were completely in accord with the action taken by the committee in reporting the House resolution, in order that the Commission may commence its activities as soon as possible.

The resolution, as amended, provides for a 25-member commission to be known as the Civil War Centennial Commission. The members of the Commission are to serve without compensation but are to be furnished transportation and reimbursement not to exceed $20 per diem while engaged in official duties relating to the Commission. The Commission is authorized and encouraged to cooperate with State, civil, patriotic, hereditary and historic groups, and with institutions of learning in order to make this commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Civil War as meaningful as possible.

This legislation would authorize the appropriation of funds of not to exceed $100,000 for the expenses of the Commission.

This centennial observance will be the occasion for nationwide commemoration. The establishment of the Commission, which is intended to be national in scope, will encourage and develop public knowledge of and interest in the history of the Civil War.

The committee believes that this is a very meritorious resolution and, accordingly, recommends favorable consideration of House Joint Resolution 253, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO MIDDLE TENNESSEE COUNCIL, BOY SCOUTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2531) to authorize the conveyance of certain lands within Old Hickory lock and dam project, Tennessee, to Middle Tennessee Council, Boy Scouts, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with an amendment on page 1, after the enacting clause, to strike out:

"That subject to section 2 and without monetary consideration, the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey to the Middle Tennessee Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following lands within the Old Hickory lock and dam project:

"Two certain parcels of land situate on the waters of Spencer Creek and the Cumberland River, in the Fourth Civil District of Wilson County, Tenn., containing in aggregate 525.80 acres, more or less, and more particularly described as follows:

"PARCEL 1

"Beginning at a corner common to lands now or formerly owned by Zac Burford and others and the lands of the United States, said corner being in a line of lands now or formerly owned by Henry Louis Bloodworth and Frank W. Bloodworth; thence, with the division line between the United States and said Burford as follows: south, 03 degrees 00 minutes west 635 feet, south 8 degrees 30 minutes west 680 feet, north 76 degrees 00 minutes west 690 feet, south 01 degree 00 minutes east 390 feet, south 80 degrees 00 minutes east 1,300 feet, and south 04 degrees 00 minutes west 1,690 feet to a corner of lands now or formerly owned by Will Walker and others; thence, with the division line between the United States and said Walker south 04 degrees 00 minutes west 985 feet to a point in a line of lands now or formerly owned by Hughlette Katherine Purnell; thence, with the division line between the United States and said Purnell north 87 degrees 00 minutes west 960 feet; thence, leaving Purnell's line, through the lands of the United States north 87 degrees 00 minutes west 120 feet to a point in the 451 foot contour line above mean sea level; thence continuing through the lands of the United States, following the 451 foot contour line as it meanders in a general westerly, northerly, and easterly direction along the northeasterly shore line of the Spencer Creek Embayment, upstream along the easterly shore line of Cumberland River, a distance of 20,200 feet, more or less, to a point in the north line of the lands of said Bloodworth; thence with the division line between said Bloodworth and the United States south 58 degree 00 minutes west 1,425 feet, to the point of beginning, containing 367.6 acres, more or less.

"PARCEL 2

"Beginning at a corner common to lands now or formerly owned by C. E. and Louise Tubbs Northern and the lands of the United States, said corner being in a line of lands now or formerly owned by Hughlette Katherine Purnell; thence, with the division line between said Purnell and the United States north 03 degrees 00 minutes east 1,240 feet to a corner of lands now or formerly owned by Will Walker and others; thence, with the division line between said Walker and the United States as follows: North 03 degrees 00 minutes east 500 feet, south 79 degrees 30 minutes east 1,085 feet, north 190 feet and north 78 degrees 00 minutes west 170 feet to a corner of lands now or formerly owned by Zac Burford and others; thence, with the division line between said Burford and the United States as follows: North 26 degrees 00 minutes west 670 feet and south 88 degrees 00 minutes east 110 feet to a corner of lands now or formerly owned by D. E. and Janie Greer Bloodworth, said corner being in the center of a road; thence with the division line between said Bloodworth and the United States along the center of said road south 88 degrees 00 minutes east 640 feet to a corner of lands now or formerly owned by F. W. Bloodworth and wife; thence, with the division line between said F. W. Bloodworth and wife and the United States and continuing along the center of said road south 88 degrees 00 minutes east at 585 feet passing a corner of said Bloodworth, continuing in all 640 feet to a corner of lands now or formerly owned by Henry and Susie Tyree; thence, leaving said road along the division line between said Tyree and the subject owner as follows: South 05 degrees 00 minutes west 280 feet, north 64 degrees 00 minutes east 125 feet, south 04 degrees 00 minutes east 160 feet, south 57 degrees 00 minutes west 210 feet, south 18 degrees 00 minutes west 410 feet, north 89 degrees 00 minutes east 340 feet and south 42 degrees 30 minutes east 335 feet to a corner of lands now or formerly owned by Lula Mae Davis; thence, with the division line between said Davis and the United States as follows: North 70 degrees 00 minutes east 315 feet and south 01 degree 00 minutes east 155 feet to

a corner of lands now or formerly owned by Talmadge and Novella Collier; thence, with the division line between said Collier and the United States as follows: South 01 degree 00 minutes east 50 feet, south 73 degrees 00 minutes west 350 feet, north 85 degrees 00 minutes west 215 feet, south 12 degrees 00 minutes west 310 feet, south 88 degrees 00 minutes east 250 feet, north 50 degrees 00 minutes east 260 feet, south 41 degrees 30 minutes east 235 feet, south 88 degrees 00 minutes east 90 feet and south 05 degrees 00 minutes east 90 feet to a corner of lands now or formerly owned by Dwight Manners; thence, with the division line between said Manners and the United States south 45 degrees 00 minutes west 350 feet to a corner of lands now or formerly owned by D. E. and Janie Greer Bloodworth; thence, with the division line between said Bloodworth and the United States as follows: South 10 degrees 30 minutes west 150 feet, north 72 degrees 00 minutes east 250 feet, south 50 degrees 00 minutes east 250 feet, and south 15 degrees 30 minutes west 285 feet to a point in a line of lands now or formerly owned by O. A. Purnell; thence, with the division line between said Purnell and the United States as follows: North 84 degrees 00 minutes west 100 feet, south 1,280 feet, north 86 degrees 00 minutes east 345 feet and south 05 degrees 00 minutes east 215 feet to a corner of lands now or formerly owned by H. B. Manners, in the center of a road; thence, leaving said road with the division line between said Manners and the United States as follows: South 86 degrees 25 minutes west 450.4 feet, south 36 degrees 06 minutes west 318 feet, north 73 degrees 21 minutes west 151.4 feet, south 35 degrees 57 minutes west 249.7 feet, north 09 degrees 07 minutes west 504 feet and north 84 degrees 48 minutes west 80 feet to a corner of said Northern in the center of a road; thence, leaving said road with the division line between said Northern and the United States as follows: North 05 degrees 00 minutes east 350 feet, south 51 degrees 00 minutes west 290 feet, north 38 degrees 30 minutes west 265 feet, north 03 degrees 00 minutes east 215 feet, south 35 degrees 30 minutes east 240 feet, north 45 degrees 30 minutes east 225 feet, north 08 degrees 30 minutes west 540 feet, south 25 degrees 00 minutes west 460 feet, north 30 degrees 00 minutes west 630 feet, north 72 degrees 00 minutes west 645 feet, north 08 degrees 00 minutes east 81.6 feet, and west 933 feet, to the point of beginning, containing 158.2 acres, more or less.

The above described parcels of land are a part of the same lands, the fee title to which was vested in the United States by reason of the following deeds of record in the Office of the Register of Wilson County, Tenn., and/or by the filing of declaration of takings in civil actions pending in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee, Nashville Division, namely:

"Tract numbered	Vendor	Date of deed and/or declarations of takings	Deed book	Page	Declarations of takings numbered	Civil action numbered
	PARCEL 1					
G-703	E. L. Gaston, trustee, and others	October 28, 1953	------	------	1	1723
G-707	Mildred Armstrong and others	October 28, 1953	------	------	1	1723
G-708	Jim Bailey and wife	June 17, 1953	137	580	------	------
G-709	William O. Barry	January 15, 1954	138	680	------	------
G-723-1 (part)	Katherine H. Purnell	June 1, 1953	137	482	------	------
Lock and dam number 4 (part):						
(a)	James Harvey Davis and others	January 3, 1894	52	163	------	(1)
(b)	Samuel Howerth and others	January 3, 1894	52	159	------	(2)
	PARCEL 2					
G-713	Zac Burford and others	March 24, 1954	------	------	1	1837
G-716	Hargrove Jenkins and wife	September 4, 1953	138	197	------	------
G-717	Willie Thompson and others	October 28, 1953	------	------	1	1723
G-718	Henry Tyree and wife	June 30, 1953	137	640	------	------
G-719	Lula Mae Davis and others	May 12, 1954	------	------	1	1862
G-720-1-2	Talmadge Collier and wife	May 21, 1953	137	428	------	------
G-721	Dwight Manners and wife	July 11, 1953	137	680	------	------
G-722	D. E. Bloodworth and wife	July 7, 1953	137	696	------	------
G-725	C. E. Northern and wife	May 20, 1953	137	419	------	------
G-726	O. A. Purnell and wife	July 24, 1953	138	36	------	------
G-731-2	Dwight Manners and others	July 6, 1954	------	------	2	1723

"(1) Judgment numbered 851.
"(2) Judgment numbered 850."

And insert:

"That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey to the Middle Tennessee Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America, without monetary consideration therefor, but subject to the conditions of this act, the area or areas he determines to be available for conveyance within the 609.2 acres of land leased to the said Boy Scouts Council at the Old Hickory lock and dam, Cumberland River, Tenn., under lease granted July 12, 1955, numbered DA-40-058-CIVENG-56-8."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey to the Middle Tennessee Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America, without monetary consideration therefor, but subject to the conditions of this act, the area or areas he determines to be available for conveyance within the 609.2 acres of land leased to the said Boy Scouts Council at the Old Hickory lock and dam, Cumberland River, Tenn., under lease granted July 12, 1955, numbered DA-40-058-CIVENG-56-8.

SEC. 2. Title to property authorized to be conveyed by this act shall revert to the United States, which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon, if the Middle Tennessee Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America—

(1) has not commenced the development of such property for recreation and camping purposes within the 3-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this act; or

(2) shall ever cease to use such property for recreation and camping purposes.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to grant to the Middle Tennessee Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America, such rights-of-way for public access and utility lines across any property of the United States as may be necessary to facilitate the development and use of the property conveyed under authority of this act for recreation and camping purposes.

SEC. 4. The conveyance of the property herein authorized shall be subject to the right to flood due to the fluctuation of the water level of the Old Hickory lock and dam project and to such other conditions, reservations, and restrictions as the Secretary of the Army may determine to be necessary for the management and operation of said Old Hickory lock and dam project.

SEC. 5. The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized herein shall be borne by the Middle Tennessee Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

APPOINTMENT OF DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

The bill (S. 1224) to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Massachusetts was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an additional district judge for the district of Massachusetts. In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the change made by this act in the number of judgeships for the district of Massachusetts, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to such district:

"Districts Judges

* * * * *

Massachusetts ---------- 6

* * * * *."

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL JUDGES FOR OHIO—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2832) a bill to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the northern district of Ohio and one additional district judge for the southern district of Ohio, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. LAUSCHE subsequently said: I objected to the consideration of Calendar No. 1120, Senate bill 2832, because it was my understanding it included three judges. I was certain that an additional judge was needed in the northern district of Ohio. I was certain that a new judge was not needed in the southern district, because the calendar is current, the bill as originally introduced contemplated the appointment of three judges. The bill now pending before the Senate has eliminated one, and if passed will authorize the appointment of two. I am therefore withdrawing my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the RECORD will so show.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Ohio very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2832) to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the northern district of Ohio, and one additional district judge for the southern district of Ohio was considered, ordered

to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the northern district of Ohio and one additional district judge for the southern district of Ohio. In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the changes made by this act in the number of judgeships for the northern and southern districts of Ohio, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to such districts:

"Districts	Judges
* * * * *	
"Ohio:	
Northern	6
Southern	4"

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make a motion, with respect to all the bills dealing with the judgeships. I move that the vote by which they were passed be reconsidered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, does that include the judgeship bills we have not yet come to?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No. We would not reconsider action on bills we have not taken up.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wanted to point out there are a couple more. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. KUCHEL. I move to lay the motion of the Senator from Texas on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO BOY SCOUTS—BILL PASSED TO THE FOOT OF THE CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 8576) to authorize the conveyance of certain lands within the Old Hickory lock and dam project, Cumberland River, Tenn., to Middle Tennessee Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America, for recreation and camping purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that bill go to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be passed to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider order of business 1145, House bill 8576.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8576) to authorize the conveyance of certain lands within the Old Hickory lock and dam project, Cumberland River, Tenn., to Middle Tennessee Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America, for recreation and camping purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I submit an amendment on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. All Members of this body are familiar with the tireless work of the senior Senator from Oregon as watchdog for the Treasury, particularly in connection with land-conveyance matters. The Senator desired to offer this amendment. It was not acceptable to the author of the bill or to the committee. The Senator from Oregon is necessarily away from the Chamber. All Members, I believe, are generally familiar with the views of the Senator from Oregon on the Morse formula. So I send to the desk amendments in his behalf, and ask that the clerk state them, and that the Members give consideration to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On the first page, lines 5 and 6, strike out "without monetary consideration therefor, but."

On page 2, line 2, after the period insert the following:

Such conveyance shall be conditional upon payment being made for the land conveyed in an amount equal to the fair market value of such land as determined by the Secretary of the Army after appraisal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] on behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The amendments were rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 8576) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2531 will be indefinitely postponed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 7168) to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CLARK. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over, by request.

MICHELE NIRO

The bill (S. 781) for the relief of Michele Niro was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Michele Niro shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MICHAEL JAMES BOLGER

The bill (S. 1403) for the relief of Michael James Bolger was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Michael James Bolger shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

C–L ELECTRIC CO.

The bill (S. 1600) for the relief of the C–L Electric Co. was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the C–L Electric Co., of 410 South Main Street, Pocatello, Idaho, the sum of $45,852.06, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for reimbursement of losses sustained by it under contract numbered 14–06–D–152 entered into on June 27, 1952, with the Bureau of Reclamation for the construction of the Lovell-Yellowtail 155 kilovolt transmission line, Missouri Basin project, such contract having been terminated on August 26, 1953, because of the failure of the Congress to appropriate funds for the carrying out of such contract subsequent to June 30, 1953: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

LINTON SEYMOUR YOUNG

The bill (S. 1606) for the relief of Linton Seymour Young was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Linton Seymour Young shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

JULIA SLIWINSKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 452) for the relief of Julia

Sliwinska, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

"That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Julia Sliwinska may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act under which such controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act: *And provided further*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLAIM OF MRS. WALTER E. VON KALINOWSKI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 573) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Mrs. Walter E. von Kalinowski, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 2, after line 2, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. The provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, shall be applicable to this act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time or any limitation upon the jurisdiction of the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on claims against the United States, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Walter E. von Kalinowski. Suit upon such claim may be instituted by Mrs. Walter E. von Kalinowski at any time within 3 years after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. The provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, shall be applicable to this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LUDWIK ABRAMSKI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1208) for the relief of Ludwik Abramski, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ludwik Abramski may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act and upon compliance with such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act: *And provided further*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HEINZ AUGUST SCHWARZ

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1287) for the relief of Heinz August Schwarz, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 11, after the word "available", to insert a colon and *"Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Heinz August Schwarz shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANZ HEHN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1359) for the relief of Franz Hehn, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Franz Hehn may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act: *Provided further*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WINIFRED C. LYDICK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1562) for the relief of Winifred C. Lydick which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the word "of" to strike out "$9,500" and insert "$2,500", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Winifred C. Lydick, of Oklahoma City, Okla., the sum of $2,500. Such sum shall be in full satisfaction of the claim of the said Winifred C. Lydick against the United States for compensation for permanent personal injuries and pain and suffering sustained by her as the result of an accident, occurring on April 14, 1955, on the island of Okinawa, in which a United States Army vehicle struck the automobile in which the said Winifred C. Lydick was a passenger: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARTHA A. McDERMOTT STOTHARD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1480) for the relief of Martha A. McDermott Stothard, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 3, after the word "sections", to strike out "18 to 20" and insert "15 to 20"; in line 5, after "5 U. S. C.", to strike out "768" and insert "765–"; in line 9, after the word "injury" to insert "alleged to have been", and on page 2, line 5, after the word "benefits", to insert "except hospital and medical expenses actually incurred", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5 U. S. C. 765–770), the Secretary of Labor is authorized (1) to consider any claim filed within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act by Martha A. McDermott Stothard, of Aurora, Colo., for compensation for disability resulting from an injury alleged to have been sustained by her in 1945 while performing services as an employee of the Department of the Army, Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Denver, Colo., and (2) to award to the said Martha A. McDermott Stothard any compensation to which she would have been entitled had such claim been filed within the time and in the manner provided by such sections. No benefits, except hospital and medical expenses actually incurred, shall accrue under this act for any period prior to the date of its enactment.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DORENE I. FAST

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1543) for the relief of Dorene I. Fast, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 7, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and *"Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (4) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dorene I. Fast may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act. This act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE H. MEYER SONS AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 1411) for the relief of George H. Meyer Sons, Brauer & Co., Joseph McSweeney & Sons, Inc., C. L. Tomlinson, Jr., and Richmond Livestock Co., Inc., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. JENNIE MAURELLO

The bill (H. R. 1474) for the relief of Mrs. Jennie Maurello was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOMER CAZAMIAS

The bill (H. R. 1502) for the relief of Homer Cazamias was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GILBERT B. MAR

The bill (H. R. 1677) for the relief of Gilbert B. Mar was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FILOMENA AND EMIL FERRARA

The bill (H. R. 4174) for the relief of Filomena and Emil Ferrara was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MME. HENRIETTE BUAILLON AND STANLEY JAMES CARPENTER

The bill (H. R. 7014) for the relief of Madame Henriette Buaillon and Stanley James Carpenter was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VIRGINIA RAY POTTS

The bill (H. R. 8374) for the relief of Virginia Ray Potts was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. HANNAH MAE POWELL

The bill (H. R. 1419) for the relief of Mrs. Hannah Mae Powell was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this bill, as amended, would pay to the claimant the sum of $11,197.95 for refund of income taxes and other expenses sustained as a result of the actions of the Collector of Internal Revenue of Philadelphia, Pa., in the years 1937, 1941, and 1942.

The claimant was for a number of years engaged in the business of distributing, under her own label, certain cosmetic preparations—ointment and shampoo. In 1933, a new excise tax was placed on manufacturers of cosmetics.

It appears that the ointment distributed by the claimant was purchased from the manufacturer in 50-pound cans, and that the manufacturer's excise tax was paid by the manufacturer and added to the sales price. The shampoo also was purchased in wholesale lots, but was not subject to the tax.

The claimant's sole function in connection with these products was to transfer the ointment from 50-pound cans to small glass jars, added labels, and assemble the products into lots ready for retail sale. Inasmuch as no ingredient was ever added by her, she took the position that she was not a manufacturer and did not make the information returns required of manufacturers of cosmetics. Four years after the effective date of the act, agents of the Internal Revenue Bureau advised the claimant that she was the manufacturer of this ointment and was subject to the tax. Upon the basis of a return prepared by the agents, which the claimant refused to sign, the tax—plus penalties and interest—was assessed against her. Subsequently, the collector proceeded to impound her bank account, attach her automobile and all her merchandise, including that on consignment in the hands of third parties, and padlock her office and warehouse.

Two separate levies were made, in the amounts of $4,718.44 and $20,240; but, inasmuch as the latter amount had been arrived at without differentiating between sales of soap—not taxable—and without taking into account freight charges, consignees' commissions, and so forth, this assessment was reduced to $3,399.40.

Shortly after the first levy, the claimant was allowed to reenter and resume business in her place of business, but found her supplies and equipment to be unsanitary and unfit for sales purposes and, therefore, a total loss. According to an affidavit executed by the claimant, losses resulting from the return of consigned goods—practically all of which had been damaged to the extent that they were entirely worthless—storage, transfer, rental, and other charges amounted to approximately $25,000. Further, her credit standing, built up over many years, was destroyed.

The claimant subsequently filed suit to contest the manufacturer's excise tax levied against her. The court found that this tax had been improperly levied, and ordered that judgment be entered in her favor in the sum of $5,753.30, together with interest and costs.

The claimant later filed suit for damages against the collector, for damages suffered by her, but was unsuccessful in the prosecution of this suit.

The committee is of the opinion that, although there is no legal basis for the claim, inasmuch as the tax assessed and the levies made pursuant thereto were improper, and in view of the fact that she suffered serious financial losses therefrom, she should, in consideration of the equities involved, receive some recompense for her losses. The bill, as referred to this committee, provided for the payment of $24,932.39, but, after careful consideration of all the evidence before it, the committee has concluded that the sum of $11,197.95 would be a fair and reasonable award, and has amended the bill accordingly.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, I was appointed a subcommittee of one to hold the hearing on this matter. I heard the facts at great length and very substantially, as the Senator from Pennsylvania has just pointed out in the course of the statement he has made.

I believe there are sufficient equities in the matter to justify allowance of the claim, and I have recommended that it be allowed in full.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Utah for his consideration of this matter, which involves a resident of Philadelphia.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, all I wish to state is that if I had a recording which had been recorded at the high speed which has been demonstrated by the acting majority leader, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], as he has proceeded in connection with this matter, with most commendable zeal—I refer to the speed with which he read the statement regarding it, and if I were to play such a recording on my child's hi-fi set, I would turn down the speed control a little. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1419) for the relief of Mrs. Hannah Mae Powell, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 7, after the word "of," to strike out "$24,932.39" and insert "$11,197.95."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

BENEDICT M. KORDUS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1883) for the relief of Benedict M. Kordus, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 2, line 2, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement in regard to this bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

BENEDICT M. KORDUS—STATEMENT OF SENATOR TALMADGE

This bill proposes to pay to Benedict M. Kordus, of Milwaukee, Wis., the sum of $6,476.06 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the payment of the amounts of the disability compensation withheld from Matthew T. Kordus, a veteran of the First World War.

The applicable law pertaining to veterans' disability compensation provides that when a veteran is hospitalized in a veterans' hospital his compensation is to be paid until the first day of the seventh calendar month. After that time, payments shall not exceed $30 a month and the amounts withheld are to be paid to specified individuals in the event of the death of the veteran while a patient. Among the classes of persons who may take are brothers and sisters. The claimant, Benedict M. Kordus, was abandoned by his mother at the home of his uncle when he was 3 days old. The uncle raised the claimant with his other children and in all ways both the uncle and his children treated the claimant as though he were a son and brother. The claimant was raised in the family, which included as one of the brothers the said Matthew T. Kordus, veteran of World War I. When Matthew Kordus became disabled due to his service-connected disability, the claimant took him into his home for a long period of time until it became necessary that Matthew Kordus be hospitalized in a Veterans' Administration hospital. The claimant and his wife cared for Matthew during the period that he was in their home and after he was hospitalized the claimant visited him regularly in the hospital. When Matthew died while still in the hospital, the claimant paid for his funeral expenses. The claimant also paid for the funeral expenses of a sister of Matthew when she predeceased Matthew. Matthew regarded the claimant as his brother and, in fact, on his insurance policy identified the claimant as his brother. After Matthew died, the claimant filed a claim with the Veterans' Administration for amounts withheld from the disability compensation of Matthew Kordus. This claim was denied for the reason that the claimant was not a brother of the whole or the halfblood of the veteran and that he was not adopted by the parents of the veteran and, therefore, did not qualify by law. The records indicate that there are no other claimants to the sums withheld.

The Veterans' Administration is opposed to the enactment of this bill.

The bill has been amended to delete attorney's fees.

The committee feels that in view of the fact that the two cousins were raised as brothers and in view of the close relationship that existed between them after they reached maturity and in view of the services rendered the deceased by the claimant prior to his death, and particularly in view of the fact that the claimant is the only person known who might apply for the amounts withheld, that the claimant should be entitled to recover the amounts withheld, in payment for moneys and services the claimant furnished the decedent prior to his death. Furthermore, the committee feels that in view of the peculiar circumstances in this case, that this bill would not present an undesirable precedent with respect to such payments. Accordingly, the committee recommends that this bill, as amended, be favorably considered.

BENEDICT M. KORDUS—STATEMENT OF SENATOR EASTLAND

This bill proposes to pay to Benedict M. Kordus, of Milwaukee, Wis., the sum of $6,476.06 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the payment of the amounts of the disability compensation withheld from Matthew T. Kordus, a veteran of the First World War.

The applicable law pertaining to veterans' disability compensation provides that when a veteran is hospitalized in a veterans' hospital his compensation is to be paid until the first day of the seventh calendar month. After that time, payments shall not exceed $30 a month and the amounts withheld are to be paid to specified individuals in the event of the death of the veteran while a patient. Among the classes of persons who may take are brothers and sisters. The claimant, Benedict M. Kordus, was abandoned by his mother at the home of his uncle when he was 3 days old. The uncle raised the claimant with his other children and in all ways both the uncle and his children treated the claimant as though he were a son and brother. The claimant was raised in the family, which included as one of the brothers the said Matthew T. Kordus, veteran of World War I. When Matthew Kordus became disabled due to his service-connected disability, the claimant took him into his home for a long period of time until it became necessary that Matthew Kordus be hospitalized in a Veterans' Administration hospital. The claimant and his wife cared for Matthew during the period that he was in their home and after he was hospitalized the claimant visited him regularly in the hospital. When Matthew died while still in the hospital the claimant paid for his funeral expenses. The claimant also paid for the funeral expenses of a sister of Matthew when she predeceased Matthew. Matthew regarded the claimant as his brother and, in fact, on his insurance policy indentified the claimant as his brother. After Matthew died, the claimant filed a claim with the Veterans' Administration for amounts withheld from the disability compensation of Matthew Kordus. This claim was denied for the reason that the claimant was not a brother of the whole or the half blood of the veteran and that he was not adopted by the parents of the veteran and, therefore, did not qualify by law. The records indicate that there are no other claimants to the sums withheld.

The Veterans' Administration is opposed to the enactment of this bill.

The bill has been amended to delete attorney's fees.

The committee feels that in view of the fact that the two cousins were raised as brothers and in view of the close relationship that existed between them after they reached maturity and in view of the services rendered the deceased by the claimant prior to his death, and particularly in view of the fact that the claimant is the only person known who might apply for the amounts withheld, that the claimant should be entitled to recover the amounts withheld in payment for moneys and services the claimant furnished the decedent prior to his death. Furthermore, the committee feels that, in view of the peculiar circumstances in this case, this bill would not present an undesirable precedent with respect to such payments. Accordingly, the committee recommends that this bill, as amended, be favorably considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

LOUIS S. LEVENSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4544) for the relief of Louis S. Levenson which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 5, after the word "of", to strike out "$1,500" and insert "$750."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

CLARA M. BRIGGS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5719) for the relief of Clara M. Briggs, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 2, line 3, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

RAMON TAVAREZ

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4335) for the relief of Ramon Tavarez, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "of", to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$12,950", and on page 2, line 4, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5822) to amend section 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 with respect to the reinvestment by air carriers of the proceeds from the sale or other disposition of certain operating property and equipment was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What disposition has been made of Calendar 1178, H. R. 5822?

Mr. BIBLE. House bill 5822 has gone over by request.

LEASING OF SPACE FOR FEDERAL AGENCIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2533) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to lease space for Federal agencies for periods not exceeding 15 years, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations, with amendments, on page 2, after line 7, to strike out:

(2) For the purposes of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Administrator is authorized to acquire real property by purchase, condemnation, lease, donation, or otherwise, to improve (including demolition) federally owned property, and to dispose of such acquired and federally owned property upon such terms as he may determine to be in the best interest of the United States.

In line 15, to change the subsection number from "(3)" to "(2)", and in line 25, to change the subsection number from "(4)" to "(3)", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 210 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U. S. C. 490), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) (1) The Administrator is authorized to enter into lease agreements with any person, copartnership, corporation, or other public or private entity, which do not bind the Government for periods in excess of 15 years for each such lease agreement, on such terms as he deems to be in the interest of the United States and necessary for the accommodation of Federal agencies in buildings and improvements which are in existence or to be erected by the lessor for such purposes and to assign and reassign space therein to Federal agencies.

"(2) If the unexpired portion of any lease of space to the Government is determined by the Administrator to be surplus property and the property is thereafter disposed of by sublease by the Administrator, the Administrator is authorized, notwithstanding section 204 (a), to deposit rental received in the buildings management fund (40 U. S. C. 490 (f)) and defray from the fund any costs necessary to provide services to the Government's lessee and to pay the rent not otherwise provided for on the lease of the space to the Government.

"(3) Lease agreements in excess of 5 years entered into under paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not be subject to the 25 percent limitation of section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278a).)

SEC. 2. The following laws are repealed: Act of March 2, 1913 (37 Stat. 718 (paragraph on leasing storage space)), as amended by section 6 of the act of June 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 258; 40 U. S. C. 36); section 407, act of June 16, 1949 (63 Stat. 199, as amended; 40 U. S. C. 37a); and the first sentence of amended section 3 of the act of August 27, 1935 (60 Stat. 257; 40 U. S. C. 304c).

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation is requested.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the bill is designed to expand the existing authority of the Administrator to procure space by lease for the accommodation of Federal agencies by authorizing execution of leases for such purposes in buildings or improvements which are in existence or to be erected by lessors for periods not in excess of 15 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are the buildings to be erected for that special purpose?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am sure that would be the intention. In order to get space in cities where space is not now available, a contractor or investor probably would be happy to invest money in a building if he thought he could lease space for 15 years and amortize the cost of the building, but he would not do so if he had to lease the space for a short term.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. CHARLES H. PAGE

The bill (H. R. 1315) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles H. Page, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

G. H. LITTS

The bill (H. R. 4351) for the relief of G. H. Litts was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MEASURES PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 80) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women was announced as next in order.

Mr. CLARK. Over, by request. This is not calendar business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1804) for the relief of Robert B. Cooper was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 148) to prescribe procedures and contents for reports to the Senate by executive agencies with respect to proposed projects for conservation and development of land and water resources was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

SALE OF LAND IN OTTAWA COUNTY, MICH.

The bill (H. R. 7900) to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to sell to individuals land in Ottawa County, Mich., which was acquired pursuant to the provisions of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an explanation of the bill.

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

EXPLANATION OF H. R. 7900

This bill will authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain lands to the highest responsible bidder at not less than the fair market price. The lands concerned are approximately 6,200 acres of land in Ottawa County, Mich., which were acquired under the submarginal land retirement program during the 1930's. They were purchased by the Government for a very nominal amount. The land is now needed for rural residential purposes because of the expansion of population in the nearby cities of Grand Haven, Holland, and Grand Rapids.

There is nothing mandatory about the bill. The Secretary is authorized to sell such land "as he determines is not needed for public purposes and is suitable for private ownership."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to inform all Members of the Senate that at the conclusion of the calendar call some bills will be taken up by motion. I am anxious to accommodate each Senator, so if there is any particular bill that a Senator is interested in that he thinks we should consider before a sine die adjournment, I hope he will contact me, or Mr. Siegel, or some member of my staff who will be here at the table. We will attempt to arrange an orderly method for considering all the bills. I thank my colleagues.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, while I have the floor, if my colleagues will permit me, I send to the desk an order and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I will say, for the benefit of my colleagues and the press, this is an order assigning committees to the newly elected Democratic Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is hereby excused from further duty with the Select Committee on Small Business, and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] is hereby assigned to service with such committee.

Ordered further, That the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] is hereby excused from further service with the Committee on Banking and Currency, and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] is hereby assigned to service on such committee.

Ordered further, That the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is hereby excused from further service with the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] is hereby assigned to service with such committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, before action is taken on the order, I send to the desk and ask to have read 3 letters from 3 distinguished Senators, all of whom have the confidence and respect of their colleagues, but I should like to observe that I have never known 3 Senators to be more unselfish or more considerate of the problems of their leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The letters will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

AUGUST 30, 1957.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR LYNDON: I have been informed that it will be necessary for existing committee

assignments to be given up by Democratic Members of the Senate so that Senator PROXMIRE can receive the standing committee assignments to which he is entitled.

Accordingly, I tender herewith my resignation from the Committee on Banking and Currency so that this assignment may be available to the new Wisconsin Senator.

Sincerely,

FRANK J. LAUSCHE.
United States Senator.

AUGUST 30, 1957.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR LYNDON: I understand that under the rule governing the division of committee seats between the majority and the minority, it becomes necessary for existing Democratic Senators to give up committee posts in order to furnish assignments to the new Senator from Wisconsin, BILL PROXMIRE.

Accordingly, I tender my resignation from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH S. CLARK,
United States Senator.

AUGUST 30, 1957.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR LYNDON: In order to provide an assignment for the new Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. PROXMIRE, I herewith tender my resignation from the Select Committee on Small Business.

Sincerely,

A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,
United States Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, before action is taken, I should like to point out to my friends of the majority and the minority a provision of rule XXV, which appears on page 43 of the Standing Rules of the Senate. The Democratic majority in the Senate increased from 49 to 50. The Republican minority decreased from 47 to 46. But, according to this rule, the Democrats lost two committee seats. The rule provides that, if there are 49 in the majority and 47 in the minority, we would have 16 third-committee assignments; but if that number steps up to 50 in the majority, as it did in this case, and 46 in the minority, we would have only 14.

That is a quirk in the rules. I guess a few weeks ago someone would have said, "We won the battle and lost the war." We won the election and lost two committee seats. That is a little unusual. However, because of the unselfishness and because of the consideration demonstrated by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], we have been able to assign to our new colleague this morning, as a result of the unanimous action of the Democratic steering committee, of which I have the honor to be the chairman, with each member participating, a seat on three excellent committees.

I had hoped it might be possible to assign the distinguished Senator a place on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, because of his great interest in agriculture and because he comes from an important agricultural State. There is no vacancy on that committee at the present time. The Senator will be considered for any vacancies that may occur.

In the meantime, I shall ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to be constantly aware of the interest of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] in farm problems. I know the Senator is willing to utilize his constructive efforts in helping us solve the problems relating to agriculture.

Mr. President, may we have the order acted upon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the order presented by the Senator from Texas? Without objection, the order is entered.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I think this is another indication of a sense of responsibility not only on the part of the majority leader but on the part of the Democratic Members of the Senate.

Frankly, I am a little surprised; because, while riding to the Capitol with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] night before last from the airport, I was under the impression that he might be able, after a great deal of effort, to be seated on two committees. However, I come to the Chamber this afternoon and I find he has been given three excellent committee assignments.

I listened to the majority leader this morning talk about the accomplishments of this session of Congress. I should like to emphasize the fact that we shall be, when we adjourn later in the day, half way through the present Congress. I think the sense of responsibility which has marked the Democratic Party during the past 4 years and 8 months has been carried down to the present day and is in large part responsible for the fact that we have a Senator from Wisconsin for the first time in almost 30 years. I think the activities of this body under the leadership of the outstanding majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], have had their impact upon the people throughout the country.

For example, because of the policies carried out by all sections of the Democratic Party represented in this Chamber, a victory in Wisconsin occurred, and we hope in the future this trend will continue. This is nothing new. This trend has been in evidence since the beginning of 1953. I think it is a trbute to the majority leader, for the fine leadership he has displayed, for the sagacity he has demonstrated, and for the gift he has for bringing various elements of the Democratic Party together.

Of course we have our differences, but we can and do overcome those differences and alleviate them. Out of that process comes good legislation, as has been indicated in recent weeks.

Mr. President, I would hazard a guess that the number of bills which a Congress passes is not of importance. What is of importance is the quality of the measures which are reported, passed, and sent to the President.

I also point out that, on the basis of what has been said, the majority leader has indicated that at least half of the President's recommendations numbering on the order of 150, have been considered in the 1st session of the 85th Congress. Every recommendation of any merit which the President sends to Congress will receive the most serious consideration of this Democratic-controlled body. That has been the policy during the past 4 years and 8 months, and it will be the policy in the future.

Mr. President, I was surprised to read on the ticker tape this morning a statement by Secretary of Agriculture Benson, who evidently is the Republican's secret weapon, to the effect that his farm policies had no effect on the vote in Wisconsin. I think the Secretary is mistaken, because in my part of the country, to the west of Wisconsin, in the Rocky Mountain-Great Plains area, in the last election the policies of Mr. Benson did help the Democrats and did, in my opinion, hurt the Republicans.

We are extremely glad to have a man of the ability of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] with us. We know he will work extremely well under the leadership of the senior Senator from Texas. We know he won a victory on the basis of a hard campaign, good issues, and because he had right in his corner. We feel that he likewise will add to the responsibility which this Congress, under Democratic control, has exhibited during the last 4½ years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield the floor so that my friends, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] may be recognized.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is recognized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want to join with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] in commending our new friend, new colleague, and distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] for his committee assignments. It is a great privilege to serve on one committee in the Senate, and it is an unusual privilege to serve on three. I am sure I speak what is in the heart of the junior Senator from Wisconsin, when I extend thanks and appreciation to our three colleagues who have so unselfishly stepped aside and given up committee posts in order to permit the Senator from Wisconsin to have important committee assignments. The Senator from Wisconsin will have the opportunity to serve his constituency on one of the greatest committees in the Senate, the Committee on Banking and Currency. It has jurisdiction over so many problems that the Senator discussed, in his campaign, such as the problems of the Eisenhower inflation, the high interest rates, and the tight-money policy, housing, and small business. The Senator from Wisconsin is intimately acquainted with these matters, and apparently the people of his State understand them, because they responded to his appeal.

I have served for 8 years as a member of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business. I can assure the Senator from Wisconsin that the opportunity to

serve on the Select Committee on Small Business is a unique privilege. I welcome the Senator to the ranks of the committee. He will find that there is a growing interest on the Main Streets of America in the work of the Senate Committee on Small Business, and he will find also—as he did find, since he is a living demonstration of it—that the independent businessmen of America are beginning to look to the Democratic Party for leadership and protection.

The Senator will also serve on the important Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Other Senators, I am sure, will make comment upon that. I only desire to add the thought that to be a friend of the civil-service employees and the postal workers is an opportunity and a responsibility. The Senator from Wisconsin has proved himself to be that kind of a friend—a friend of the workingman, of the farmer, and of the businessman.

I wish to commend the majority leader for what I like to call the "Johnson doctrine" of assigning new Senators to serve upon at least one major and important committee. I do not want to tell the other side of the aisle how to run its business, because that is a Republican problem, but I will say that on the Democratic side of the aisle since the majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas, has been at the helm we have seen to it that every Senator has been given one or more important committee assignments. Believe me, this means something to the people back home, as well as to the Senator who receives such an assignment.

I desire to conclude, Mr. President, by stating that I could not help but note that my esteemed friend, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] mentioned the name of Mr. Benson. Mr. Benson is a very well known name in the Halls of Congress. It is a well-known name in the great plains and prairies of the West and Midwest. Mr. Benson may disavow any connection with the Wisconsin election, but I think at some time later on we will hear again from the people of Wisconsin as to how effective Mr. Benson's policies are.

I want the RECORD to note this, if my colleagues will bear with me. I have been trying to get Secretary Ezra Taft Benson to appear before a Senate subcommittee for 3 weeks. I want Senators all to know that we almost succeeded yesterday, because last evening he was in the front row in the family gallery with his delightful and lovable family. He has a wonderful family. He was there. He almost got to the committee.

I am of the opinion that the Secretary of Agriculture thinks he is going to outwait the junior Senator from Minnesota, because he indicated to me that after Labor Day he might be available for a committee hearing. Well, Ezra, I want to tell you something: I am staying in Washington until after Labor Day, because I am so fond of the Secretary of Agriculture that I want to have a chance to visit with him on the matter of how he is reorganizing the Rural Electrification Administration.

If the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin plans to remain in the city until after Labor Day, I will say to him that an experience he will never forget is in the offing for him—the opportunity to meet the Secretary of Agriculture, the man who has driven down agricultural prices, who has literally taken money away from the farmers of Wisconsin and Minnesota, particularly our dairy farmers.

I welcome the junior Senator from Wisconsin to this privilege of visiting with the Secretary of Agriculture. That is the word which the Secretary used. He said he wanted to visit with me. I welcome the junior Senator from Wisconsin to that experience.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the majority leader for the policy he has followed since his inauguration into that office. Senators on this side of the aisle, even though we hold many divergent views, have been inspired by the leadership of our majority leader. He has led us to a championship race which was climaxed in Wisconsin only a day or two ago. Wisconsin has sent to the Senate a man who, I know, will be a worker. If he is not, he should not want three committee assignments. The majority leader took a look at this man and said, "There is a worker"; and he gave him three committee assignments.

He gave him one very good committee assignment, to the Committee on Banking and Currency. The junior Senator from Wisconsin is a worker. He will fit nicely into that committee. I know that he is a bit disappointed that he cannot serve on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry at this time. That is another fine, hard-working committee.

Service on the Committee on Banking and Currency will be an experience for the junior Senator from Wisconsin that he will always cherish. It is a tribute to the State of Wisconsin that he should be placed on that committee.

The majority leader has been tireless in all his efforts. He has been fearless. As was said a little while ago by the Senator from Minnesota, he is a man who has followed the precepts and principles which he expounded at the beginning of 1953.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I wish to congratulate that committee upon the accession to its membership of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. I have served on the committee for 9 years. It is one of the most important committees of this body, dealing with a wide variety of subjects.

We are very sorry to lose the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], who has been a tower of strength, and whose integrity and sincerity have impressed us all. We are very happy to have the junior Senator from Wisconsin among us. He is extremely well qualified for membership on the Committee on Banking and Currency. Some years ago he served a period of time in the canyons of Wall Street.

In that connection, I am reminded of a couple of lines from a poem by Rudyard Kipling, written many years ago. It was very widely quoted at the time:

> If you can talk with crowds and keep your virtue,
> Or walk with kings—nor lose the common touch.

The junior Senator from Wisconsin has been talking with crowds in Wisconsin for 6 years, and has retained his virtue. He has never made promises which he did not keep; and he has spoken out when frequently it seemed to be to his political disadvantage.

As I have said, for a brief period of time he walked with the kings of Wall Street, at the lower end of Manhattan Island, but he did not lose the common touch as he walked with them. He obeyed the injunction of the Master, who said that we should be as wise as serpents and as harmless as doves.

The junior Senator from Wisconsin has acquired a knowledge of the financial world, but he will use that knowledge for the benefit of the people.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as a member of the Democratic steering committee I was very happy to join the majority leader in making these three committee assignments, and I compliment the three distinguished Senators who gave up their assignments in order to enable the junior Senator from Wisconsin to accept three important committee assignments.

I only regret that the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin will not be able to serve at this time on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. As chairman of that committee it is my hope that when January comes the committee will go into detail with respect to one of the important segments of our farming problem, a segment which needs assistance. I refer to the dairy industry.

I take this opportunity of inviting my good friend, the junior Senator from Wisconsin, to study the problem from now until January, and give us the benefit of his views when we meet, in order to attempt to solve the problems facing the farmer.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, yesterday I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD certain statements with respect to the new Senator from Wisconsin. I should like to repeat a few of them, to show that the confidence of the majority leader was well placed when he chose these three important committee assignments for the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

In the statement which I had printed in the RECORD yesterday I said:

> BILL PROXMIRE is a man seasoned in combat, undismayed by reverses, enlightened by education, blessed by a charming wife, endowed by nature with a keen intellect, vigorous in action, strong in mind and body, and dedicated to the public good. Such a combination in one man carried with it the elements of victory, and were, in my opinion, the biggest single factor in BILL PROXMIRE'S victory in Wisconsin.

I think he has shown that he is worthy of the three committee assignments.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, flattering words come easily on the floor

of the Senate, I have found. However, one of the highest tributes which our colleagues could show to the outstanding record of the new Senator from Wisconsin is the fact that three illustrious Democratic Senators in the Senate have voluntarily relinquished their seats on important committees so that the new Senator from Wisconsin could serve in a capacity for which his great experience and ability qualify him.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am very much aware of the cardinal rule that a freshman Senator, a new Senator, should not address the Senate very soon after he becomes a Member of the Senate. However, I cannot let this moment pass without expressing on behalf of the people of Wisconsin our gratitude for the fine thing the majority leader has done for us. The Johnson doctrine is something for which I believe the people of Wisconsin must be very grateful. I know how unusual it is for a new member of any legislative body to be given this kind of consideration. I think that it is a recognition of the extremely important problems which are facing the people of Wisconsin. I wish to thank our distinguished and great majority leader for having done this. I am sure the people of Wisconsin are very grateful for it.

I also wish to say that the three selfless men who stepped down from important committees in behalf of the people of Wisconsin so that they could be represented on these vitally important committees deserve special thanks. They are the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. I am sure the people of Wisconsin are extremely grateful. I might say also to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] that we are looking forward at some time in the future to representation on his very, very important committee, because the dairy farmers of Wisconsin feel very deeply that their cause must be pleaded as vigorously as possible.

I wish to thank all my colleagues for their very generous and extremely flattering, if undeserved, comments with respect to me personally, and to thank them in behalf of my State.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's very fine statement.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am sure that in the experience of all the Members of the Senate, we have known of no action similar to that taken in the assignment of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] to important Senate committees.

Of course, at the beginning of a session of Congress, after there may have been to some extent a turnover in the membership of the Senate, and when a considerable number of vacancies may exist on Senate committees, in the case of the representation on either one side of the aisle or the other, new Members of the Senate may secure assignments to important committees.

However, I am certain that if historians will search the records of the United States Congress, they will not find another instance in which a Senator who has commenced his service during the middle of a Congress—as has the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin—has been assigned to committees of the importance of those to which the junior Senator from Wisconsin has been assigned, or any other instance in which such great sacrifices have been made on the part of Senators of one particular party, to enable a new Senator to have such important assignments.

Let me say that I have had the privilege of being in Wisconsin; and I realize the great importance, both to the dairy farmers of Wisconsin and to all the other people of Wisconsin, of having the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin serve on the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I join him in expressing the hope that whenever a vacancy occurs in the membership of that committee he will be considered for appointment to it; and I am sure he will be.

In the meantime, in the case of the committees to which the junior Senator from Wisconsin has now been appointed, he is immediately in a position to perform outstanding and most valuable service, as a Member of the Senate and as a member of those committees, for the people of his State. I congratulate him.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to state that I share most wholeheartedly the sentiments which have been expressed this afternoon by so many of the Members of the Senate about the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

RECOMMENDATION OF APPOINTMENT OF SENATOR PROXMIRE TO DELEGATION TO VISIT THE GERMAN BUNDESTAG

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to inform the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] that the majority leader has been requested by the German Government to suggest two Members of the United States Senate, from the majority party, to visit the German Bundestag sometime between October 1 and December 1, 1957.

I wish to inform the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin and, through him, the people of his State and the other Members of the Senate, that I shall recommend to the Vice President the appointment of the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] as one of the members of that delegation. I expect to recommend a senior Senator and a junior Senator; and I want the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin to know that he will be one of the delegation of four Senators, representing the United States Senate at that German meeting.

FOREIGN OIL IMPORTATIONS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the increasing flood of foreign oil and the worsening economy of the oil-producing States due to this flood of foreign oil, has resulted in curtailed drilling, decreased oil runs, shut in oil wells, lower income, lower tax collections, increased unemployment in the oil-producing States, increased mortgage foreclosures, loss of properties through foreclosures, loss of sales of oil-well equipment, and a general business and economic recession in the oil-producing areas of the Southwest.

The United States Treasury is not receiving tax money on foreign oil production to replace revenues lost on reduced domestic oil production, because the American oil companies operating in Saudi Arabia are allergic to American income taxes and have devised means of dodging them. And the oil importers register their oil tankers, which bring this foreign oil to American shores, in foreign corporations that pay no income taxes. Those operating the bulk of these oil tankers that bring this foreign oil to this country are building up huge profits in the United States which are convertible into gold and on which no taxes are paid.

So it is easy to see why the President's plan for voluntary restriction of oil imports by voluntary action of the importing companies is not working satisfactorily. Several oil companies have announced that they would not abide by the administration's request for voluntary action.

The time for action has come. The big importing companies have turned their backs on the President of the United States and on our domestic economy. I request that the President of the United States protect the domestic economy of the United States by putting into effect compulsory controls on oil imports. Nothing else will work, simply because the big importers are too greedy to heed the plight of our domestic oil-producing States. Our domestic economy is imperiled by oil imports; the President's special six-man Cabinet Committee has already found that. Now is the time to stop that peril. Act now, Mr. President. Act for the American people.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PURTELL. Am I correct in understanding that the Senate is engaged in the call of the calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PURTELL. Am I correct in understanding that there are only about six more bills on the calendar, which could be disposed of very quickly?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is approximately correct.

Mr. PURTELL. I thank the Chair.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LAND IN THE STATE OF MISSOURI

The bill (H. R. 580) to authorize the exchange of certain land in the State of Missouri was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a statement in explanation of H. R. 580 printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ELLENDER

The State of Missouri owns approximately 5,500 acres of lands within the boundaries of the Clark and Mark Twain National Forests which were granted to the State by the United States pursuant to the provisions of the Morrill Act approved July 2, 1862. These lands, which are held for the benefit of the University of Missouri, are intermingled with national forest lands. The State desires to consolidate its holdings and the Department of Agriculture desires to consolidate the national forest lands. Such consolidations will make each group of lands more useful and easier to administer. Federal and State legislation is necessary to authorize the State to exchange the Morrill Act lands and this bill will constitute the Federal consent to such exchange.

PRINTING OF REPORT OF 38TH BIENNIAL MEETING OF THE CONVENTION OF INSTRUCTORS OF THE DEAF

The resolution (S. Res. 194) to print the report of the proceedings of the 38th biennial meeting of the Convention of the Instructors of the Deaf was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the report of the proceedings of the 38th biennial meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, held at Knoxville, Tenn., June 23–28, 1957, be printed with illustrations, as a Senate document.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF PRODUCTION, DISTRIBUTION, AND SALE OF NEWSPRINT IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, because this is probably the last day of the present session, I wish to make a statement on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Washington.

I should like to take advantage of the opportunity on the call of the calendar to speak with respect to Calendar No. 131, Senate Concurrent Resolution 20, authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to make an investigation in relation to newsprint, the possibility of price-fixing in newsprint, and the possibility of violation of antitrust and monopoly laws.

Within the next few months there may again be a rise in the price of newsprint. Some months ago—and this is no coincidence—when one company raised its price for newsprint by $5 a ton, all the other producers did likewise.

We are dependent to a great extent for our supplies of newsprint—I think probably 82 percent of it—on foreign countries, mainly Canada. Our publishers have had a difficult time in being able to maintain publishing schedules and meeting costs and estimates. Every time they do, the newsprint producers, mainly those controlled in Canada, raise their prices.

The supply has been short. Fortunately in the last few months it has loosened up a little. The purpose of the resolution was to suggest to the Federal Trade Commission—as has been done by the committee on perhaps six other occasions, and on one of which occasions newsprint producers were indicted for violation of the antitrust laws, and on other occasions were severely reprimanded for price fixing—to look into the situation again. I do not suggest that such practices are now being followed in the United States.

I do suggest that the practices in Canada are such that, if they were carried on in the United States they would be in violation of our antitrust laws. I mean a civilian violation, not a criminal violation.

The only purpose of the resolution is to have the Federal Trade Commission undertake a continuing study of the possibility of such a situation being in existence. It is a very serious problem in relation to newsprint, which is one of the most valuable commodities in the whole Free World.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] on occasions has objected to consideration of such a resolution, on the ground that the Federal Trade Commission can do it anyway. That is true, but sometimes, in order to get the Commission to do things, Congress must give it a slight push. That is the only purpose. I understand the Senator from Louisiana still objects, but I wish to ask him so that the record may be clear, whether, even though he objects, on the ground that the Federal Trade Commission can do this job anyway, he is in sympathy with the purpose of the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator has said, I have opposed this kind of resolution for the simple reason that the Commission has ample authority to do the jobs without the resolution. I express the hope that the Commission will take action and look into this important situation. There is no reason why the resolution should be adopted, because I consider it absolutely unnecessary.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL JUDGES FOR COURT OF APPEALS FOR CERTAIN COURTS IN THE SOUTHERN AND EASTERN DISTRICTS OF NEW YORK

The bill (S. 2864) to provide for the appointment of additional judges for the court of appeals of the second circuit and district courts for the southern and eastern districts of New York was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an additional circuit judge for the second circuit. In order that the table contained in section 44 (a) of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the change made by this section in the number of circuit judgeships for the second circuit, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to said circuit:

"Circuits:	*Number of judges*
* * * * *	
Second	7
* * * * *	*".

SEC. 2. The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the southern district of New York and one additional district judge for the eastern district of New York. In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 will reflect the changes made by this section in the number of judgeships for the southern and eastern districts of New York, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to said districts:

"Districts:	*Judges*
* * * * *	
New York:	
* * * * *	
Southern	19
Eastern	7
* * * * *	*".

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which S. 2864 was passed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from New York.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from New York and I may be permitted to insert in the RECORD the pertinent portions of the hearings before the Judiciary Committee concerning the need for additional judges in the second circuit and in the southern and eastern districts of New York.

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

THE JUDICIAL BUSINESS OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

As originally enacted, the Judicial Code of 1911 provided for 4 circuit judgeships for the second circuit (36 Stat. 1131). The number was raised to 5 by the act of February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1346) and to 6 by the act of May 31, 1938 (52 Stat. 584). The number of judgeships has remained the same since that time. The jurisdictional area of the circuit covers the States of Connecticut, New York, and Vermont which, according to the 1950 census, had a combined population of 17,215,219. Court is held in New York City.

From 1941 to 1950 there was a declining trend in the cases filed in this court. For the next 4 years the number stabilized in the vicinity of 350 cases a year, but during the fiscal year 1955 there was an increase of almost 60 percent over the previous fiscal year,

resulting in an increase in pending cases from 154 on June 30, 1954, to 282 on the same date a year later. During the fiscal year 1956 there was some reduction in the number of cases commenced. The number of cases terminated continued to increase however and pending cases were reduced by 18. The figures were: cases commenced 462, cases terminated 480, and cases pending at the end of the fiscal year, 264. In the first half of the fiscal year 1957 covering the period from July 1 to December 31, 1956, the upward trend has been resumed with filings greater than those in the first half of the record fiscal year 1955.

The flow of cases in the first half of the fiscal years 1955, 1956, and 1957 in this court have been as follows:

	Pending at beginning of half-year period	Filed July 1, to Dec. 31	Terminated July 1, to Dec. 31	Pending at end of half-year period
July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	154	275	142	287
July 1 to Dec. 31, 1955	282	224	174	332
July 1 to Dec. 31, 1956	264	281	183	362

In the first half of the fiscal year, which includes the summer vacation, it is natural for terminations to be less than cases filed, but a warning signal is given when the pending load continually mounts as it is doing in this circuit.

The figures for the past 16½ years are given in table I, attached.

Almost one-half of the cases commenced in the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit are appeals from the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, and the number of these filed annually averaged about 170 cases from 1950 to 1954, but increased to 270 in the fiscal year 1955, and was 251 in 1956. Appeals from the other district courts have also increased. The following table shows the source of appeals for the last 7 years:

Source of appeals and original proceedings commenced in the U. S. Court of Appeals for the 2d circuit during the fiscal years 1950 to 1956

Source of appeal	Fiscal year						
	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956
Total appeals	318	361	350	352	366	581	462
Connecticut	16	11	15	17	22	33	21
New York, northern	7	5	10	12	10	31	15
New York, eastern	34	49	33	43	39	76	65
New York, southern	186	177	165	167	159	270	251
New York, western	15	11	7	19	19	28	15
Vermont	4	2	2	3	3	8	6
The Tax Court of the United States	32	54	57	43	52	69	51
National Labor Relations Board	18	31	35	29	45	36	20
All other boards and commissions	5	12	12	12	7	16	10
Original proceedings	1	9	14	7	10	14	8

From 1950 to 1956 total appeals have increased by 45 percent and appeals from the courts by 42 percent. During the first half of the fiscal year 1957 the trend is again up.

For the last 6 years the number of appeals commenced per judgeship in the second circuit has averaged 69 compared to the national average per judgeship in the same period of 50.

The caseload per judgeship for each circuit since 1941 is shown in table 2, attached. The number of cases filed per judgeship in 1954, 1955, 1956, and the first half of 1957 was as follows:

Cases commenced per judgeship

	Fiscal year			
	1954	1955	1956	1st half of 1957
All circuits	51	54	53	27
District of Columbia	52	49	60	24
1st	35	51	42	18
2d	61	97	77	47
3d	36	44	39	20
4th	70	67	70	37
5th	73	75	73	37
6th	51	53	52	28
7th	50	48	49	24
8th	33	37	34	13
9th	57	43	43	25
10th	42	48	48	23

In the fiscal year 1954, the second circuit caseload per judge of 61 was exceeded only by the fourth and fifth circuits and was 20 percent over the national average of 51. In the fiscal year 1955, the second circuit stood first with an average caseload per judge of 97, almost 80 percent above the national average of 54. Again, in 1956, the second circuit was first with 77 cases filed per judge compared with the national average of 53, and, once again, in the first half of the fiscal year 1957, it had the largest number of cases filed per judge, with a caseload 74 percent above the national average and 10 cases per judge more than in any other circuit.

The median from docketing to disposition for this circuit compared with the median for all circuits since 1942 is shown in table 3, attached.

In spite of the heavy load, including many cases of great importance, the circuit has kept up its excellent record of prompt disposition of appeals. With the recent death of Circuit Judge Jerome Frank, the court now has an added handicap until the vacancy is filled, particularly since Judge Frank was known for the speed and facility with which his able opinions were written.

The following table shows the caseload per judge in other circuits in the fiscal year preceding that in which Congress created additional judgeships. In all but one instance this followed a recommendation by the Judicial Conference of the United States.

Additional circuit judgeships created by Congress since 1939 with the caseload per judge of the circuit in which the judgeship was recommended during the year preceding the action by Congress

Circuit	Number of additional judgeships	Date of act	Caseload per judge of cases filed during preceding fiscal year
6th	1	May 24, 1940	60
8th	2	do	63
5th	1	Dec. 14, 1942	77
3d	1	Dec. 7, 1944	55
District of Columbia	3	Aug. 3, 1949	77
3d	1	do	42
7th	1	do	55
10th	1	do	54
5th	1	Feb. 10, 1954	80
9th	2	do	64

The 1955 caseload of 97 cases commenced per judge in the second circuit is larger than that of any other circuit where the creation of judgeships was recommended, and the 1956 caseload of 77 cases per judge is equal to that of the fifth and District of Columbia circuits, when additional judgeships were created for those circuits.

The Judicial Conference of the United States on March 24, 1955, in response to a request from the judicial council of the second circuit, recommended the creation of one additional circuit judgeship for this court.

At a meeting in January 1957 the circuit council of the circuit voted to recommend 2 additional circuit judges for this court instead of 1. The reason for this is the current increase in the business of the court, which seems to be in line with the long-term trend, the greatly augmented strain under which the court has been working during the last 2 years, and the growing number of trials and, thus, potential appeals in the district courts of the circuit.

The following table compares the cases per judge filed in the circuit in 1956 with the average for all circuits, and then on the basis of 7 judges for the second circuit court, the total for all circuits including the 2 judgeships recommended by the Judicial Conference (1 for the second circuit and 1 for the fourth) and finally on the basis of 8 judges for the second circuit court and for the national average the present number of judgeships plus 2 for the second circuit and 1 for the fourth.

	2d circuit— Number of—		All circuits— Number of—	
	Judgeships	Cases	Judgeships	Cases
1956	6	77	68	53
1956: On the basis of the judgeships recommended by the Judicial Conference	7	66	70	51
1956: On the basis of the judgeships recommended by the Judicial Conference plus an additional judgeship for the 2d circuit	8	58	71	51

It will be observed that with 8 judges, based on the 1956 cases filed, the second circuit caseload per judge is well above the national average and, as will be seen from table 2, would be above the caseload in 7 of the other circuits.

The recommendation of the second circuit council for an eighth judge for this court will be considered by the Judicial Conference of the United States when it meets on March 14 and 15, 1957.

Respectfully submitted.

WILL SHAFROTH,
Chief, Division of Procedural Studies and Statistics, Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

FEBRUARY 5, 1957.

TABLE 1—*Second circuit*

Fiscal year	Filed	Terminated	Pending	Terminations after hearing	Terminations per judgeship after hearing
1941	533	548	142	408	68
1942	501	471	172	363	61
1943	499	504	167	338	56
1944	595	547	215	349	58
1945	466	520	161	380	63
1946	425	450	136	296	49
1947	378	386	128	269	45
1948	381	378	131	287	48
1949	344	351	124	270	45
1950	318	355	87	292	49
1951	361	319	129	268	45
1952	350	349	130	286	48
1953	352	359	113	296	49
1954	366	325	154	264	44
1955	581	453	282	349	58
1956	462	480	264	369	62
1957 (1st half)	281	183	362		

TABLE 2.—*Cases commenced per judgeship in the United States Courts of appeals during fiscal years 1941–56, by circuit, including 1st half of fiscal year 1957*

NUMBER OF CASES COMMENCED

Circuit	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949
Total all circuits	56	57	53	53	46	45	44	47	51
District of Columbia	45	58	45	47	47	49	44	58	77
1st	29	33	40	35	28	25	33	26	25
2d	89	84	83	99	78	71	63	64	57
3d	57	58	71	55	50	33	44	48	42
4th	53	46	52	49	41	36	43	49	56
5th	81	77	58	59	55	50	54	66	76
6th	54	47	46	41	34	39	35	38	36
7th	68	65	57	56	48	52	56	46	55
8th	47	40	44	36	30	39	23	27	29
9th	42	48	42	49	38	41	45	41	46
10th	47	62	47	48	55	45	40	49	54

Circuit	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1st half of 1957
Total all circuits	44	46	47	50	51	54	53	27
District of Columbia	48	44	48	47	52	49	60	24
1st	22	27	27	28	35	51	42	18
2d	53	60	58	59	61	97	77	47
3d	34	39	40	42	36	44	39	20
4th	65	58	58	56	70	67	70	37
5th	68	70	75	80	73	75	73	37
6th	40	38	38	51	51	53	52	28
7th	46	39	34	43	50	48	49	24
8th	26	32	34	33	33	37	34	13
9th	45	58	63	64	57	43	43	25
10th	32	39	38	32	42	48	48	23

TABLE 3.—*Median time interval in months from docketing to final disposition of cases heard or submitted, fiscal years 1942–56*

Fiscal year	2d circuit	All circuits
1942	3.9	7.7
1943	3.3	6.5
1944	4.5	6.5
1945	4.3	7.0
1946	3.7	6.8
1947	3.8	6.9
1948	3.5	6.3
1949	3.6	7.1
1950	3.3	7.1
1951	3.3	6.7
1952	3.9	7.3
1953	4.3	7.0
1954	4.6	7.1
1955	5.1	7.3
1956	6.6	7.4

THE JUDICIAL BUSINESS OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

There are six judgeships provided for the United States District Court for the eastern district of New York, which has headquarters at Brooklyn. The jurisdiction of the court embraces Staten Island and Long Island and, concurrent with the southern district, the waters within Bronx and New York counties. The Judicial Code of 1911 provided 2 judgeships for the district; a third judgeship was authorized as temporary in 1922; 2 more judgeships were provided in 1929, and in 1935 the temporary judgeship created in 1922 was made permanent and a sixth judgeship was added. There has been no increase in judgepower for the district in more than 20 years.

The civil business of the court has not increased materially since the prewar period as shown in table 1, attached, and in the postwar period the number of filings has been remarkably steady. A slight decrease in business during the war years was followed by a sharp rise in civil filings in 1945, 1946, and 1947 as the result of a large volume of price- and rent-control litigation. Since then the 1,383 civil cases filed in 1948 and the 1,384 filed in 1955 have been the years with the peak loads. In the fiscal year 1956 there were 1,185 civil cases commenced, compared with 1,272 in 1941, the last year before World War II.

During the war years, 1 and often 2 judges from this district sat regularly in the southern district of New York, but the docket conditions in Brooklyn have prevented this in recent years. Since 1945, the pending civil cases in the eastern district have increased rapidly. In 1947, the figure was 2,200, where it remained for about 3 years, and, in 1951, increased to 2,400. At the end of the fiscal year 1956 there were 2,588 civil cases pending in the district, including 1,801 private civil cases. The condition of the dockets appears from the following table, showing the number of cases pending on the trial calendars of the court in the last 10 years:

Cases pending on the civil and admiralty trial calendars, eastern district of New York

	Total	admiralty	Civil	
			Non-jury	Jury
December 1946	303	240	6	57
June 1947	419	244	114	61
June 1948	712	309	152	251
June 1949	908	432	135	341
June 1950	1,053	503	254	296
June 1951	1,149	518	241	390
June 1952	1,299	485	274	540
June 1953	1,299	454	319	526
June 1954	1,491	405	417	669
June 1955	1,607	366	453	738
June 1956	1,625	286	532	807
January 1957	1,476	254	544	678

A reduction in civil cases pending on the calendars in the first 7 months of the current fiscal year is the result of a successful calendar call which has cleared away some deadwood and has resulted in the settlement of other suits. However, a great deal remains to be done, if the arrearages are to be cleared away within a reasonable period.

For many years the median time intervals for the disposition of civil cases terminated after trial in the southern district were the longest in the country, but in 1956 the southern district was replaced by the eastern district as the court with the longest delays. Many factors including the practices of the bar enter into the delay of litigation, but the median time figures take into account these factors in all districts. The median interval of 41.0 months from filing to disposition of the 160 cases terminated after trial in the eastern district of New York in 1956 was 2⅔ times as long as the national median of 15.4 months and the median time interval of 38.6 months between issue and trial for these same cases in 1956 was 3¾ times as long as the national median of 10.3 months. Eleven years ago the majority of cases were being reached for trial in the eastern district in a little more than 6 months from the joinder of issue and were being disposed of within 15 months of the date of filing. Complete information on the time intervals for the intervening years from 1945 to 1956 is given in table 4, attached.

The accumulation of civil cases in this court at a time when the volume of litigation has not been increasing is unusual and has been caused in part by a significant change in the character of the litigation handled. In the first half of the 1940–50 decade the private civil caseload consisted mostly of admiralty litigation, which on the average is not time consuming, although the cases tend to remain on the dockets for a long time due to the unavailability of witnesses who are at sea. But around 1946 a decline in admiralty litigation set in, while other types of time consuming private litigation began to increase.

In 1947 the Federal Tort Claims Act began to produce litigation against the Government which is significant in any consideration of the workload of this court because of the many Government installations on Long Island including the Brooklyn Navy Yard. The amount of money in controversy in some of these cases is often not large, but where the Government contests the claims, considerable work is required on the part of the court.

A comparison of the number of certain types of cases filed immediately after the war with the number presently being handled is revealing. For example in 1945 there were 45 Employers' Liability Act cases filed in Brooklyn compared with 76 in 1956. Inasmuch as the Tort Claims Act did not exist in 1945, there were no such cases in that year, but there were 63 in 1956. Patent litigation has been and remains very heavy in the district. In 1956 there were 8 such cases commenced per judgeship compared with the national average of 3. The diversity caseload is below average, but the negligent-personal-injury suits under this jurisdiction in 1956 numbered 59 per judgeship compared with the national average of 50 per judge. These large caseloads contrast with the decline in private admiralty litigation from 312 cases filed in 1945 to 78 in 1956.

The effect on the work of the district of the increasing volume of these time-consuming types of cases is evident from the number now pending on the dockets. On June 30, 1956, there were 36 Federal Tort Claims Act cases pending per judge in the eastern district compared with the national average of 8; there were 16 patent suits pending per judge compared with the national average of 5; and finally there were 95 diversity negligent-personal-injury suits, other than those arising out of motor-vehicle accidents, pending per judge compared with a national average of 21. Other details concerning the types and the age of the pending cases may be found in table 7, attached.

The criminal caseload for the district has doubled in the last 5 years (see table 2), but is still somewhat below the average per judge nationally. Criminal cases receive priority and the dockets of the districts are reasonably current, although the number of cases pending at the end of the year has also been increasing for the last 5 fiscal years.

The recommendations of the Judicial Conference of the United States for additional judgeships are designed to provide sufficient judicial manpower to enable the courts to reach a condition where civil cases may be reached for trial within 6 months of filing. In order that this goal may be achieved in the eastern district of New York the conference has recommended that two additional judgeships be created for this district.

A recent drive by the court to clear the deadwood from the civil docket and try to settle some of the cases which have been pending for some time had brought about a reduction of 129 cases in the calendar between June 30, 1956, and January 31, 1957. However, there were still a very large number of cases on the dockets. Complete statistical tables showing the judicial business of the district for the last 16 fiscal years are attached.

Respectfully submitted.

JOSEPH E. SPANIOL, JR.,
Attorney, Division of Procedural Studies and Statistics, Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

FEBRUARY 12, 1957.

EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

TABLE 1.—*Civil cases commenced and terminated, by fiscal year, and pending at the end of each year beginning with 1941*

TOTAL CIVIL CASES

Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30	Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30	Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30
1941	1,272	1,109	1,223	1947	1,721	1,412	2,243	1952	1,167	1,272	2,307
1942	1,062	1,176	1,109	1948	1,383	1,435	2,191	1953	1,251	1,073	2,485
1943	987	1,099	997	1949	1,346	1,381	2,156	1954	1,180	1,174	2,491
1944	1,007	897	1,107	1950	1,198	1,237	2,117	1955	1,384	1,111	2,764
1945	2,263	1,955	1,415	1951	1,266	971	2,412	1956	1,185	1,361	2,588
1946	2,054	1,535	1,934								

PRIVATE CIVIL CASES

Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30	Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30	Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30
1941	724	627	790	1947	735	554	955	1952	677	789	1,560
1942	647	704	733	1948	862	530	1,287	1953	741	644	1,657
1943	559	671	621	1949	733	613	1,407	1954	684	588	1,653
1944	490	474	637	1950	658	644	1,421	1955	729	617	1,765
1945	538	479	696	1951	808	557	1,672	1956	691	655	1,801
1946	545	467	774								

TABLE 2.—*United States civil cases and criminal cases commenced and terminated, by fiscal year, and pending at the end of each year beginning with 1941*

UNITED STATES CIVIL CASES (UNITED STATES A PARTY)

[Price and rent control cases are in parentheses [1]]

Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30	Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30	Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30
1941	548	482	433	1947	986 (615)	858	1,288	1953	510 (41)	429	828
1942	415	472	376	1948	521 (173)	905	904	1954	496	486	838
1943	428 (12)	428	376	1949	613 (239)	768	749	1955	655	494	999
1944	517 (166)	423	470	1950	540 (171)	593	696	1956	494	706	787
1945	1,725 (1,228)	1,476	719	1951	458 (0)	414	740				
1946	1,509 (1,111)	1,068	1,160	1952	490 (38)	483	747				

CRIMINAL CASES

[Cases transferred are not included in "Commenced" and "Terminated" columns]

Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30	Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30	Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30
1941	259	288	134	1947	366	422	151	1953	237	241	101
1942	344	260	218	1948	338	393	107	1954	358	289	180
1943	556	515	259	1949	333	341	106	1955	408	404	189
1944	722	724	257	1950	266	298	84	1956	488	483	209
1945	526	554	229	1951	251	265	76				
1946	543	570	202	1952	230	231	93				

[1] Price and rent control cases are separately listed from 1943 to 1953. In many of these years they constituted a large proportion of all civil cases commenced, although they required on the average a relatively small proportion of court time per case for disposition. They are included in the figure which they follow.

TABLE 3.—*Cases commenced per judgeship*

Fiscal year	Number of judgeships	Total civil cases		Private civil cases		Criminal cases (less immigration) [2]		Fiscal year	Number of judgeships	Total civil cases		Private civil cases		Criminal cases (less immigration) [2]	
		New York, eastern	National average [1]	New York, eastern	National average [1]	New York, eastern	National average [1]			New York, eastern	National average [1]	New York, eastern	National average [1]	New York, eastern	National average [1]
1941	6	212	164	121	82	43	153	1949	6	224	238	122	121	55	123
1942	6	177	168	108	77	57	161	1950	6	200	222	110	113	44	116
1943	6	165	158	93	58	88	174	1951	6	211	204	135	111	41	106
1944	6	168	169	82	56	115	184	1952	6	195	236	113	126	38	112
1945	6	377	295	90	57	86	176	1953	6	209	261	124	146	39	114
1946	6	342	321	91	70	89	142	1954	6	197	210	114	127	57	103
1947	6	287	271	123	109	60	134	1955	6	231	212	122	126	66	104
1948	6	231	205	144	117	56	123	1956	6	198	225	115	135	77	102

[1] This column includes 86 districts for 1949 and thereafter; 84 districts before 1949.
[2] Immigration cases have been eliminated from this table because they occur in volume in only 5 districts on the Mexican border and because the average judicial time per case for their disposition is small.

TABLE 4.—*Time elapsing in civil cases tried* [1]

Fiscal year	Number of cases tried	Median interval in months from filing to disposition		Median interval in months from issue to trial		Fiscal year	Number of cases tried	Median interval in months from filing to disposition		Median interval in months from issue to trial		Fiscal year	Number of cases tried	Median interval in months from filing to disposition		Median interval in months from issue to trial	
		New York, eastern	National median	New York, eastern	National median			New York, eastern	National median	New York, eastern	National median			New York, eastern	National median	New York, eastern	National median
1945	16	14.8	9.0	6.3	5.3	1949	170	21.8	10.4	13.5	5.9	1953	98	32.6	12.4	28.5	7.4
1946	98	18.0	8.9	8.6	5.0	1950	173	21.4	11.2	17.9	6.7	1954	108	39.5	13.5	34.2	8.1
1947	98	17.3	9.0	7.9	5.1	1951	130	15.7	12.2	20.0	7.3	1955	86	45.1	14.6	39.4	9.1
1948	133	17.3	9.9	9.4	5.8	1952	126	25.4	12.1	17.2	7.0	1956	160	41.0	15.4	38.6	10.3

[1] The median time interval in months is computed for the civil cases in which a trial was held, which were terminated during the year, excluding land condemnation, habeas corpus, and forfeiture proceedings. No median interval is shown for the years 1945 through 1952 where less than 25 cases were terminated after trial. For the year 1953 and subsequent years, where there were less than 25 cases terminated after trial, a median is listed with an asterisk (*) on the basis of the number of cases terminated after trial for the last 2 years, provided there were 25 such cases for the 2 years.

TABLE 5.—*Cases commenced per judgeship in this district and in 86 districts by nature of suit, fiscal year 1956*

	New York, eastern	86 districts
Civil cases:		
Total cases	198	225
United States cases	82	90
Private cases	115	135
United States cases:		
United States plaintiff	54	73
Land condemnation	1	4
Fair Labor Standards Act	6	2
Other enforcement suits	2	2
Food and Drug Act	6	4
Liquor laws		2
Other forfeitures and penalties	3	5
Negotiable instruments	10	25
Other contracts	17	21
Other United States plaintiff	9	8
Civil cases—Continued		
United States cases—Continued		
United States defendant	28	18
Enjoin Federal agencies	7	3
Habeas corpus	2	3
Tort Claims Act	11	4
Tax suits	4	5
Other United States defendant	5	3
Private cases:		
Federal question	38	33
Copyright	2	1
Employers' Liability Act	13	6
Fair Labor Standards Act		1
Habeas corpus		3
Jones Act	6	10
Civil cases—Continued		
Private cases—Continued		
Federal question—Con.	2	2
Miller Act	8	3
Patent	7	7
Other Federal question	64	90
Diversity of citizenship	4	15
Insurance	10	16
Other contracts		3
Real property		
Personal injury (motor vehicle)	12	33
Personal injury (other)	37	17
Other diversity	1	5
Admiralty	13	11
Criminal cases (less immigration)	77	102

TABLE 6.—*Civil and criminal trials commenced*

BY FISCAL YEAR

Fiscal year	Total trials commenced	Civil			Criminal		
		Total	Nonjury	Jury	Total	Nonjury	Jury
1951	141	123	62	61	18	2	16
1952	139	117	49	68	22	8	14
1953	114	103	46	57	11	5	6
1954	165	123	72	51	42	10	32
1955	145	107	75	32	38	5	33
1956	197	160	76	84	37	5	32

PER JUDGESHIP

Fiscal year	Number of judgeships	Total trials		Civil		Criminal	
		New York, eastern	National average [1]	New York, eastern	National average [1]	New York, eastern	National average [1]
1951	6	24	39	21	28	3	11
1952	6	23	40	20	27	4	13
1953	6	19	44	17	29	2	15
1954	6	28	40	21	25	7	15
1955	6	24	41	18	26	6	15
1956	6	33	43	27	29	6	14

[1] This column includes 86 districts.

TABLE 7.—*Civil cases pending on June 30, 1956*

PER JUDGESHIP

Nature of suit	Cases pending per judgeship	
	New York, eastern	National average
Total civil cases	431	236
United States civil cases	131	74
Private civil cases	300	162
United States plaintiff	58	46
Land condemnation	4	14
Antitrust		
Other enforcement suits	20	5
Forfeitures and penalties	3	4
Negotiable instruments	7	8
Other contracts	14	9
Other United States plaintiff	11	7
United States defendant	73	27
Tort Claims Act	36	7
Tax suits	9	8
Other United States defendant	29	13
Federal question	89	44
Antitrust	1	2
Copyright	3	1
Federal Employers' Liability Act	32	8
Jones Act	18	16
Patent	16	5
Other Federal question	19	11
Diversity of citizenship	157	98
Insurance	6	11
Other contracts	19	20
Real property		3
Personal injury (motor vehicle)	34	34
Personal injury (other)	95	21
Other diversity	3	9
Admiralty	54	20

AGE

Jurisdiction	Total pending	Age of civil cases pending						
		Less than 6 months	6 months to 1 year	1 to 2 years	2 to 3 years	3 to 4 years	4 to 5 years	5 years and over
Total civil cases	2,588	467	381	653	410	303	129	245
United States civil	787	167	90	169	119	95	19	108
United States plaintiff	348	85	37	67	50	28	11	70
United States defendant	439	82	53	102	69	67	28	38
Private civil	1,801	300	291	484	291	208	90	137
Federal question	535	101	95	162	88	47	15	27
Diversity	942	180	160	274	156	82	33	57
Admiralty	324	19	36	48	47	79	42	53

THE JUDICIAL BUSINESS OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

The United States District Court for the Southern District of New York is the largest trial court in the Federal judicial system in number of judges and of big cases and it is located in the greatest commercial and industrial center in the world. Its 18 judges handle a very great percentage of all antitrust litigation and a large share of the patent, copyright and trademark cases as well as time-consuming criminal prosecutions of national and international importance. New York is the largest port in the Nation and in the last few years about 40 percent of the admiralty and maritime litigation in the Federal courts has been filed in the southern district. The business of the court has multiplied in the last half century and from time to time additional judgeships have been added. The 4 judges provided for the district by the judicial code of 1911 were raised to 6 in 1922, to 9 in 1929, to 11 in 1936, to 12 in 1938, to 16 in 1949, and finally to 18 in 1954. Court is held only in New York City.

The history of this court from the end of World War II to 1955 can be described only in terms of excessive caseloads, large numbers of protracted cases, a continual accumulation of arrearages, and mounting delay. The judicial assistance provided to meet the situation has been neither timely nor adequate to meet the ever-increasing business and until recently the trial dockets have been very congested. In 1941 and through the war years when there were 13 judgeships for the district (including 1 temporary position which expired in 1943), the pending civil cases fluctuated between 3,500 and 4,500, but by the end of 1945 increased to 5,800. Two years later the pending civil cases surged upward by 70 percent to 10,100, which prompted the Judicial Conference of the United States in 1947 to recommend 2 additional judgeships and to ask that the expired temporary position be reestablished. When the pending caseload increased another 800 cases in the ensuing 12 months, the Judicial Conference requested 4 additional judgeships for the district and these positions were provided in the omnibus judgeship bill passed in 1949.

Still the civil backlog piled up and delay increased. On June 30, 1950, the pending civil caseload reached 11,134 and it became clear that the extra judge-power provided was inadequate to overcome the enormous arrearages. The pending civil cases in this district alone were more than one-fifth of the number in all district courts. In September of that year the Judicial Conference of the United States recommended 5 more judgeships for the district, including 2 on a temporary basis. By the end of the fiscal year 1953 the arrearages had reached 11,768 civil cases including 9,385 private civil cases and in addition delays in criminal cases were being felt and the pending criminal caseload topped 1,000 for the first time in almost 10 years.

In 1954, 2 of the 5 judgeships recommended by the Judicial Conference were created. The Conference immediately renewed its request for the other three judges and supplemented this in 1956 by a recommendation for a fourth new judgeship. The purpose of these Conference recommendations is to provide sufficient judicial manpower to enable the courts to eliminate arrearages and reach a point where the average civil case can be reached for trial within 6 months of the date of filing.

Although there has been some improvement in the docket conditions in the southern district of New York recently, additional help is needed if the goal of the Conference is to be achieved within a reasonable time. The backlog of 8,205 civil cases on June 30, 1956, was more than twice the 4,087 civil cases pending on June 30, 1941. But 2 years ago the delays in the district were so bad that many cases being disposed of by trial had been pending on the dockets more than 4 years and had been awaiting trial more than 3 years. The median interval from filing to disposition of cases terminated after trial in 1955 was 45.9 months and the median from issue to trial was 34.8 months. And even with such delays the judges were often without cases to try due to recurring calendar breakdowns. At that time the court appointed a committee of judges to investigate what steps may be taken to improve the condition of the calendars. Drastic changes in the calendaring practices were devised and the court embarked upon a program designed to provide firmness and stability to these calendars. The calendars for the first time were put in the charge of the judges. A year ago last fall a call of the entire civil calendar consisting of 5,700 cases was completed with startling results. By the end of the court year the calendared cases were reduced to 1,800 and the number of cases pending on the dockets decreased from 10,334 to 8,205, a gain of more than 2,000 cases. A continuation of the same practices in the current court year has reduced the size of the calendar to 767 cases as of December 31, 1956, although the total number of civil cases on the dockets on the same date remained at a level of 8,500.

Principal efforts of the court until recently have been to dispose of cases on the calendars and this has greatly reduced the number of cases ready for trial. Now older cases on the dockets which have not yet been calendared have been called and counsel have been asked to report the status of these cases. This will bring some cases to the trial dockets and will also result in settlements and dismissals. The cases which are not calendared all constitute potential trials and if the litigants are to receive prompt attention, the court must exercise some measure of control over them, which is now being done.

The details of the new calendaring system are set forth in an article by Judge Irving Kaufman which appeared in the December 1956 issue of the Journal of the American Judicature Society. A copy of that article is attached to this statement.

The achievements of the court are encouraging. They have been made possible in part through the able assistance of three retired judges of the court and the services of visiting judges from other districts. This has proven to be a very desirable expedient, but it cannot be relied upon as a substitute for permanent judgeships. Retired judges cannot maintain an unslacked pace and visiting judges are often difficult to secure. The four judgeships recommended by the conference are needed and Judge Kaufman views the necessity for them as follows:

"I will not detail the need for additional judicial manpower. Suffice to say, part I has demonstrated that there are a sufficient number of hard-core triable cases well in excess of the number our present quota of judges can handle, and if our calendars are to be maintained in their present current status, the implementation of the Judicial Conference's recommendations for new judgeships is a necessary first step."

Notwithstanding the improved calendar situation the accumulated backlog of civil cases is enormous. As of June 30, 1956, the 8,205 pending civil cases amounted to 456 per judgeship or almost twice the national average of 236 civil cases pending per judgeship. With 8 percent of the judges in all the 86 districts having solely Federal jurisdiction, the backlog of private litigation in the district was 18 percent of the national total. As of June 30, 1956, 44 percent of all pending private admiralty cases, more than one-half of all Jones Act suits involving injury to seamen, one-third of all copyright cases, one-fourth of all Government civil antitrust suits, and about one-fifth of all private antitrust suits were on the dockets in the district. The Government civil antitrust suits were 15 in number and these actions together with the 4 criminal antitrust prosecutions pending on July 15, 1956, are listed in appendix A. The number of time-consuming private antitrust suits pending in the district at that time numbered 100. Further details concerning the age and composition of the pending civil cases are given in table 7.

The court in the southern district of New York serves New York City exclusive of Staten and Long Islands, and to a certain extent serves also the entire New York-northeastern New Jersey area which in 1950 had a population of almost 13 million. New York is the financial capital of the world and the Nation's largest port. Complicated commercial litigation and important criminal cases tend to gravitate to this region and in the last 3 years the southern district has had 22 trials which have required 20 or more actual trial days not including the time spent in the preparation of the case and the writing of opinions.

Long trials in this district which have attracted much public attention in recent years have included the important Smith Act case, *U. S.* v. *Dennis et al.*, tried by Judge Medina which took 168 trial days; the Investment Bankers antitrust case, *U. S.* v. *Morgan*, which required 309 trial days, also tried by Judge Medina (he was occupied with the case for 3 years); *U. S.* v. *Flynn*, also a Communist case, tried by Judge Dimock for 154 trial days; *Ferguson* v. *Ford*, a multimillion-dollar suit against the Ford Motor Co. tried by Judge Noonan for 120 trial days and finally settled; and *U. S.* v. *Imperial Chemical Industries*, tried by Judge Ryan for 56 days.

The trial time in these cases is only a small part of the time they require of the judge and this is particularly true of the antitrust cases. The number of exhibits, depositions, and documents in this type of proceeding is almost unbelievable. For example in the Alcoa case, there were 15,000 pages of record; in the National Lead case, 1,400 exhibits and 5,000 pages of record; in Imperial Chemical Industries, 3,700 exhibits; and in the Investment Bankers case, 10,600 exhibits. *Ferguson* v. *Ford* contained 27,000 exhibits and 10,000 pages of record and the trial was never concluded. When the case was settled the plaintiff had not yet completed his direct case.

The Judicial Conference Committee on Procedure in Antitrust and Other Protracted Cases has recommended in its report adopted by the Conference in 1951 that cases of this type should be assigned to a judge from their inception and that the judge to whom such a case is assigned "should be relieved of all other duties from the commencement of the trial until his judgment is pronounced." This has frequently been impossible in this court. There were 5 cases tried in 1956 which required 20 days or more:

Civil cases: *Universe Tankships, Inc.* v. *Bethlehem Steel*, 43 trial days, contract action. *Banking & Trading Corp.* v. *R. F. C.*, 20 trial days, contract action.

Criminal cases: *U. S.* v. *Klein*, 77 trial days, tax fraud. *U. S.* v. *Kiame*, 33 trial days, tax fraud. *U. S.* v. *Allied Stevedoring Corp.*, 31 trial days, tax fraud.

Another long Smith Act case, *U. S.* v. *Trachtenberg*, tried by Judge Bicks, was commenced during the fiscal year and completed shortly after the close of the year, requiring 59 trial days.

The large backlog of potentially long and complicated cases as well as the number being filed is an important factor in the Judi-

cial Conference recommendation for four additional judgeships. But help is needed also to handle the large caseloads of more or less routine litigation. Four judgeships would increase the judicial staff by 22 percent, but would not reduce the average caseload per judgeship in the district to a point below the national average. On the basis of the 5,033 civil cases filed in the court during the fiscal year 1956 the effect would have been to reduce the average incoming caseload in the district from 280 cases per judge to 229, which is 4 cases more than the average per judgeship nationally of 225 in 1956 and considerably in excess of the caseload of 196 civil cases per judge, if all the judgeships recommended by the Conference had existed. Again on the basis of the 1956 filings the 4 extra judges would have reduced the caseload of incoming private civil cases from 226 to 185 per judge, which is 50 cases more than the average that year of 135 private civil cases commenced per judgeship nationally and 68 cases more than the national average per judgeship on the basis of the 262 judgeships including 34 recommended by the Conference in the 86 districts having purely Federal jurisdiction.

In the first half of the fiscal year 1957 there has been a decided upsurge in civil filings to 2,775, or 500 civil cases more than the number filed during a like period of the preceding fiscal year. All of this increase has occurred in the time-consuming private civil cases. A comparison of the civil cases, private civil cases, and criminal cases commenced and terminated in the district in the first half of the fiscal years 1956 and 1957 (July 1–December 31) appears in the following table:

Cases commenced and terminated

TOTAL CIVIL CASES

Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending at end of half-year period
6 months of 1956	2,284	3,379	9,239
6 months of 1957	2,775	2,475	8,505
PRIVATE CIVIL CASES			
6 months of 1956	1,791	2,725	7,529
6 months of 1957	2,292	2,001	7,053
CRIMINAL CASES			
6 months of 1956	434	510	629
6 months of 1957	426	511	435

The criminal caseload in the district is not heavy numerically and the dockets are reasonably current because of the priority to which they are entitled and receive. However, criminal cases are a factor to be considered in the workload of the district because of the many protracted trials, which in past years have included celebrated Smith Act and sedition trials, tax-evasion cases, and criminal antitrust suits.

Complete statistical tables showing the judicial business of the district in the last 16 fiscal years are attached.

Respectfully submitted.

JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, Jr.,
Attorney, Division of Procedural Studies and Statistics, Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

FEBRUARY 18, 1957.

CREATION OF NEW JUDICIAL DISTRICT IN CALIFORNIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2840) to create a new and separate judicial district in California and to create a new division for the northern district of said State which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 2, line 15, after the word "Park" to insert the words "Mariposa, except Yosemite National Park," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 84 (a) of title 28 of the United States Code is hereby amended as follows:

(1) By amending the first sentence thereof so as to read: "The northern district comprises three divisions."

(2) By amending the second subparagraph thereof to read as follows:

"(2) The southern division comprises the counties of Marin, Monterey, San Benito, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Santa Cruz. Court for the southern division shall be held at San Francisco."

(3) By adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph as follows:

"(3) The eastern division comprises the counties of Alameda and Contra Costa. Court for the eastern division shall be held at the county seat of Alameda County."

SEC. 2. That section 84 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by striking out subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"CENTRAL DISTRICT

"(b) The central district comprises two divisions.

"(1) The northern division comprises the counties of Fresno, Inyo, Kern, Kings, Madera, except Yosemite National Park, Mariposa, except Yosemite National Park, Merced, and Tulare.

"Court for the northern division shall be held at Fresno.

"(2) The southern division comprises the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, and Ventura.

"Court for the southern division shall be held at Los Angeles.

"SOUTHERN DISTRICT

"(c) The southern district comprises the counties of Imperial and San Diego.

"Court for the southern district shall be held at San Diego."

SEC. 3. Section 133 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out

"California:
"Northern 7
"Southern ..... 11"

and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"California:
"Northern 7
"Central 9
"Southern ..... 2"

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which S. 2840 was passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from California.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

COMMEMORATION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADMISSION OF THE STATE OF OREGON INTO THE UNION

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 131) authorizing the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to commemorate with appropriate ceremonies the 100th anniversary of the admission of the State of Oregon into the Union was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue, on or before February 14, 1959 (the 100th anniversary of the date on which the State of Oregon was admitted into the Union), a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to commemorate with appropriate ceremonies the 100th anniversary of the admission of Oregon into the Union.

REMOVAL OF LIMITATON ON USE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY CONVEYED TO THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TEX., BY THE UNITED STATES

The bill (H. R. 7964) to remove the limitation on the use of certain real property heretofore conveyed to the city of Austin, Tex., by the United States was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: I move to reconsider the vote by which House bill 7964, Order of Business No. 1195, was passed.

Mr. McNAMARA. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the call of the calendar.

ROMA H. SELLERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1714) for the relief of Roma H. Sellers, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$12,500", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Roma H. Sellers, of Preston, Miss., the sum of $12,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all her claims against the United States for compensation for permanent personal injuries and pain and suffering sustained by her, and for reimbursement of hospital, medical, and other expenses incurred by her, as a result of the improper administering of an anesthetic in the course of an operation performed on her January 7, 1955, by United States Air Force doctors at the Nazareth Hospital, Mineral Wells, Texas: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The bill (S. 49) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CLARK. With deep regret, I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, before the session closes, I should like to say that the Senator from Washington is fully cognizant that there are many practical, legislative, and other reasons why the bill must go over. I know the Senator from Pennsylvania is not opposed to the bill. I hope, however, that statehood for Hawaii and for Alaska will be one of the first orders of business when Congress reconvenes in January. All of us have been vitally interested in this matter. I think all the hearings have been held that are necessary. All the facts are in. It has been discussed pro and con by the committees, Members of the Senate, and Members of the House. I think it is time the Congress faced up to a decision on the matter. I appreciate the reasons given now for passing the bill over, but I hope that next January the leadership on both sides of the aisle, the two political parties having pledged themselves solemnly at many conventions that they are for statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, will face up to a decision on this issue by a yea-and-nay vote in the United States Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

That completes the call of the calendar.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, when Congress met in January, the President requested the highest peacetime budget in history. For the current fiscal year he asked for $73,300,000,000 in appropriations—including other new expenditure authorizations—and estimated expenditures at $71,800,000,000.

From the grassroots, the people let their dissatisfaction be known in no uncertain terms. As Congress adjourns, the President's original appropriation budget, exclusive of the postal deficit, according to calculations by the staff of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, has been cut $6,500,000,000 to a total of $66,800,000,000.

I ask unanimous consent that the table be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

[Rounded to billions of dollars]

Category	President's January budget	Reductions	Enacted to date
National security:			
Military functions	38.5	3.1	35.4
Stockpiling and defense production	.1	.1	------
Atomic energy	2.5	.2	2.3
Subtotal	41.1	3.4	37.7
Foreign aid and international affairs:			
Mutual security:			
Military assistance	2.4	1.1	1.3
Economic assistance	2.0	.6	1.4
Subtotal, MSA	4.4	1.6	2.8
Other	.5	.1	.4
Subtotal	4.9	1.7	3.2
Domestic-civilian	27.3	1.4	25.9
Total	73.3	6.5	66.8

Mr. BYRD. In my March analysis of the President's budget, I concluded appropriations could and should be reduced by at least $6.5 billion, and expenditures by $5 billion to $7 billion. While the figures above will have to be adjusted because Congress failed to increase postal rates, I am pleased at the proximity of the appropriation reductions, and I believe determined executive control over spending agency activities can result in substantial expenditure reduction.

The President must exercise his authority to hold down expenditures, because reduction in current new appropriations does not affect the availability of balances carried over from prior years. These unexpended balances now total $70 billion. This carryover combined with new appropriations makes approximately $137 billion available in expenditure authorization for Federal agencies.

With expenditures authorized in such an amount, the debt ceiling is the most effective expenditure curb remaining with Congress in the current situation. The terrible Federal debt is now bumping the $275 billion statutory ceiling. To prevent deficit financing, along with other reasons, as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I shall oppose any increase in the debt limit short of dire national emergency after the President has exhausted all practicable means of spending control.

The President would be keeping faith with demand by the American public if he would require reduction in expenditures this year equal to the reduction in new spending authority, or more. The people have demonstrated their ability to translate their will into Federal action, and they can render themselves and their country good and patriotic service if, at this time, they will:

First. Communicate with the President and the Bureau of the Budget, demanding (a) further reductions in expenditures in the current fiscal year, and (b) reduction in new appropriations and expenditures in the budget, now in preparation, for delivery to Congress by the President in January; and

Second. Demand of their representatives in Congress continuing support of reductions in both expenditures and new appropriations.

The reaction in Washington to public demand last spring for budget reduction was unprecedented, especially in view of the President's opposition in many areas. The Appropriations Committees of Congress, in particular, are to be commended for their constructive work.

The committees achieved even greater reductions in appropriations under their jurisdiction than show in overall figures. Committee cuts were partially offset by increases in authority to spend out of the debt, which bypass appropriation control. The President asked for $1.3 billion in this kind of expenditure authority, and the Congress enacted $2.3 billion. Practically all of this increase was in Federal housing programs, the Federal National Mortgage Association in particular.

I hope the President will avoid a postal deficit and control expenditures in a manner to require the minimum of supplemental appropriations and get the budget to a level where we can begin to consider reduction in debt and taxes.

The people of this Nation are carrying a terrible burden of both debt and taxes. They deserve reduction in both. This requires expenditure reduction first. Appropriations have been cut. Expenditure reduction, under existing fiscal procedures, lies largely with the President.

FACILITATION OF CONDUCT OF FISHING OPERATIONS IN ALASKA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on August 20, the Senate passed, and sent to the House of Representatives, a bill relating to the fishery operations in Alaska. That bill was Senate bill 2349.

Two days later—on August 22—the House of Representatives passed an identical measure, House bill 9280; and that bill has been sent to the Senate.

Of course, the House of Representatives usually passes a companion Senate bill, in case it has previously been passed by the Senate. I do not know why that procedure was not followed in this case.

Mr. President, it is most important that this House bill be acted on at this time, in view of the fact that the fishing season is now under way. I am told that the committee action on this measure was unanimous. It may be that an oversight occurred somewhere along the line.

At any rate, House bill 9280 has now been sent to the Senate. Since the Congress is about to adjourn, and inasmuch as the fishing season is under way, and inasmuch as the two bills are identical, I ask that the Chair lay House bill 9280 before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 9280) to facilitate the conduct of fishing operations in the Territory of Alaska, to promote the conservation of fishery resources thereof, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 9280) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1791) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1959. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the report.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have a brief statement which I should like to have printed in the RECORD, in order to explain the provisions of the conference report. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

The House of Representatives amended the bill to eliminate a present provision in the Reorganization Act requiring that, before a reorganization plan submitted to the Congress can be disapproved, a resolution of disapproval must be adopted "by the affirmative vote of a majority of the authorized membership of that House." The effect of the amendment is to require that a reorganization plan submitted by the President will take effect within 60 days after its submission, unless, before the expiration of such time, a resolution of disapproval has been passed by a simple majority of those present and voting in either the House or the Senate.

This amendment accords with the position taken by the Committee on Government Operations and by the Senate when the act was originally approved in 1949. At that time all exemptions of agencies from application of the act contained in prior reorganization acts were removed. It was the position of the Senate, in removing these exemptions and granting far wider powers to the President in submitting reorganization plans than previous acts had authorized, that a simple resolution of disapproval by either the House or the Senate would be sufficient to reject or disapprove any reorganization plans submitted by the President. This view was reiterated by the Committee on Government Operations when it reported the pending bill on May 29, 1957 (S. Rept. No. 386).

The provision repealed by the House amendment was originally inserted in the Reorganization Act of 1949 at the insistence of the House conferees, after the Senate conferees had unanimously supported retention of a provision for rejection of a plan by a simple majority vote of either House. The House amendment therefore conforms to the position taken by the Senate when the act was originally approved. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

LEGISLATIVE WORK OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, 1ST SESSION, 85TH CONGRESS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as the 1st session of this 85th Congress draws to its close, it may be useful to review briefly some of the legislative work undertaken this year by the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, so that Senators will be informed of the progress being made on several important measures which are likely to come before this body for consideration next year.

During this first session, our committee's members have devoted themselves primarily to essential preparatory research, hearings, and discussions on four major public questions embodied in bills pending before it:

First, how shall the integrity of billions of dollars' worth of employee welfare and pension plans be protected?

Second, should veterans of peacetime military service receive GI benefits, or readjustment assistance; and, if so, of what kind?

Third, should minimum-wage protection be extended to additional millions of employees not now covered under the Fair Labor Standards Act?

Fourth, how can retirement pensions and unemployment insurance for railway workers be improved without overburdening either the employees or the carriers; and, even more important, how can the long-term actuarial stability of the railroad retirement fund be maintained?

Three standing subcommittees and one special subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare have conducted lengthy public hearings and held numerous executive discussions on the many problems raised by these major questions. The printed record of the hearings on these four topics will be available during the recess for all who may be interested in examining and evaluating it.

In addition to the many hours and days which have been devoted to studying these four major legislative questions, the committee has also taken action on a number of other measures, including several strongly recommended by the administration, which did not require such extensive deliberation, but which will, when enacted into law, be of great benefit to various groups of our people. Of those reported by the committee and approved by the Senate, I shall enumerate only a few:

We have initiated a new program of research and training of teachers for the million and one-half unfortunate children in this country who are mentally retarded or emotionally disturbed, and who, we believe, can be measurably helped to live more useful and happier lives. This legislation was highly recommended by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

We have approved a bill to establish a library of films bearing captions like those of the old-fashioned silent movies. This library will be available to institutions, schools, or associations for deaf persons, for whom the advent of the sound film has meant a great loss in ability to understand and learn from moving pictures.

We reported a bill which, by restricting the application of the wage-hour law in foreign overseas bases, will relieve our Government of a potential liability for claims estimated at one-half a billion dollars. Approval of this measure was strongly urged by the Department of Defense. The bill also will result in raising the minimum wage in the American overseas areas of Guam and the Canal Zone to the $1-an-hour minimum required since 1956 for other American workers by the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The committee reported a resolution, strongly recommended by the Department of Labor, which requires the Secretary of Labor to make available to the public and the press the financial reports of labor unions, which now are merely filed with him under the Taft-Hartley Act.

We approved one additional year's extension of the Federal program to provide financial assistance for school construction in areas of the country suffering a heavy impact from Federal activities, such as defense installations and the like.

The committee has also reported a bill extending the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act under which private rehabilitation agencies may use for another year previously granted Federal funds, to help carry on their humanitarian work.

Of course, Mr. President, many other minor bills and numerous nominations were reported to the Senate. Among the important nominations ordered reported to the Senate, for confirmation, were those of James T. O'Connell, to be Under Secretary of Labor; Leroy E. Burney, to be Surgeon General; Lawrence G. Derthick, to be Commissioner of Education; Howard W. Habermeyer, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board; Joseph A. Jenkins, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board; Jerome D. Fenton, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board; Katherine Brownell Oettinger, to be Chief of the Children's Bureau; Dr. Alan T. Waterman, to be Director of the National Science Foundation; Robert O. Boyd, to be a member of the National Mediation Board; James Gilhooley, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor; and 10 eminent persons, to be members of the Board of Regents of the new National Library of Medicine.

Mr. President, the members of the committee take great satisfaction from the fact that the Senate in its wisdom has given its approval to every bill,

every resolution, and every nomination reported this session from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The Calendar of the Senate, so far as this committee is concerned, has been cleared.

I wish to compliment all the members of the committee, both Republican and Democratic, for the earnest and faithful service they have performed in this session; and especially do I thank them for the splendid cooperation and unfailing courtesy they have shown me, as their chairman. The ranking majority member and distinguished former chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], has been, as always, a stanch friend of the people in whose behalf our committee seeks to legislate, and has been of unflagging assistance to his successor as chairman of the committee. The ranking minority member of the committee, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has been, as always, a delightful and cooperative associate in our common efforts to guide the committee's business.

It should be pointed out, Mr. President, that four members of the Senate Labor Committee this year have been called upon to serve on another specially created committee dealing with matters affecting the labor movement; I refer to the Select Committee To Investigate Improper Activities in Labor-Management Relations, generally known as the McClellan Committee. These four were Senators KENNEDY, MCNAMARA, IVES, and GOLDWATER. They have carried on their work in that investigation, in addition to the responsibilities they have borne in our committee.

I wish also to pay tribute to the chairman and members of the subcommittees of our committee for the care, diligence, and thoughtful attention they have given the major legislative proposals which were referred to their respective units for appropriate consideration and action.

I should like to mention particularly the work of the four subcommittees which carried the greatest burden this year:

A special seven-man Subcommittee on Welfare and Pension Plans Legislation was established this year, under the able chairmanship of Senator JOHN KENNEDY, to consider proposals designed to protect the millions of working people for whose benefit many billions of dollars have been, and are being, invested in pension and welfare programs. After extensive hearings and careful executive consideration, the special subcommittee on Monday of this week ordered reported to the full committee a bill requiring registration, reporting, and disclosure of these plans. Further consideration awaits the reconvening of Congress in January. Meanwhile, Senators will be able to study the record and reflect on the provisions of this highly important proposal relating to a vast and growing problem. Besides the chairman, the subcommittee is composed of Senators MURRAY, MCNAMARA, MORSE, IVES, PURTELL, and ALLOTT. They are to be congratulated on their accomplishment.

Our Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, STROM THURMOND, has made a profound study of the problems arising from the fact that, for the first time in American history, our young men are subject to compulsory military service in peacetime. While the subcommittee has carefully assembled almost all the information it will need to enable it to decide what type of readjustment assistance, if any, should be granted peacetime veterans, it has wisely determined to withhold further action until January, so that the Members can appraise the effects of the recent reduction in both our Armed Forces and in the call-ups under the draft. With this later information before it, the subcommittee will be in a position to act forthwith in this important area. Besides the chairman, the subcommittee members are Senators KENNEDY, GOLDWATER, COOPER, and myself.

The Subcommittee on Labor, also under Senator KENNEDY'S chairmanship, has completed an exhaustive series of hearings on proposals to extend coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act to millions of additional employees, and has reported a bill to the full committee. This subcommittee, in addition to its chairman, is composed of Senators NEELY, MCNAMARA, MORSE, IVES, GOLDWATER, and PURTELL. The full committee has discussed the minimum-wage bill during several executive meetings, and essential groundwork has been laid for decisions in this controversial matter next year.

The Subcommittee on Railroad Retirement, under the capable leadership of its chairman, Senator WAYNE MORSE, has compiled an excellent record of hearings on a number of proposals to improve the laws governing pensions and unemployment insurance for railway labor. This record, which will be before the committee next January, will be of great value in clarifying the issues so as to permit early resolution of several complex problems and to assure the financial soundness of the railroad retirement fund. Besides the chairman, the subcommittee is composed of Senators KENNEDY, THURMOND, COOPER, and ALLOTT.

It goes without saying, Mr. President, that the achievements of a Congress are not to be measured until adjournment sine die at the end of its second session. What can be measured at the end of the first session is the progress being made.

A committee which has before it major controversial legislation is following good legislative procedure when it devotes the bulk of its attention during the first session to searching out and assembling all pertinent facts about the problems involved, holding public hearings to obtain the views of all interested parties, and examining in detail the various issues raised and the alternatives posed. Once this essential preparatory work has been done, the committee can then proceed, in the second session, to bring to the Senate floor bills which are the product of mature deliberation and which are grounded on careful, thorough, and, at times, exhaustive study and analysis.

During the first session of the present Congress, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has made substantial and noteworthy progress toward the resolution of many difficult problems on which there is deep division of opinion, and on the proper solution of which may depend the security and well-being of many millions of our citizens. When the vital preparatory work has been done in the manner in which subcommittees of our committee have done it this session, the Senate can be assured that important proposed legislation reported to it by the committee at the next session will be sound, reasonable, and workable—proposed legislation which will, I believe, contribute still further to the progress of our Nation.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO CITY OF WARNER ROBINS, GA.—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I wish to report favorably without amendment H. R. 7972, and I submit a report (No. 1165) thereon, a small land bill which authorizes the Secretary of the Air Force to convey to the city of Warner Robins, Ga., title to two parcels of land aggregating 5.78 acres with any improvements.

This land has an estimated valuation of approximately $35,000, and the bill provides that the city of Warner Robins will pay the fair market value of the property.

The bill does no violence to the Morse formula, and is in complete accord therewith.

The Department of the Air Force has stated that it has no further use for this property, and the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget have indicated to the committee that they have no objection.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7972) to provide for the conveyance to the city of Warner Robins, Ga., of certain lands and any improvements located thereon in such city.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DELAY OF DATES FOR SUBMISSION OF PLAN FOR CONTROL OF PROPERTY OF MENOMINEE TRIBE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives on H. R. 6322, a bill to amend the Menominee Termination Act of 1954.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6322) to provide that the dates for submission of plan for future control of property and

transfer of the property of the Menominee Tribe shall be delayed, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment to H. R. 6322, agree to the conference asked by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to; and the Chair appointed Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. CHURCH, and Mr. WATKINS conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in connection with the action just taken by the Senate in appointing conferees on H. R. 6322, I should like to make a short statement.

On August 28, the House disagreed to the Senate amendments to this bill and requested a conference. Yesterday morning my staff informed the House Members that we would name our conferees early on August 29 and be willing to meet that afternoon at any convenient hour. Shortly thereafter, I was advised that, even though the Senate conferees were named, there would be no meeting to work out our differences on this legislation. I want the RECORD to be very clear that the Senate conferees were ready to meet, and that a definite hour was set, but that the House Members did not desire to confer with us. Therefore, the responsibility for failing to have the bill enacted must lie with our colleagues in the other body. I make this statement for the benefit of the sponsor of the bill and the Menominee Indians of Wisconsin.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I should like to present for printing in the RECORD a very justifiable and a very fair letter, dated today, which I have just received from the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin, who has only recently been sworn in as a Member of this body and assigned to this committee, and ask unanimous consent that the letter of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] to me be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
August 30, 1957.

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Within the past few days the Senate has passed and sent back to the House, with amendments, H. R. 6322, a bill to amend the Menominee Termination Act of 1954.

As passed by the Senate, this bill provides that the tribe shall have 1 additional year within which to submit its plan for the future operation of tribal assets, and extends the final termination date to December 31, 1960. The bill further provides that the tribe shall assume one-half of the total costs of preparing for termination.

The House Interior Committee in passing H. R. 6322 recommended an extension to 1959 for the submission of the tribal plan, and that the final termination date be set at June 30, 1961. No reference was made in the House bill with respect to the Indians paying any of the costs of termination.

The House has disagreed to the Senate amendments and requested a conference on the Menominee bill. I would like to take this opportunity to urge that the Senate conferees reconsider the Senate's language with respect to payment by the tribe of half of the termination cost, and the language extending the terminal date to December 31, 1960. The 84th Congress enacted legislation which relieved the tribe of the burden of paying any of the costs of termination. To change that arrangement at this time seems to me to be a clear breach of faith with the Menominee Tribe. The various groups within the State of Wisconsin who have been aiding the Indians in making studies, investigations, and reports with respect to future management of the tribe have suggested that it will be necessary for the State legislature to consider legislation to permit the continued sustained yield operation of the tribal forced lands under favorable economic conditions. This action cannot be taken in less than 4 years, and therefore an extension of the final termination date to June 1961 is mandatory.

The Menominee termination program will mean a drastic transition for these people. The very least that we in the Congress can do, I think, is to afford them sufficient time to make proper plans to permit this transition with the least possible difficulty.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
United States Senator.

AUTOMOBILE WORKERS' PROPOSAL TO REDUCE PRICE OF NEW CARS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, some days ago the president of the United Automobile Workers, AFL–CIO, Mr. Walter Reuther, addressed a very able proposal to the presidents of the major automobile companies, in which he urged that they decrease the prices of their new cars by $100 on the coming models, and that in return the United Automobile Workers would be willing to consider the modification of the wage demands they would otherwise make upon those companies. I regret very much the heads of the automobile companies rather summarily dismissed the suggestion of Mr. Reuther, which I think was deserving of careful consideration.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the telegram which Mr. Reuther addressed to the President of the United States on August 27, 1957, on this matter, be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

It will be noticed that Mr. Reuther suggested that the Government institute a study and bring that study to an early conclusion by getting the facts on the proposal, to enable both the companies and the public to judge more fully about the merits of the idea.

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

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States, The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I was encouraged to learn from your press conference of August 21, 1957, that you had assigned to your economic advisers for study, my request that you intervene on behalf of the American people in an attempt to persuade the three major automobile producers to consider favorably the UAW offer to join in a cooperative effort to dampen the fires of inflation.

Dr. Gabriel Hauge of your staff has written me that you regard the sentiments expressed in my letter "as a hopeful augury that a sense of civic responsibility will prevail in the future negotiations between labor and management."

Moreover, Dr. Hauge emphasized your hope "that all parties will enter into and conduct their collective-bargaining negotiations with a keen awareness that the public as well as the parties have an interest in the agreement they reach."

However, over the past few days, as you know, the three firms have arbitrarily rejected our offer. We in the UAW were deeply disturbed by their summary refusal to agree to this economically sound and socially responsible proposal which was made in complete good faith. We are certain that millions of Americans who have been pressed to the wall by constantly rising prices, share with us our disappointment at this rejection.

Despite the rejection by the corporations of our reasonable proposal for a $100 price reduction on 1958 models, we in the UAW are determined to continue our efforts to reverse the inflationary trend. We shall continue to seek ways by which labor and management can voluntarily join together in the discharge of their responsibilities to all of the American people.

Meanwhile, however, we should like to call to your attention the fact that the time for effective action for contributing to the reversal of the inflationary trend in the automotive industry is fast running out.

We are rapidly approaching the time when the automobile manufacturers are expected to announce higher prices on their new models, thus adding another significant upward spin to the inflationary spiral.

It would therefore be highly desirable to expedite the promised study of the UAW proposal. This study could be greatly facilitated and brought to an early conclusion by obtaining the facts from the parties directly concerned in the proposal; namely, our union and the major automobile corporations.

We are convinced that a meeting, called in the very near future by your economic advisers with the heads of these automobile companies and representatives of our union, would provide the basic information on which our proposal should be evaluated and would further show clearly that it is a socially responsible and practical way for free labor and management to exercise the economic statesmanship you have advocated.

While the auto companies have rejected our offer to join in a common fight against inflation, they would be compelled to give very serious consideration to any such recommendation you might make, particularly when that recommendation was made on the basis of a thorough and impartial examination of all the facts by your economic counselors.

You may, of course, count on the full and unqualified support and cooperation of the UAW in obtaining, whether through the means suggested above or by any other means, all of the data required by those to whom you have entrusted the study of this matter.

On behalf of the American consumers, we urge your prompt and sympathetic consideration.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER P. REUTHER,
President, International Union, UAW.

SENATOR NEUBERGER'S FIGHT FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Oregon papers of yesterday, August 29,

1957, carried the following alleged quotation from our respected Senate colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], to the following effect:

DICK NEUBERGER was one of the Democratic liberals sucked in on the civil-rights bill hoax and sham. * * * Dixiecrat Senators are laughing up their sleeves at the strategy they have engineered.

I feel quite confident that this is a misquotation by the press of whatever the Senator from Oregon may have said on his way to his daughter's wedding. I assert this confidently because I know that the statement as printed is incorrect and, from my long acquaintance with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I know that he would never knowingly make an untrue statement. I have always found the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to be extremely careful of the truth and most generous in his appreciation of his colleagues.

In these days of instantaneous communication, an incorrectly reported interview can, however, go around the world before the truth has time to put on its boots. In the event that some people may have been taken in by this obviously garbled statement, I should like to set the record straight.

No man in the country is more sincerely devoted to civil rights than the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. He has fought for this cause as a private citizen, then as a member of the Oregon Legislature, and finally, ever since he came to the Senate in 1955, he has been a tower of strength for us in this battle.

He joined with our nonpartisan group in seeing that if H. R. 6127—the civil-rights bill—were referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee, as some desired, it would almost inevitably have been buried there, as a similar bill had been buried last year and as an identical bill had been buried there for 6 months this year. A filibuster inside the committee which would almost certainly have been carried on, would have smothered the bill.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] was a leading member of our nonpartisan coalition which, without regard to party or political fortune, finally forced the civil-rights bill onto the floor of the Senate so that we could act, and made it the order of business. This was done over the opposition of the southern group of Senators. I do not question the right of those Senators to oppose—or their sincerity. The junior Senator from Oregon fought with all his strength to retain part III in the bill and to prevent the voting rights section from being crippled. On every rollcall his vote was in direct opposition to that of the southern bloc.

In view of this record it becomes apparent that the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] was indeed misquoted. Since this is the final day of the session and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is unavoidably detained in Oregon, I think it is important that a correct statement be made here.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to associate myself fully with every word the Senator from Illinois has stated. I have listened attentively. I, too, was very disturbed when I read the alleged comment concerning our distinguished friend and colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

I wish to add that I do not consider under any circumstances the civil-rights bill which was adopted is a sham or a hoax. It did not go nearly so far as the Senator from Minnesota would have liked, but in the legislative process we understand that we do not always have our way, and that in a representative body sometimes—and most frequently—compromise is one of the attributes or one of the facts of legislation.

To speak specifically about the junior Senator from Oregon, he has unquestioned integrity in whatever he does. His dedication to the cause of civil liberties and civil rights is excelled by no one. His efforts in trying to obtain an effective civil rights measure are known by the Members of the Senate, by the press, and I believe by the public. The junior Senator from Oregon has conducted himself in the debate on civil rights in a manner which pays tribute to himself and to his State.

I want to say, since this matter has been brought to our attention, that it has been a joy and a pleasure to work with the junior Senator from Oregon. He, as is true of the Senator from Illinois—and I include both in this statement—has been a tower of courage and strength in a very difficult period of our legislative history. The people who are deeply concerned about the fulfillment of the promises and commitments of the Constitution, particularly as they relate to the right to vote, owe a great deal to the junior Senator from Oregon and a great deal to the senior Senator from Illinois. I am happy to have been associated with them in what I believe was a very historic and important development in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I, too, regard the bill in its final form as a step forward, although a modest one. I am very glad that the Senator from Minnesota, who has been one of the leaders in this battle for well over a decade, who has played such an important part in this victory, recognizes, as we all do, the sterling contribution of the junior Senator from Oregon.

I personally am confident that the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] never made the statement which is alleged.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I join in that expression.

SGT. DONALD D. COLEMAN

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives amending S. 1007, a bill for the relief of Sgt. Donald D. Coleman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1007) for the relief of Sgt. Donald D. Coleman, which was, on page 1, line 7, strike out "$15,000" and insert "$8,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

DELFINA CINCO DE LOPEZ

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives amending S. 1636, a bill for the relief of Delfina Cinco de Lopez.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1636) for the relief of Delfina Cinco de Lopez, which was, in line 3, after "of" insert "subsection (a) of section 201 and."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on August 20, 1957, the Senate passed S. 1636, to enable a native and citizen of Mexico to qualify for a nonquota visa as a native of an independent country of the Western Hemisphere, notwithstanding the fact that he is indigenous to a country within the Asia-Pacific triangle. On August 29, 1957, the House of Representatives passed S. 1636, with an amendment which is technical in nature and does not change the intent of the bill.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 1636.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SYMINGTON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

HIGHWAY TREE BELTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a fine suggestion has been advanced by a Member of the other House, from Minnesota, to which I should like to call the attention of the Senate.

Representative JOHN BLATNIK, of Minnesota, an outstanding legislator from Minnesota's northlands and famous Iron Range area, has suggested a gigantic reforestation program involving the planting of a belt of trees alongside the hundreds of thousands of miles of new highways and roads being built under the Federal Aid to Highways Act of 1956. I am sure the suggestion will appeal to everyone interested in natural scenic beauty. Representative BLATNIK is a member of the House Subcommittee on Public Roads, and he has been developing details for this plan with officials of the United States Forest Service and the Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a news release from Representative BLATNIK describing this project.

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

Congressman JOHN A. BLATNIK, Democrat-Farm-Labor, of Minnesota, urged today that the Nation embark on a "gigantic reforestation program by planting a belt of trees alongside the hundreds of thousands of miles

of new highways and roads being built under the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956."

After a preliminary meeting with officials of the United States Forest Service and Bureau of Public Roads, BLATNIK said he will ask these agencies "to formulate a highway tree-planting program to foster highway beautification, conservation, and youth opportunity." The Minnesota legislator, a member of the House Subcommittee on Public Roads, said that he would prepare a bill for introduction next session and call for hearings on this proposal some time next year.

After his meeting with Federal officials, BLATNIK said that "although there are many complex details yet to be worked out, I think we are on the right track. My proposal calls for a greatly expanded tree-planting program along the Nation's highways. This would increase the scenic value of the actual road structure, act as a windbreak and snow fence, thereby cutting down greatly on maintenance costs, since snow removal is a high cost factor in highway maintenance, contribute to soil conservation, add substantial acreage of new reforested areas and give wholesome part-time employment in the outdoors to hundreds of thousands of young people."

BLATNIK said he could foresee no problem in reforesting land along Federal, State, county, and other such public lands adjacent to highways. "Furthermore, existing Federal laws could be amended to permit planting on private land such as pasture land and marginal farm lands," he added.

"Under this highway tree-planting program," BLATNIK said, "I think we could add at least 100,000 square miles of reforested acreage to the Nation's forestry acreage. That's an area equal to all of Minnesota and the northern one-third of Iowa combined. This could be the largest tree-planting program ever undertaken."

BLATNIK pointed out that in addition to the scenic, economic, and conservation benefits of his proposal, "it would be an excellent means to provide an opportunity for young men to work during summer vacations in the good healthy outdoors. Overhead costs would be low, since these young men could work near their home communities and not need to live in camps as in the old CCC days. They could earn while they learn about conservation and outdoor living which is becoming more and more prevalent as leisure time increases in the United States. Instead of hanging around street corners, our young men will be able to get out during the day in a healthy and productive atmosphere, making a real contribution to the betterment of their community. It will give their vacation period purpose and direction, something that is too often lacking today and which is a direct cause of juvenile delinquency. It will also provide many jobs for otherwise unemployed high-school and college boys on summer vacation."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, since this announcement by Congressman BLATNIK, one of my Minnesota constituents, Ed Roster, of Northfield, has written adding to the suggestion.

Mr. Roster suggests the possibility of mobilizing Boy Scout tree nurseries on pieces of public land around the country to provide seedlings for such a gigantic reforestation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some excerpts from Mr. Roster's letter.

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

Forepart of July I was at Many Point Lake, Ponsford. My grandson was in scout camp. I went to the campsite in densely wooded area and noticed a giant hard maple. Under and around it, perhaps 80 to 100 feet diameter, hundreds of little maples were growing from seed this spring. Perhaps 1 in 100 of these seedling will have a chance to grow up in the location where they sprouted because of the crowded tree population. Perhaps this same situation may be found in hundreds of other locations.

It occurred to me that if a tree nursing and planting activity could be set up as a scout activity that this sort of a program would be of immense benefit to the generations to follow and it would be making good use of some of the generous gifts of mother nature. And, some of today's Scouts will contribute to industry and recreation for their grand and great grandchildren in that they have nursed along and reared types of trees that are more useful as well as more ornamental than the boxelder, willow, poplar, and the useless brush that flourishes along with weeds on many hundreds of acres throughout the south and west portions of our State.

There are corners and slices along highways, abandoned roads, and railroad right-of-ways, and a lot of river bottom. Perhaps much of this, as well as a lot of privately owned land might be given gratis to an organization like the Scouts.

Then, too, if an activity of this sort were properly directed it would make room for 10 times as many boys to get into Scout activities and maybe there would not be so many young hoodlums and youthful gangsters.

And, the youngsters having learned some of the fundamentals, may upon attaining maturity, want to engage in tree farming as their life work. Undoubtedly, the time will come when pulpwood trees will have to be planted to maintain an adequate supply for the ever-increasing need.

Perhaps the Fedral Government would go along on this, too, with something along the line of the conservation camps that were set up back in F. D. R. times. The Scouts with their organization could easily carry on and encourage a nationwide exchange both on ideas as well as varieties that are adaptable to other areas.

THE FUTURE OF DISARMAMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, another phase in the 12-year attempt to achieve a disarmament agreement appears to be moving rapidly to an unsuccessful conclusion. In the early weeks of the London meeting of the United Nations Disarmament Subcommittee, we held cautious hope that it would produce the agreement by which some beginning toward the control and reduction of armaments would be made. More recently, however, the actions of the Soviet Union in the Disarmament Subcommittee, as well as in other areas of foreign policy, have greatly reduced even this guarded optimism.

It seems clear that for the time being the Soviets have no intention of using the disarmament talks for anything but propaganda. They have immediately and bluntly rejected the entire, carefully formulated, working paper submitted by the Western nations. Any sincerity of purpose would have dictated the most careful study of this document. If the Soviets had any real desire to attain disarmament they would have scrutinized every word, as we do the Soviet proposals, to find any new area of agreement, any slight change of position.

The United States has made concessions in its proposals in an effort to reach an agreement. We have extended our proposal of a 10-month suspension of nuclear weapons tests from a period of 10 months to a period of 2 years, which was the minimum demand of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union, however, has refused to make similar necessary concessions which would move both parties closer to a common middle ground.

On the matter of aerial inspection, where we insist some kind of beginning be made, even if it is only a small beginning, the Soviets have offered only the obviously unacceptable proposal of inspection of all the United States west of the Mississippi in return for inspection of Soviet territory comprised mainly of Siberia and other relatively unimportant territory. They have continued to call for an immediate unconditional cessation of nuclear weapons tests without giving any consideration to the measures suggested by the West which, coupled with a test suspension, could make a significant beginning toward the control of nuclear weapons.

It is not only the words of Mr. Zorin, the Soviet delegate in the London meetings, which give rise to the belief that Soviet intransigence once again threatens to increase international tension and hinder any progress toward arms control. Equal proof is offered in the boastful Soviet statement on the successful testing of an intercontinental ballistic missile. The tests were made several weeks ago. Announcement of the tests, however, was deferred until this week when, it was believed, the best propaganda mileage could be obtained.

Mr. President, all of us who have studied the disarmament problem carefully have kept in mind the additional complications which would arise once an accurate intercontinental ballistic missile was in production. We have hoped that the disarmament negotiations could move fast enough to be able successfully to control the development of these missiles before enough could be manufactured and hidden for an eventual surprise attack.

Mr. President, I digress to point out that in the hearings in Boston, Mass., about a year ago, scientists from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology warned the Government of the United States that if the Soviet Union got the advantage over us in the development of the intercontinental ballistic missile and was able to produce any number of them, and had time to hide them and to build launching platforms underground, which could be camouflaged, and therefore would not be subject to detection, our country would be in mortal peril.

Any Senator who will look into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for purposes of study will find that the Subcommittee on Disarmament has repeatedly warned the executive branch of this Government, the Congress, and the American people that the race in the field of missiles could well spell the difference between successful disarmament negotiations or none at all.

I think it is quite interesting to note that the Soviet Union became more intransigent than ever during the past few weeks, when the development of the

missile, as now revealed, was an evident fact.

The Western proposals have called for the establishment of an international committee to study an inspection system which would make it possible to insure that all objects entering outer space would be used exclusively for peaceful purposes. It appears that Soviet development of missiles is not yet so far advanced that such a system could not be effectively established. However, instead of agreeing to this preliminary step, the Soviets have tried to scare the peoples of the world with boasts about their intercontinental missile.

Apparently the opportunities for constructive achievement in London are rapidly dwindling. Unless sincere negotiation is resumed, the time has come to transfer the case to a larger forum, the United Nations. There the United States should reoffer its proposals and reemphasize the reasoning behind them. We should expose the Soviet position, their refusal to make a beginning on inspection, and their oversimplification of the question of controlling nuclear weapons tests. There we can mobilize world opinion which is already strongly in favor of making a beginning toward the control of armaments. We could make another attempt to convince the Soviet Union of the folly of resuming the cold war and of the mutual advantages of ending the arms race in a safeguarded manner.

Even though the London talks may end in failure to obtain even a small first-step agreement on disarmament, we cannot afford to resign ourselves simply to a renewed arms race at the level of intercontinental missiles and antimissile missiles. Our present apparent failure may seem more discouraging than hitherto, because we recently came nearer to agreement than in any of the previous 12 years of negotiating. We must remember that under the best of conditions the establishment of an arms control system will require many years.

Moreover, Mr. President, we should not forget that there have been several advances made at London which represent distinct steps forward. For example, we have reached agreement with our allies on both the general approach to and on specific proposals for disarmament. We can now move with a greater strength of unity in this field than we have previously enjoyed. I hope we will use that strength to convince the Soviet Union that the entire world will have real security only when there are safe controls over all weapons of terror, including the new weapons of which they are boasting.

Mr. President, in concluding my remarks, I would like to ask unanimous consent for the inclusion at this point in the RECORD of the following material: The text of the Western disarmament proposals made public yesterday as printed in the New York Times this morning; an editorial entitled "Cold War: New Chapter," which appeared in this morning's Washington Post; an article by Stewart Alsop in the same paper entitled "Reds Zoom Ahead in Missile Race"; and an article in the same paper by Chalmers M. Roberts entitled "Reaction to Soviet Arms Stand."

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

[From the New York Times of August 30, 1957]

TEXTS OF THE WEST'S DISARMAMENT PROPOSALS AND A STATEMENT ISSUED BY UNITED STATES

(WASHINGTON, August 29.—Following are the texts of the United States-British-French-Canadian disarmament proposals, under the title "Working Paper—Proposals for Partial Measures of Disarmament," and of a statement by the United States Government expressing hope that the Soviet Union will accept the plan, as made public here today.)

WORKING PAPER

I. The limitation and reduction of armed forces and armaments

A. Within 1 year from the entry into force of the convention, the following states will restrict or reduce their armed forces respectively to the maximum limits indicated below: France, 750,000; United Kingdom, 750,000; Soviet Union, 2½ million; United States 2½ million.

The definition of the armed forces will be annexed to the convention.

B. During this same period, these states will place in storage depots, within their own territories, and under the supervision of an international control organization, specific quantities of designated types of armaments to be agreed upon and set forth in lists annexed to the convention.

C. The relation of other states to the convention, including the agreed levels of their armed forces, will be determined later.

D. The states listed in paragraph I–A will be prepared to negotiate on a further limitation of their armed forces and armaments upon condition that:

1. Compliance with the provisions of the convention has been verified to their satisfaction.

2. There has been progress toward the solution of political issues.

3. Other essential states have become parties to the convention and have accepted levels for their armed forces and armaments, fixed in relation to the limits set out in paragraphs A and B above.

E. Upon the conditions cited above, negotiations could be undertaken by France, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States on a further limitation of their armed forces, which would involve agreed reductions for the United States and the Soviet Union to not less than 2,100,000 men each. The levels of other essential states would be specified at the same time through negotiations with them.

F. Thereafter, and subject to the same conditions, negotiations could be undertaken on further limitations to not less than 1,700,000 men each for the United States and the Soviet Union. The levels of other essential states would be specified at the same time through negotiations with them.

G. Upon the conditions cited in paragraph D above, these states will also be prepared to negotiate on further limitations of armaments. The calculation of any such armament limitations will be in agreed relation to the armed forces determined in paragraphs E and F, above, and will be completed prior to the application of the further limitations in armed forces. The parties must be satisfied before such further limitations of armaments are undertaken and at all times thereafter that the armaments at the disposal of any party to the convention do not exceed the quantities thus allowed in each category.

H. No measures for the reduction and limitation of armed forces and armaments beyond those provided for in paragraphs A and B, above, will be put into effect until the system of control is appropriately expanded and is able to verify such measures.

II. Military expenditures

In order to assist in verifying compliance with the provisions of paragraph I, and looking forward to the reductions of military expenditures, France, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States agree to make available to the international control organization information about their military budgets and expenditures for the year preceding entry of the convention into force and for each year thereafter. The categories of information to be supplied will be agreed in advance and annexed to the convention.

III. Nuclear weapons

Each party assumes an obligation not to use nuclear weapons if an armed attack has not placed the party in a situation of individual or collective self-defense.

IV. The control of fissionable material

A. The parties to the convention further undertake:

1. That all future production of fissionable materials will be used at home or abroad, under international supervision, exclusively for nonweapons purposes, including stockpiling, beginning 1 month after the international board of control described in paragraph VIII has certified that the installation of an effective inspection system to verify the commitment has been completed.

2. That they will cooperate in the prompt installation and in the maintenance of such an inspection system.

3. That for the purpose of accomplishing the above undertakings, the five governments represented on the [United Nations Disarmament] subcommittee will appoint a group of technical experts to meet as soon as possible to design the required inspection system, and to submit a progress report for their approval within the first 10 months after the entry into force of the convention.

B. The parties which are producers of fissionable material for weapons purposes at the time of cessation of production for weapons purposes undertake to provide, under international supervision, for equitable transfers, in successive increments, of fissionable material for previous production to nonweapons purposes, at home or abroad, including stockpiling; and, in this connection:

1. To fix the specific rates of quantities of fissionable materials of comparable analysis to be transferred by each of them, and

2. To commence such transfers at agreed dates and in agreed quantities at the fixed ratios following the cutoff date for production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes.

C. From the date of the cessation of production of fissionable material for weapons purposes provided in paragraph IV, A–1:

1. Each party undertakes not to transfer out of its control any nuclear weapons, or to accept transfer to it of such weapons, except where, under arrangements between transferor and transferee, their use will be in conformity with paragraph III.

2. Each party undertakes not otherwise to transfer out of its control any fissionable material or to accept transfer to it of such material, except for nonweapons purposes.

V. Nuclear weapons testing

A. All parties to the convention undertake to refrain from conducting nuclear test explosions for a period of 12 months from the date of entry into force of the convention, provided that agreement has been reached on the installation and maintenance of the necessary controls, including inspection posts with scientific instruments, located within the territories of the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, the United States, the area of the Pacific Ocean, and at

such other places as may be necessary, with the consent of the governments concerned.

B. A group of technical experts appointed by the five governments represented on the subcommittee will meet as soon as possible to design the inspection system to verify the suspension of testing.

C. Upon termination of the 12 months period, the parties will be free to conduct tests unless they have agreed to continue the suspension for a further period under effective international inspection.

D. If the inspection system referred to in paragraph V, A is operating to the satisfaction of each party concerned and if progress satisfactory to each party concerned is being achieved in the preparation of an inspection system for the cessation of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes agreed to under paragraph IV, A–1 above, all parties to the convention undertake to refrain from conducting nuclear test explosions for a further period of 12 months. Such an extension will be made only with the understanding that testing may, at the discretion of each party, be conducted 24 months after the entry into force of the convention if the inspection system for the cessation of production for weapons purposes has not been installed to the satisfaction of each party concerned before the end of the 24 months and if the cessation of production for weapons purposes has not been put into effect.

E. If tests are resumed, each party undertakes to announce and register in advance the dates of each series and the range of total energy to be released therein; to provide for limited observation of them; and to limit the amount of radioactive material to be released into the atmosphere.

VI. The control of objects entering outer space

All parties to the convention agree that within 3 months after the entry into effect of the convention they will cooperate in the establishment of a technical committee to study the design of an inspection system which would make it possible to assure that the sending of objects through outer space will be exclusively for peaceful and scientific purposes.

VII. Safeguards against the possibility of surprise attack

A. From the entry into force of the convention the parties concerned will cooperate in the establishment and maintenance of systems of inspection to safeguard against the possibility of surprise attack.

B. The establishment of such systems will be subject to agreement on the details of its installation, maintenance and operation. It is proposed as a matter of urgency that a working group of experts appointed by the five governments represented on the subcommittee be set up at once to examine the technical problems and to report their conclusions, which could form the basis for an annex to the agreement.

C. With regard to inspection in the Western Hemisphere and in the Soviet Union, the Governments of Canada, France, the United Kingdom and the United States propose the following:

1. That all the territory of the continental United States, all Alaska including the Aleutian Islands, all the territory of Canada and all the territory of the Soviet Union will be open to inspection.

2. If the Government of the Soviet Union rejects this broad proposal, to which is related the proposal for inspection in Europe, referred to in paragraph D below, the Governments of Canada, France, the United Kingdom and the United States (with the consent of the Governments of Denmark and Norway) propose that:

All the territory north of the Arctic Circle of the Soviet Union, Canada, the United States (Alaska), Denmark (Greenland) and Norway; all the territory of Canada, the United States and the Soviet Union west of 140 degrees west longitude, east of 160 degrees east longitude and north of 50 degrees north latitude; all the remainder of Alaska; all the remainder of the Kamchatka Peninsula, and all of the Aleutian and Kurile Islands will be open to inspection.

D. With regard to inspection in Europe, provided there is commitment on the part of the Soviet Union to one of the two foregoing proposals, the Governments of Canada, France, the United Kingdom and the United States, with the concurrence in principle of their European allies and in continuing consultation with them, subject to the indispensable consent of the countries concerned and to any mutually agreed exceptions, propose that an area including all of Europe, bounded in the south by latitude 40 degrees north and in the west by 10 degrees west longitude and in the east by 60 degrees east longitude will be open to inspection.

E. If the Government of the Soviet Union rejects this broad proposal, then, under the same proviso expressed above, a more limited zone of inspection in Europe could be discussed but only on the understanding that this would include a significant part of the territory of the Soviet Union, as well as the other countries of Eastern Europe.

F. The system of inspection to guard against surprise attack will include in all cases aerial inspection, with ground observation posts at principal ports, railway junctions, main highways and important airfields, etc., as agreed. There would also, as agreed, be mobile ground teams with specifically defined authority.

G. Ground posts may be established by agreement at points in the territories of the states concerned without being restricted to the limits of the zone described in paragraphs C 1 and 2, but the areas open to ground inspection will not be less than the areas of aerial inspection. The mobility of ground inspection would be specifically defined in the agreement with, in all cases, the concurrence of the countries directly concerned. There would also be all necessary means of communication.

H. Within 3 months of the entry into force of the convention, the parties will provide to the board of control inventories of their fixed military installations, and numbers and locations of their military forces and designated armaments, including the means of delivering nuclear weapons armaments, including the means of delivering nuclear weapons located within an agreed inspection zone or zones, and within such additional area or areas as may be agreed.

1. Any initial system of inspection designed to safeguard against the possibility of surprise attack may be extended by agreement of all concerned to the end that ultimately the system will deal with the danger of surprise attack from anywhere.

VIII. The International Control Organization

A. All the obligations contained in the convention will be conditional upon the continued operation of an effective international control and inspection system to verify compliance with its terms by all parties.

B. All the control and inspection services described in the convention and those which may be created in the course of its implementation will be within the framework of an international control organization established under the aegis of the Security Council, which will include, as its executive organ, a board of control in which the affirmative vote of the representatives of the governments represented on the subcommittee and of such other parties as may be agreed will be required for important decisions.

C. All parties to the convention undertake to make available information freely and currently to the board of control to assist it in verifying compliance with the obligations of the convention and in categories which will be set forth in an annex to it.

D. The functions of the international control organization will be expanded by agreement between the parties concerned as the measures provided for in the convention are progressively applied.

E. Other matters relating to the organization will be defined in annexes to the convention. These matters will include the duties which the organization is to carry out, the method by which it shall function, its composition, its relationship to the General Assembly and the Security Council of the United Nations, its voting procedures, its working conditions, jurisdiction, immunities and prerogatives.

IX. Movement of armaments

In addition to other rights and responsibilities, the board of control will have authority to study a system for regulating the export and import of designated armaments.

X. Suspension of the convention

A. Each party will have the right to suspend its obligations, partially or completely, by written notice to the international control organization, in the event of an important violation by another party, or other action by any state which so prejudices the security of the notifying party as to require partial or complete suspension.

B. At its option a party may give advance notice of intention to suspend its obligations, in order to afford opportunity for correction of the violations or prejudicial action.

XI

This working paper is offered for negotiation on the understanding that its provisions are inseparable. Failure to fulfill any of the provisions of the convention would create a situation calling for examination at the request of any party.

UNITED STATES STATEMENT

The proposal which Canada, France, the United Kingdom and the United States laid before the London Disarmament Subcommittee today is a practical, workable plan for a start on world disarmament.

While it was formally advanced by these four nations as members of the subcommittee, it bears also the approval of Italy, Belgium, Luxembourg, Iceland, The Netherlands, West Germany, Norway, Denmark, Greece, and Turkey.

In addition, continuous consultation was carried out with numerous other nations in order that their views might be incorporated in the proposals to the maximum possible extent. And special consideration was given to the proposals submitted by other governments to the United Nations and sent to the subcommittee by the General Assembly.

The proposal now awaits the acceptance of the Soviet Union.

With ratification of the agreement, followed by honest observance, this plan would:

1. Stop all nuclear bomb testing.

2. Bring a halt in production of nuclear bomb materials.

3. Start a reduction in nuclear bomb stockpiles.

4. Reduce the dangers of surprise attack through warning systems.

5. Start reductions in armed forces and armaments.

The Western Allies themselves have accomplished a major task in forging the plan. It involves major concessions by every one of them.

The Western Allies earnestly hope the Soviet Union will give full consideration to this far-reaching proposal. Soviet acceptance will enable a start to be made toward removing the terrible dangers of nuclear war that hang over the whole world.

[From the Washington Post of Friday, August 30, 1957]

COLD WAR: NEW CHAPTER

Plainly the Soviet Union has decided upon a speedup of the cold war, and the most sinister aspect is in the attempt to isolate the United States from its Free World friends and allies. The timing of the announcement of the Russian intercontinental missile (which the United States Government had known about for perhaps 2 months), the virtual turndown almost immediately afterward of the Western plan on disarmament, the Russian machinations in Syria, the stiffened attitude against concessions in the satellites—all of these factors point to the same conclusion.

It is a plausible inference that Mr. Khrushchev has been experiencing so much trouble in consolidating his power at home that he must make a show of strength abroad. The harder Soviet line thus can be a combination of diversion from internal difficulties and appeasement of the more rigid factions, notably the army, that hold a mortgage on Mr. Khrushchev. Perhaps the change also stems from a psychological compulsion to assert Soviet equality or superiority. Many visitors to Moscow report that the Russians suffer from an almost morbid fear that they may be considered weak or backward. The Soviet muscle-flexing with the ICBM may in part be a sort of offset to the occasional unfortunate braggadocio by American military men about how Russia could be pulverized by weapons from this country or overseas bases.

The Western position at the arms-control talks in London probably had little or nothing to do with this change. The Soviet delegate, Mr. Zorin, has accused the West and particularly the United States of trying to make propaganda out of the talks—which is precisely what the Soviet Union has been doing. Seemingly the Russians have concluded that there is almost no chance of agreement at London even on suspension of nuclear weapons tests, and hence they are not even listening to Western proposals. Modifications in these proposals have come late, but they have gone a long way toward meeting Soviet objections. The Russians, however, evidently expect at least a temporary breakdown. They may, indeed, have intended their ICBM announcement to improve their bargaining position at future meetings.

None of this is an indication that Russia is bent on war. On the contrary, Mr. Khrushchev and Marshal Zhukov appear to have comprehended the awful possibility of mutual nuclear annihilation. What they seem to have decided is that for the moment there would be no gain in accommodation with the West. They have set out vigorously to take advantage of Western weaknesses and to pursue their objectives through intimidation, indirect aggression, and other means short of all-out war.

This sort of wedge driving always holds a danger for the West, and no doubt Russia hopes that her possession of the ICBM will sap the confidence of other countries in alliances with the United States. On this point there is some ground for satisfaction in the progress of missile defense and the availability of intermediate-range missiles. As Marquis Childs relates today, the United States has learned of not 1 but 6 Soviet long-range missile tests. Whether or not this information should have been made public earlier, the fact that it was obtained is significant. It testifies to the prowess of American intelligence, and it may well indicate further that the United States has perfected long-range radar that can detect the reentry of ballistic missiles into the earth's atmosphere. This, in company with the work on the anti-missile missile, is very hopeful.

What must be avoided in the new stage of the cold war is any tendency toward isolationism in the American response. It is, of course, essential to produce an American intercontinental missile as soon as possible as part of the overall military deterrent. But the ICBM is essentially an isolationist weapon, and it ought not to be emphasized to the detriment of other missiles and rounded military capability. One immediate counter to the Soviet ICBM, for example, is the ability to fire intermediate-range missiles from the overseas bases which Russia condemns so loudly. There are two lessons here. One is that this country's alliances have become more, not less important. The other is that the confusion over service prerogatives in intermediate-range missile development and production ought to be ended forthwith.

The new Soviet cold war tactic will succeed only if we and our allies fail to move together. What is imperative is recognition that the Soviet Union is employing a combination of military, political, and economic techniques all over the world to achieve its ends. The West requires no less an integration of its own strategy, and wise use of economic and political power is just as necessary an element as additions to military power.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of August 30, 1957]

REDS ZOOM AHEAD IN MISSILE RACE

(By Stewart Alsop)

Is the Soviet model of an intercontinental ballistic missile truly operational? That is, is it a weapon capable of being used in war, rather than a mere prototype? And, if it is operational, is it sufficiently advanced for the Soviets to freeze on the model, as is their invariable custom when they are satisfied with a weapon, and proceed to mass-produce it?

Behind the bland mask of complacency which the Eisenhower administration has assumed for public purposes, these are the key questions which the Government's intelligence experts and policymakers are anxiously asking. They are quite genuinely life-and-death questions. They cannot be answered with assurance. Yet they tell a lot about the real meaning of the latest Soviet ICBM test.

For the first thing to understand about the Soviet test is that it was not something new or unexpected.

The American Government has been aware of Soviet progress throughout, though the administration has chosen to conceal it from the American people. The details of how the Government has known are of course properly secret. But certain obvious facts are public property—that radar is a line-of-sight instrument of theoretically unlimited range; and that ballistic missiles reach an altitude of hundreds of miles at the highest point in their trajectory, and are thus subject to radar detection at great range.

The Soviets' first prototype test of their ICBM was roughly comparable to the Air Force test of the American Atlas ICBM in April, with the difference that the Atlas test failed while the Soviet test succeeded. As this reporter pointed out in reporting the Soviet test: "There is a long, difficult road to travel between the first test firing of a prototype missile and the achievement of an operational weapons system."

How far have the Soviets now traveled along that road? Part of the answer, at least, is suggested by a comparison between the Soviet claims for their ICBM model and the known characteristics of Atlas, which is at the present stage in no sense a weapon for use in war, but a research test vehicle.

The Soviets claim their model is a "multi-stage ballistic rocket," whereas the Atlas model unsuccessfully fired last spring consisted only of the huge initial-stage rocket. The Soviet model is "intercontinental," and the "results obtained show that it is possible to direct rockets to any part of the world." The Atlas model fired last spring was designed to fly only about 3,000 miles. Finally, "the rocket landed in the target area," whereas the Atlas test prototype was not expected or designed to achieve any degree of accuracy.

The Soviet claims for their model are certainly vague, and designedly so. But in the past, Soviet claims have tended actually to understate Soviet achievements in the air-atomic field. Some experts, noting this fact, believe on the basis of the Soviet claims and other evidence, that the Soviets already have an operational weapon ready for mass production.

Others believe, or hope, that more tests must be made, and more time must elapse, before the Soviets can go into quantity production.

"I had thought they were about a year ahead of us," one expert has remarked, "but now it looks more like 2 years." Despite the official complacency, it is well to understand what it could mean if this estimate is correct. For suppose the Soviets achieve a fully operational ICBM system 2 years before this country achieves a comparable system.

They will then be able to threaten, not only American cities, but the system of Strategic Air Force bases, whose location is well known, with instant destruction. They could thus threaten to weaken decisively, or even eliminate entirely, the American retaliatory power which is the only real shield of the Free World. No one can predict whether in such circumstances the Soviets might actually launch a surprise attack. But it is not hard to predict that the Soviets would take every advantage of the obvious opportunity to blackmail the United States into accepting a super-Munich.

In these circumstances, it is simply incomprehensible that the Eisenhower administration has chosen to tell the American people not to worry, and that everything is going to be all right.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of August 30, 1957]

POLICY PUZZLE—REACTION TO SOVIET ARMS STAND

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

Official Washington's attitude toward the Kremlin's new turn to a tough line is one of puzzlement. The reaction is to batten the hatches. The local crystal balls are far too fuzzy to predict the outcome.

The simple and generally acknowledged fact is that, for whatever reasons, the Soviet Union has decided to break off what looked like serious negotiations on the limitation of armaments. On top of this the Soviets are indulging in muscle flexing—the claim of the first successful intercontinental ballistic missile test and the use of jet airlines to fly their delegates here for the United Nations meeting next month. The high degree of Soviet involvement in Syria fits the general tough pattern in foreign relations.

How far it will go is just as much a puzzle as why the switch was made. Some American officials are awaiting the Soviet reply to an American offer to sit down in October to discuss exchanges of students, among other matters. If the Soviets cut off the exchanges, things may really get rough, these officials figure.

And yet, try as they will, American officials can figure out no reason for any change in the basic calculation which they believe dominates Soviet policy: That the risk of all-out nuclear war is too dangerous to take and therefore the East-West political temperature must be kept reasonably low.

Some speculate that perhaps the Kremlin sees so much unilateral disarmament in the United States, under budget ceiling pressures, that it reasons it need not sacrifice anything.

But the most plausible thesis heard within the Government runs like this: When Nikita Khruschchev purged his Kremlin rivals at the end of June it was inevitable that he would adopt a stand-still policy, meaning no agreement with the West, no change in any satellite. This meant a breaking off of the London arms talks which is now taking place. The muscle flexing is an added item to show that Khrushchev can be just as tough with the West as any of his purged opponents, but without their risk of war.

The heart of this thesis is that Khrushchev is faced with a mass of domestic problems, some of them impinging on foreign policy. He is granting the demands of Marshal Georgi Zhukov and the military, whose support in the purge was vital if not decisive, that there be no military retreat in the satellites or no arms agreement which would weaken the Soviets in relation to the United States—a sort of Soviet version of the Radford-Strauss line in Washington.

Khrushchev's visits to Czechoslovakia and East Germany trumpeted the line of no changes in the satellites. We know now with reasonable certainty that Zhukov himself opposed Gomulkaism in Poland and long ago urged a show trial of the Poznan rioters, only to be overruled. Presumably, Zhukov recalled this at the time he sent the Red Army into Hungary—and perhaps at the time he struck a bargain with Khrushchev, if so he did, at the time of the Kremlin purge.

Probably, too, the now evident beginnings of a rehabilitation of Red Army officers slaughtered in Stalin's great purge is a payoff to the military, however dangerous it may be on Khrushchev personally to open up the Pandora's box of the crimes of the mid-1930's.

At home, Khrushchev appears far from secure and the Government line often sounds defensive. The purged Malenkov is assailed again and again, smeared with crimes of which he may be guiltless in order to destroy him as a potential rival since Khrushchev fears to kill him. And Khrushchev today is outpromising the relatively popular Malenkov (once the apostle of giving the Soviet consumer a break). And the Khrushchev promises will be hard to make good, American officials are convinced.

Since nobody here knows how far the turn of events will go the only response is to batten the hatches against Soviet propaganda barrages and the accompanying muscle flexing. The United States now assuredly will take a tougher position at the U. N. on the Hungarian issue next month than it might have while there was a chance of an arms agreement. Right now it is sounding out other nations on how many votes can be had for how tough a resolution condemnatory of the Soviet action in Hungary.

On disarmament it hurriedly put forward the long-delayed Western package. And President Eisenhower speaks of a Soviet rejection condemning humanity to an indefinite future of immeasurable danger.

Yet, as far as the eye can see, nothing has yet occurred to alter the basic East-West balance. It may be altered before long, however, by the ICBMs, by Soviet gains in the Middle East, by the encroaching Communist gains in Indonesia or by now unforeseen events in some other place.

The unanswered question today is how long Khrushchev & Co. will play the tougher line in foreign policy and whether they will risk heating up the cold war to a degree where it might explode.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senate on Tuesday, August 27, quite properly demonstrated its appreciation for the loyal and faithful civil servants of our Government by overwhelmingly approving a badly needed and long-deserved upward pay adjustment for men and women in the classified service.

It is regrettable to note that this constructive action is already being written off as in vain, because of repeated hints that the President would veto the measure. I sincerely hope that is not so. I hope the President of the United States fully realizes the extent to which effective, efficient Government hinges upon the career people required to carry out its functions.

Before the President acts adversely on this pay raise measure for all Government employees, I hope he pauses to consider, in all fairness, the cooperation the Congress has given him in meeting his requests for additional top level positions in our Government, and increased compensation for such positions at the Presidential appointment level.

I also hope he will take into consideration the reduction in his budget requests by over $5 billion.

Requests of this administration for a greatly expanded number of top level positions, and increased compensation for these posts, have been granted by the Congress in deference to the President's judgment that such higher salaries were needed to attract the kind of people he wanted to serve in our Government.

I just want to comment, Mr. President, that the same reasoning certainly applies right down the line to the lowest-paid worker in our Government. If we want good, conscientious career employees at every level, we must be prepared to pay them decent wages. If we want to avoid the costly waste of excessive turnover and training of new help, we would be far better off to take proper care of the people who have served us faithfully.

Mr. President, at my request the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has compiled a record of the top level positions established since January 1953, and those whose compensation has been substantially increased since that date.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this study be printed at this point in the RECORD, and urge its careful review in connection with the decision the White House must soon make on fair play for the rest of our Government employees.

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

TOP LEVEL POSITIONS ESTABLISHED SINCE JANUARY 1953 AND THOSE WHOSE COMPENSATION HAS BEEN SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASED SINCE THAT DATE

(By Margaret Fennell, American Law Division)

PART I—POSITIONS ESTABLISHED

Department of Agriculture: Assistant Secretaries [1] (2 additional), $20,000,[2] Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 (67 Stat 633, sec. 2).

Department of Agriculture: General Counsel,[1], $19,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 742, sec. 301, 739, sec. 106 (b) (9)).

Department of the Air Force: Assistant Secretaries,[1] (two additional), $20,000, act of August 3, 1954 (68 Stat. 649, sec. 3).

Department of the Army: Assistant Secretaries [1] (two additional), $20,000, act of August 3, 1954 (68 Stat. 649, sec. 1).

Budget Bureau: Assistant Directors, three (two provided for under act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 299), plus 1 under joint resolution of August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 887); $15,000, act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 299), increased to $20,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 106 (a) (9)).

Central Intelligence Agency (under National Security Council): Deputy Director,[1] $14,000 (under former set-up by act of October 15, 1949, 63 Stat. 881, sec. 6), new position fixed at $20,500, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 105 (26)).

Department of Commerce: Assistant Secretary,[1] (one additional); $20,000, act of July 2, 1954 (68 Stat. 430, sec. 304).

Department of Commerce: Federal Highway Administrator in Bureau of Public Roads,[1] $20,000, act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 990).

Department of Defense: Assistant Secretaries,[1] (six additional), $20,000, Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1953 [2] (67 Stat. 638, sec. 3).

Department of Defense: General Counsel,[1] $15,000,[2] Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1953 (67 Stat. 639, sec. 4), increased to $19,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 739, sec. 106 (a) (9)).

Office of Defense Mobilization: Director,[1] $22,500, Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1953 [2] (67 Stat. 634, sec. 1 (b)).

Office of Defense Mobilization: Deputy Director,[1] $17,500, Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1953 [2] (67 Stat. 634, sec. 1 (c)), increased to $20,500, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 105 (27)).

Export-Import Bank of Washington (as independent agency of United States): President,[1] $17,500, act of August 9, 1954 (68 Stat. 677), increased to $21,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 736, sec. 104 (a) (11)).

Export-Import Bank of Washington: First Vice President,[1] $16,000, act of August 9, 1954 (68 Stat. 677), increased to $20,500, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 105 (31)).

Foreign Claims Settlement Commission: $15,000, Chairman,[1] $15,000, Members [1] Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1954 [2] (68 Stat. 1279), increased to $20,500, Chairman,[1] $20,000, Members,[1] act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 105 (10), 738, sec. 106 (a) (45)).

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Secretary,[1] $22,500, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 [2] (67 Stat. 631), increased to $25,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 736, sec. 102 (10)).

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Under Secretary,[1] $17,500, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 [2] (67 Stat. 631), increased to $21,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 104 (a) (20)).

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Assistant Secretaries (two),[1] $15,000, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 [2] (67 Stat. 631), increased to $20,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 738, sec. 106 (a) (14)).

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Special Assistant to the Secretary (Health and Medical Affairs),[1] $15,000, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 [2] (67 Stat. 631), increased to $20,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 138, sec. 106 (a) (41)).

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: General Counsel,[1] $19,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 742, sec. 301 (a), 739, sec. 106 (b) (9)).

International Cooperation Administration: Six offices,[1] $16,000 (for 2), $15,000 (for 4), Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1953,[2] section

[1] Appointments made by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

[2] Reorganization plans are prepared by the President and transmitted to Congress.

[1] Appointments made by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

[2] Reorganization plans are prepared by the President and transmitted to Congress.

1 (d) (67 Stat. 640), increased to $19,000 (for all 6), act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 740, sec. 111).

Post Office Department: Assistant Postmaster General (additional),[1] $15,000, act of July 20, 1953 (67 Stat. 183), increased to $20,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 106 (a) (10)).

Post Office Department: General Counsel,[1] $19,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 742, sec. 301 (a), 739, sec. 106 (b) (9)).

Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation: $17,500, Administrator,[1] $16,000, Deputy Administrator,[1] act of May 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 93, sec. 2 (a) (b)), increased to $20,000, Administrator,[1] $17,500, Deputy Administrator,[1] act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 106 (a), (6), 739, sec. 107 (a) (19)).

Small Business Administration: Administrator,[1] $17,500, act of July 30, 1953 (67 Stat. 233, sec. 204 (c)), increased to $20,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 106 (a) (5)).

State Department: Deputy Under Secretaries of State (three),[1] $15,000, act of August 5, 1955 (69 Stat. 536), increased to $20,500, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 105 (29)).

Treasury Department: Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs,[1] $17,500, act of July 22, 1954 (68 Stat. 496), increased to $21,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 736, sec. 104 (a) (13)).

Treasury Department: Assistant Secretary (additional),[1] $15,000, act of July 22, 1954 (68 Stat. 496, sec. 4), increased to $20,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 738, sec. 106 (a) (18)).

United States Information Agency: $17,500, Director,[1] $16,000, Deputy Director,[1] Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1953[2] (67 Stat. 642), increased to $21,000, Director,[1] $20,500, Deputy Director,[1] act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 736, sec. 104 (a) (9), 737, sec. 105 (28)).

PART II—POSITIONS WHOSE COMPENSATION HAS BEEN SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASED SINCE JANUARY 1953 (OTHER THAN POSITIONS ESTABLISHED SINCE JANUARY 1953, WHICH APPEAR IN PART I)

Changes have been made in the compensation provided for the following positions:

Vice President of the United States from $30,000 (under 1949 act) to $35,000 (in 1955).

Speaker of the House of Representatives from $30,000 (1949) to $35,000 (1955).

Senators and Representatives from $12,500 (plus $2,500 expense allowance) under 1946 act) to $22,500 (1955).

United States Supreme Court: Chief Justice from $25,500 (1946) to $35,500 (1955), Associate Justices from $25,000 (1946) to $35,000 (1955).

Executive Departments: Heads from $22,500 (1949) to $25,000 (1956), Under Secretaries, Deputy Secretaries, and Assistant Secretaries from salaries ranging from $15,000 to $20,000 (1949) to $20,000 to $22,500 (in 1956).

Department of Agriculture: Rural Electrification Administrator,[1] $15,000, act of October 15, 1949[1] (63 Stat. 881, sec. 5 (a)), increased to $20,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 106 (a) (4)).

Architect of the Capitol: $15,000, act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 881, sec. 5 (a)), increased to $19,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 739, sec. 106 (b) (1)).

Atomic Energy Commission: Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee,[1] $15,000, act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 881, sec. 5 (a)), increased to $20,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 738, sec. 106 (a) (23)).

Budget Bureau: Director, $17,500, act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 880, sec. 3), increased to $22,500, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 736, sec. 103 (a) (1)).

Budget Bureau: Deputy Director (formerly Assistant Director), $16,000, act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 880, sec. 4), increased to $20,500, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 105 (25)).

Central Intelligence Agency: Director,[1] $16,000, act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 880, sec. 4), increased to $21,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 736, sec. 104 (a) (2)).

Civil Aeronautics Administrator[1] (in Department of Commerce), $15,000, act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 881, sec. 5 (a)), increased to $20,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 102 (a) (2)).

Civil Aeronautics Board: $15,000, Chairman;[1] $15,000, members,[1] act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 881, sec. 5 (a)), increased to $20,500, Chairman;[1] $20,000, members,[1] act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 105 (1), 738, sec. 106 (45)).

Civil Service Commission: $16,000, Chairman;[1] $15,000, members,[1] act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 880, sec. 4, 881, sec. 5 (a)), increased to $20,500, Chairman;[1] $20,000, members,[1] act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 105 (2), 738, sec. 106 (a) (45)).

Department of Commerce: General Counsel,[1] $15,000, act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 881, sec. 5 (a)), increased to $19,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 739, sec. 106 (b) (9)).

Comptroller General of the United States[1] (in G. A. O.): $17,500, Comptroller, $16,000, Assistant Comptroller, act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 880, secs. 3, 4), increased to $22,500, Comptroller, $20,500, Assistant Comptroller, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 736, sec. 103 (a) (2), 737, sec. 105 (22)).

Comptroller of the Currency[1] (Treasury Department): $16,000, act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 880, sec. 4), increased to $20,500, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 105 (4)).

Export-Import Bank of Washington: Board of Directors[1] (3 appointive members): $15,000, act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 881, sec. 5 (a)), increased to $20,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 738, sec. 106 (a) (45)).

Federal Civil Defense: $17,500, Administrator,[1] $16,000, Deputy Administrator,[1] act of January 12, 1951 (64 Stat. 1247, sec. 101), increased to $21,000, Administrator, $20,500, Deputy Administrator,[1] act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 736, sec. 104 (a) (4), 737, sec. 105 (23)).

Federal Communications Commission: $15,000, Chairman,[1] $15,000, members,[1] act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 880, sec. 5 (a)), increased to $20,500, Chairman,[1] $20,000, members,[1] act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 105 (4), 738, sec. 106 (a) (45)).

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation: Board of Directors, $16,000, Chairman,[1] $16,000, members,[1] act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 880, sec. 4), increased to $20,500, Chairman,[1] $20,000, members,[1] act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 105 (5), 738, sec. 106 (a) (45)).

Federal Home Loan Bank Board: $15,000, Chairman,[1] $15,000, members,[1] act of August 10, 1948 (62 Stat. 1283, sec. 501 (a)), increased to $20,500, Chairman,[1] $20,000, members,[1] act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 105 (11), 738, sec. 106 (a) (45)).

Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service: Director,[1] $16,000, act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 880, sec. 4), increased to $20,500, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 105 (30)).

Federal Power Commission: $15,000, Chairman,[1] $15,000, members,[1] act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 880, sec. 5 (a)), increased to $20,500, Chairman,[1] $20,000, members,[1] act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 105 (7), 738, sec. 106 (a) (45)).

Federal Reserve System, Board of Governors: $16,000, Chairman,[1] $16,000, members,[1] act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 880, sec. 4), increased to $20,500, Chairman,[1] $20,000, members,[1] act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 105 (8), 738, sec. 106 (a) (45)).

Federal Trade Commission: $15,000, Chairman,[1] $15,000, members,[1] act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 880, sec. 5 (a)), increased to $20,500, Chairman,[1] $20,000, members,[1] act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 105 (9), 738, sec. 106 (a) (45)).

General Services Administrator:[1] $17,500, act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 880, sec. 3), increased to $21,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 736, sec. 104 (a) (5)).

Housing: Administrator of Housing and Home Finance Agency,[1] $17,500, act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 880, sec. 3), increased to $21,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 736, sec. 104 (a) (6)).

Housing: Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration,[1] $15,000, act of August 10, 1948 (62 Stat. 1283, sec. 501 (a)), increased to $20,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 738, sec. 106 (a) (25)).

Housing: Commissioner, Public Housing Administration,[1] $15,000, act of August 10, 1948 (62 Stat. 1283, sec. 501 (a)), increased to $20,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 738, sec. 106 (a) (26)).

Interstate Commerce Commission: $15,000, Chairman,[1] $15,000, Members,[1] act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 880, sec. 5 (a)), increased to $20,500, Chairman,[1] $20,000, Members,[1] act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 105 (12), 738, sec. 106 (a) (45)).

Department of Labor: Administrator of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division,[1] $15,000, act of October 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 911, sec. 4), increased to $20,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 106 (a) (7)).

Librarian of Congress:[1] $15,000, act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 881, sec. 5 (a)), increased to $20,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 738, sec. 106 (a) (38)).

Department of Justice: Assistant Attorneys General,[1] $15,000, act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 881, sec. 5 (a)), increased to $20,000, act of March 2, 1955 (69 Stat. 10, sec. 3 (c)).

Department of Justice: Deputy Attorney General[1] (formerly Assistant to the Attorney General), $17,500, act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 880, sec. 3), increased to $21,000, act of March 2, 1955 (69 Stat. 10, sec. 3 (a)).

Department of Justice: Solicitor General,[1] $17,500, act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 880, sec. 3), increased to $20,500, act of March 2, 1955 (69 Stat. 10, sec. 3 (b)).

National Labor Relations Board: $15,000, Chairman,[1] $15,000, members,[1] act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 880, sec. 5 (a)), increased to $20,500, Chairman,[1] $20,000, members,[1] act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 105 (13, 738, sec. 106 (a) (45)).

National Labor Relations Board: General Counsel,[1] $15,000, act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 881, sec. 5 (a)), increased to $20,500, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 738, sec. 106 (a) (37)).

National Mediation Board (Railroads): $15,000, Chairman,[1] $15,000, members,[1] act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 881, sec. 5 (a)), increased to $20,500, Chairman,[1] $20,000, members,[1] act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 105 (a) (14), 738, sec. 106 (a) (45)).

National Science Foundation: Director,[1] $15,000, act of May 10, 1950 (64 Stat. 151, sec. 5), increased to $20,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 738, sec. 106 (a) (34)).

Post Office Department: Assistant Postmasters General (four),[1] $15,000, Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1949[2] (63 Stat. 1066, sec. 3), increased to $20,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 106 (a) (10)).

Public Printer:[1] $15,000, act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 881, sec. 5 (a)), increased to $20,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 738, sec. 106 (a) (40)).

[1] Appointments made by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

[2] Reorganization plans are prepared by the President and transmitted to Congress.

[1] Appointments made by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

[2] Reorganization plans are prepared by the President and transmitted to Congress.

[1] Appointments made by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

[2] Reorganization plans are prepared by the President and transmitted to Congress.

Railroad Retirement Board: $15,000, Chairman,[1] $15,000, members,[1] act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 881, sec. 5 (a), increased to $20,500, Chairman,[1] $20,000, members,[1] act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 105 (15), 738, sec. 106 (a) (45)).

Renegotiation Board: $17,500, Chairman,[1] $15,000, members,[1] act of March 23, 1951 (65 Stat. 19, sec. 107), increased to $20,500, Chairman,[1] $20,000, members,[1] act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 105 (16), 738, sec. 106 (a) (45)).

Rural Electrification Administrator. See Department of Agriculture.

Securities and Exchange Commission: $15,000, Chairman,[1] $15,000, members,[1] act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 881, sec. 5 (a)), increased to $20,500, Chairman,[1] $20,000, members,[1] act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 105 (17), 738, sec. 106 (a) (45)).

Selective Service Director: [1] $14,000, act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 881, sec. 6 (a)), increased to $20,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 738, sec. 106 (a) (35)).

Solicitor General. See Department of Justice.

State Department: Assistant Secretaries (10),[1] $15,000, act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 881, sec. 5 (a)), increased to $20,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 738, sec. 106 (a) (17)).

State Department: Counselor,[1] $15,000, act of August 5, 1955 (69 Stat. 536), increased to $20,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 738, sec. 106 (a) (28)).

State Department: Legal adviser,[1] $15,000, act of August 5, 1955 (69 Stat. 536), increased to $20,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 738, sec. 106 (a) (17)).

Subversive Activities Control Board: $15,000, Chairman,[1] $15,000, members,[1] act of July 12, 1952 (66 Stat. 590), increased to $20,500, Chairman,[1] $20,000, members,[1] act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 105 (18), 739, sec. 106 (a) (45)).

Tariff Commission: $15,000, Chairman,[1] $15,000, members,[1] act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 880, sec. 5 (a)), increased to $20,500, Chairman,[1] $20,000, members,[1] act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 105 (20), 739, sec. 106 (a) (45)).

Tax Court of the United States [1] (formerly Board of Tax Appeals): $15,000, act of August 16, 1954 (68A Stat. 879, sec. 7443), increased to $22,500, act of March 2, 1955 (69 Stat. 10, sec. 1 (h)).

Tennessee Valley Authority: Board of Directors,[1] $15,000, Chairman, $15,000, members, act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 881, sec. 5 (a)), increased to $20,500, Chairman, $20,000, members, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 737, sec. 105 (19), 739, sec. 106 (a) (45)).

Administrator of Veterans' Affairs: [1] $17,500, act of October 15, 1949 (63 Stat. 880, sec. 3), increased to $21,000, act of July 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 736, sec. 104 (a) (17)). [Provision now included in act of June 17, 1957 (71 Stat. 91, sec. 210 (a))].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to have the President of the United States be as generous with the civil-service workers of our Government as he has been with the top Cabinet and executive officers of the Government. Despite all the boasts of the administration as to its business like attitude toward the Government, and the "great savings" it has made for the American people—and I put the words "great savings" in quotation marks—it will be noted that the Library of Congress in a very factual and objective study has brought to our attention that there are literally dozens of assistant secretaries and administrators and bureau chiefs and deputy secretaries and deputy assistant secretaries, and what have you, who have been added to the Federal payroll. In fact, I have in my hand several pages of the report of the number of new executive officials who have been added to the executive branch of the Government.

One of the great accomplishments of the Eisenhower administration has been the increase of the public payroll, particularly in the higher levels of appointment. I hope the President, in reviewing the statement—or a member of his White House staff, perhaps—will exercise the same generosity with respect to the civil servants that has been exercised for the palace guard.

[1] Appointments made by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

[2] Reorganization plans are prepared by the President and transmitted to Congress.

CLAIMS FOR SURPLUS FEED GRAINS AGAINST COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1064, H. R. 2486.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2486) to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to grant relief with respect to claims arising out of deliveries of eligible surplus feed grains on ineligible dates in connection with purchase orders under its emergency feed program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment on page 2, line 7, after the word "than", to strike out "12 months from the date the purchase order was issued to the farmer" and insert "1 month from the expiration date of the purchase order issued to the farmer."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate, H. R. 2486, is similar to a bill I introduced in the Senate earlier this year. This legislation is designed to bring relief to ranchers and feed dealers who in carrying out the emergency drought feed program in 1954, 1955, and 1956, found it necessary for deliveries of feed to be made outside of the then legal delivery periods.

In order to prevent hardship on the very people who the emergency drought feed law was intended to benefit, it is necessary that the actual delivery dates, made without any intention of violating the law, be legalized. The House passed the bill extending the time period for 12 months. The Senate Agriculture Committee reported the bill with an amendment restricting the additional period to 1 month from the expiration date of purchase orders.

The Department of Agriculture and the people concerned in the several States have furnished concrete evidence that a 1-month extension period will not take care of all of the cases of delivery outside the proper time periods. I have discussed this matter with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and he has indicated a willingness to amend the bill to extend the period to 6 months.

Even this extension may not cover all of the cases. In extending the delivery period for 6 months, it is not our intention to foreclose further legislative action by the Congress.

The very able Senator from Delaware has assured me that if this does not cover the cases, he is willing to sit down and go over the matter in an attempt to evolve a fair and equitable solution. Those of us who know the Senator from Delaware fully understand that that would be done.

The late deliveries involved in this program resulted from a lack of storage facilities on the part of the farmers. The feed dealers accommodated the farmers by keeping their feed until such time as they were able to use it. In some cases, this period of time extended on into many months.

I believe it would be wise for Congress to act now in extending the delivery time period for 6 months, while at the same time making it clear that we do not wish the Department of Agriculture to demand refunds in the delivery cases not covered by this legislation.

I urge the Senate to accept the amendment that I now offer and approve the bill so that the House can act upon it at the earliest possible moment.

I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "1 month" and insert in lieu thereof "6 months."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. I did not object to the amendment. However, I wish to make a short statement with respect to it. The bill before us is the same bill which was introduced by me and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I wish to repeat and emphasize what the majority leader has said. It is a very critical situation with which we are confronted. The period of 6 months is a necessity if we are going to get any action. Only 15 percent of these accounts have been audited, and they must have the same action if the people involved are to get any relief.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from California.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CONTRIBUTIONS BY STATE GOVERNMENTS TO COST OF FEED OR SEED FURNISHED FARMERS, ETC.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1077, S. 304.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 304) to provide for a specific contribution by State governments to the cost of feed or seed furnished to farmers, ranchers, or stockmen in disaster areas, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the bill would condition Federal feed and seed disaster relief in any State upon contribution by the State of between 25 and 50 percent of that part of the cost of the feed and seed not paid for by the recipients. Such State participation should result in more economical operation, better use of funds, and more equitable distribution of assistance. The bill would carry out the President's recommendations of March 5 for keeping administration of these programs close to the local people and for greater State and local participation.

The President in his 1957 message to Congress endorsed this legislation.

The Committee on Appropriations of the House in its report on the urgent deficiency appropriation bill on February 1, 1957, likewise endorsed this proposal.

The Secretary of Agriculture, in a letter dated August 23, 1957, urges the prompt enactment of this bill, not only in the interest of economy, but states that "the Department of Agriculture feels strongly that participation by the States in the cost of drought relief is necessary if sound management of the assistance program is to be obtained."

The American Farm Bureau has likewise endorsed the principal of State participation as embodied in S. 304.

As a part of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a letter dated August 23, 1957, signed by Secretary Benson, and a second letter under the same date signed by Mr. Matt Triggs, assistant legislative director of the American Farm Bureau, both urging the enactment of S. 304.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., August 23, 1957.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in reply to your request of August 22 for our comments on S. 304, a bill to provide for a specific contribution by State governments to the cost of feed or seed furnished to farmers, ranchers, or stockmen in disaster areas, and for other purposes.

The bill proposes that no feed for livestock or seed for planting shall be furnished to farmers, ranchers, or stockmen under existing disaster relief legislation unless, in addition to administrative costs that may be assumed by the State, the State agrees to contribute not less than 25 percent or more than 50 percent, as the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine to be equitable, of the cost of such feed or seed which is not paid by the recipient thereof.

On the basis of its experience with the administration of drought-relief programs the Department of Agriculture feels strongly that participation by the States in the cost of drought relief is necessary if sound management of the assistance program is to be obtained. The President, in his message to Congress on March 5, 1957, called to the attention of the Congress two general conclusions:

"The first is that administration of emergency disaster programs must be kept close to the local people;

"The second is that State and local governments should assume a greater part in alleviating human distress and hardships and in meeting other local needs in times of disaster, calling on the Federal Government only to supplement their own resources."

The Committee on Appropriations of the House, in its report on the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, 1957, on February 1, 1957 (Rept. No. 24) stated:

"At the time this emergency program was adopted by Congress, it was intended that the States would participate substantially in a financial way. It appears, however, that amounts advanced by States to date have been very small—hardly enough to cover the cost of handling their contributions. The committee feels that steps should be taken to correct this situation. Accordingly, it recommends that, as soon as present contracts have been honored, the Secretary require that the governor or appropriate authority in each State participating in the program should commit the State to assume at least 25 percent of the cost."

State participation in the operation and management of a feed-assistance program at the State and local level would result in more economical operation, better use of funds, and more equitable distribution of assistance.

The Department endorsed the enactment of such legislation in its letter of March 5 to the President of the Senate and its letter of March 15 to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

We recommend passage of the bill.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

E. T. BENSON, *Secretary.*

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington D. C., August 23, 1957.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: S. 304, to provide for a specific contribution by State governments to the costs of feed or seed furnished to farmers in disaster areas, has been reported to the Senate by the Senate Agriculture Committee.

This letter is to urge you to use your influence in getting the principles of this bill passed by the Senate this session if at all possible.

Droughts, floods, and other disasters occur in some areas each year. The national policy that emergency assistance should be provided in extreme cases has been well established.

At our last annual meeting consideration was given to the policy issues raised by this program. The delegates representing the member State farm bureaus were strong in their belief that there was need to improve the administration of this program by the development of permanent, uniform procedures. More specifically, the view was expressed that administration of the program would be improved and abuses minimized if the responsible participation of State governments was obtained by providing for some degree of financial contribution by the States toward the cost of such emergency assistance.

Very sincerely,

MATT TRIGGS,
Assistant Legislative Director.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, no feed for livestock or seed for planting shall be furnished to farmers, ranchers, or stockmen pursuant to Public Law 875, 81st Congress (42 U. S. C. 1955 and the following); Public Law 115, 83d Congress, 1st session; Public Law 357, 83d Congress, 2d session; Public Law 480, 83d Congress, 2d session; or pursuant to any other law as a disaster relief measure, unless, in addition to such administrative costs as may be assumed by the State, the State in which such feed or seed is furnished agrees to contribute such percentage, not less than 25 nor more than 50, as the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine to be equitable of that part of the cost, including transportation, of such feed or seed which is not paid for by the recipients thereof.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to announce that I shall ask to make a bill the unfinished business, but that I do not propose to take any action on it at this session of Congress.

I have discussed the matter a number of times with the very able and very thorough Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], a distinguished member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Great demand has been made on the leadership to schedule the bill for consideration.

In view of the far-reaching implications involved, and in view of the very logical and persuasive statements made by the Senator from Ohio, I believe the bill will require more discussion than we are able to give to it and also adjourn sine die today.

Therefore, I shall make it the unfinished business, but no action will be taken on it until we come back next January.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I subscribe fully to the suggestion made by the distinguished Senator from Texas. This bill deals with allowing commercial airline companies to retain capital gains without having them credited to their subsidies. The Civil Aeronautics Board is now conducting an investigation pertaining to the very subject about which this bill contemplates action, and the study being made by the Civil Aeronautics Board will provide information for the Senate to be used next January that will make much simpler a disposition of the bill. I am glad to hear that the Senator from Texas is making it the first order of business for January, at which time we shall discuss it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator. I move that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar Order No. 1178, H. R. 5822. I would like the staff to inform the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] that I shall move to take the bill up, so as to make it the unfinished business, but it will not be considered until January.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5822) to amend section 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 with respect to the reinvestment by air carriers of the proceeds from the sale or other disposition of certain operating property and equipment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

WILLIAM G. LIAS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a brief address I have prepared.

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

On October 17, 1951, I called to the attention of the Senate the fact that Mr. William G. Lias, a racketeer in West Virginia, owed the Government over $2 million in taxes, having been delinquent for a number of years and yet as of that date the Treasury Department had not even filed liens against his property.

During the years while his tax obligation was accumulating Mr. Lias had been allowed by the Treasury Department to give away to his family sizable portions of his assets and the Treasury Department had recognized the validity of these gifts by acceptance of his payments of gift tax.

They even went so far as to approve some of these gifts on a retroactive basis by allowing him to file and pay retroactively gift tax on assets which had been transferred to members of his family in prior years, during which years his delinquent taxes were accumulating.

This case of how the Treasury Department had been pussyfooting in the handling of the tax claim against this racketeer is fully documented in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 10, pages 13325–13330.

It was only after this statement that the Treasury Department filed liens on that portion of his property which had not been given away, and action was started through the courts to recover payment. The first step was to place Mr. Lias' assets under a receivership.

On May 10, 1956, I criticized the situation wherein Mr. Lias was being allowed $35,000 a year by the court-appointed receivers to operate his own receivership, and I called attention to the fact that as an assistant to help Mr. Lias the courts had approved the employment of another notorious tax evader, Mr. George Lewis. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 6, pp. 7902–7903.) Mr. Lias was removed from this lucrative position.

In view of the fact that this case is at last approaching a conclusion, I requested a report from the Department of Justice as to the amount they had thus far collected from Mr. Lias toward payment of his tax liability, and under date of August 7, 1957, I received their report.

This report will be incorporated in the RECORD in its entirety; however, I quote from pages 5 and 6 thereof which sums up the results:

"On July 11, 1957, the District Director at Parkersburg, W. Va., received $1,566,073.46 to apply on the judgment against Lias. The District Director also received $5,677.57, representing the entire net assets of Zellers, to apply on the judgment against it. In addition, on the same date, the District Director received additional interest on the tax claims against Automatic which, together with prior payments on account, resulted in payments of principal, assessed interest and accrued interest of $216,388.23. Thus, the Government has thus far collected in back taxes from these sources a total of $1,788,139.26. It is estimated that there is sufficient cash on hand to pay approximately $54,000 more which, together with $18,043,44 collected from Mrs. Lias in satisfaction of deficiencies assessed against her, will make a grand total of back taxes collected of approximately $1,860,182.70."

* * * * *

"In addition to the collection of back taxes as set forth above, current taxes have been paid to the United States from inception of the receiverships up to April 30, 1956, in the amount of $2,878,248.91, and it is estimated that final figures will show that about $150,000 more will have been paid in current taxes for the period subsequent to that date."

In view of the dilatory manner in which the tax claim against this racketeer had been handled in earlier years I think the Department of Justice should be commended upon the progress they have made toward collecting the delinquent account from this individual. Also, I am glad to note in the letter that they are not waiving the unpaid balance but are still able to list several possible steps for future action.

In dealing with the average American citizen who, as the result of conditions beyond his control, becomes delinquent in taxes it is expected that the Federal Government should display reasonableness in working out arrangements; however, in dealing with racketeers and members of the underworld there should be no compromise. There is no excuse for the Federal Government's displaying any leniency whatever to this element and certainly they should not be permitted to continue their illegal operations while being carried on the books of the Federal Treasury as tax delinquents.

As one who criticized the laxity of the departments in the early stages of this case I am glad to submit this report along with words of commendation for the results achieved after public attention was focused on this case.

I attach at this point the complete report of the Department of Justice.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY
ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., August 7, 1957.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is with reference to your letter of July 15, 1957, to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in which you requested that the Commissioner furnish you with a complete report as to the settlement of the Government's tax claim against William G. Lias. As you have been previously advised, the Commissioner, on July 17, 1957, referred your letter to this Department in view of the fact that this Department has been in charge of the litigation concerning Lias' tax liability.

While your letter requests a report as to the settlement of the Government's tax claim against Lias, it is assumed that what you desire is a report on the progress of the litigation, and on the steps taken to satisfy Lias' tax indebtedness. There has been no settlement or compromise of any part of the liability which the Government has asserted against Lias. The litigation has not been finally concluded as yet but the following is a summary of its more important aspects up to the present time.

You will recall that some years ago William G. Lias was indicted for evading his Federal income taxes for the years 1942 to 1945, inclusive, but a trial held before District Judge Harry E. Watkins, northern district of West Virginia, resulted in a jury verdict of acquittal on July 2, 1949. The Commissioner then asserted additional civil tax liability against Lias for the years 1942 to 1947, inclusive, as well as against Automatic Cigarette Sales Corp. (Automatic) and Zellers Steak House Inc. (Zellers), corporations in which it was believed that Lias had an interest. Lias, Automatic, and Zellers petitioned the Tax Court of the United States for a redetermination of the proposed deficiencies.

On October 18, 1951, the Commissioner made jeopardy assessments against Lias and the two corporations. On December 2, 1951, in order to prevent possible dissipation of the property out of which the asserted deficiencies, if sustained by the courts, would be satisfied, the Government brought a proceeding before Judge Watkins for (a) foreclosure of the tax liens, (b) appointment of receivers for Lias and the two taxpayer corporations, and (c) appointment of receivers for several corporations which owed no taxes but in which it was believed Lias owned an interest. The latter corporations were Laconia, Inc., Wheeling Downs Racing Association, and Wheeling Downs, Inc. In a decision reported (103 F. Supp. 341), Judge Watkins, on February 22, 1952, approved appointment of receivers for Lias and the various corporations. On appeal, the decision was affirmed by the fourth circuit in a per curiam opinion reported (196 F. 2d 90).

It was immediately determined that one of Lias' principal assets was his interest in Wheeling Downs, Inc., a corporation which owned a racetrack located on an island in the Ohio River near Wheeling, W. Va., and leased it to Wheeling Downs Racing Association to conduct horseraces. His other known assets consisted of stock in the various corporations named above. The receiver for Wheeling Downs Racing Association recognized that the litigation would in all probability not be concluded for some time, and if the track were to be prevented from deteriorating to a small fraction of its value and if the valuable racing dates allocated to it by the West Virginia Racing Commission were to be preserved, it would be necessary for him to operate the track. Accordingly, the receiver petitioned Judge Watkins for permission to hold a racing meet in the summer of 1952. Unable to find an experienced manager to operate the track, the receiver petitioned the court for permission to engage Lias as general manager. Among the reasons given to the court by the receiver for the necessity of hiring Lias were (a) he was well qualified to run a track, having done so successfully since 1945; (b) by experience he was particularly qualified to cope with the special problems of this track (the most serious of which is flooding); (c) he

had a competent organization which, because employment at a racetrack is of a seasonal nature, is usually difficult to obtain; and (d) it was not believed feasible to hire another competent manager (particularly after the season had commenced) since the necessity of obtaining the court's permission prior to each meet precluded hiring any such person except upon a meet-to-meet basis.

By order dated July 18, 1952, Judge Watkins approved the meet and the hiring of Lias as general manager, his compensation being left entirely to the discretion of the court. Subsequent meets, with Lias as general manager, have been approved from time to time by Judge Watkins who has, at all times, found the continued employment of Lias as general manager to be in the best interests of the receivership.

In 1953, the question of Lias' compensation was presented to the court, and in an opinion reported (113 F. Supp. 502), Judge Watkins approved compensation of $35,000 for the first year, subject, however, to further consideration of a claim by the United States Government that it had a lien upon all compensation paid to Lias. A reading of that opinion will amply demonstrate the reasoning of Judge Watkins in approving operation of the track and in setting Lias' compensation. The following excerpts from that opinion indicate the court's attitude (pp. 502–503):

"The receiver reported to the court that the prior manager of the track, William G. Lias, had refused to serve as manager of the track for the scheduled spring meeting beginning in April 1952, and that without the services of Lias, he did not believe he could profitably operate the track. The April 1952 meet was canceled.

"Later Lias changed his attitude and agreed to serve as manager of the track under the receiver. He asked to be employed at the same yearly compensation which he had received for the year ending April 30, 1951, prior to the receivership when he was paid $60,000 for his services. He was employed as manager of the track with the understanding that he would be allowed such compensation as the court deemed fair and reasonable. * * *

"He has served as general manager of the racetrack since July 18, 1952. Two racing meets were thereafter held in 1952, one in the summer and another in the fall. A total of $16,930,270 was handled during these 2 meets. The races were attended by 288,587 persons. The State of West Virginia received over $700,000 from the 2 meets. Over $500,000 was realized in profits to the receivership before deduction of current Federal income taxes and compensation to the receiver and general manager. The meets were the most successful, both in attendance and in profits, in the history of the track. A third meet was held in May 1953. Although handicapped by rain and competition from a nearby track, profits of $119,000 were realized, before payment of Federal income taxes and compensation to the receiver and general manager."

* * * * *

"There is evidence to the effect that the general manager of another racetrack received $60,000 per year and the manager of another track is paid $75,000 per year. This type of employment is highly skilled and technical.

"The receiver has stated that he is doubtful whether he could have successfully operated the track without the services of Lias and his experienced staff of assistants. * * *

"It is my opinion that the sum of $35,000 should now be allowed to William G. Lias as payment on account for his services, up to and including April 30, 1953."

At a later date the question of a possible lien of the United States upon Lias' salary (left open in the above opinion) was presented to the court, and an order was entered that the $35,000 allowed to him by the court should be distributed as follows: $15,000 to the Director of Internal Revenue to apply on Lias' current taxes; $10,000 to be paid to Lias' personal receiver to apply on the taxes alleged to be due for past years; and the remaining $10,000 to be paid to Lias. This arrangement whereby all but $10,000 of the $35,000 salary is set aside for the benefit of the United States was continued from year to year until 1956 when racing operations were suspended. The receiver has held the stock of the corporation and Lias has not received any dividends during the receivership.

At a hearing before the Tax Court, which consumed nearly a month and the transcript of which covered approximately 7,150 pages, the deficiencies asserted by the Commission against Lias personally were sustained. The decision is reported in volume 24, Tax Court Reports, page 280, and on appeal by Lias the fourth circuit affirmed. (See 235 F. 2d 879 (August 3, 1955).) Lias then petitioned the Supreme Court of the United States for a writ of certiorari which was denied on April 22, 1957. (See 353 U. S. 935.) Zellers' tax liability was determined by stipulation before the Tax Court. The deficiency asserted against Automatic was sustained by the Tax Court in a decision not officially reported (docket No. 26151, decided January 26, 1955), and that decision was affirmed by the fourth circuit in an opinion reported in volume 234, Federal Reporter, second series, at page 825; certiorari was denied by the Supreme Court on December 17, 1956. (See 352 U. S. 951.) As a result of the above-described litigation, deficiencies were determined as follows: Lias, $2,487,543.87; Automatic, $176,466.42; and Zellers, $37,543.53. The deficiency against Lias included tax, penalties (including the 50-percent fraud penalty), and assessed interest; no penalties were assessed against Automatic or Zellers.

After the court of appeals affirmed the Tax Court's decision in Lias' personal tax case, Judge Watkins, by order dated November 30, 1956, ordered the track closed and practically all employees, including Lias, discharged. On December 1, 1956, the track employees, except for an accountant and 4 watchmen, were discharged, and on December 3, 1956, the track was closed. On the receiver's recommendation, Judge Watkins, by order dated December 30, 1956, directed that the 1957 30-day spring meet not be held.

After denial on April 22, 1957, of Lias' petition for certiorari in his personal tax case, the Government on May 1, 1957, petitioned the district court to enforce its liens and for an order of sale of the track. By order dated May 13, 1957, Judge Watkins gave judgment for the Government against Lias in the amount set out above and held that its liens were prior, valid, and subsisting against all of his properties. By order of the same date, the track was directed to be sold at public sale for cash on June 12, 1957, after advertisement as fixed and determined by the court.

The sale was advertised once a week for 4 successive weeks in the Wheeling Intelligencer and the Wheeling News-Register. In addition, advertisements were inserted for 3 successive weeks in the Wall Street Journal, the Morning Telegraph, and the Daily Racing Form, and public notices were posted in accordance with State law.

The conduct of the sale, the events leading up to confirmation of the Hazel Park Racing Association, Inc., as purchaser of the track for $1,780,000, and the reasoning of the court in the premises are fully set forth in the opinion of Judge Watkins of July 9, 1957, a copy of which is annexed.

On July 11, 1957, the district director at Parkersburg, W. Va., received $1,566,073.46 to apply on the judgment against Lias. The district director also received $5,677.57, representing the entire net assets of Zellers, to apply on the judgment against it. In addition, on the same date, the district director received additional interest on the tax claims against Automatic which, together with prior payments on account, resulted in payments of principal, assessed interest and accrued interest of $216,388.23. Thus, the Government has thus far collected in back taxes from these sources a total of $1,788,139.26. It is estimated that there is sufficient cash on hand to pay approximately $54,000 more which, together with $18,043.44 collected from Mrs. Lias in satisfaction of deficiencies assessed against her, will make a grand total of back taxes collected of approximately $1,860,182.70.

The funds applied to the judgment against Lias arose principally from the collection of accounts and notes receivable for which Lias' receiver asserted claims against Wheeling Downs, Inc., and from Lias' stock interest in that corporation and in Wheeling Downs Racing Association and Laconia, Inc. Lias' interest in each of these corporations had been determined by the district court by order dated March 8, 1954, pursuant to stipulation of the parties, to be approximately 60 percent, which is substantially the same basis as that upon which the assessments had originally been made. These corporations, as well as Automatic and Zellers, have all been liquidated.

In addition to the collection of back taxes as set forth above, current taxes have been paid to the United States from inception of the receiverships up to April 30, 1956, in the amount of $2,878,248.91, and it is estimated that final figures will show that about $150,000 more will have been paid in current taxes for the period subsequent to that date. The receiverships have also benefited the State of West Virginia and the city of Wheeling, the former having collected $3,716,874.96 in current taxes and the latter $112,403.59 for the period.

A few matters still remain outstanding before this phase of the Lias tax matters can be finally concluded. The Tananbaum group (described in the annexed opinion of Judge Watkins) has indicated that it will not appeal the court's refusal to entertain an additional upset bid on behalf of Yonkers but there are several minor matters such as a claim for an additional receiver's commission which will be decided next fall.

As appears from the foregoing, even after application of all available assets to Lias' tax liability, there still remains a substantial unsatisfied indebtedness. The Internal Revenue Service has conducted exhaustive investigations in an effort to locate additional assets. Two bank accounts containing about $17,000 have been located in Canada, and there are some indications that they may belong to Lias. Mrs. Lias, however, claims that the accounts belong to her, and it is expected that the question of ownership will be determined by the court next fall. In any event, the uncollected portion of the deficiencies against Lias have now been reduced to judgment and any other assets of his which the Internal Revenue Service may discover during the life of the judgment can be applied against it.

If the foregoing summary is not sufficient for your purposes or if you have any questions on any particular phase of the various receiverships, we shall be glad to furnish more details on request.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Deputy Attorney General.

POPULATION GROWTH AND RECLAMATION

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the August 9, 1957, issue of U. S. News & World Report features an article entitled

"Where Will United States Put 60 Million More People?" This is a most provocative article and I commend it to your reading and serious consideration. It focuses attention on many problems associated with our booming population, estimated to total 227 million in 1975.

We think of Munich and the beginning of World War II as only yesterday. May I remind you that this date, so clearly stamped in the memory of each of us, was only 18 years ago. The date 1975 is only 18 years in the future. Many in this illustrious body will be dealing with the problems of 1975 and as they cast shadows on the problems of the year 2000.

Let me give you a few brief highlights as taken from the article in U. S. News & World Report. The farm population which now stands at 22 million will decline to about 15 million. This means that only 7 percent of our population will be providing the food and fiber needs for the other 93 percent. Today approximately 13 percent of our population lives on the farm. The major portion of the population gain will be in the suburban areas surrounding the large cities. In general, the shift of population will be westward. Almost 18 million of the increase will be in the 11 States west of the Rockies; another 15 million will be added to the Southern States; 14 million in the Midwest and 13 million in the East.

Percentagewise Nevada will increase by about 96 percent; Arizona will be second with an increase of almost 94 percent, and California third with a net increase of 91 percent. Numerically California will add the greatest number of inhabitants; its increase will exceed 12 million. New York will increase more than 4½ million; Texas almost 3½ million; Michigan and Ohio will add more than 3 million each; Illinois more than 2½ million and Pennsylvania almost 2½ million. In all, 21 States will increase from about 1 million to 12 million each. The remaining States will increase in varying numbers up to almost 1 million each.

The article points out that direction in the flow of population will be influenced by climate and by the availability of water. While we can do little, if anything, about climate, we should recognize now the tremendous impact of the potential population gains upon water needs. Other problems emphasized in this article are the future needs for schools, streets, sewer, and highway construction. The number of students in elementary and high schools is estimated to increase from 38 million to 56 million, resulting in a need for 600,000 additional classrooms. Residential and industrial construction should develop in proportion to other requirements.

Only a few decades ago we used approximately 95 gallons of water per person per day. Today this rate of use has increased to 145 gallons per day. We may well expect the average use to reach 200 gallons per day when we consider the rate at which we build homes with two or more bathrooms, install air conditioners, garbage disposals, automatic washing machines and other equipment which uses water at greater and greater amounts.

The article concludes with a rather complacent statement that while we can expect 60 million more mouths to feed in 1975 and while we are losing about 1 million acres of farmland each year to housing, industrial development, highways, airports and other uses, that the past record of the American farmers would indicate that future needs can be met relatively easily. The 7 percent of our population which will be residing on farms will need to produce at least one-third more milk, 40 percent more truck garden crops, 50 percent more beef and 40 percent more pork. These future needs should raise the red flag of alarm to each of us, particularly when we know that the land available for crop production has changed but little in the last 4 decades. The amount of new land brought into production is being offset by losses to highways, airports, industrial expansion and urbanization. For reasons of easy construction the highway and other expansions take place in the level areas, the land best suited to agriculture. We cannot long continue this practice if we are to meet our needs in 1975.

I am told that in 1920 we had about 5.6 acres of equivalent cropland for each inhabitant. This measurement assumes a productive value below cropland for grazing areas in open pasture and woodland pasture. Today we have the equivalent of 3.7 acres of cropland available for each person. In 1975 based on the forecast of the Department of Agriculture of the amount of land available for crop and pasture we will have only 2.7 acres. As I view the situation we will be hard pressed by 1975 to meet the needs of our booming population. The figures and conditions which I have recited are related to a population of about 227 million in 1975. As we look back on earlier population forecasts we find they have consistently been conservative. The Bureau of the Census forecast in 1946, for example, based on assumptions of medium mortality, medium fertility and no net immigration between 1945 and 2000 indicated the population in 1955 to be just under 150 million. We passed that mark 5 years earlier. That same forecast showed for 1975 a population of 162.3 million. We have long since passed that mark. This 1946 forecast also showed the population in year 2000 to be 163.3 million. We have already exceeded that estimate by 8 million. The point I wish to make is that the present estimate and the conditions related in U. S. News & World Report, also may be conservative. Assuming that the article gives a fair appraisal of what we may expect in 1975, may I suggest that we focus our attention on the period following 1975. The year 2000 is only 43 years away. Should we plan to meet the conditions of the immediate future or should we look ahead to the days of our children and grandchildren? Our present rate of population gains seems to indicate a total population in the United States in year 2000 of three hundred million or more inhabitants. That figure is approximately double our population of 1950.

Even if we tried we would be unable to visualize the many changes that are inherent in our Nation's growth. However, I believe the article in the U. S. News & World Report is correct in the appraisal that our population growth will be influenced by climate and availability of water. Water, or rather the lack of it, has been a continuing problem in the arid West. The eastern seaboard area is now feeling the effects of drought. Pastures are dry and the farmers must either feed or sell their livestock. Everyone concerned with the production, processing and handling of the products of the farm will be affected. In recent years irrigation, a necessity in the arid West, is being resorted to each year on more and more farms in the eastern humid areas to provide moisture during periods of deficient rainfall in order to stabilize production at a high level. I am reminded of a statement made by Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Ervin L. Peterson about 2 years ago regarding the significance of adequate moisture for crop production in the East.

Mr. Peterson stated:

> As the use of improved seed, as increased amounts of fertilizer are applied, as better growing practices are applied, the need for water goes up. For example, reports indicate that at Blacksburg, Va., rainfall during the past 56 years has been adequate to produce 25 bushels of corn per acre every year except 2. This same rainfall would have been adequate to produce 75 bushels per acre only about half of those years. Yet as a result of application of known methods of farming to growing corn, 75 bushels per acre is a potential production figure at Blacksburg if water is available. This example repeats itself in some form throughout the country. Thus water supply and not fertilizer or lack of knowledge is an important limiting factor to any significant increase in food production which will ultimately be required by a growing nation.

Also, as the eastern population zooms to new heights water will become a greater and greater problem for municipal and industrial needs. Water-resource developments started today in the East, and in the West offer a means of meeting our needs tomorrow.

I was heartened by a statement a few days ago by our distinguished majority leader, Senator JOHNSON of Texas, that he has brought together the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers in a water-resource-development program for the State of Texas. Not only am I pleased that these two great organizations will be working hand in hand in meeting the problems of drought and flood in the great State of Texas, but also that my distinguished colleague has stated so clearly the need for a water-resource program for attaining full economic development of his State. May I add that such is the case in my State, Utah, and in every State of the Union as well. This you have heard me say many times.

Fully recognizing the need for water-resource developments in Texas and elsewhere I cannot refrain from calling attention to an item of paramount importance. With each proposal for a water-resource development that includes irrigation the hue and cry go up that the project will add to our overflowing granaries—that the Congress in approving a project will be spending money to produce crops and more money to buy them. This argument of reclamation

and the crop surplus was answered in a straightforward factual analysis by one of the economists of the Bureau of Reclamation in a paper presented at the annual convention of the Western Farm Economics Association, Las Cruces, N. Mex., July 15, 1957.

The paper referred to emphasizes that the production from reclamation projects is largely forage and feed grains and specialty food crops. Four principal commodities—corn, wheat, cotton, and tobacco, which comprise 87 percent of all commodities under loan and inventory by the Commodity Credit Corporation, are analyzed. Tobacco is not grown on reclamation projects; corn and wheat production aggregates less than four-tenths of 1 percent and 2 percent, respectively, of the United States production. It is shown that where dryland wheat areas are put in irrigation the acreage actually planted to wheat is less, resulting in fewer actual bushels of wheat from each 100 acres. With respect to cotton the paper shows production on reclamation projects to be only about 6 percent of United States production. This crop is moving westward because of high yields and efficiency of production. Altogether about three-fourths of the irrigated acreage in reclamation projects produce forage and grain crops that are fed locally. Another and equally important aspect of the production from irrigated lands of the West, including reclamation projects, is the large contribution to our supply of fruits, vegetables, nuts, and specialty crops. It is shown that the irrigated West produces, for example, virtually all of our apricots, almonds, walnuts, filberts, dates, lemons, figs, prunes, mustard, olives, and garlic and a major portion of a long list of other vegetables and fruits which we enjoy during the winter months when large areas of our country lie dormant. Not only do these water resource projects render a great service to our standard of living and everyday enjoyment but they have essentially no effect on the farm surplus.

May I suggest also that the development or extension of a basic resource creates new opportunities. In the West two or more families are provided with the means of livelihood in the service trades and industries in the nearby towns for each farming opportunity created. Furthermore, the water developed initially for agriculture remains permanently available for future industrial and municipal uses. Thus water resource developments will help to fill the impending void in many segments of our economy. Again I recommend for your thoughtful consideration the feature article in the August 9, 1957, issue of U. S. News & World Report and the paper presented at the Western Farm Economics Association meeting regarding Federal reclamation and the crop surplus problem.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE AIR FORCE

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I had intended to deliver a full-scale speech on a matter I consider to be of importance to expose misrepresentations compounded by subsequent misrepresentations. The truth is too sacred to be permitted to be dealt with loosely.

Because the adjournment is coming sooner than the heretofore set Saturday date, and apparently will come within a few hours and because I do not wish to delay unduly the adjournment time, instead of taking the time of the Senate to make my speech, I ask unanimous consent that my statement be placed in the body of the RECORD.

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

In the controversy over the Air Force Reserve general nominations, I felt that the matter had been completed and closed when the Committee on Armed Services withheld approval of 2 nominees and reported out favorably 9 nominees. I had no desire to prolong the controversy as there are important matters to be attended in the rush of these closing days.

But a member of the committee who opposed me in this matter took the position that I had an obligation to make my statement to the committee public and have it printed. I complied with his feeling and desire and so inserted my statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Compliance with his feeling apparently has caused embarrassment to Lieutenant General O'Donnell, who issued a statement to the press. He is reported by the press to have stated that he did not seek to change "one iota" of his basic testimony. I now place his statement in the RECORD:

"STATEMENT BY GENERAL O'DONNELL RELATIVE TO SENATOR MARGARET CHASE SMITH'S STATEMENT IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

"Senator SMITH has made a very serious charge against me—that of giving extensive false testimony and of making repeated misrepresentations before the Senate Armed Forces Committee. The implication is that I deliberately falsified my testimony with the intent to deceive the committee. This allegation and its attendant implications are wrong.

"In my capacity as Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel, on the Air Staff of the United States Air Force, it is my duty and responsibility to give testimony to the Armed Forces Committee of the Senate in support of nominations of this kind. It is not within my province to select individuals for nomination to general officer rank or to any other rank. This is accomplished by action of a selection board composed of general officers. The Air Force applauded the selections of the board and forwarded them to the President with approval of the Chief of Staff, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Secretary of Defense. The board at no time was under any pressure or compulsion to either include or exclude any individual by name for promotion, and arrived at its findings completely independently.

"The questioning of the committee covered not only the promotion list under consideration, but also the full gamut of Reserve affairs. When the committee sent me the verbatim transcript of the hearings with instructions to correct it, I did just that. (This, by the way, is customary procedure.)

"I had no prepared statement for the committee, because I could not anticipate the scope of the hearings. I gave opinions and answered questions to the best of my ability and knowledge at that time, with no intention ever of misrepresenting the facts or of giving false testimony. Much of the discussion centered upon opinions as to Air Force policy. I found myself in frequent disagreement with Senator SMITH in this area.

"The real issue, it appears to me, is the criteria for promotion to general officer in the Reserve. Senator SMITH puts great weight on current participation, longevity, and active-duty training. The Air Force agrees that these are important, but it puts greater weight upon past performance and future potential, with emphasis on the latter. Every officer on the list then under consideration had participated in Reserve activities to the extent required by law in order to be eligible for consideration for promotion. These selections, made upon a best qualified basis, included consideration not only of participation, but also of past performance and of future potential in the event of national emergency.

"Naturally, I do not relish being publicly and wrongly accused of untruthfulness, falsification, and misrepresentation by the distinguished Senator from Maine. I am at a loss to understand her action and am shocked at the harsh language of her assertion."

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Whether this statement of his is true or not I will leave to the judgment of the American people on the basis of the facts I shall subsequently reveal in the following analysis.

Before I deliver that analysis, I shall read portions of his statement and make comments.

STATEMENT BY GENERAL O'DONNELL

"Senator SMITH has made a very serious charge against me—that of giving extensive false testimony and of making repeated misrepresentations before the Senate Armed Services Committee. The implication is that I deliberately falsified my testimony with the intent to deceive the committee. This allegation and its attendant implications are wrong."

MY COMMENT

This statement raises two questions. First, whether the testimony itself was false, and second, whether it was deliberately made false with intention to deceive. I merely stated that General O'Donnell gave false testimony with respect to certain nominations. There was no statement with respect to the reasons or intent as to why the testimony was not true.

The last sentence of the above statement may be considered true if both the allegation and the implications are considered, since of course there is no way of knowing the intent of the untrue statements. The last sentence is not true if it is confined only to the question of whether certain of the statements were in fact false.

STATEMENT BY GENERAL O'DONNELL

"The questioning of the committee covered not only the promotion list under consideration, but also the full gamut of Reserve affairs. When the committee sent me the verbatim transcript of the hearings with instructions to correct it, I did just that. (This, by the way, is customary procedure.)"

MY COMMENT

With regard to the question of whether the entire gamut of Reserve affairs was discussed, it could be said that there were no matters covered which should not have been within the knowledge of General O'Donnell. The fact that the overwhelming portion of the questions were based on information already furnished by the Air Force is later pointed out.

The verbatim transcript was furnished informally to the Air Force for correction in the customary manner. The custom of the committee has always been to limit the changes to those of an editorial nature, such as punctuation and improvement of grammar, and also to permit the insertion of additional information. It has never been customary to permit complete changes in answers to be made by the witness in the transcript. Due to the serious changes made

by General O'Donnell the hearing was printed verbatim in its original form with an Air Force letter of correction also added at the end of the hearing.

STATEMENT BY GENERAL O'DONNELL

"I had no prepared statement for the commitee, because I could not anticipate the scope of the hearings. I gave opinions and answered questions to the best of my ability and knowledge at that time, with no intention ever of misrepresenting the facts or of giving false testimony. Much of the discussion centered upon opinions as to Air Force policy. I found myself in frequent disagreement with Senator SMITH in this area."

MY COMMENT

The overwhelming portion of the questions was based on information already furnished to the committee by the Air Force prior to the hearing which was held May 2, 1957. On February 25, 1957, the committee received the nomination list together with the records of service on each officer. These records covered the history of all military service by date, location, promotion record, their pilot rating, and awards and decorations. (Contained in printed hearing, pages 1–16.)

On March 20, I requested the chairman to obtain additional detailed information relating to the number of points earned by the nominees. (This information was furnished by the Air Force on April 3, 1957, and is contained in the printed hearing, pages 18–25.)

In addition, the Air Force was given informally 31 questions relating to the entire gamut of Air Force Reserve matters, including details on the nominees. The answers to these questions were prepared by the Air Force and given to the committee and me a number of days prior to the hearing of May 2.

In view of all the advance information it cannot be said that there was any atempt to take General O'Donnell by surprise with respect to the questions raised during the hearing.

STATEMENT BY GENERAL O'DONNELL

"The real issue, it appears to me, is the criteria for promotion to general officer in the Reserve. Senator SMITH puts great weight on current participation, longevity, and active duty training. The Air Force agrees that these are important, but it puts greater weight upon past performance and future potential, with emphasis on the latter. Every officer on the list then under consideration had participated in Reserve activities to the extent required by law in order to be eligible for consideration for promotion. These selections, made upon a best-qualified basis, included consideration not only of participation, but also of past performance and of future potential in the event of national emergency."

MY COMMENT

The points raised in the statement were also discussed only generally in the hearing. It would be true to say that the Air Force has not furnished a precise list of the criteria and the relative weight given to each factor with respect to the basis for promotions to Reserve general. Since the Air Force states that no one attempted to influence the board and since the board gave no reasons for its selections it would be difficult to know just on what basis the board did select the officers who were nominated.

Mr. President, for over a decade I have fought the fight for reservists. No one in Congress has fought more for reservists than I have. No one has introduced more Reserve legislation than I have. And because I have fought for reservists I have incurred the enmity of some of the Regular brass in the Pentagon. I unhesitatingly accept that price of enmity.

In a world that has been, and continues to be, threatened with war, it has been my belief that the only way that Americans can maintain the necessary national defense without ultimately bankrupting the economy of our country, and thus permitting the Communists to take over without firing a shot, is through the maintenance of the largest possible and best trained Reserve.

The average well-trained reservist costs the American taxpayer only one-seventh to one-tenth what a Regular does. Yet, in past wars, over 90 percent of the fighting in defense of our country has been carried by the non-Regular citizen soldiers.

It is only common sense—taxpayers' dollars and cents common sense—to maintain the best possible Reserve for the defense of our country and for discouraging Communist Russia from attacking us. That is the core of the importance of the reservists to all Americans—and that is why I have been constantly fighting for reservists, for better Reserve programs, for more equitable treatment of reservists—to attract the best to the Reserve and to keep the best in the Reserve.

I have been amazed at the "couldn't care less' attitude of some key Regular generals who control such vital policies as those on personnel with respect to the Reserves. I have been shocked at their lack of knowledge about matters with which they have a serious responsibility—a lack of knowledge which clearly results from their "couldn't care less" attitude about the Reserve.

The most recent example of this was forcefully exhibited and displayed in the recent inquiry and hearings of the Senate Armed Services Committee on the nominations of 8 Air Force reservists for brigadier general rank in the Air Force Reserve and 3 Air Force reservists for major general in the Air Force Reserve.

Representatives of the Air Force at the hearings made serious misrepresentations about the Reserve and the nominations to the committee. They displayed a shocking lack of knowledge about the Reserve and the records of the nominees. Even in written answers and material furnished by the Air Force there are glaring inaccuracies and contradictions.

Retention in the Reserve, and promotion in the Reserve, is regulated according to the provisions of the Reserve Officer Personnel Act of 1954 and the 1955 amendments to that act. As the principal Senate sponsor of this legislation, I have a keen desire to see that the intent, as well as the letter, of this law is carried out and that the will of the Congress is not thwarted and nullified.

Inquiry into the Air Force Reserve general nominations and the hearing on those nominations exposed certain facts that raise serious question as to whether the Air Force is complying with the letter of the law. The most lenient observation that can be made of the Air Force record as exposed by the hearing is that the Air Force is skating on the thinnest of ice in the justifications of minimums that it gave in apology and defense of several of the nominations.

I think it is clear from the hearing record that the Air Force has not been complying with the intent of the law—for one of the very purposes of ROPA was to eliminate from the Reserve those reservists who were not active in the Reserve and who did not train to keep themselves proficient and of the best effectiveness if and when our country should be attacked. This is only honest realism—for we want and need a real Reserve instead of merely a paper Reserve in which we merely are kidding ourselves if the reservists on whom we depend are not trained and proficient.

It is sharply surprising to discover the striking inactivity record of several of the nominees since the end of World War II. Yet, instead of being removed from the Reserve because of such inactivity, lack of training and proficiency, several of these nominees of records of inactivity for many years are being rewarded with promotion to the ranks of 1- and 2-star generals. It appears that the ROPA law is being administered by the Air Force in reverse to the objective of the law and the clear intent of Congress.

For as far as these nominees are concerned, participation in the Reserve is minimized instead of emphasized. In fact, it would not be inaccurate to characterize the Air Force policy in this respect as one of de-emphasis—with training being held in comparative derogation when matched against success in big business and the movies.

There seems to be an almost contempt for point participation, which is the very foundation of the development and maintenance of the proficiency of the individual reservist. For the best measure we have for knowing whether an officer is trained is his participation in training duty. If there are officers who do not complete the required training or need not do so, then by definition there is no requirement for them in the Active Reserve.

Yet, General O'Donnell, Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, told the committee that in his opinion one of the nominees need not put in 1 training period for the next 5 years and would still be best qualified to command a Strategic Air Force. What kind of blind thinking is this in these days when we are quickly shifting from manpiloted strategic bombers to robot-guided missiles? To what extent can an apologetic defense and attempted justification of a nomination be carried? Surely the maintenance of realism in the national air defense of our country is more important than conveniently adjusting the national air defense to justify the inactivity of one of the nominees and to meet his convenience for the acquisition of a star.

This is dangerous thinking that holds active participation in such low regard and derogation. It is bad enough, but it is even more shocking when such thinking goes to such extremes as to cast aspersions on the motives of loyal reservists for keeping up steady training participation—when a reservist is to be condemned for steady training participation to make himself proficient for the defense of his country, for your defense, for my defense, and for the defense of more than 170 million Americans.

But the thinking on the part of some influential, powerful, and responsible people has reached this radical extreme of derogation of loyally participating reservists. Such thinking was openly and vigorously expressed in the committee hearings on these nominations.

I call your attention to page 49 of the committee hearing where it was charged that point-participating reservists participate just to get the money so they can eat—that their primary interest was that they wanted more money. They are characterized in this extreme thinking as constant protesters primarily seeking more money—and they are held in derogation while some who participate relatively few days in a year are praised in highest esteem when compared to the loyal, steady participating reservists.

I shall now turn to specific, individual nominees. First, let me say that some of the nominees have most admirable records—the kind of records of Reserve training that you would expect of any reservist nominated for general rank. Clearly the best nominee record of Reserve participation is that of Brig. Gen. T. B. Herndon, who is nominated for the rank of major general. Ever since the end of World War II, General Herndon has faithfully put in his time in Reserve training. He is the only one of the 11

nominees who has such a Reserve training and participation record.

Col. J. O. Bradshaw has an excellent record that is second only to that of General Herndon on Reserve training and participation.

General Smith and Colonels Larson, De Brier, and Stiles have honorable and admirable war records, but their Reserve training records do not match such records as that of General Herndon.

General Henebry and Colonels Montgomery, Alison, Potts, and Stewart have excellent war records but there are gaps in their Reserve training records—and the gaps in the records of Colonels Montgomery, Stewart, and Alison are striking—no Reserve training or participation by Colonel Montgomery for over 15½ months after he was commissioned in the Reserve—only 9 days for Colonel Stewart in an 11-year period—only 6 days for Colonel Alison in a 9-year period. General Henebry failed to perform in his 1957 retention year required participation in his training category A. General Smith had to make a photofinish to meet the requirements of his training category D in his 1957 retention year.

Without question, a good war record is an excellent criterion for selection for general rank. But there is a limitation as to how controlling it can be as a substitute for nonparticipation in the Reserve. This was acknowledged by General O'Donnell, the Personnel Chief, when he stated at page 63 of the committee hearing:

"No; I wouldn't say not participate, and that is why we have the minimum participation. They can't go resting on their laurels. What they did between 1941 and 1945 becomes less and less significant as time goes on."

COL. JOHN B. MONTGOMERY

Col. John B. Montgomery is 1 of the 8 Reserve colonels nominated for the rank of brigadier general in the Air Force Reserve. For the detailed facts in his case, your attention is invited to pages 33 through 42 of the committee hearing record.

The facts in the case of Colonel Montgomery are disturbing because they raise some question and suspicion as to the use that the Air Force is making of the Air Force Reserve in his instance. Such question and suspicion arise from the circumstances surrounding the resignation of Colonel Montgomery from the Regular Air Force when he was a major general and his obtaining through the Reserve what was refused him on his application for retirement as a Regular officer—and his failure to have any participation or training in the Reserve for over 15½ months after being sworn into the Reserve.

The very uniqueness of the Montgomery case and the inequity that accrues to the special benefit of Colonel Montgomery was admitted by none less than the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel at pages 37 and 39 of the committee hearing record. At page 39, General O'Donnell acknowledged:

"I have been in the personnel business for 4 years over there, and that is the first time an action like this has been taken, and I don't anticipate any in the future because of this."

Briefly, the pertinent facts of the Montgomery case are:

(1) Because he was offered a higher paying position with the American Airlines as vice president in charge of maintenance and found his pay as a major general in the Regular Air Force to be inadequate to meet his financial commitments to his family, Montgomery applied on May 10, 1955, for voluntary retirement as a major general in the Regular Air Force.

(2) The Air Force rejected his application for retirement in his temporary grade of major general and instead offered to retire him in his permanent grade of colonel.

(3) Montgomery then rejected the offer of retirement in his permanent grade of colonel and elected to resign completely from the Air Force thereby losing all of his retirement rights, which included more than 50 percent of the base pay of a colonel.

(4) But the day immediately following his resignation from the Air Force, Montgomery was sworn in the Air Force Reserve as a colonel—and thereupon under the provisions of title II of the Reserve Retirement Act gained (a) back all of the retirement rights he had lost the day before upon resignation—and (b) more than what he would have been permitted in the Regular Air Force, in that he would accrue retirement benefits at the same rate as an officer who remains on active duty in the Regular Air Force. Thus, through the Reserve he got what he couldn't get as a Regular—(a) being able to apply for retirement at any time as a major general instead of just a colonel, (b) getting a full year's retirement credit just as though he were on active duty 365 days a year by putting in as little as 15 days a year in the Reserve—and the opportunity to build his retirement pay up to the very maximum—75 percent of the base pay of a major general, and (c) at the same time hold down a much better paying civilian job.

(5) Having accomplished this, Montgomery did not participate in the Reserve for over 15½ months—did not put in a single period of training in the Reserve.

(6) He will be required as a category D trainee to put in the very minimum of time in the future and no extensive participation in the Reserve will be required of him.

The defense offered in this case reveals some very interesting contradictions. First, the personnel chief flatly stated at the hearing that I was incorrect in stating that after Colonel Montgomery resigned, had he not been appointed in the Reserve component, he would not be eligible for any future retirement benefits of any kind.

General O'Donnell made it a special point to challenge me on this and to accuse me of being incorrect for he interrupted a statement that I was making. I invite your attention to page 34 of the hearing record. Then later the Air Force admitted that my statement was correct and accurate and not incorrect as General O'Donnell had charged. For this retraction I invite your attention to page 79 of the hearing record.

Second, defenders of this matter represented at the committee hearing that Montgomery made a great financial sacrifice in resigning from the Regular Air Force and then being sworn in the Air Force Reserve. On this I invite your attention to pages 36, 41, and 42 of the hearing record. In fact, the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel stated at page 36 about Montgomery: "He is taking a terrific financial sacrifice." Yet, in almost the same breath they say that Montgomery had to leave the Regular Air Force to be better off financially and to be able to meet his financial obligations to his family. On this I invite your attention to pages 36 and 41 of the hearing record.

The defenders make much of the fact that Montgomery did not retire as a Regular colonel and start receiving his retirement pay as a Regular colonel but instead did forego getting that retirement pay by going into the Reserve. In this, they attribute to him a personal financial sacrifice prompted by his desire to be active in the Reserve—even though he went for over 15½ months before doing anything in the Reserve and even though he has been placed in one of the least-active Reserve training categories—category D.

Let us examine this claim of financial sacrifice a little more closely. In the first place, Montgomery left the Regular Air Force to better himself financially—to get a higher paying job with American Airlines and later go with General Electric. I do not know what his salary was with American Airlines or what his salary is with General Electric. I have been told that his salary with American Airlines was much greater than his major general salary and that he is receiving a higher salary than that with General Electric.

Had Montgomery retired as a colonel in the Regular Air Force, he would have received retired pay of $376.74 a month, or $4,520.88 a year. Now just how much of this could he have actually realized after taxes when it is added to his salary with American Airlines or General Electric? Probably as little as half of it.

Instead Montgomery elected to resign, forego retired pay as a Regular Air Force retired colonel, and be placed in the Reserve—under which arrangement he would defer receiving any retired pay until he could get a higher percentage, 75 percent as compared to 55 percent, and on a higher base pay, major general as compared to colonel, and at a time when taxes would not take such a bite out of his retired pay.

Instead Montgomery elected to wait until later when he would be able to receive 30-year-service retired pay for a major general of $807.30 a month or $9,687.60 a year (instead of $376.74 a month or $4,520.88 a year as a retired colonel). If Montgomery fully retires at that time and is not working for General Electric or any other concern and receiving no income from them, at the present tax rates, he would have to pay only a fraction of what he would have on the retired pay of a colonel on top of his salary with American Airlines or General Electric.

Defenders of the Montgomery case interestingly make a vigorous claim that Montgomery went into the Air Force Reserve because of alleged devotion to the service—on this I invite your attention to pages 34, 37, and 39—and that defense was even carried to the point of claiming that Montgomery would rather stay in the service through being in the Reserve than to receive money (see p. 41) and that Montgomery deliberately planned to resign instead of retire so as to avoid taking retirement money from the Government (see p. 42).

In other words, in this attempt to picture Montgomery as being so devoted to the service, claims are made that Montgomery (1) did not want to retire, and (2) that he resigned and went into the Reserve to save the Government money. The ridiculousness and the sophistry of these claims is exposed by the official records and the facts in the Montgomery case.

Make no mistake about it, Montgomery wanted to retire as a major general instead of going into the Air Force Reserve.

Make no mistake about it, Montgomery wanted the retired pay of a major general in 1955—instead of wanting to avoid receiving retired pay from the Government and so desiring to make a financial sacrifice by going into the Reserve.

Make no mistake about it, Montgomery did not originally plan to deliberately resign instead of retire.

That this is the real Montgomery story is officially recorded in the Air Force records. For those records show that Montgomery himself applied on May 10, 1955, for retirement as a major general in the Regular Air Force. The records show that his application was disapproved.

Thus, the official record shows that Montgomery did try to get the retired pay of a major general—that he did not attempt to stay in the service and avoid leaving it by retirement—that he did not deliberately elect to make a financial sacrifice so that he could stay in the service—that he did not deliberately attempt to save the Government money—that he did not originally deliberately resign instead of retire so he could stay in the service and save the Govern-

ment from paying him retired pay—that he did not do these things for the purposes and reasons claimed by his defenders.

Instead the official records of the Air Force reveal that when Montgomery's application for retirement as a major general in the Regular Air Force was rejected and instead he was offered retirement in his permanent grade of colonel, that then and only then did Montgomery elect to resign instead of retire and go into the Air Force Reserve.

It does not take a mind reader to see that Montgomery's first concern and attempt was to get retired as a major general and not any concern with staying in the service through the Reserve or trying to save his Government any money. Even the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel admits that Montgomery because of pride was not willing to retire as a colonel but wanted to retain his rank as a major general (see p. 34).

It is clear that the only way that he could do this was by being put in the Reserve, for under Title II of the Reserve Retirement Act he was entitled to retire in the rank of major general instead of colonel.

It was clear that he could get through this Reserve clause device as much as 30 years' credit and maximum 75 percent retired pay with very little additional effort in the Reserve instead of the only 20 years retired pay of a mere colonel in the Regular Air Force.

It was clear that he could make a much better tax saving through this device.

Again we have an illustration of the shockingly distorted thinking on the part of some on these nominations. How can the defenders of the Montgomery nomination really have the temerity to make the obviously ridiculous claims that they do?

But how about the Reserve record of Colonel Montgomery? That record shows that Montgomery did not participate in the Reserve until after over 15½ months after he was commissioned in the Reserve. Is that a record of having his heart in the Reserve as the General O'Donnell, the personnel chief, claimed at page 37 of the hearing record?

He finally got around to a 15-day training tour in October 1956—not long before the news that a general promotion board would meet. And he has not done any Reserve training since that time. In other words, he has earned only 15 points in the Reserve in over 2 years.

And what is expected of him in the future? Very little in spite of the fact that his mobilization assignment is that of deputy commander of the 8th Force of the Strategic Air Command. For he has been placed in training category D, one of the least active of Reserve training categories which requires only a 15-day training tour in each year.

In fact, the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel seemed quite emphatic on this, for at page 35 of the hearing record, he stated: "He [Montgomery] could not go to any drill for the next 5 years and still be outstandingly qualified to move into the job for which he has a mobilization assignment out in SAC."

What kind of thinking is this when 5 years from now in the rapid changing character of our Air Force—of the Strategic Air Command—when we are shifting from man-piloted B–52's to mechanically piloted guided missiles—when in 5 years from now it is obvious that the Strategic Air Command will be radically different from what it is now and what it was in 1955 when Montgomery resigned from the Air Force?

One final note about the strange contradictory and distorted defense made by the Air Force of the Montgomery nomination. The Air Force, through its Secretary of the Air Force and its Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, glaringly contradicted itself in its special defense of the Montgomery nomination.

In written answers submitted to the committee, the Air Force, through the office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, represented to the committee that all 8 nominees for the rank of brigadier general were considered to be so equally best qualified that it was impossible to select only a 5 best from the 8 and thus unable to comply with the original instructions given to the selection board to select only 5 colonels for promotion to brigadier general—so impossible that the board requested and received amendment of the instructions to permit the selection of 8 instead of 5.

Thus, the Air Force in its written answer at page 69 of the hearing record represented that all 8 nominees were equally best qualified and none of the 8 were superior to the other 7. The Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel when asked about this written answer reaffirmed, at page 66, that answer. He also stated, at page 63: "* * * we permitted them to name 8 instead of 5, because they said they were all so closely alined * * *."

Yet, in making a special defense of the Montgomery nomination, the then Air Force Secretary Quarles wrote me that Montgomery was selected as 1 of the 5 best and that he was not in the additional 3. Secretary Quarles wrote me (see p. 66): "Colonel Montgomery was not 1 of these additional 3, in that he had already been selected in the first 5 as being outstandingly qualified."

When confronted with this contradiction, the Air Force rationalization and attempted explanation was just as illogical and unconvincing as the other strange, contradictory, and distorted defense made in other aspects of the Montgomery nomination, which I have previously outlined. In a written explanation the Air Force said that the discrepancy was caused by the use of the word "selection" and drew a distinction between ballot and selection, saying:

"The apparent discrepancy in Secretary Quarles' letter and General O'Donnell's testimony is caused by the use of the word 'selection' by Secretary Quarles. Selections are technically not completed until the board adjourns. The board voted unanimously on the first ballot that General Montgomery should be one of those officers selected for promotion. Consequently, it is believed that Secretary Quarles meant that if the list was restricted to 5, General Montgomery would have been 1 of these 5." (See p. 67 of the hearing record.)

The Air Force explanation misses the point, unintentionally or otherwise. The point is that on the one hand General O'Donnell, the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, represented that all 8 nominees were considered so equally best qualified that the selection board could not narrow the selection down to 5 as it had been instructed to and was forced to ask that the instructions be amended to permit the selection of 8—while on the other hand, Air Force Secretary Quarles, in the special defense of the Montgomery nomination, stated clearly that all 8 were not considered equally best qualified but that Montgomery was considered to be in the best 5 and therefore better than the additional 3 selected.

In fact, the O'Donnell rationalization and attempted explanation itself further contradicts the original written answer given by General O'Donnell's office that all 8 were found to be equally best qualified—for in the O'Donnell attempted explanation it is admitted that all eight were not considered to be equally best qualified and that Montgomery was considered better qualified than others of the nominees.

Analysis of the Montgomery case, as presented by the Air Force to the committee, reveals a pattern of disregard for truth, disregard for accuracy, and disregard for encouragement of active participation in the Air Force Reserve—a pattern you will see abundantly and repeatedly displayed as I reveal the true and pertinent facts in the cases of others in this list of nominees.

In addition to the facts of the Montgomery case which I have set forth, there is an equally serious question as to whether the Reserve retirement laws will not be used in the Montgomery case in the manner in which this legislation was never intended. Montgomery will eventually retire as a major general under title II, Public Law 810, and will receive a full year's credit for each year in the Reserve for retirement pay purposes. I would like to emphasize that title II of this statute does not require the completion of any retirement points in order to be credited with the full year's retirement credit.

The provisions which are usually referred to as the Reserve Retirement Act are contained in title III, not title II, of Public Law 810. Under title III, reservists receive an equivalent of about one-seventh of a full year in terms of retirement pay for each year of retirement participation. In order to receive this modest credit, a reservist must be credited with at least 50 points for a year's participation. Montgomery, therefore, is receiving a full year's credit even though he is not required to participate by law even to the extent of the reservists who will receive only one-seventh of a year's credit under title III.

There is also another aspect of the Montgomery case which in my opinion might constitute a breach of trust with the Committee on Armed Services. General O'Donnell indicated that the Air Force refused to permit Montgomery to retire since the Air Force had verbally agreed with the committee that the temporary generals would be required to serve 30 years before retirements would be approved. Since Montgomery preferred a Reserve commission in lieu of being retired as a colonel, and since he will eventually receive the retirement pay of a major general, there is in my mind a serious question as to whether his appointment as a reservist did in this way violate the spirit of the requirement of the 30 years of active service.

COL. JAMES M. STEWART

Col. James M. Stewart is 1 of the 8 Reserve colonels nominated for the rank of brigadier general in the Air Force Reserve. For detailed facts in his case, your attention is invited to pages 42 through 49 of the committee hearing record.

The question in the case of Colonel Stewart is his record of inactivity in the Reserve for so many years—a record of only 9 days of Reserve service in a period of 11 years—no Reserve activity or service in 1946, 1947, 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951, 1953, 1954, and 1955. In fact, Colonel Stewart's record of inactivity became such that as recently as 1955, and apparently less than 2 years ago, he was put in the Inactive Reserve.

From the end of World War II until about a year ago in July 1956, Colonel Stewart did only 9 days of Reserve duty. That was in 1952. The nature of that duty is recorded as with Psychological Warfare Division of the Air Force in Washington. The Air Force has furnished no further information on the nature and character of that duty.

From the end of World War II Colonel Stewart did not perform a 15-day training tour until a year ago in July 1956. Through the fiscal year 1957, Colonel Stewart performed only 4 inactive duty training periods.

Such is the past record of Colonel Stewart. Now what is expected and required of him on participation in the Air Force Reserve in the future? Not much more than his rate of very limited participation in the past. For he has been placed in one of the least active training categories of the Air Force Reserve. He has been placed in a training category "D", which has as its only requirement the performance of a 15-day tour

of active duty each year and absolutely nothing else.

This low activity training category for Colonel Stewart is puzzling and disturbing in view of the fact that the mobilization assignment given to him is that of deputy director of operations of the Strategic Air Command. That is a highly important and strategic assignment in the defense of our country—for the backbone of our present defense and our military might is the combination of our Strategic Air Command plus the atomic-hydrogen bombs. And the very heart of the Strategic Air Command is the Operations Division.

In other words, mobilization assignment given to Colonel Stewart is the deputy or that of the No. 2 commander of the very heart of our national defense. Yet, Colonel Stewart is put in one of the least active training categories of only 15 days required a year.

Does that make sense? Does it require, or even permit, Colonel Stewart to develop and maintain a proficiency for him to be able to handle such a tremendously important assignment if war comes? Or can it be the case that the Air Force has no intention of Colonel Stewart holding down the position of Deputy Director of Operations of the Strategic Air Command if war comes?

Honest realism indicates a negative answer to the first of two questions—and a positive answer to the last question.

Now let us take a look at the justification given by the Air Force for the training category it designates as training category D. The justification given by the Air Force at pages 54 and 71 of the hearing record is: "These individuals are considered proficient in their AF specialty by virtue of their recent release from active military service or maintain their proficiency through their normal civilian pursuits."

How do either of these bases apply to Colonel Stewart? He was released from active military service in September 1945. That is not a "recent release" by any stretch of the imagination, however convenient or wishful, unless you consider something that happened 10 or 12 years past to be recent.

Nineteen hundred and forty-five is not recent in terms of the status of the Air Force and its operations. There have been tremendous changes in the Air Force since 1945. In fact, the United States Air Force and the Department of the Air Force did not exist at the time of Colonel Stewart's release from active military service. In fact, the Strategic Air Command was not in existence and did not come into existence until after Colonel Stewart was released from active military service. In fact, since that time the B–29 has been replaced by the B–36 and the B–36 replaced by the B–52. In fact, since that time propeller-driven aircraft have been replaced in the Air Force by jet-powered, propellerless aircraft. In fact, now the next step appears to be the transition from piloted aircraft to ballistic missiles.

No, 1945, the year of Colonel Stewart's release from active military service is not a recent year—either in terms of time or in terms of changes and developments.

But perhaps the other basis for training category D properly applies to Colonel Stewart. What is that other basis? "Maintain their proficiency through their normal civilian pursuits" is the other basis. What is the normal civilian pursuit of Colonel Stewart? In other words, how does he make his living? Is it as an airline pilot or executive? No. Is it in the aircraft industry? No.

Of course, you and I know, so do millions of his fans and admirers, that Col. James Stewart's normal civilian pursuit is that of motion-picture actor. I leave it to your judgment as to whether Colonel Stewart can maintain through the making of motion pictures an adequate proficiency for the position of Deputy Director of Operations of the Strategic Air Command. The inescapable answer is "No."

Inferences were made at the committee hearing that Colonel Stewart should not be barred from being made a general in the Air Force Reserve because he is "a moving-picture star" (see pp. 43 and 49). No one has ever suggested that he should be barred because he is a motion-picture actor. But he should not be made a general merely because he is a motion-picture actor.

In fact, I have not made any derogatory reference to his motion-picture status. I did not suggest that factor as an issue. It was the Air Force defenders of the Stewart nomination who brought that in as an issue at the hearing.

More than that, it was the Air Force itself that officially and inescapably brought that factor into consideration by the very wording of the language on training category D—the training category of Colonel Stewart—by the selection of the criterion of "normal civilian pursuits" as applied to measuring the proficiency of an individual reservist in relation to his specific mobilization assignment.

Yes, the Air Force itself brought this factor into consideration—the application of Colonel Stewart's normal civilian pursuit of motion picture actor to his proficiency and relative need of activity, or inactivity as this case is, on his mobilization assignment of Deputy Director of Operations of the Strategic Air Command.

Do you believe that Colonel Stewart's work as a motion picture actor makes him so proficient for being Deputy Director of Operations of the Strategic Air Command that he does not have to train 48 periods a year or 24 periods a year like other reservists whose normal civilian pursuits are not related to their mobilization assignments? Do you believe that there is real justification for requiring of Colonel Stewart only one-fourth or one-half of training required of other reservists?

With interest I have read publicity evolving from the committee's consideration of the Stewart nomination. Much of that publicity has been misleading in attempting to give the impression that Colonel Stewart has been quite active in the Reserve and that he is outstandingly proficient as a pilot.

There are three pilot ratings for pilots in the Air Force. The highest is command pilot. The second highest is senior pilot. The lowest is pilot.

There are many active Air Force Reserve colonels who have the highest pilot rating of command pilot. Now for as important a mobilization assignment as Deputy Director of Operations of the Strategic Air Command, I would think that the Air Force would assign a reservist with the highest pilot rating of command pilot—and if not that, with the rating of senior pilot.

But it did not. For Colonel Stewart's rating is neither that of command pilot or senior pilot—but instead that of pilot, the lowest of the three pilot ratings.

At the hearing, General O'Donnell, the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel betrayed a shocking lack of knowledge on this very important point. I asked him in connection with Colonel Stewart's mobilization assignment and nomination if it wasn't a fact that the overwhelming number of rated Air Force Reserve general officers were either command pilots or senior pilots. Eagerly and without the slightest hesitancy or qualification, General O'Donnell answered categorically and flatly and with emphasis, "Oh, no. Definitely not."

I then asked him to furnish a list of all rated Air Force Reserve general officers, together with their ratings. When he subsequently furnished such a list, he also sought to have his answer for the printed copy of of the hearing changed from "Oh, no. Definitely not" to an opposite answer of "Yes." I invite your attention to pages 45 and 80 of the hearing record.

General O'Donnell's defense of the Stewart nomination was either so eager that he made a deliberate misrepresentation to the committee on a vital point—or he was so indifferent that he had made no effort to do his homework for the hearing and make it a point to be informed on a personnel matter on which he, as Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, should be informed and on which he was assigned by the Air Force the responsibility of being the Air Force representative at the hearing for the specific purpose of answering the questions of the committee. For after all, the committee did not ask for him to testify, it was the Air Force who designated him.

It is abundantly clear why General O'Donnell sought to change his false answer—for in the list that I requested, it was revealed that of the 21 rated Air Force Reserve general pilots, 18 are listed as command pilots or senior pilots and only 3 with the lowest pilot rating of pilot like Colonel Stewart. That is a ratio of 6 to 1—which I believe could reasonably be characterized as an overwhelming ratio as I so characterized it in my question to which General O'Donnell gave a false answer. On this I invite your attention to pages 45 and 46 of the hearing record.

Even then in his written answer and list subsequently submitted, General O'Donnell continued to give erroneous and inaccurate information to the committee. For he listed as one of the three pilots, Brig. Gen. Robert J. Smith—and this was in direct contradiction with information which he had earlier submitted to the committee in which he represented General Smith to be a command pilot. For this contradiction and further example of repeated sloppiness and inaccuracy of the Air Force in representations and information that it submits to the committee, I invite your attention to pages 6 and 46 of the hearing record.

It appears that the more accurate of these two representations is the earlier one at page 6 which represents General Smith to be a command pilot. That then makes the division 19 to 2 or a ratio of 9½ to 1, and an even more overwhelming ratio substantiating the observation that I made to which General O'Donnell gave a false answer.

Tone of the misleading information and misrepresentations made by representatives of the Air Force to the newspapers about the Stewart nomination was revealed in an item in the March 23, 1957, issue of the Air Force Times which stated:

"Action by Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Republican, of Maine, in temporarily blocking Reserve general promotions of 11 Air Force officers has stirred up considerable comment here. At question, it seems, is whether the officers have participated enough to warrant stars. Film star Jimmy Stewart, up for one star, is on the list. Insiders, citing his long record of participation and strong support of USAF, are decidedly unhappy over the holdup. The full list of names was published in Air Force Times for March 2."

Now I call your attention to that part of the item which states: "Insiders, citing his long record of participation * * *" and I recall your attention to the fact that in an 11-year period from September 1945 to July last year, Colonel Stewart participated only 9 days in Reserve activity. I ask you if that is a long record of participation or a long record of nonparticipation. It is just another example of the reverse thinking and the strange, contradictory, and distorted defense made by the Air Force on these nominations. Actually it constituted nothing less than a misrepresentation of Colonel Stewart's record on participation in the Reserve.

In keeping with this false publicity given to the newspapers on the Stewart nomi-

nation, an article in the Washington Daily News of April 4, 1957, reported that an official of the Air Force Association stated with respect to Colonel Stewart:

"He trains actively with the Reserve every year." When asked about this at the hearing, the Air Force Personnel Chief branded this as a false statement as he said, "That is not a true statement." On this I invite your attention to page 44 of the hearing record.

In the same newspaper article, the unidentified Air Force Association official is further quoted as saying about Colonel Stewart:

"He's had 18 hours as first pilot of a B–52." When asked if this statement was true, the Air Force Personnel Chief said, "I don't know, but my answer would be, 'No.' I don't see how he could be the first pilot of a B–52." On this I invite your attention to page 45 of the hearing record.

In the same newspaper article, the unidentified Air Force Association official was quoted as saying that Colonel Stewart could fly a B–52 anywhere in the world. When asked about this statement, the Air Force Personnel Chief not only admitted that Colonel Stewart could not be in command of a B–52—but what is even more important and significant in relation to Colonel Stewart's mobilization assignment as Deputy Director of Operations of the Strategic Air Command—the Air Force Personnel Chief admitted that Colonel Stewart is not current on any Air Force aircraft and that Colonel Stewart is not fully qualified on any military aircraft. On this I invite your attention to page 45 of the hearing record.

In the same newspaper article, Colonel Stewart himself is quoted as saying with respect to his nomination:

"I didn't even know I was up for brigadier. I read it in the papers."

When asked about this, the Air Force Personnel Chief admitted that Colonel Stewart had received an official telegram from the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel notifying him of his nomination. The Air Force Personnel Chief termed the newspaper item inaccurate and said that worldwide notice was given on December 14, 1956, through various newspapers and other news media that all Air Force reservists who had served 1 year as a colonel would be considered for promotion to brigadier general and that thus Stewart was put on notice. On this I invite your attention to pages 46 and 68 of the hearing record.

Thus, the hearing established that false stories had been carried in the newspapers making misrepresentations that (1) Colonel Stewart had a long record of participation in the Air Force Reserve when just the opposite was the case as he had a long record of nonparticipation; (2) that he trained actively with the Reserve every year when just the opposite was the case as he did not start such training until less than a year before the date of the article and had not performed a 15-day training tour for 11 years from the end of World War II until July 1956; (3) that he was first pilot of a B–52 when just the opposite was the case as he not only was not the first pilot of a B–52 but he was not even current or qualified on any military aircraft; and (4) that Colonel Stewart had had no notice or knowledge that he was being considered for promotion to brigadier general, when as a matter of fact he had been put on notice by the worldwide announcement made 72 days prior to announcement of the nominations and when he had received an official telegram of notification from the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel.

While this pattern and design of misrepresentations is disturbing on the test of truth alone, the significance of it is not limited to the factor of veracity. Perhaps even more significant in the revelation of the misrepresentations is the revelation of the facts that Colonel Stewart did not possess the record and proficiencies that were claimed for him in connection with his qualifications for his mobilization assignment as Deputy Director of Operations of the Strategic Air Command on which was based and justified his nomination to brigadier general.

As in the Montgomery case, again the Air Force pattern of disregard for truth, disregard for accuracy, and disregard for encouragement of active participation in the Air Force Reserve is again abundantly and repeatedly displayed in the Stewart case.

COL. JOHN R. ALISON

Col. John R. Alison is one of the eight Reserve colonels nominated for the rank of brigadier general in the Air Force Reserve. For the detailed facts in his case, your attention is invited to pages 49 through 53 of the committee hearing record.

Like Colonel Stewart, the question in the case of Colonel Alison is the record of inactivity in the Reserve for so many years—a record of only 6 days of Reserve service in a period of 9 years—a record of no Reserve activity in 1947, 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951, and 1952—and with only 3 points earned in 1953 and only 3 points earned in 1954.

Colonel Alison was almost completely inactive until he was given command of a Reserve reconnaissance wing in May of 1955. He did not work up to or earn that wing command through activity and participation in the Reserve. Instead it was the opposite as he demonstrated no willingness to become active in the Reserve until he was given a Reserve assignment that carried the authorization of the rank of brigadier general. This is hardly an example for the Air Force to exhibit to boost the morale of reservists who for years participate and train actively in the hopes of being rewarded with promotion from within the organization.

At page 52 of the hearing record in response to the request of Senator STENNIS for a list of all nominees who have served more than the minimum requirements, the Air Force listed Colonel Alison as being one of the "officers who are up for promotion [who] have had more than the minimum 15 days' active duty per year since 1954."

This is a misrepresentation and untruthful for the record on Alison submitted by the Air Force on pages 14 and 24 of the hearing record show that Alison had no 15-day active duty in 1954 and the first half of 1955 and that Alison earned only 3 points in 1954 and no points in the first half of 1955.

Again as in the cases of Colonel Montgomery and Colonel Stewart, here in the case of Colonel Alison we see the Air Force pattern of disregard for truth, disregard for accuracy, and disregard for encouragement of active participation in the Air Force Reserve abundantly and repeatedly displayed.

BRIG. GEN. ROBERT J. SMITH

Brig. Gen. Robert J. Smith is one of the three Reserve brigadier generals nominated for the rank of major general in the Air Force Reserve. For detailed facts in his case, your attention is invited to pages 5, 20, and 27 through 33 of the committee hearing record.

Based on information furnished by the Air Force to the committee, it does not appear that General Smith has had a consistently active participation in the Air Force Reserve since 1950. The information furnished and brought out at the hearing reveals that at the time of the hearing:

(1) He had not performed a 15-day tour of duty since fiscal year 1950 although that is the only requirement of the training category D in which he has been placed;

(2) He earned only 1 point in 1951—did not earn any points in 1952—only 12 points in 1953—only 18 points in 1955—only 23 points in 1956—and only 10 points in the first half of fiscal 1957;

(3) No considerable Reserve activity or participation is expected of him in the future, since he has been assigned a training category D, one of the least-active training categories;

(4) At the time of the hearing he had taken no training at all in any of his three mobilization assignments since 1951—or for over 6 years, which prompts me to make the inquiring observation of what is the purpose of a mobilization assignment if you do not train in it?; and

(5) His last three mobilization assignments have been on positions occupied by colonels while he has been a brigadier general and is now nominated for promotion to major general.

General Smith is in training category D in which reservists participate in no inactive duty training but are required to perform a 15-day tour of active duty each year. Yet at the time of the hearing (May 2, 1957) he had not performed a 15-day tour of active duty since 1950.

General O'Donnel[1], personnel chief, in answer to a question put by Senator STENNIS stated that a 2 weeks' tour is the minimum requirement (see p. 51 of the hearing record). In answer to questions put to him by Chairman RUSSELL, General O'Donnell stated that those who did not do the 2 weeks' duty would be dropped from the rolls and in answer to Chairman RUSSELL's question of "They are dropped from the rolls?" General O'Donnell said, "Yes." (See pp. 53 and 59 of the hearing record.) Yet, General Smith, in spite of the fact that at the time of the hearing he had not performed a 2 weeks' tour since 1950, had not been dropped from the rolls.

Apparently the committee's investigation and holdup on these Reserve general nominations has had some beneficial effect in this case of General Smith, for the first time since 1950—for the first time in 7 years—General Smith has performed a 15-day tour of active-duty training.

However, the last-minute timing of that Reserve participation on the part of General Smith is most revealing in its implications. He did not comply with this training category D requirement until the very last possible time—he just barely got under the wire in a photofinish on compliance with Reserve training regulations.

He performed that required duty in the period June 16 through June 30 of this year. His deadline for starting such compliance was June 16 and for ending it was June 30. Had he started in 1 day later, he would have been in default and subject to being dropped from the rolls according to testimony given by General O'Donnell.

Yet, had the committee automatically rubber-stamped these nominations when they came up in February and not taken a position that the Air Force comply with the law and enforce its regulations on Reserve training and participation—and had General Smith failed to make his photofinish—we would have had the situation of the committee approving of the promotion of a reservist to major general who shortly thereafter had been dropped from the rolls for failure to participate and comply with the Reserve training regulations.

The Smith promotion nomination for promotion to major general was submitted to the committee on February 25, 1957—the hearing was on May 2, 1957. At neither of these times had General Smith fully complied with the requirements of his low training category D. The holdup on committee action on these nominations has been because of the training deficiencies of the nominees.

If it has served no other purpose, it is clear that the committee's holdup of these nominations until after the end of fiscal year 1957

was apparently convincing to some of the nominees, who finally met the requirements before fiscal year 1957 expired, that the committee meant business and would insist upon the nominees meeting the minimum 15-day active duty tour even if the Air Force didn't so insist.

It will be interesting to see if these nominees with such poor participation and training records and who so tardily begin to meet this requirement, will continue to do so once they have gotten their promotions or if they will lapse back again into their previous deficient and inactive records on training participation.

It is of further interest that only after the challenge was made on the training participation records of the nominees was a record of all 11 nominees doing a 15-day tour achieved—that fiscal 1957 is the first year in which all nominees complied with this requirement.

At page 28 of the hearing record, General O'Donnell made a direct and unequivocal misrepresentation to the committee in stating that General Smith had done a 15-day tour in 1956 and had served from December 10 to December 31, in 1956. When it was called to his attention that the record of information furnished to the committee by General O'Donnell's office on General Smith did not support his assertion, General O'Donnell again repeated his misrepresentation.

The truth is that General Smith did not serve at any time during the period of December 10 to December 31, 1956.

So that there may not be the slightest question about the direct and unequivocal misrepresentation that General O'Donnell not only made, but even repeated, when his attention was called to the fact that the information his office had submitted was at variance with his misrepresentation, I quote the hearing record on this.

"Senator SMITH. * * * Since General Smith has had no 15-day tour since 1950, and has earned only a nominal number of points for other years, what is the basis of his promotion to major general?

"General O'DONNELL. Senator SMITH, he met the minimum requirements for retention, year of 1956, in serving from the 10th to the 31st of December. * * *

"Senator SMITH. I do not see that it does, in this record, but of course you know.

"General O'DONNELL. To December 31, 1956."

Later General O'Donnell attempted to change his testimony to strike his false answer and misrepresentation on this point. He was not permitted to change his false testimony but instead permitted to have the Air Force file a letter of correction of his false testimony in the appendix of the hearing record at page 79.

And as a final note on the misrepresentations made by the Air Force in the General Smith case, attention is invited to the glaring contradiction in the written information submitted by General O'Donnell to the committee.

At page 45 of the hearing record, when General O'Donnell, in answering my question about the overwhelming number of rated Reserve general officers being command pilots or senior pilots instead of the lowest rating of pilot like Colonel Stewart had, denied that was true with the emphatic statement of "Oh, no. Definitely not" (which incidentally was another direct misrepresentation in itself and which General O'Donnell later sought to have stricken from the printed record). I then asked General O'Donnell to furnish the committee with a list of all rated Reserve general officers by name and by rating. He later did and in that list he submitted, General Smith was listed as one of the small number of three rated Reserve Air Force generals with the lowest pilot rating of pilot. I invite your attention to page 46 of the hearing record.

Yet, on February 25, 1957, when the nominations were sent to the Senate, General O'Donnell sent information on each nominee and in the printed information on General Smith it was stated that General Smith was a command pilot. I call your attention to page 6 of the hearing record.

Now just which pilot rating does General Smith have—the lowest rating of pilot or the highest rating of command pilot? To say the least, this is another example of the shocking carelessness of General O'Donnell and his office with the truth and with accuracy in these cases.

But it is in character and in the Air Force pattern of disregard for truth, disregard for accuracy, and disregard for encouragement of active participation in the Air Force Reserve as previously exhibited in the résumé of the records in the Montgomery case, the Stewart case, and the Alison case.

BRIG. GEN. JOHN P. HENEBRY

Brig. Gen. John P. Henebry is one of the three Reserve generals nominated for the rank of major general in the Air Force Reserve. For detailed facts in his case, your attention is invited to pages 4, 19, 57, and 59 of the committee hearing record.

General Henebry failed to perform a 15-day tour of active duty in fiscal years 1953, 1954, and 1956.

General Henebry has a training category A assignment, which, according to Air Force representations made to the committee at pages 53 and 71 of the hearing record, requires personnel assigned to this category "to perform 48 inactive duty training periods annually and to perform a 15-day tour of active duty."

Of these two training category A requirements, General Henebry complied with only one in fiscal 1957—and that he did very belatedly and, like General Smith, almost too late—and only after these nominations had been held up by the committee because of the training record deficiencies of the nominees.

The nominations have been before the committee since February 25, 1957, and the committee hearing was on May 2, 1957. General Henebry's retention year ended June 30, 1957. He didn't perform his required 15-day tour of active duty until June 9 through June 23, 1957—just a week before the deadline—and 4 months after his nomination had been held up in committee because of his noncompliance with the requirements of training category A—and 7 weeks after the committee's hearing on May 2, 1957.

While General Henebry thus did finally and belatedly comply with one requirement of his training category A, nevertheless he failed to comply with the other requirement of that category—performing 48 inactive duty training periods annually.

He not only failed to perform 48 inactive duty training periods in his retention year 1957 (which is also the fiscal year 1957) but his record on this requirement was actually zero on this training category A requirement as he did not perform any inactive duty training period in his 1957 retention year. In fact, in all of that year he earned only 26 points altogether, all of which was active duty, including 15 points for his belated 15-day active duty tour.

General O'Donnell testified that no waivers had been granted to any of the nominees (see p. 60 of the hearing record) and that all nominees had met the minimum requirements (see p. 59 of the hearing record).

Obviously, General O'Donnell gave false testimony and made serious misrepresentations as to General Henebry's record and participation—for General Henebry obviously failed to meet the minimum rules and yet General O'Donnell says that none of the nominees were granted waivers and all nominees met the minimum rules. He made these answers at points in the hearing record when Senator SYMINGTON spoke specifically about General Henebry.

General O'Donnell at the hearing misrepresented that General Henebry had had more than the 15 days' active duty per year since 1954 (see p. 52 of the hearing record) when the truth was that as of the time of this representation to the committee General Henebry had not performed 15 days' active duty in his then current retention year. Again, as in the Montgomery case, Stewart case, the Alison case, and the Smith case, there is repeated the Air Force pattern of disregard for truth, disregard for accuracy, and disregard for encouragement of active participation in the Air Force Reserve.

COLS. DANIEL DE BRIER, RAMSAY D. POTTS, JR., AND KENNETH STILES

Cols. Daniel DeBrier, Ramsay D. Potts, Jr., and Kenneth Stiles are 3 of the 8 Reserve colonels nominated for the rank of brigadier general in the Air Force Reserve. For detailed facts in their cases see pages 9, 12, 15, 22, 23, 25, and 57 through 60 of the committee hearing record.

These reservists have considerably better participation and training records than the nominees I have previously discussed. But Colonel Potts did not perform a 2-week duty tour in 1951, 1953, 1954, and 1955—a total of 4 years. Colonel DeBrier did not perform a 2-week duty tour in 1953, 1954, 1955, and 1956—a total of 4 years. Colonel Stiles did not perform a 2-week duty tour in 1951, 1952, and 1955—a total of 3 years.

But according to an International News Service article dated March 16, 1957:

"The Air Force said none of the officers could have been nominated if they had not served 2 weeks of active duty each year."

According to this statement attributed to the Air Force, these Reserve colonels would not be eligible for nomination.

Not until I confronted General O'Donnell with this newspaper article was there any Air Force refutation of this statement. In other words, the Air Force for 47 days after the publication of this statement permitted it to stand unchallenged and permitted the newspaper reading public to be misled in this respect. And it did not correct it until I confronted General O'Donnell with the statement.

There was another inaccurate impression created in that article about these nominations as the article said at another point:

"However, the Air Force and the Reserve Officers Association said all 11 men nominated for major general and brigadier general are fully qualified and active."

Now in sharp contrast to the Air Force's failure for 47 days (and not until I confronted General O'Donnell with it) to refute the statement in the article that the Air Force had said that none of the officers could have been nominated if they had not served 2 weeks of active duty each year, the very morning that this INS article appeared in the papers the national president of the Reserve Officers Association called my office and repudiated the statement in the article attributed to the Reserve Officers Association.

In sharp contrast to the attitude and policy of the Air Force to permit a false impression to be given to the reading public and failure to refute such a false representation until its hand was called on this matter, the national president of the Reserve Officers Association immediately, and on his own initiative, acted to refute the misrepresentation attributed to the Reserve Officers Association. He followed up with a letter to me officially repudiating the false representation attributed to the Reserve Officers Association. On this I invite your attention to that letter at pages 17 and 18 of the committee hearing record.

Again as in the Montgomery case, the Stewart case, the Alison case, the Smith case, and the Henebry case, there is repeated the Air Force pattern of disregard for truth, disre-

gard for accuracy, and disregard for encouragement of active participation in the Air Force Reserve. The only difference is that the degree in the DeBrier, Potts, and Stiles cases is somewhat less.

COL. JESS LARSON

Col. Jess Larson is one of the eight Reserve colonels nominated for the rank of brigadier general in the Air Force Reserve. For detailed facts in his case see pages 6, 20, and 54 through 57.

Colonel Larson has a good record of Air Force Reserve participation beginning in 1953 up to the present time. However, he did not join the Air Force Reserve until August 1952. In the short space of 4½ years he is nominated for promotion to brigadier general.

The Air Force represented to the committee that Colonel Larson had a training assignment in training category A. On this I invite your attention to page 20 of the hearing record.

Since the Air Force at pages 53 and 71 of the hearing record made the following statement about membership in training category A:

"Training category A: Air Reserve wings rated mobilization assignees, separate units such as AACS squadrons, navigation training squadrons are identified with this training category," and since Colonel Larson had the mobilization assignment of Director of Legislation and Liaison, Office, Secretary of the Air Force, and was not a rated mobilization assignee or in any of the units or groups ascribed to training category A, I asked Air Force representatives at the hearing how Colonel Larson could have a training category A assignment.

I never got a satisfactory answer at the hearing. There was no attempt on the part of the Air Force representatives at the hearing to deny that Colonel Larson had a training category A assignment or to admit that the information given was incorrect.

To the contrary, Air Force representatives left the committee with the impression that Colonel Larson did in fact have a training category A assignment. And what is more the Air Force was perfectly willing to permit that erroneous impression stand and the misrepresentation to remain uncorrected.

For it was not until after I made an issue of getting at the truth on this point by writing a letter to the chairman of the committee on May 17, 1957, asking for the Air Force to clear up the matter, that the Air Force finally did admit that it had submitted incorrect information to the committee and that Colonel Larson did not have a training category A assignment but rather that he had a training category B assignment. And the Air Force did not make this correction until 22 days after the hearing. On this see page 56 of the hearing record.

What training category Colonel Larson had was not of any immense importance in this matter. What is significant is that the Air Force was willing to let the committee remain misled until I called the hand of the Air Force on this point. It illustrates again the disregard of the Air Force for giving the committee the truth and accurate information—an indication of a calloused indifference to the committee's request for accurate information.

The frantic extent to which the Air Force has gone to defend these nominations was sharply illustrated by the observations of an Air Force defender at pages 56 and 57 of the hearing record. The Air Force defender argued that the Air Force is constantly criticized in some quarters for its lack of logistic ability—and that the Larson nomination was justified because Colonel Larson is an expert on logistics.

Well, even granting that these assertions are true, what relevancy do they have to the Larson nomination? Obviously none—for Colonel Larson does not have a mobilization assignment in the field of logistics—and the promotions to brigadier general are keyed to the very mobilization assignments these nominees have.

Instead Colonel Larson has the mobilization assignment of Director of Legislation and Liaison of the Air Force which is not a part of the logistics command and has nothing to do with logistics. How ridiculous can the Air Force defenders of these nominations make themselves in attempting to pull irrelevant smokescreens over the real issues in these nominations? To what extent will they go?

Again as in the Montgomery case, the Stewart case, the Alison case, the Smith case, the Henebry case, the DeBrier case, the Potts case, and the Stiles case, there is repeated the Air Force pattern of disregard for truth, disregard for accuracy, and disregard for encouragement for long active participation in the Air Force Reserve. The degree is somewhat less. But this time something new has been added—and that something new is the disregard for honest logic.

SELECTION BOARDS

Analysis of the representations made by the Air Force through General O'Donnell and his office with respect to the selection boards that selected these nominees for promotion to the ranks of brigadier general and major general reveals a confused, contradictory and disturbing situation.

The Air Force represents at some points in the hearing record that there were 2 separate boards—1 for brigadier general and 1 for major general. On this see pages 64 and 68 of the hearing record. Yet at other points in the hearing record the Air Force definitely gives the impression that only one board sat on all these promotions. On this see pages 62, 63 and 81.

For example at page 63 of the hearing record, General O'Donnell stated:

"After the board was in session, the chairman came to me and said that they were having a great deal of difficulty in breaking down—they got their 3 major generals all right, but they were in real straits for selecting the 5 best out of 8 that they had narrowed the field down to, and they asked for permission to have their quotas changed."

This statement of General O'Donnell speaks in terms of one board making the selections for both major generals and brigadier generals.

More than that, it represents that the 3 major generals were selected prior to the granting of the authority to select 8 instead of 5 brigadier generals. Yet, the Air Force at pages 64 and 68 represented that the major general board did not sit until after the brigadier general board completed its work and that "The boards were not in session concurrently at any time."

Perhaps there were two boards and perhaps they were not in session concurrently, but they had common membership in some instances as admitted by General O'Donnell at page 27 of the hearing record. And the two boards apparently had the same president or chairman as indicated by General O'Donnell's answer on page 63 quoted above.

Common membership on two boards whereby some brigadier generals, who sit in the morning on a brigadier general selection board with major generals, are up for consideration from promotion to major general that afternoon by some of the major generals they sat with that morning—such common membership arrangement in my opinion does not make for a proper selection process. Yet, this was the case in this instance.

In fact the Air Force reports that the brigadier general board was composed of 6 members—3 regulars and 3 reservists and that the major general board was composed of 5 members—4 regulars and 1 reservist. There was a common member composition of the 2 boards in 4 officers, as the 3 regulars that served on the brigadier general board also served on the major general board and 1 of the 3 reserve officers that served on the brigadier general board also served on the major general board. The officer that served as president of the brigadier general board also served as president of the major general board. Two of the Reserve brigadier generals serving on the brigadier general board stepped out when the major general board met and considered them among others for promotion to major general. The major general board was not a 6-man board like the brigadier general board since only 1 officer—a Regular—was added to the 4 officers, who had served on the brigadier general board, to make up the law-required composition of 5 members.

BRIGADIER GENERAL SELECTION BOARD

The official duty of this board was to consider fully the 1,969 Reserve colonels eligible for promotion to brigadier general. Yet, this board was in session only 1½ days—January 22, 1957 and the morning of January 23, 1957. On the basis of an 8-hour working day, the board members then had on the average only 22 seconds to review the record of each one of the eligible 1,969 Reserve colonels—hardly enough time for an objective review and evaluation. Your attention to these facts is invited to page 64 of the hearing record.

In answer to my question about how it was originally decided that only 5 Reserve colonels would be selected for promotion to brigadier general and only 3 Reserve brigadier generals for promotion to major general, General O'Donnell stated that the Air Force Reserve is not up to strength or close to it with the filling of the number of Air Force Reserve general positions authorized by the law because (1) to do so would "stifle and stagnate promotion" and (2) that the promotion policy on the Reserve generals followed the promotion policy on the Regular generals.

General O'Donnell said specifically at page 63:

"What we try to do is, we try to handle the Reserves the same way we do the Regulars, and we try to make it possible each year—we missed last year—each year we hope to have an increment promoted, and we don't promote everybody all at once because it would stifle and stagnate promotion from then on. For instance, we are entitled by law to have three-hundred-and-thirty-odd Regular generals, and we have only 156. We space them over the years."

Both the logic and the accuracy of this statement of General O'Donnell is subject to serious question and challenge. For the Army Reserve is kept up to authorized Reserve general strength or close to it—and if the Army does it for its reservists why doesn't the Air Force do it for its reservists? Why does the Air Force ask Congress to authorize 157 Air Force Reserve general positions and then proceed to fill only 78 of those authorized positions—to fill less than one-half of what the Air Force itself asked for on authorized Reserve general positions?

Written information furnished to the committee by General O'Donnell on February 25, 1957, on the filling of the authorized Air Force Reserve general positions and on May 29, 1957, on the filling of authorized Air Force Regular general positions contradicts the above-quoted statement of General O'Donnell at the hearing on May 2, 1957.

The written information submitted by General O'Donnell to the committee on May 29, 1957, on Air Force Regular general positions is that there are 446 Air Force Regular general positions authorized by law and that of this the Senate Armed Services Committee has set a limitation of 425; that of this number, 411 of these positions have been filled; in other words, that the Air Force has filled 411 of the 425 Air Force Regular general positions permitted by the

Senate committee limitation, thus leaving only 14 vacancies unfilled out of the 425 positions. Ten of the 425 positions are filled by Reserve generals on extended active duty. This is hardly the same record of filling only 156 out of some three-hundred-and-thirty-odd Air Force Regular general positions as represented by General O'Donnell at the hearing. It is glaringly contradictory.

Before you accept the hearing statement of General O'Donnell that the Air Force applies to Reserve general promotions the same policy that it applies to Regular general promotions, just make a statistical comparison of the official, written information submitted to the committee by General O'Donnell on February 25, 1957, and May 29, 1957.

That information shows the following facts and numbers on general officer positions in the Air Force divided between regulars and reservists:

	Number authorized limitation	Number assigned	Number unfilled	Percentage unfilled
Regulars	[1] 415	[2] 401	14	3½
Reserves	157	78	79	51

[1] 425 minus 10 reservists.
[2] 411 minus 10 reservists.

In other words, the cold and factual statistics refute General O'Donnell's misrepresentation at the hearing to the committee—for these statistics show that the Air Force fills up practically all of its authorized Regular general spots with a high 96½ percent assignment record and a low vacancy record of only 3½ percent—whereas in sharp contrast, these statistics expose the fact that the Air Force fills up less than one-half of the Reserve general positions authorization and has a vacancy rate of 51 percent. In other words the Reserve general vacancy rate percentagewise to the Regular general vacancy rate is a rate of 15 to 1—15 times as great.

In the face of these undisputed statistics, how can General O'Donnell represent that the Air Force policy on Reserve general selections and assignments follow the same policy set for Regular generals? How can he, or the Air Force, in the face of these statistics deny that the real truth is just the opposite of what General O'Donnell represented at the hearing to the committee? How can he, or the Air Force, in the face of these statistics, deny that there is a double standard applied by the Air Force to regulars and reservists that discriminates against the reservists with the policy being to fill practically all of the Regular general authorized spots and in direct contrast to fill less than half of the Reserve general authorized spots?

This is just another illustration in this Air Force pattern of representing its position with respect to the Reserve of being favorable when the cold facts show that it is not.

Another disturbing facet about the brigadier general selection board is the contradictory statements made by Secretary of the Air Force Quarles and General O'Donnell on just how the board arrived at its selection of the eight Reserve colonel nominees for promotion to brigadier general. I previously outlined this in the discussion of the Montgomery case.

In that résumé, I revealed how on the one hand it was represented to the committee by General O'Donnell and his office that all eight Reserve colonel nominees were considered so "equally best qualified" and "so closely alined" that the board could not select any 5 best of the 8 and had to ask that the instructions be amended to permit the selection of all 8—while on the other hand, in his special defense of the Montgomery nomination, Secretary of the Air Force Quarles wrote that a "first 5" were selected and that Montgomery was in the "first 5" and not in the "additional 3." So that no one less than the then Secretary of the Air Force stated that the board did find a "first 5" best over the "additional 3" and thus that all 8 were not found "equally best qualified" as represented by General O'Donnell.

Again we have another illustration of the Air Force pattern of disregard for accuracy.

MAJOR GENERAL SELECTION BOARD

The Air Force has informed the committee that the composition of the major general selection board was 4 Regular officers and 1 Reserve officer. This composition raises a serious question as to the legality of this board for section 203 (b) of the Reserve Officer Personnel Act states:

"At least 50 percent of the members of any selection board appointed under the provisions of this act shall, to the extent practicable, be Reserve officers."

The major general selection board was 20 percent composed of Reserve officers—1 out of 5. Thus, this selection board would clearly be illegal and its acts voided and without any authority and standing were it not for the escape clause of "to the extent practicable."

And as is to be expected in this continuing Air Force pattern of finding loopholes, of stressing minimum compliance with the law and regulations, and of failure to encourage participation in the Air Force Reserve—in this instance of sitting on a major general selection board—the Air Force falls back on this loophole in the law and on this escape clause.

Actually, in this loophole-strategy-device pattern, the Air Force could have had the major general selection board composed of all Regular officers and no Reserve officers and still have technically squeezed through the loophole in the law. This would certainly violate the spirit of the law and the intent of Congress even though technically complying with the letter of the law through a loophole.

That is, in principle, what did happen in this case for the difference of a selection board composed of five Regulars and no Reserves is only a difference in slight degree from the actual selection board composition of 4 Regulars and 1 Reserve. Neither meets the 50 percent standard which would dictate at least 3 Reserve officers on the board—and the actual composition of the board was nearer a zero percent of Reserve officers than a 50 percent.

As the principal Senate sponsor of the Reserve Officer Personnel Act of 1954, I know what the real intent of this section 203 (b) was. It was to insure that the Reserve officers themselves would have at least one-half of the voice on their own promotions instead of those promotions being completely dominated and controlled by the Regular officers.

And when I say Reserve officers having a voice, I mean an independent voice—the kind of independence of the reservist whose daily peacetime occupation is a civilian occupation or pursuit—and not a Reserve officer who has been on extended active duty for so long that his identity has become more associated with the regulars than with the reservists.

Yet the sole Reserve officer—the only Reserve officer—serving on this major general selection board was a Reserve officer who has been on extended active duty for over 6 years now—and regardless of his fine record—whose daily contacts for these several years has unbrokenly been more constantly with Regular officers and with Regular thinking on Reserve matters than with reservists engaged in civilian occupations.

The Air Force resorted to the loophole clause and assigned only one Reserve officer to the major general selection board since apparently there were no other Reserve major generals available to serve on the board.

Frankly, I am not impressed with this reason. For such a condition—such a paucity and rarity of Reserve major generals—is the fault of no one but the Air Force itself. For the Air Force had filled only 17 of the 77 authorized Reserve major general positions that Congress has given to it. In other words, at the time that this major general selection board met there were 60 unfilled Reserve major general positions as contrasted to only 17 filled Reserve major general positions.

If the Air Force would fill a respectable number of these 60 unfilled Reserve major general positions, it could easily have 3 Reserve major generals serving on major general selection boards. No, the scarcity of Reserve major generals to serve on this board is an Air Force created scarcity—and apparently for its own convenience and for continued dominance of the Reserve selection board by Regular officers, contrary to the letter and intent of the law.

In the attempted explanation of unavailability of Reserve major generals to sit on this board, the Air Force reported that one Reserve major general had informed the Air Force he was unavailable to sit on the board. That, in itself, is disturbing—for the major general selection board sat only one-half of 1 day—only in the afternoon of 1 day.

Just how interested and active in the Air Force Reserve is a Reserve major general who won't sit for one-half day, for one afternoon on a selection board? Just how much is he contributing to the Air Force Reserve by such an attitude of unavailability? Regardless of how much an admirable war record he may have, what is his real value to the Air Force and the Air Force Reserve by such an attitude of unavailability for such a short time? In fact, this raises a question of just how active has this particular service-declining Reserve major general been since the end of World War II in the Reserve?

Another reason why I am not impressed with the Air Force not having the composition of the major general selection board comply with the intent, at least, of the law, is that if there were not enough Reserve major generals available to sit on the board at that time, then why have the board sit at that time? Why not set a time when enough Reserve major generals are available to sit to make the composition of the board comply with both the intent and the letter of the law? Why not set such a time if the Air Force is not going to require from its Reserve major generals such needed and important participation in the Air Force Reserve as sitting on a selection board to enable the Air Force to comply with the law without having to resort to loopholes?

Again as has been illustrated repeatedly and abundantly heretofore in the cases and the examples set forth, we see clearly exhibited and displayed a continuing Air Force pattern of disregard for encouragement for active participation in the Reserve and a disregard for complying with the spirit of the law—but instead an emphasis on squeezing through the loopholes and doing only the bare minimum requirements.

MISREPRESENTATIONS MADE CONCERNING NOMINEES

One of the most disturbing things about these nominations is the heavy preponderance of misrepresentations made in connection with these nominations. In all of the 17 years that I have served in Congress, I have never seen the truth treated so lightly as in the defense of these nominations—I have never seen such a display of disregard for accuracy and the truth.

In the presentation that I have already made I have documented at least 23 instances of false and untruthful representa-

tions about these nominees, their records, and the manner in which they were selected.

Five of these misrepresentations were attributed to sources outside the Air Force. The responsibility for the 18 other misrepresentations and false statements is that of the Air Force itself—16 of which are attributable to the Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, Lt. Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, Jr.

This is not a matter to be taken lightly. It is a grave matter which raises the very serious question and consideration of whether, in the interest of encouraging and inducing more truthful testimony and accurate answers and information to questions asked by the Senate Armed Services Committee and its members, it will be necessary in the future for the committee to place General O'Donnell under oath before interrogating him.

The printed record clearly documents these misrepresentations and falsehoods. What the printed record does not reveal is the attempt made by General O'Donnell to do a sweeping and extensive rewriting of his public hearing testimony.

That transcript is 104 pages in length. Of those 104 pages, General O'Donnell made statements and gave answers on 83 pages.

Now of the 83 pages on which General O'Donnell gave answers and made statements, he sought to change his answers and statements on 62 pages. In other words, he sought to change his answers and testimony on about three-fourths of the pages on which his answers and statements appear, and in this attempt of his he left unchanged only about one-fourth or 21 pages.

If that is not literally a wholesale rewriting of one's testimony, I don't know what is.

Of the 62 pages on which General O'Donnell sought to change his answers, 43 pages are on answers to questions that I asked him. In contrast, there were only six pages on which he gave answers to me that he did not attempt to change. In other words, he changed his answers to me at the rate of more than 6 of every 7 pages.

On all three of the pages on which Senator Barrett questioned General O'Donnell with respect to the financial aspects of Colonel Montgomery's attempted retirement and later resignation from the Regular Air Force and his appointment in the Reserve, General O'Donnell sought to change his answers.

On 5 of the 6 pages on which he gave answers to questions asked by Senator STENNIS, General O'Donnell sought to change his answers.

In response to the more sympathetic questions of Senator SYMINGTON, General O'Donnell's rate of attempted rewriting of his testimony is not nearly so high as in these previously mentioned instances. For on 12 of the 21 pages on which General O'Donnell gave answers to Senator SYMINGTON'S questions, General O'Donnell sought no changes.

I opposed permitting General O'Donnell to make such a sweeping rewriting of his public testimony. I notified the chairman of the committee that I felt that the integrity of the committee would be better served by General O'Donnell submitting a letter of changes and extensions to be placed in the hearing record and to let the original transcript stand in its true, pure and unadulterated form.

General O'Donnell was then notified that his attempted sweeping rewriting of his testimony was not acceptable to the committee, and that instead he should submit such changes and extensions he desired in the form of a letter.

General O'Donnell then drastically scaled down the rate of his requested changes and extensions in his testimony from that on 62 pages that he sought in the official reporter's transcript to only 11 pages as listed in the Air Force letter of correction appearing in the appendix of the committee hearing record at pages 79, 80, and 81. Quite a scaling down to only a fraction of the attempted sweeping rewriting he first sought before being denied by the committee.

There were only two other changes in the Air Force letter of correction with respect to the testimony of the other Air Force witness who had relatively little participation at the hearing and played a comparatively very minor role.

The most charitable characterization that I can ascribe to General O'Donnell's testimony and appearance before the committee is to conclude that he was not very well informed on the matters on which he was interrogated, and that he apparently made no effort to get himself informed and prepared to answer questions and to provide the committee with accurate information.

Since he was selected by the Air Force to be its principal representative at the hearing and its spokesman to answer the questions and was not the selection of the committee, I would suggest to the Air Force that in the future it require its official spokesmen appearing at hearings of the committee to do their homework before coming before the committee. The hearing record makes it abundantly clear that General O'Donnell did not see fit to do the committee the courtesy of doing his homework. In his failure to do so, he not only exhibited lack of respect for the committee but he pointedly let the Air Force down in his role as its representative and spokesman.

EFFECT OF NOMINATIONS ON MORALE OF AIR FORCE RESERVISTS

At the committee hearing, defenders of these nominations contended that the selection of these very nominees was beneficial to the morale of Air Force reservists. See pages 32, 33, and 43 of the committee hearing record. In fact, they characterized these nominations and selections as inspirational (see pp. 49 and 50 of the hearing record) and the type to draw a good many people to the Reserves (see p. 43 of the hearing record).

Perhaps these defenders are right. I do not question the war records and the characters of the nominees. What I do question is their degree of activity in the Reserve—or more accurately put, their inactivity in the Reserve. I do not think that their inactivity has been such as to be an example for all reservists to follow—for if it were we surely would have a woefully inactive Air Force Reserve. Nor do I think that their records of inactivity are inspirational to thousands of Air Force Reservists, or that the selection of them for general rank on the basis of such records has served as an inspiration to all Air Force Reservists, particularly the really active Reservists, or that their selections have boosted the morale of the membership of the Air Force.

Certainly the mail and oral expressions which I have received on these selections has not indicated any real basis for these claims by the defenders of the nominations. To the contrary, the overwhelming expression which I have received has been just the opposite of what the defenders of these nominations claim.

Some past national presidents of the Reserve Officers Association and the Air Reserve Association have criticized these selections very vigorously. They have fully supported the holdup and investigation on the nominations. I shall not name them, because to do so would subject them to the vindictive, retaliatory punitive action that the Air Force would probably take against them.

I have had Regular Air Force generals—both one star and two star—express to me their resentment and criticism of the Montgomery nomination, in view of his leaving the Regular Air Force and then being able to get through the Reserve just as much retirement pay as they who faithfully stay on the job every day in the Regular Air Force for 30 years, while Montgomery leaves the Air Force for a high paying civilian job. I have been told by nongeneral officers who served under Montgomery of the bad effect which his resignation had on the morale and recruiting program of the service. I will not name these men because I know that to do so would destroy their careers in the Air Force simply because they expressed their honest reactions.

To those who claim that these nominations and selections of Air Force reservists with such inactive records is good for the morale of the Air Force Reserve, I quote from a few of the communications I have received on this matter. These communications include letters and telegrams from Maine to California—from all over the continental United States—yes, even a cablegram from outside the continental United States—from Reserve wing commanders, from Reserve squadron commanders, from persons inside the Department of the Air Force, from persons who have served under some of the nominees, and from others.

Here are a few of the expressions:

From the commander of an Air Reserve squadron: "The reason I write is not because I am objective about this. I with most of my officers who have done more than what was required am being dropped from a half decent program when 11 officers some of whom have done a hell of a lot less are being elevated to or in general rank. We would like to know if they are going to be required to meet any criteria after they are promoted and what such requirements will be. It is heartening to know that someone will make an effort to inquire into the ground rules and raise the question as to their observance. Many officers share my feeling so please accept our thanks for what must appear at times as a thankless job."

From the commander of an Air Reserve wing: "Congratulations on your stand blocking promotions of Reserve Air Force generals. It is time someone recognizes the flagrant violations against more deserving officers."

From inside the Department of the Air Force in an official envelope of the Air Force: "The enclosed clipping announcing the public hearing of these promotions has reestablished my faith in the responsibilities of the Senate Armed Services Committee. More important were your personal efforts in writing to Chairman RUSSELL your contentions relative to these promotions. This action by you, in the final analysis, will bestow honorable credit to you in discharging the trust of your high office and prove to be of unestimable service to the primary mission of our Nation's military establishment."

From a California Air Force Reserve colonel: "As I understand the situation, you have been particularly concerned with the promotion of * * * a Reserve colonel, due to lack of active participation. I would venture a guess that several hundred Air Force Reserve colonels have been similarly concerned due to the fact that as actively participating and dedicated Reserve officers we have continuously and conscientiously contributed a goodly portion of our 25 to 30 or more years of military service with at least an occasional thought that a few might ultimately earn a promotion. This then raises a question as to whether the momentary publicity which would result from * * * promotion would offset the effect on morale of several hundred Reserve colonels each of whom in turn could influence hundreds and possibly thousands of other active Reserve officers."

From a retired Air Force Reserve colonel in Maine: "* * * if movie actors, Wall Street

brokers and lawyers and others of big business or social prominence are the only officers promoted to brigadier general from the Reserves, the Reserves will not last very long.

"Instead of equable distribution of promotions of Reserve colonels to brigadier general spread over the country, the nominations seem to be of people like * * * and others in like categories, one of their principal qualifications apparently being the publicity and glamour they bring to the particular service. Obviously their eminence in the eyes of the general public is helpful and is a factor to be considered. However, I think you are very right when you ask about the nominees being truly active reservists."

From a Texas Air Force Reserve colonel: "I am a full colonel in the Air Force Reserve. I have no intention of degrading anyone but it does make me sick at my stomach to see how things can be twisted and bent in order that a few friends of some people can be promoted when they have not done what is required of them. Read ROPA and see."

From Chicago: "I wish to commend you on holding up appointments for Reserve generals in the Air Force. The morale of the Regular Air Force is at stake."

From a Tennessee reservist: "* * * Colonel * * * may have been an inspiration for the enlistment of many Reserve recruits, but the proposed promotion and other promotions which have been made on a comparable basis made many Reserve officers resign or request placement on the retired list."

From an Air Force Reserve colonel in New Jersey: "You are to be commended most highly for investigating the sorry records of those who were nominated recently for a general rank in the Reserves. I am sure every conscientious, hard-working colonel joins me in thanking you for your stand. * * * It is a great morale booster, and a great pleasure to all qualified Reserve officers."

From a Massachusetts Air Force reservist: "All of us men and women in the Reserve forces want to congratulate you on your great stand against outright promotions for inactive reservists who, at present, are in the limelight for promotion to general."

From a Pennsylvania reservist: "Read your question. Think it's great. What about Ted Williams. The Marine Corps twice had his most productive years interrupted by the armed services. If they are going to make a general out of * * * why don't they make a major general out of Ted Williams."

From the president of a leading midwestern college: "Speaking as the commanding officer of a Navy electronics unit and also as the president of a State college where several thousand boys have belonged to Reserve units since 1945, I wish to thank you for your courage in opposing such promotions. * * * Many reservists have faced serious hardship, loss of vacation time, and financial difficulty in order to continue in military Reserve units in this country. It will indeed be bad for the morale of these boys to know that men like * * * no matter how attractive or glamorous or capable they may be, who have not spent this training time may be promoted."

I will not disclose the residence of the writer of the next letter I quote for he could be in that manner too easily identified out of a group of 44 for retaliatory and punitive action for expressing agreement with my stand and disagreement with the position of the Air Force. Suffice it to say about this writer's pedigree that the Air Force felt that he was important enough to select him to send him to the Air Force Command and Staff College.

"As a Ready Reserve colonel, I recently completed the 2-week Reserve officers indoctrination course at the Command and Staff College at Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala. In the class were 44 full colonels, so naturally there was much discussion about the recent nominations to brigadier general which you have so ably brought before the Armed Services Committee for investigation. I assure you that all 44 colonels admire your stand on this matter."

CONCLUSIONS

The individuals and personalities involved in these nominations are not at issue here. It is their records of inactivity that are at issue. Rewarding inactivity with promotion to general rank involves a question of principle not of personalities.

Perhaps the Air Force has a better case than its uninformed defenders have presented. That could easily be the case when the principal spokesman of the Air Force displayed such an amazing lack of knowledge about the Air Force Reserve and these nominations which the Air Force sent him up to the Senate committee to defend.

It could easily be the case when another leading defender, at the very outset of his defense of these Reserve nominations revealed his ignorance on Reserve matters by calling the first nominee on the list "a Regular officer" and by referring to this particular reservist as having "a fairly distinguished record as a regular officer" although the reservist had never been a Regular. On this I invite your attention to page 32 of the committee hearing record.

Black cannot be made white. A reservist is not a Regular any more than inactivity in the Reserve can be pictured to be great activity.

Yet, we have the principal spokesman for the Air Force saying at page 29 of the hearing record that no training in one's mobilization assignment is realistic training and then 4 pages later on page 33 of the record saying that the Air Force is enjoined by the law to base its promotions on mobilization requirements.

Black cannot be made white. Yet we have the principal spokesman for the Air Force at page 40 giving contradictory answers to two successive questions by saying first that the Air Force lost when General Montgomery shifted to the Reserve and that "it would be much better to have General Montgomery on active duty than to have him on Reserve status"—and then immediately following that up with the contradictory statement that he would say that General Montgomery's service would be just as great by staying in the Reserve as it would be by staying in the Regular Establishment. How can it be both ways, General O'Donnell? How can it be better for Montgomery to be in the Regular Air Force than in the Reserve—and still be just as great by being in the Reserve?

Black cannot be made white. Yet we have the principal spokesman for the Air Force saying at page 36 of the hearing record that Montgomery took a "terrific financial sacrifice" by resigning from the Regular Air Force and going into the Reserve—and 6 pages later at page 42 saying that Montgomery "never would have resigned unless he cared nothing about the money at all."

Black cannot be made white. Yet we have the principal spokesman for the Air Force saying at page 40 of the record that Montgomery, who has the least active Reserve record of all 11 nominees, is a great come-on to the Reserves.

Black cannot be made white. Yet in almost the same breath in which the Air Force representatives defend the nominations for general ranks of some reservists with very inactive records, they indicate that 45,000 to 50,000 Reserve officers have been removed from the Air Force Reserve for inactivity in the last 3 or 4 years. I commend the Air Force for initiating a policy that requires participation as a condition for remaining in the Reserve. At the same time, I condemn a double-standard application of this policy whereby some of the nominees have apparently been permitted to remain in the Reserve despite little or no Reserve participation. On this I invite your attention to pages 44 and 51 of the hearing record.

With such contradictory Air Force statements and testimony as I have cited to you—together with the documented misrepresentations made by the Air Force—in these cases, it is extremely difficult to determine just what is the actual policy, position, and attitude of the Air Force on selection of Reserve generals and on required active participation in the Air Force Reserve.

One is forced to guess—and it would appear that the Air Force policy and position is best set forth at page 67 of the hearing record where General O'Donnell described the Air Force position as being one of getting men of national repuation.

Perhaps that is a better criterion than active participation or realistic training in the Reserve. I don't think so. But even assuming that it is, the Air Force should get rid of its double standard on promotions—whereby it kicks out 45,000 to 50,000 Reserve officers from the Air Force Reserve for lack of active training and participation in the Reserve and still promotes to general rank some Reserve officers with woefully inactive records—whereby it requires active participation in the Reserve up to the rank of colonel and, on the other hand, drops that basis on general officer rank and substitutes for it a policy of minimizing participation and emphasizing as primary requirements for promotion to general rank, glamor and big business connection.

Whatever is to be the policy and the basic ground rules, the Air Force should drop this dishonest double standard system. The Air Force should stop fooling reservists who are loyally participating in Reserve training and activity—who are working hard to develop and maintain their proficiency for defending our country, if and when war comes. Prime examples of this are the Air Reserve wing commanders who work hard throughout the year to keep their Reserve wings in shape.

If realism proves training participation and point earning to be outmoded and unrealistic—and dictates that it be replaced by similarity of civilian occupation to mobilization assignment—then the Air Force should be honest enough to make necessary changes and inform all reservists of those changes.

The real point is that all Air Force reservists should be informed fully and should not be misled. If active participation, such as inactive training and annual 15-day active duty training, is not to have a major bearing on promotion but instead is to be overshadowed, if not disregarded, in favor of the business activity record of a reservist, then the Air Force should so inform all reservists instead of misleading them.

For then the really active, hard-working, loyally participating reservists would have an opportunity to stop and drop participation in the Air Force Reserve and instead use that valuable time working in the aviation industry or in motion pictures toward earning promotion in the Air Force Reserve.

If "national reputation" is to be a prerequisite to becoming a general in the Air Force Reserve—if general nominations and selections in the Air Force Reserve are to be for the purpose of attracting publicity to the Air Force—if the Air Force Reserve is to be a "back door" medium through which a Regular Air Force general can leave the Air Force for a high-paying civilian job and still continue to accrue retirement benefits at the same rate as a Regular officer who remains on active duty—then the Air Force should tell not only all Air Force reservists but also all young men who are considering joining the Air Force Reserve. It should be honest enough to tell them so that they will not be misled and have any illusions that some day they might become a general in the Air Force Reserve through constant, loyal training participation in the Reserve.

The hearing and inquiry on this matter does not reflect credit upon the Air Force. I would hope that the Air Force has learned some lessons from it.

I would hope that the Air Force has learned from the hearing and the committee inquiry into this matter that it must start presenting truthful information and honest reports to Congress instead of making misrepresentations, inaccurate statements.

I would hope that the Air Force has learned a lesson to send up informed representatives who will speak the truth—who are well informed and know what they are talking about—or who will get themselves informed instead of treating Congressional inquiries lightly with a brushoff—representatives who will at least do their "home work" before appearing before a Senate committee to defend Air Force actions and to answer questions about those Air Force actions.

I must give General O'Donnell, the principal Air Force spokesman in this matter, credit for truthfulness and accuracy at one point in the hearing. In fact, I think that he was more truthful, accurate, and to the point than he would want to admit—that he brilliantly and succinctly stated the actual Air Force position and dubious record on this matter (which I have documented in detail and at length)—when he said at page 38 of the committee hearing record: "* * * it is a very difficult thing to explain here. I am not very good at explaining."

Truer words were never spoken. More appropriate words were never said. "It is a very difficult thing to explain" because there is no reasonable, honorable, and logical explanation of this matter by the Air Force. And, obviously, General O'Donnell was not very good at explaining.

IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Donald R. Larrabee on the immigration bill which appeared in the Quincy Patriot Ledger, as well as several telegrams which I have received on this legislation.

I am very proud to have played a role in the passage of this bill. It marks a major step forward in our attempts to enact more liberal immigration legislation. The bill represents a realistic approach which will have untold and lasting benefits for our country for the some 60,000 to 70,000 who are directly affected by it. We have taken action and moved forward in an area where there has been no major progress since passage of the Immigration Act in 1952.

My heart is glad for the thousands of American citizens who will now be able under the terms of this bill to be reunited with their families from whom they have been separated because of the workings of our immigration law. Among these are some 33,000 Greeks, Italians, and persons of other nationalities. I am likewise pleased that persons chargeable to the quotas of Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, and other countries, whose quotas had been heavily mortgaged by the Displaced Persons Act and other laws, will now be able to move more freely under the provisions of this bill which lift the mortgages imposed on these quotas. I rejoice with those of our citizens who have adopted alien children who will be permitted, under the terms of this legislation, to join their adoptive parents in the United States—truly the opportunity which we have given to these youngsters who are the victims of war and its aftermath justifies all of our work on this bill. We can also be proud that, by the passage of this legislation, we have opened new vistas and extended that precious element of hope to refugees from communism and other forms of tyranny, including that most worthy group of refugees who have recently fled from the Middle East.

Mr. President, in summary I think that the Congress can close this session with a deep sense of satisfaction that, having enacted this major piece of immigration legislation, it has restored hope to the hopeless, strengthened and supported family life, and ameliorated some of the harsh provisions of our immigration law. Truly, this Congress has made a major step forward in the perfection of our immigration policy. Much remains to be done in this area and I pledge my strength to the attainment of more far-reaching adjustments in our immigration policy in future years.

STORY BEHIND A BILL—SENATOR KENNEDY AND IMMIGRATION

(By Donald R. Larrabee)

WASHINGTON.—Any Congress, in the windup of a session, provides a case study in the ability of its Members to face up to political realities. Most legislation contains an element of compromise, but when time is running out on a Congress, the compromise must be carefully calculated or the result is a big nothing. This is the real story of the emergency immigration bill which will reach the President's desk before adjournment.

POLITICAL REALITY

The immigration measure bears the imprint of Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY (Democrat) of Massachusetts who saw the political reality that a broader and stronger bill would never clear Congress. KENNEDY talked with enough of his colleagues to know what changes in existing law could be passed without controversy or acrimony in the short time left. He drew provisions here and there from pending bills, pieced them together in a proposal that had the blessing of the leadership on both sides of the Capitol.

The final work was a far cry from what KENNEDY himself had proposed earlier in the year. It didn't begin to go to the heart of what many Senators believe are the critical weaknesses in our immigration policies. It ignored many of the major changes requested by President Eisenhower, but it also ignored such controversial proposals as the revision of the 33-year-old national origins quota system. If the latter had been included, KENNEDY would not have had the support of key House and Senate leaders on immigration legislation. What remained, when KENNEDY completed his draft, was a bill to deal with urgent, hardship cases.

Other Senators, with immigration bills of their own, quickly fell in line behind KENNEDY. None of them were happy to forego action on basic liberalizing changes in the law, but they knew this was all they could get passed so late in the session. They remembered that the Senate hastily passed a broader bill at the last session, only to see it die in the House because that body's immigration leader, Representative WALTER (Democrat of Pennsylvania) had not been consulted.

Thus, support for KENNEDY came from Senate floor leaders JOHNSON and KNOWLAND; Senator WATKINS, Republican, of Utah, who was sponsoring the administration's bill; Senator DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, who had a slightly different version; and several Democrats, like Senator PASTORE, Democrat, of Rhode Island, who favor a wholesale alteration of our immigration statutes. PASTORE said the Kennedy bill didn't measure up to his hopes, but it was an affirmative step. Added PASTORE: "It may be termed a compromise; but, indeed, it is not a surrender." The Rhode Islander, another political realist, declared: "We can accept it, as practical people, in the closing hours of this session, as an accomplishment, whereas otherwise we might be left with no advance at all."

The Kennedy bill, on which House action is expected early this week, will let in about 60,000 more persons in various categories. Among these will be 18,000 refugee-escapees from the Middle East and from Communist-dominated countries. It erases "mortgages" carried over from the Displaced Persons Act which have had the effect of holding down quotas.

A little-noticed provision of the Kennedy measure would provide relief in the situation where a foreign diplomat presently in this country cannot or does not choose to return home. The need was brought to the attention of Congress in the case of Wellington Koo, former Chinese Ambassador to the United States, who could not return to his own country and became, in fact, a man without status of any kind.

RELIEF PROVISIONS

President Eisenhower asked for about 20 technical amendments to the basic law—and he will get about 7. He asked for permanent legislation to deal with the orphan problem and the Kennedy bill provides a 2-year program. But, Mr. Eisenhower is going to get the waiver of existing mortgages on quotas and a portion of his request designed to relieve Congress of much of the burden of considering private immigration bills. In addition, he will receive relief provisions for skilled specialists and relatives and the provision for 18,000 refugee-escapees.

A major deficiency in the Kennedy bill—one proposed by the President and advocated by many Senators—would have given permanent status to 27,000 Hungarian "parolees" who came here last winter. When these people arrived, there was widespread public sympathy that they should be given a chance to become candidates for citizenship. This is a major piece of unfinished business on which Congress will surely go to work in January, judging from the Senate debate on the Kennedy bill.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *August 29, 1957.*

Senator KENNEDY,

The Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations enactment S. 2792 which I believe represents most important step forward in refugee immigration field in recognition of our foreign policy leadership requirements and the humanitarian need of refugees.

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *August 29, 1957.*

Senator JOHN KENNEDY,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

Please accept our most sincere gratitude and appreciation for your leadership and tireless efforts on behalf of those who have escaped Communist oppression. We know the bill passed yesterday was strongest measure possible at this time, and that its passage could not have been achieved without your initiative and dedication.

ANGIER BIDDLE DUKE,

International Rescue Committee.

BOSTON, MASS., *August 29, 1957.*

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY,

Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your victory for the immigration bill presented by you. As president of American Committee on Italian Migration of Boston I am very grateful for

consideration that you have for our Italian colleagues of Italy. Wishing you further success.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. DANIEL RUFO.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *August 29, 1957.*

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY,

Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

We appreciate that the refugee legislation adopted today was due greatly to your sympathetic efforts. This stopgap measure will give homes and future to many thousands homeless and destitute people. Congratulations.

JAMES P. RICE.

Executive Director, United HIAS Service.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *August 28, 1957.*

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY,

United States Senate,

Washington, D C.:

Sincere congratulations to you on your fine leadership in getting the refugee bill passed. This constitutes a real help to thousands of worthy people of vital concern to our country and to our churches whose aim always is to express Christian brotherhood and to give aid to the oppressed.

ROLAND ELLIOTT,

Director, Immigration Services, Church World Service.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 28, 1957.*

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Kindly accept our hearty congratulations on passage today in Congress of your well-tempered proposals effecting much-needed changes in current immigration procedures. Most certainly you and your associates in Congress can take justifiable pride in this splendid accomplishment. The happiness that will accrue to the many thousands of beneficiaries, separated spouses and children, orphans, the refugees, and others will justify your fine statesmanship. We of the department of immigration of the National Catholic Welfare Conference are edified and deeply grateful. You have our cordial personal best wishes.

BRUCE M. MOHLER.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 29, 1957.*

Senator JOHN KENNEDY,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on the passage of your bill which will give new hope to so many thousands of refugees.

Father FREDERICK MCGUIRE, C. M.,

Mission Secretariat.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I have addressed the Senate on several occasions, calling the attention of this body to what I consider to be a very serious problem, namely, the fact that many communities throughout the Nation do not share in the general prosperity and that unemployment in many of these communities is on the rise. I have suggested that the administration has taken far too sanguine a view of these serious problems and has been notably restrained in acting to ameliorate the serious economic crisis in which many of these communities find themselves.

One of the communities to which I have given attention in my own State is Fall River, Mass. As this session of Congress draws to a close, I should like to summarize the results of my efforts to assist this community in solving some of its economic problems. Frankly, Mr. President, I have been deeply disappointed that despite my very vigorous efforts on behalf of this and many other communities in Massachusetts, the employment situation in these communities has not materially changed since this time last year.

I have made every legitimate effort to acquaint manufacturers and other businessmen in these communities with the procedures for obtaining Government contracts, and by and large these businessmen have responded with enthusiasm and intelligence. However, despite our very best efforts, little Government business has gone into Fall River and the other communities which have been so hard hit economically for reasons quite beyond the control of the local citizenry. To some degree, this lack of success in channeling Government procurement into these areas has been due to the restrictions imposed by law, but I am not entirely convinced that within these restrictions a good deal more could not have been done by administrative action. To the extent that this is true, I believe that the administration has been derelict in its responsibility to many hard-pressed communities throughout our country.

I am happy to say that, through the combined efforts of the local community and my office, we have been able to obtain a planning grant from the Community Facilities Administration to enable Fall River to complete plans for the improvement of its industrial water supply. When this work is finished it should provide a sound and long-term basis for industrialization of this community, and I am extremely hopeful that the provision of adequate quantities of clean water will form an incentive to businesses to locate in this fine community with its large pool of skilled manpower.

I have been disappointed that the Area Redevelopment Act, of which I am a co-sponsor, has not been acted upon during this session of Congress. I believe that if this legislation were on the books we would have a positive program which would be of great assistance to economically depressed areas throughout our country. As far as I am concerned, this is high priority legislation for the next session of Congress.

Finally, Mr. President, I again wish to stress to the Senate the fact that these economically hard-hit communities are subject to the inflationary pressures which beset the whole country. Under these conditions they are in a sense placed in double economic jeopardy. Wages and employment are down and yet the prices of food, rent and other necessities are skyrocketing, with apparently little or no control being placed on them by the Government. The situation is serious and we dare not ignore it much longer.

THE CIVIL-RIGHTS BILL

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, last night the Senate in approving the conference report on H. R. 6127, the civil-rights bill, took a historic step toward showing to all of our citizens their constitutional right of voting. I am very glad that I had the opportunity to vote for this bill and to support it during its stages of development in the Senate of the United States. I hope that it will mark the beginning of a new era in the confirmation of the equal rights of all the peoples of the United States. There were many in this body and in the House of Representatives who played an important part in the development and passage of this important measure, but I do want to pay a tribute to the ability of our distinguished minority leader, Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND of California and his indomitable will and determination that a civil-rights bill should be enacted. I think it should always be remembered that it was his affirmative and positive determination to secure action that in the end brought about the passage of the civil-rights bill in the Senate.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S FISCAL POLICIES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, during this session, many of us have expressed deep concern over the effect on our economy of the fiscal policies of this administration, as initiated and implemented by ex-Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey. We have contended that the Humphrey tight-money policy is throttling business—particularly small business. We have expressed the fear that the administration, in its obsession to stop inflation, could produce an Eisenhower depression.

The very thing we feared has happened in some sections of the country. I would like to insert as a part of my remarks some recent letters I have received from the State of Washington indicating the detrimental effects of high interest rates on two important segments of our economy.

Also, I am including from the Economist, Britain's highly influential financial journal, excerpts from an article entitled, "Mr. Humphrey's Failure." This article appeared in the Economist on August 3.

ABERDEEN, WASH., *August 13, 1957.*

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We here in the heart of the lumbering industry have seen logging operations, sawmills, plywood plants and pulp mills all closing down recently. As each one of these parts of the industry close down, either indefinite or forever, company officials in every operation have blamed it on the "soft lumber market."

I wonder if you could tell me what is the matter with the lumber market, what can be done about it and what you as a Senator from a lumbering State are going to try to do about it?

Hoping to hear from you soon, I remain

Sincerely yours,

MAHLON CHESTNUT,

Recording secretary, International Woodworkers of America, Local No. 23–2.

[From the Economist of August 3, 1957]

MR. HUMPHREY'S FAILURE

Mr. George Humphrey left the Treasury last week in blaze of disappointment. He

had three objectives when he came to Washington four and one-half years ago and all three are still to be achieved.

His latest borrowing will add $250 million a year to the public debt's cost. This is the final proof of Mr. Humphrey's failure.

PORTLAND, OREG., *August 25, 1957.*

WARREN MAGNUSON,
United States Senate.

SIR: I have been traveling your State for 15 years. At the present, I am at the Olympic for our showing of late fall and holiday apparel. Never in all these years have so many merchants complained about business conditions.

We read, day in and day out of fantastic corporation profits and read also of the healthy state of the banking industy.

I suspect the high interest rates accounts for the slow business recession.

May I, as one small individual of the traveling fraternity, suggest you and your fellow Senators do something, and quick, for the small merchant and manufacturer.

Thank you.

E. C. MCLACHLAN.

ALOHA, OREG., *August 23, 1957.*

Senator WARREN MAGNUSON.

SIR: We are here at an Apparel Market Week.

There is no business, and nothing but complaints from the smaller merchant.

Why can't something be done about this "hard money" policy and these 6 percent and 7 percent interest rates?

The only ones making a living are the bankers.

CARL PETERS.

SENATOR MATTHEW M. NEELY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we have all been aware of the travail through which the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] has been going this year. He has on occasion shown himself to be a Senator of extraordinary attainment.

I have in my hand a letter which was written to our colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia, by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. It is such a good and such a sweet letter that I think it ought to be made a part of the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that it be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., August 26, 1957.

Hon. MATTHEW M. NEELY,
U. S. Senate.

DEAR MATT: Work is slackening up here a bit, and one has a little chance for reflection and thought.

I have been thinking what a marvelous career you have had—State legislator, lawyer, Congressman, Senator, Governor, Congressman again, and Senator again, and all the time a terrific battler for the people. You have been afraid of no one and have pushed in to issues which the timid have shunned. Always your heart has been warm and brave. You have been, and are, a real tribune of the people.

In the history of the United States Senate, there have been all too few of that kind, and so I want to greet you and salute you.

My warmest best wishes.

Faithfully yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

AUTHORIZATION TO SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I submit an order which I ask to have agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order will be read.

The order was read and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the present session of the Congress, the Secretary be, and he is hereby, authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives after the sine die adjournment.

AUTHORIZATION TO PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE TO MAKE APPOINTMENTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I submit another order which I ask to have agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order will be read.

The order was read and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That notwithstanding the final adjournment of the present session of the Congress, the President of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to make appointments to commissions or committees authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate.

TENDER OF THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I submit a resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have stated; and I request unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 202) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to the Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over its deliberations during the 1st session of the 85th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

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

TENDER OF THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I submit a resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have stated; and I request unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The resolution (S. Res. 203) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, President pro tempore of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over its deliberations during the 1st session of the 85th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

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

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, very shortly the adjournment bells will signal the end of the first session of the 85th Congress.

It has been a good session, one that was constructive and contributed to the welfare and the unity of the American people.

I have already reviewed the accomplishments of this session. But there is another statement I would like to make, a statement based on a personal note.

Like every Member, I have a deep affection and a reverance for the institution of the United States Senate. That affection and that reverence rest upon many things, and one of the most important is my close personal tie to everyone who is associated with the Senate.

Mr. President, it would be impossible for me to list all of the people to whom a personal acknowledgment should be made. There are 96 who stand on this floor and who vote and who get the headlines, sometimes good and sometimes bad. Sometimes they even are mentioned in newspaper columns.

But behind those 96 are large numbers of faithful employees who work day and night, with neither overtime pay nor glory as compensation. Mr. President, I want every single one of them to know of the deep debt that the Senate owes to them; and I am only sorry that limitations of space prevent my listing them individually by name.

This is a body which in many respects is unusual. It is a place where men can feel deeply on opposite sides of emotional and controversial questions and still be the firmest of friends.

I list among the closest of my friends the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. We have stood on opposite sides of the political fence on many basic issues. There have been times when we may have been even a little short with each other.

But, Mr. President, I believe our personal friendship is as strong as the friendship between any two men anywhere. And when we agree, we have no hesitancy in marching together, without regard to partisan labels.

He is a man of honor, a man of integrity, and a man of justice; and even though it is difficult for me to concede the need for a Republican Party [laughter], I will unhesitantly say that no party could have a finer man for its leader.

Mr. President, I regret that Senator KNOWLAND cannot be with us as we conclude this session. I am delighted that he has asked our very able and understanding friend, his junior colleague [Mr. KUCHEL] to sit in his seat and to

wear his honors. All of us have great respect and affection for Senator KUCHEL.

Mr. President, in this Senate, I have a strong right arm. It rests in the person of the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]—a scholar, a statesman, a diplomat, and a man of unflagging courage. His steadying influence makes all of us a little more certain and a little more confident in the things we are doing.

On the other side of the aisle, the minority leader is ably served by the skillful and genial Senator from Illinois EVERETT DIRKSEN. Those of us in my party recognize him as a formidable, but always fair and just, opponent.

The Republican policy committee chairman, STYLES BRIDGES, is a man of tremendous ability and warmth. I have been proud to call him my good friend for many years. We have labored together in this body on many matters, vigorously and harmoniously. All of my colleagues, I am certain, join me in wishing him a restful adjournment period. We have missed him these past weeks, and will eagerly anticipate and look forward to his return in January.

I should like to make particular mention of a colleague on the other side of the aisle with whom I have served through the years. He is the tall, very gentle, very courageous Yankee from Massachusetts—LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

He is a statesman, and he is my friend, and no man is more understanding and more ready to be cooperative.

We have as President pro tempore a man who spans a vital stage of America's history. That man is the senior Senator from Arizona, CARL HAYDEN, the only Member who entered the Congress as his State entered the Union.

CARL HAYDEN is one of the most skillful, one of the most able, and one of the most loyal legislators of our time. This Congress could not have rolled up its truly amazing record in economy this year without his help.

There are other Members whom I should like to mention. Every one of them, without exception, is close to my heart; and I do not feel that I stand as an enemy to anyone on either side of the aisle.

I am particularly grateful to the great and experienced men who chair out 15 standing Senate committees. To each of them, I—as the majority leader—am deeply indebted, as are we all.

Only those of us who fully understand and appreciate the importance of the committee system in our legislative branch of Government can truly appreciate the monumental work of these fine public officials.

To all of you I say: my thanks for your cooperation; my everlasting gratitude for your generosity and your friendship.

A man in the position I hold must rely on the assistance of many people. None who serves me and my party does a better job than my trusted and beloved friend, Earle Clements. As executive director of our senatorial campaign committee, Earle is a stalwart of good counsel and always good judgment. His value to the Democratic majority in the Senate is simply impossible to overstate.

One of the keys to this Senate rests in the person of our beloved Secretary Felton M. ("Skeeter") Johnston. For 28 years he has been associated with this body, and today he may well be considered our 97th Senator. He is a wise man, a kindly man, and a man who understands the great difficulties under which we labor, and who does much to ease our burdens.

The secretary to the majority is the most tireless and indefatigable man on this floor. Bobby Baker is a young man who already has gone much further in life than many others of far greater years. And, Mr. President, it is my personal opinion that he is just getting started.

There is a very simple formula that explains Bobby's success. He gives of himself unsparingly, and without regard to what he will get in return. He usually gets from me some perhaps intemperate words, for which I am sorry the next morning. But, Mr. President, his first thought is always of those of us he serves. And everyone of us knows that we can call upon him at any hour of the day or the night, and he will not be found wanting. He is a man who truly serves his country, and I consider him one of my most trusted, most loyal, and most competent friends.

Bobby and the Senate are ably assisted on the floor by Jay McDoncll, the assistant to the secretary for the majority; the young men in our cloakroom: Joe Stewart, Dick Darling, and Jim Daniel; and all of our eager and helpful young page boys on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. President, a man who looks after us, who guards us, and who is responsible for a great deal of the Capitol responsibilities, is a very genial, a very able, and a very effective Arizonian. His name is Joseph Duke, and he is our Sergeant at Arms. Joe Duke knows how highly I think of him, and in what high regard he is held by all the Members. He is a "can-do" man, and our country is fortunate to have him serving us during this period.

Mr. President, there are so many other officials who keep the wheels of legislation rolling smoothly. To name them is to call the roll of men who have served their country selflessly and well.

For example, one of Joe Duke's assistants is Charley Jones, the head Doorkeeper, and his tactful staff, including Richard Reidel, who has been the personal friend of hundreds of Senators for many years.

Under the direction of the Secretary of the Senate are: Emery L. Frazier, the Chief Clerk of the Senate, who sits there in front of us all day, and many times into the night.

Charles L. Watkins, the Parliamentarian, who was serving the Senate when I was a very small boy.

Floyd M. Riddick, our Assistant Parliamentarian.

No body has two more able parliamentarians counseling them each day than does the Senate of the United States.

Edward J. Hickey, the journal clerk, who frequently says to me, "Stop, look, and listen. Just a moment, please."

Edward E. Mansur, Jr., the legislative clerk, who can get a quorum or not get one, depending on the needs of the Senate and the country.

Lewis W. Bailey, the executive clerk in charge of nominations; William H. Wannall, our printing clerk and his capable assistant, Thomas N. Gay; J. Fred McClerkin and Harold G. Ast, our bill clerks; Paul McBride, the enrolling clerk and, at this time, I want to say farewell to my good friend Harvey E. Carrell who, for 15 years, has served as technical assistant to the enrolling clerk and is now retiring. We appreciate his devoted service and wish him well. To show you how valuable his services are, just a few minutes ago we had him standing by to get a bill enrolled on a moment's notice.

Harry C. Burke, the clerk of enrolled bills; James L. Johnson, the registration clerk and his fine and capable assistant George F. Thompson who was formerly our financial clerk; and Vernon Talbertt, the Senate's chief messenger.

Robert A. Brenkworth, the financial clerk and his capable assistant, William A. Ridgely, who manage to keep straight our accounting system. Theron W. Marshall, Superintendent of the Senate Document Room and his fine assistant, John T. Waggoner; Andrew J. Kramer, as keeper of the stationery does his best to keep us supplied, while Richard D. Hupman and his capable staff refresh our memories with Library knowledge. To keep us abreast of what we did yesterday and plan to do tomorrow, we rely upon Frederick H. Green and Dwight B. Galt, Jr. of the Daily Digest. John T. Chambers, superintendent of our service department, is another of the many whose presence is indirectly felt in the legislative field. And may I take another moment to say thanks and bless you to each and every one of the telephone operators who render the same type service as every other employee on Capitol Hill.

I do not intend to forget the minority employees. I have found J. Mark Trice, Oliver J. Dompierre, Bill Reed, Bill Brownrigg and their colleagues to be men with whom cooperation is possible in the interests of efficiency and good legislation, and the country, to which they are devoted.

There are a group of men for whom the lights burn late at night after the rest of us have left. They are probably the ablest staff of Official Reporters in the world, headed by James W. Murphy and John D. Rhodes.

The performance of these men is truly amazing. Day after day they put together a verbatim account of our proceedings—a verbatim account upon which the world relies for its knowledge of the workings of the United States Senate. Supreme Court decisions depend upon the accuracy of their work. Reputations can be made or unmade by a slip of their pen.

I wish to call the roll of this highly skilled group:

Francis J. Attig, Herbert N. Budlong, Nicholas J. Cinciotta, Charles J. Drescher, Elmer L. Koons, Joseph A. Koons, R. Thomas Loftus, Gregor MacPherson, Paul J. Plant, Willard W. Pru-

ett, Julian R. Serles, Perry B. Smith, Wilbur T. Smith, Placidino Zagami.

There is another group of men to whom tribute should be paid. They are the police who protect us and who guard the Capitol.

We have our own Chief Robert C. Pearce with his very efficient staff and in addition there is the highly competent detail from the Metropolitan Police Department headed by a warmhearted Irishman, Capt. Michael Dowd.

I wish I could call the roll further. If I have missed anyone it is simply because there are only so many pages in the RECORD, and only so much time my colleagues will indulge me.

I would like to end by expressing my deep thanks to two of the members of the Senate Democratic policy committee: George E. Reedy, the staff director, and Gerald W. Siegel, the general counsel. These men, who serve me most directly, in truth serve the entire majority membership of, and the entire Senate itself.

George Reedy is not often seen on the Senate floor. But his excellent advice, superior analytical ability and judgment are constantly felt in my work.

Gerry Siegel is often on the floor. He has kept track of the bills and I think every Member of the Senate will agree he has made a contribution to the work of this session.

I know of no more promising young lawyer than Gerry Siegel. I predict he is destined to go far.

To both George and Gerry, and all the extremely able people who work with them on the policy committee staff, such as the very able lawyers, Solis Horwitz and Harry McPherson, who often assist me on the floor, I express my deepest gratitude.

In closing, I can only say that within a few hours, I hope, I will be headed for Texas. I am going to my ranch on the banks of the Pedernales, where I will lie in the sun and enjoy the peace and quiet of the central Texas hill country.

Before I leave I want to express to all the newspapermen and those in the radio and television gallery my thanks for their cooperation and for the understanding and justice they have shown, particularly the wire service people, including Jack Bell, bureau chief of the Associated Press in the Senate, Raymond Lahr, bureau chief of the United Press Associations in the Senate, Bill Theis, head of the INS, and Rose McKee, correspondent for International News Service, one of my favorite ladies.

Mr. President, I am going home, where it will be restful and relaxing, but my thoughts will be with my colleagues and with those who have made it possible for me to carry on, in some fashion, the responsibilities I have attempted to shoulder.

I hope they realize that my thoughts will be with all of them. I hope I can see them—many of them—during the fall recess. I extend to one and all a cordial invitation to visit me in Texas.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I want to say to my beloved friend from Louisiana that, as usual, he has been patient and understanding. His friendship has meant a great deal to me. He always is a tower of strength to me.

Mr. LONG. Of course, the Senator from Texas knows his feelings are completely reciprocated. I have the highest affection and respect for him.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 201) was read and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join a similar committee of the House of Representatives to notify the President of the United States that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn unless he has some further communication to make to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the resolution, the Chair appoints the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] the committee to notify the President.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is at the desk a concurrent resolution from the House, which the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read House Concurrent Resolution 230, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

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

COMMENDATION OF MINORITY AND MAJORITY LEADERS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, all of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, I know, would want me to make a very brief response to the generous words which the majority leader of the Senate has just uttered. My statement will be brief.

The Republicans in the Senate have been most proud to rally around the minority leader, whose friendship I have cherished for very many years. This is the end of the fifth session of the Senate of which I have been a Member, and I can understand the heartfelt respect which Senators have for their colleagues, as years of their service go by in their membership in this House of Congress.

I want to say as we leave on this occasion that the Republicans wish to pay their respects to the majority leader. All of us can testify that even when the debate has been heated and when the lines of cleavage have been drawn, especially lines of cleavage between the two parties, all of us have been most proud of the manner in which the majority leader of the Senate of the United States has conducted the business of this great body.

One further thought occurs to me, and then I shall conclude. This has probably been reiterated many times before. The line which divides the Democrats from the Republicans does not divide a mutuality of respect, patriotism, and dedicated desire to serve our country.

SECRETARY BENSON AND THE FARM POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the light of the comments by the Secretary of Agriculture relating to the election in Wisconsin and his feeling that the farm policies of the Republican administration had no effect on that election, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement of the Wisconsin Farmers Union in connection with the special Wisconsin Senate election.

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

STATEMENT OF WISCONSIN FARMERS UNION IN CONNECTION WITH SPECIAL WISCONSIN SENATE ELECTION

Agricultural Secretary Ezra Benson and the Eisenhower administration farm planners risk all-out farmer rebellion aimed at the Republican Party in 1958 if they continue their downward farm price-support policies. This is shown in results from the farm areas in the Tuesday Wisconsin special Senate election. The election of WILLIAM PROXMIRE to the United States Senate should serve notice on Mr. Benson that his farm policy has been completely repudiated in Wisconsin.

The victory of PROXMIRE over former Gov. Walter Kohler, a Benson supporter, in the special election is clear indication of the lack of faith which farmers place in the Benson-Eisenhower farm program. In rural precinct after rural precinct across Wisconsin, farmers went to the polls to protest the disastrous Benson farm-price policies by voting for PROXMIRE. Wisconsin's new United States Senator, who has been promised a seat on the key Senate Agricultural Committee, became an anti-Benson symbol to farmers in his State.

Farmers all over the United States can gain new confidence from the results of the Wisconsin special election—new confidence in knowing that Secretary Benson will have to think twice about his intended plans to reduce farm price supports, all the way down to zero, if necessary. And Wisconsin dairy farmers can thank themselves for the Proxmire victory when the time comes next year for Secretary Benson to follow through his predicted support cut in dairy products. Considering the heavy Proxmire vote in the farm area, Benson wouldn't dare put through another reduction in dairy farmer income next spring.

The Farmers Union is confident that, in BILL PROXMIRE, the dairy farmers of Wisconsin and the Nation will have their most effective Senate spokesman, from his vantage point on the vital Senate Agricultural Committee. By sending a proven friend of agriculture to the United States Senate, where he can serve farmers on this important committee, the Wisconsin farmers have won for themselves a tremendous victory.

WILLIAM PROXMIRE'S election has thrown a monkey wrench into the calculate Benson steamroller, aimed at the liquidation of America's family farmers.

A sample of the manner in which PROXMIRE swept through the farm areas of Wisconsin is shown in this township breakdown for strictly rural precincts in Eau Claire County.

	Kohler	PROXMIRE
Bridge Creek	48	108
Brunswick	57	118
Clear Creek	25	92
Drammen	26	103
Fairchild (T)	17	26
Lincoln	22	108
Ludington	26	104
Otter Creek	24	63
Pl. Valley	54	122
Seymour	103	335
Union	113	306
Washington	180	309
Wilson	13	66
Rural precinct total	772	1,870

(PROXMIRE carried Eau Claire County, 7,816 to 5,323, winning the city of Eau Claire by a 5,395 to 4,122 margin.)

PROXMIRE carried every county in the Ninth Congressional District in western Wisconsin. This is the district which sent Representative LESTER JOHNSON to Congress in a special election 4 years ago. JOHNSON became the first Democrat to win election in this district, and has been reelected in two successive elections on a program based on continued opposition to the farm policies of the Eisenhower administration. JOHNSON'S district contains the strongest activity of Farmers Union membership in Wisconsin.

The breakdown for this district:

County	Kohler	PROXMIRE
Barron	2,276	2,804
Buffalo	919	1,314
Chippewa	3,136	5,450
Clark	2,228	3,744
Dunn	1,944	2,420
Eau Claire	5,323	7,816
Jackson	1,038	1,883
Pepin	392	548
Pierce	1,621	1,733
St. Croix	2,457	2,768
Trempealean	1,624	2,426

The new Wisconsin United States Senator's margin of victory was 116,000 votes, out of a total of about 780,000 cast. Approximately one-third of Wisconsin's eligible voters turned out to give victory to PROXMIRE, the first Democratic Senator from Wisconsin in 25 years.

The victor carried populous Milwaukee County by about 50,000 votes. In all, PROXMIRE beat out Kohler in 56 of the State's 71 counties. The near-final tally from the State's 3,361 precincts gives PROXMIRE 435,000 votes; Kohler, 318,000; independent Howard Boyle, 20,000; independent Douglas Wheaton, 2,000; Mrs. Georgia Cozzini, independent, 700.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a news story from the Washington Star of yesterday which brought to the attention of the people of this area the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture found the time to attend the Fairfax County Fair, in Virginia, although he is unable to find the time to appear before a Senate subcommittee, despite repeated requests by the chairman of that subcommittee.

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

BENSON SURPRISE VISITOR AT FAIRFAX COUNTY FAIR

Secretary of Agriculture Benson paid an unexpected visit to the Northern Virginia Fair and Industrial Exposition in Fairfax County yesterday.

Mr. Benson, who has been a county-fair fan since his own farming days, toured the dairy, produce, home arts, and commercial exhibits. He spent an hour at the fairgrounds, located on route 50 at Pender, several miles west of the town of Fairfax.

EMBASSY AIDS ATTEND

Other visitors yesterday included representatives from the embassies of Ireland, Burma, Canada, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, and Libya.

In the Jersey cattle classes judged at the fair yesterday George Noland, of Calverton, Va., showed grand champion, junior and senior champion, females. In Jersey bull classes Jack Fogle, of Manassas, showed grand champion, junior, senior, and reserve champion.

In Guernsey classes, 4–H and open, Charles Landis, of Manassas, won grand, junior, senior, and reserve championships. In Holstein classes, open and 4–H, Bill Harrison, of Herndon, showed champion female, senior champion female, grand champion, and reserve champion female.

FAUQUIER COUNTY WINS

Fauquier County beat Prince William County with a county herd of Jerseys. A Fairfax County herd of Holsteins had no competition. In poultry judging, top winners who showed 30 breeds were Delbert O'Meara, Hall O'Meara, and Jack Fogle. Top market birds were shown by Larrie and Karen Blair.

Rosalind Virginia Farrar, 12-year-old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Larston D. Farrar, of route 5, Fairfax, won 4 prizes in the baking department, in the 4–H class. She won second prize for toll-house cookies, third prize for biscuits, and third prize for earrings in the handicraft division.

Last year Rosalind won second prizes for cake and biscuits at the fair. She is a student at the Navy School in Fairfax County.

COMMENDATION OF MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the majority leader for 1 minute, which is as long a time as I shall impose upon the Senate.

As the Senate makes ready to adjourn sine die, I happen to be the only Member on the floor who helps represent the Pacific Northwest. I think I speak for all my colleagues of both parties from that region when I thank the majority leader for the unselfish interest and the lack of provincialism which has impelled him to take such a broad and generous approach toward many of the problems of our area. I want him and the constituents he represents to know that we reciprocate by trying to understand the problems of the great State he represents.

In conclusion, I may say to the Senator, he has worked hard—I think too hard. I think he has subjected himself, his constitution, and his nervous system to cruel and inhuman punishment. I hope he will be able to enjoy a complete rest at home and that his health and that of his family will be of the best.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank my friends, the Senator from California and the Senator from Oregon, in particular, for their generous statements. I assure the Senator that Monday morning I am going out dove hunting.

REPORT OF NOTIFICATION COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. KUCHEL, the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to wait upon the President of the United States, appeared in the center aisle, and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas said:

Mr. President, the committee appointed to wait upon the Presidcnt has notified the President of the United States that the Congress is about to adjourn sine die until January 7, next year, and asked him if he had any messages to communicate to the Senate.

I think it is fair to say, Mr. President, that we are all anxious to return to our homes and to conclude this very arduous session, but I do not think anybody is going to be more pleased that it has come to an end than the President of the United States. He said the only message he desired to communicate to us was that he wished for us the best of health and happiness and hoped that our work between now and the time we reassembled would be fruitful and productive and in the Nation's interest.

Mr. President, I yield to my friend, the acting minority leader [Mr. KUCHEL], so that he may make any observations he cares to make, since he was on the committee and talked to the President with me.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I must say I felt quite honored to accompany the majority leader as a member of the committee of two to inform the President that the Senate was ready to adjourn sine die, and the implications which the majority leader put into words as to the President's views with respect to that coming event I am in a position to concur with most heartily.

There is nothing from the executive branch by way of messages, except those of good cheer, good luck, and Godspeed.

I thank my friend.

THE TIGHT MONEY POLICY IS ECONOMICALLY UNSOUND AND SOCIALLY UNJUST

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, for more than 2 months the Senate Committee on Finance has been investigating the fiscal and monetary condition of the United States Government and the soundness of the American economy. Close attention is being given to the tight-money policy and rising interest rates, and their effect upon almost every aspect of public finance, business activity, employment, and national well-being. The investigation will continue into the next session.

Although this inquiry is still in its early stages, now is a logical time to review the results thus far accomplished. The two most important agencies of

Government concerned with the subject matter of the inquiry have completed their very extensive presentations. The three witnesses thus far heard—the recent Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey, the Under Secretary of the Treasury W. Randolph Burgess, and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board William M. Martin—have been courteous and cooperative.

The have confirmed what all of us already knew—that they are men of wide experience and exceptional competence. Whether the policies which they have persistently advocated and vigorously pursued are good or bad—and whether the continuance or profound alteration of these policies is essential to our economic safety and progress—will be the subject matter of my remarks today.

MONETARY AND CREDIT POLICIES VITALLY AFFECT EVERYONE

There is an unfortunate tendency in some quarters to regard problems of monetary and credit management as too complex for understanding by the average citizen, or even by Members of the Congress who are not specialists in this subject. This is a most dangerous tendency in a democracy, for the people and the Congress must make the ultimate decisions.

The problems confronting the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury, their method of dealing with these problems, and the consequences of their actions, can and must be made plain to those of us who are not experts, but who nonetheless are intelligent and responsible.

Monetary and credit policies directly affect every level of Government. At the Federal level, these policies affect our ability to reduce unnecessary expenditures, to balance the Federal budget, to afford vital programs, and to achieve a financial posture where much-needed tax reduction becomes practicable.

At State and local levels of government, these same policies affect the ability to obtain sufficient credit on reasonable terms for essential public services; and this problem is doubly acute, when the Federal Government carries so heavy a national defense burden that it must properly look to the State and local governments to finance and carry additional domestic burdens.

These monetary and credit policies, by their direct effect upon the costs of government at all levels, also affect virtually every taxpayer, and consequently affect the overwhelming majority of all American families.

Indirectly but even more importantly, these monetary and credit policies vitally affect the performance of the whole American economy. They affect the price level, the levels of production and employment, the rate of economic growth, and the standard of living.

They affect the degree of economic opportunity afforded to the small as well as the large, the weak as well as the strong. They affect not only the degree of economic stability and progress, but also the degree of economic justice or injustice.

THE ECONOMIC PHILOSOPHY UNDERLYING THE TIGHT MONEY POLICY

Before getting into the details of all of these effects, I want to stress one point which is to my mind controlling.

There is a deep cleavage between the views of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board on one hand, and my views on the other. It reflects a difference of fundamental economic philosophy—a difference which has persisted throughout our history as a Nation, and particularly during the current century.

The difference is between those who believe in an economy of scarcity, and those who believe in an economy of abundance; between those who feel that we must still have occasional recessions or depressions, and those who feel that we have the brains and the tools to move forward without substantial interruption. It is a difference between those who feel that social injustice is the price we must pay for economic progress, and those who feel that social justice and economic progress are one and inseparable.

THE TIGHT MONEY POLICY MUST NOT BE TREATED AS A NARROW PARTISAN ISSUE

Issues of this character should not be treated in a partisan or political way, except in the broad sense that political and party responsibility are an essential part of our American system, particularly in dealing with national policies which must be guided by legislation. We are all politically answerable to the people. Consequently, I do not approach the problem of monetary and credit policies in a narrowly political or partisan spirit.

Certainly, the outstanding magazine Business Week, cannot be regarded as a partisan or ultraliberal political journal. But almost nowhere can be found so consistent and vigorous a challenge to the tight money policy and rising interest rates, as has appeared in this magazine during recent months.

On July 27, 1957, Business Week, on page 168, had this to say:

> Certainly, the evidence to date suggests that, though monetary policy has slowed down economic expansion, it has not impeded the climb of wages and prices. It is also clear that excessive demand, which is regarded as the traditional stimulus of inflation, is not the main cause of the pressure now being felt. * * * There is growing doubt that this unorthodox type of inflation can be successfully defeated by the orthodox weapons of fiscal and monetary policy. * * * A sizable body of opinion, both here and abroad, feels that dependence on orthodox policies, if pressed too far, might halt inflation only by inducing deflation.

Now, let us turn to a more precise examination of the issues before us.

WHAT IS THE TIGHT MONEY POLICY IN A NUTSHELL?

First of all, what is the tight money policy in a nutshell? Here is a concise though oversimplified answer. It is a policy of expanding the supply of money and credit less rapidly than the American economy demands. This policy is founded primarily upon the belief that the current restraints upon the growth of the privately held supply of money and credit are desirable to restrain inflation.

The Federal Reserve Board is the key force in this process of restraint, not because it controls the entire supply of money and credit but rather because it controls enough of the money and credit supply at crucial points to determine within limits the rate at which this supply grows. The Federal Reserve Board exercises this power of restraint through the rediscount rate, through determining the amount of Government securities which may be held by member banks of the Federal Reserve System as a base for the expansion of bank credit, and in a variety of other ways.

The policy of monetary and credit restraint causes interest rates to rise, for precisely the same reason that a restraint upon any supply in relationship to demand exerts an upward pressure upon prices. It is entirely academic and fruitless to examine whether the Federal Reserve Board has wanted interest rates to rise, or has merely taken a course of action which necessarily has permitted interest rates to rise.

It is correct to state, however, that spokesmen for the Federal Reserve Board have not hesitated to defend rising interest rates as desirable under current economic conditions. It is therefore only fair to conclude that the restraint of money and credit availability which has resulted in the upward movement of interest rates has been the purpose of the Federal Reserve Board.

The Treasury is also involved in this whole process, because the extent to which the Federal Reserve System acquires Government securities has a direct bearing upon the limits of the expansion of bank credit, and because the degree to which the Federal Reserve System supports or does not support Government issues, by buying them, affects the whole financing program of the Government and the costs at which such financing is undertaken. It affects the whole management of the national debt.

Technically, the Federal Reserve Board is independent of the Treasury. But it has usually been true, and it should always be true, that the views and the purposes of the Treasury and those of the Federal Reserve Board interact upon each other. It is really not important to determine the extent of interaction at this time.

The views of spokesmen for Treasury and Federal Reserve, as expressed before the finance committee, were for most important purposes, indistinguishable. Each might have presented the testimony of the other.

EXTENT TO WHICH TIGHT MONEY POLICY IS INCREASING THE INTEREST BURDEN

The aspect of rising interests rates which is easiest to examine with exactitude is the effect upon the cost of Government at all levels. So I shall deal with this first. The year 1950 is used as the base, because new monetary and credit policies initiated an upward movement of interest rates in 1951 which has continued until now at an accelerated rate with some undulations.

Compared with 1950, the computed annual interest rate on the national public debt as a whole had risen by more than 24½ percent by July 1957. By June 1957, compared with 1950, the interest rate on United States Government 3 to 5 year issues had risen by more than 151 percent, and on 9 to 12 month issues by more than 181 percent.

Naturally, the interest rate on Federal obligations is the base from which other interest rates are largely determined. Comparing June 1957 with 1950, the interest rates on State and local general obligations advanced more than 88 percent; the interest rate on corporate bonds advanced more than 45 percent; and the bank rates on short-term business loans of all sizes in 19 large cities advanced almost 63 percent.

It is not possible to now provide the Senate with the increased interest rates paid by small business, homeowners, farmers, and consumer purchasers of goods on credit. Although the Treasury has been asked for detailed information on this subject since early April, it has failed thus far to provide the Finance Committee with comprehensive information on these matters. The Treasury has told us that it did not have the information available.

An effort by the Treasury to obtain this information would be very slight, compared with the magnitude and the cost of rising interest rates, and compared with the economic consequences of rising interest rates. I simply fail to comprehend a degree of irresponsibility which insists upon remaining substantially in the dark on this whole matter. It would appear that the architects of the tight-money, high-interest policy wish to keep the public as much in the dark as possible regarding the costs and consequences of their work.

Yet we do know enough, from the facts which I have just cited, to make approximate calculations of the direct cost of rising interest rates.

The Treasury has admitted that higher interest rates have already resulted in an increased annual interest burden upon the Treasury of more than a billion and a quarter dollars each year.

Taking into account State and local governments, and taking into account also private indebtedness, it appears that the increased annual cost of higher interest rates throughout the Nation is by now in the neighborhood of $4 billion.

The accumulated cost of these higher interest rates, over the years since the trend commenced in earnest, is in the neighborhood of $8 billion.

If all debts private and public were now refinanced at current interest rates, the increased annual costs due to higher interest rates would conservatively be in the neighborhood of $15 billion.

This is not an unfair figure to use, because it is based on current interest rates on new financing, while in fact interest rates are still rising, and day by day we have additional examples of refinancing of private and public obligations at higher interest levels.

I shall not indulge in speculation as to what the increased annual interest burdens would be within a very few years if interest rates continue to rise at their current pace. The figure would be astronomical.

Instead, let us use the conservative $15 billion figure which I have just stated.

This comes to an average of about $300 for every family in the United States and consequently represents enough money to reduce the taxes of every American family at all levels of government by an average of $300. It represents a great deal more than half of our total Federal expenditures for all purposes other than major national security items.

It represents about 1½ times as much money as would be needed annually to double the social security old age insurance payments as well as the public welfare old age assistance payments to every recipient of these benefits in the United States. It represents enough money to replace a million and a half slum homes with decent housing every year.

It is five times more than the funds necessary to finance our ambitious interstate highway program at its peak. Can we tolerate the prospect of such an increased annual interest burden within a few years, when it is claimed that we do not have the resources to meet the great and growing needs of our people for tax reduction, better housing, improved social security, and a multitude of other things?

WHO GETS HELPED AND WHO GETS HURT DIRECTLY BY RISING INTEREST RATES?

I wish to read a truly fantastic statement, with respect to this increasing interest burden, made by the Under Secretary of the Treasury. On page 1447 of volume 15 of the stenographer's transcript of the Finance Committee hearings on Monday, July 29, Mr. Burgess said this:

> The money used to pay the interest is collected from many people in taxes, and the money is paid out again partly to the same people and partly to others. I think it is fair to say that about as many people benefit directly or indirectly from these interest payments as are hurt by them.

The then Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, said practically the same thing.

This amounts to saying that, because every loan represents both a borrower and a lender, changes in interest rates make no difference to the people as a whole. This is just as ridiculous as to say that, at a given level of national income, it makes no difference how the income is distributed; or to say that, at a given level of taxation, it makes no difference how the tax burden is distributed.

The statistics of the Federal Reserve Board indicate that in early 1957, 25 percent of all consumer units in the United States had no savings; 55 percent had no savings or had savings below $500; and 77 percent had no savings or had savings below $2,000. Only 10 percent had savings of $5,000 and over. Can the Treasury really believe that the benefits of rising interest rates flow to these 77 percent of our families, even relative to the size of their incomes, in the same way that they benefit wealthy families who obviously have big savings?

In 1955, more than 8¼ million multiple- and single-person families in the United States had incomes below $2,000 and about 22 million had incomes below $4,000. These families are the same families who have practically no savings or very little, and most of them certainly do not engage in money-lending on any substantial scale. Can the Treasury really believe that these more than 22 million families, coming to more than 40 percent of the population of the United States, benefit from rising interest rates, even relative to the size of their incomes, to the same extent as families with incomes of $50,000 or $100,000 a year?

In 1955, 12 percent of all farm-operator families in the United States had incomes under $1,000, 37 percent had incomes under $2,000, and 72 percent had incomes under $4,000. How much do these families benefit by rising interest rates?

In 1955, about 19 percent of all multiple-person families with heads aged 65 and over, and 61½ percent of all unrelated individuals aged 65 and over, had total money incomes below $1,000; 44 percent of these multiple-person families and 86½ percent of these unrelated individuals had money incomes under $2,000. What savings do these people have, and what money-lending activities are they engaged in, and how do they benefit by rising interest rates?

The Treasury tells us that the social-security trust funds benefit from rising interest rates. But if this be so, the expansion of these trust funds adds nothing to the incomes or the benefits being received by our senior citizens. Nobody but a certain type of banker could look at what is happening to the trust funds, instead of looking at what is happening to the families.

I notice also from statistics for 1955 that the percentage of employed men earning less than $2,000 in money income was more than 67 percent for those engaged in personal services; more than 26 percent of those engaged in retail trade; 23 percent of those engaged in professional and retail services. Even in manufacturing, the figure was more than 12.7 percent.

The situation among employed women is very much worse. Does the Treasury really believe that these people benefit by rising interest rates, in the sense that they get their fair share of rising interest payments?

I have roughly calculated that families with more than $15,000 drawing interest on net balance benefit from rising interest rates, but that families below this level are hurt on net balance. Generally speaking, the lower their incomes, the more they are hurt. This is for the very simple reason that all families do not have the same amount of savings relative to their incomes; the higher income people save a larger percentage of their incomes, and the lower-income people save a smaller percentage.

The confusion which exists in these matters is to the advantage of the proponents and beneficiaries of high interest rates. For example, the interest rate on United States Government series E-bonds has recently been increased by

one-fourth of 1 percent. Thus, a family with $5,000 in such bonds in the event of their exchange for new bonds, gains $12.50 in interest each year.

Yet, on the other hand, that same family may be living in a $20,000 house and paying 1 percent more interest on the mortgage because of higher interest payments. On a level payment plan, the annual additional interest payment would be about $130 greater on a 20-year mortgage. Thus on net balance, the family might think it was breaking nearly even, when it was in fact losing $117.50 a year.

The meaning of all these statistics is that rising interest rates, looked at without regard to other factors, constitute an unconscionable redistribution of income in a grossly regressive direction.

Rising interest rates do more than rob Peter to pay Paul; they do rob a thousand Peters to enrich one Paul. Rising interest rates also take money away from school districts, and pay it out to coupon clippers.

Rising interest rates take money away from roads and hospitals, and pay it out to those who live in the most luxurious style. They take money away from farmers, and pay it out to investment bankers.

I shall deal later on with the fallacious argument that rising interest rates help all the people by curbing inflation.

At this point, it is well to distinguish between the nature of interest income and the nature of other income, such as wages. Interest income is merely a transfer payment. It does not increase the net income of the Nation in any respect. It is a shift of income from borrowers to lenders, which does not in and of itself increase the wealth of our people as a whole. When interest is increased unreasonably, it has the effect of reducing the net income of the many, while greatly enlarging the net income of the wealthy few.

This operation does not reflect itself directly in the per capita income of the Nation, because the average per capita income remains the same. It is only the final distribution of income that has been changed. This has somewhat the effect of a share-the-wealth program operating in reverse.

THE TIGHT MONEY POLICY RATIONS CREDIT IN THE WRONG DIRECTION

The current tightening of credit, which is the cause of rising interest rates, is having an equally perverse effect. The biggest businesses can still get all the credit they want, and the cost of interest to them is less than 1 percent of their total costs of doing business. Thus, the tight money policy hardly affects them much one way or the other directly.

Also, the biggest corporations can avoid the problem of tight credit and rising interest rates entirely, by financing larger portions of their investment programs out of retained earnings, and by lifting their prices to enlarge these earnings, which they have been doing for some time. They can also shift any rising interest rate costs which they incur to the consumer through price increases. Whichever alternative they select, rising interest rates are in themselves inflationary, just like other rising costs.

A very powerful inflationary factor is the ability of major industries to impose price increases, against which the public is defenseless. A good illustration exists in the recent increases in the price of steel, when all steel companies increased their prices simultaneously, despite the fact that the industry was using its plants at well below 90 percent of capacity. The public had no opportunity to purchase from any company which had not increased its prices.

A few months previously, the major oil companies had advanced the price of crude oil. Now we are told that the automobile manufacturers are preparing to advance the prices of the new models of their cars. These price increases might in some cases be partially justified because of increases in the cost of labor and materials. None of them can be completely justified on that basis, however.

I am not here condemning management or labor. In the main, I believe that increased profits and wages should be related directly to increased production and productivity. In the long run, that is the only way the public as a whole will benefit. If we are looking at the overall picture, any other increase in income is a mere delusion.

It is agreed by all that the increase in investment in new plant and equipment by the big concerns, has contributed more than anything else to the inflation which is occurring at the present time. It is agreed that high interest rates have had little effect on the decisions of these major industries to increase plant expansion. Also, a great many of our major manufacturing corporaticns collect more interest than they pay out on an annual basis.

On the other hand, depreciation amounts to about 10 percent of industrial expenses, and taxes take more than 50 percent of corporate profits. When the administration recommended and the Congress adopted measures in 1954 to permit a larger amount of depreciation to be taken on expenditures for plant and equipment during the first few years of their life, both the administration and Congress joined hands in contributing mightily to the investment boom, which all witnesses tell us is the largest single factor causing the inflation which exists today.

Now, if the administration or the Congress wishes to retard the excessive investment in plant and equipment, it would be far preferable to repeal the accelerated depreciation provisions which were enacted in 1954, rather than to pursue a high interest rate policy which penalizes the masses of our people, and fails utterly to retard capital expansion. Frankly, I do not believe that either such repeal or rising interest rates are necessary or desirable, but I would prefer the former to the latter if confronted with the necessity of making a decision.

In sharp contrast to big business, the small-business man usually cannot increase his prices. Moreover, he finds that he cannot get the credit he needs to finance his inventories or to undertake the capital improvements which are essential to put him on a basis of competitive efficiency with giant business. Higher cost credit hurts him even if he gets it, because interest is a larger part of his total business costs than in the case of giant industry, and he has less financial resources in any event.

The farmer is tremendously dependent upon credit, and he cannot shift higher costs to anybody.

A 1-percent rise in interest rates, which has no appreciable impact upon giant industry, increases by about 10 percent the total payments of a homeowner during the life of his mortgage. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in my remarks a table to illustrate this situation.

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

Effects of the increase of 1 percent (i. e., from 4 percent to 5 percent) on interest payments for mortgages of various principal amounts and maturities

Principal	Term (years)	Interest rate (percent)	Monthly payment to principal and interest	Total interest payment
$10,000	20	5	$66.00	$5,838.19
$10,000	20	4	60.60	4,543.28
Difference			5.40	1,294.91
Percent increase in monthly payments				8.9
$10,000	25	5	$58.50	$7,525.55
$10,000	25	4	52.80	5,831.51
Difference			5.70	1,694.04
Percent increase in monthly payments				10.8
$10,000	30	5	$53.70	$9,317.20
$10,000	30	4	47.80	7,167.42
Difference			5.90	2,149.78
Percent increase in monthly payments				12.4

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, new rental housing will also carry this 10 percent increase in cost, which will be passed on to the tenant. This causes inflation, in the form of higher costs for home ownership or rental. Moreover, the tightening of credit, and the rising interest rates, caused investment in residential nonfarm construction to decline by 11.6 percent from 1955 to 1956, measured in uniform 1956 dollars.

The rate of nonfarm housing starts has been moving severely downward since the end of 1954, and in recent months has been averaging an annual rate about 400 thousand below 1955. This low rate of residential construction, related to new family formation, and related to the amount of substandard housing, is obviously another example of the inflationary effect of the tight money policy and rising interest rates.

The unorganized worker cannot shift to anybody else the higher cost of living which results from higher interest rates. In the case of organized workers with cost-of-living contracts, the higher interest rates add to the cost of living, and are therefore inflationary.

They result in immediate pay raises to meet the higher cost of living. These pay raises cause management to raise the price of the product.

The ordinary consumer, who buys an automobile, a lawnmower, a refrigerator, or a television set, must pay for the cost of rising interest rates out of his own pocket.

Because of these higher costs, he must borrow more to make ends meet. The higher interest rates further increase his cost of buying the product, which is another illustration of the inflationary effects of rising interest rates.

In short, the tight credit policy, and the consequent increase in interest rates, is providing relatively more credit and relatively more income for those who already have plenty, and providing relatively less credit and relatively less income for those who already have too little.

THE TIGHT MONEY POLICY RATIONS NATIONAL INCOME IN THE WRONG DIRECTION

The best illustration of these trends is the relative trends in personal income. I shall depict all of these trends in uniform 1956 dollars.

During the 5½ years from the beginning of 1953 to the middle of 1957, personal interest income and dividend income have been growing at average annual rates almost twice as fast as wages and salaries. They have been growing about 8 times as fast as the income of unincorporated small businesses and professional people.

Meanwhile, farm operators' net income has been collapsing at an average annual rate of about 5 percent. During the most recent year and a half, dividends and personal interest income have been growing more than 60 percent faster than wages and salaries, while unincorporated small businesses and professional people have registered no income growth whatsoever.

Farm operators' net income has continued to decline at an average annual rate of almost 3½ percent. This is indeed a process of feeding the fat and starving the lean.

Mr. President, I do not claim that the policy of tight money and rising interest rates is solely responsible for all of these socially unjust and economically dangerous trends. But it bears an important share in this responsibility.

It bears a share which the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury can do something about, while they alone may be able to do very little about some of the other causes of these highly unfavorable trends. Moreover, the policy of tight money and rising interest rates is but one startling manifestation of an entire economic philosophy which I have already described in general terms.

Other examples of the same philosophy have been embodied in the Government's attitude, until very recently, toward rapid tax amortization; the Government's attitude toward the redistribution of the tax burden in a regressive direction; the Government's attitude toward the awarding of defense contracts; the Government's resistance to fair expansion of social security; and above all the Government's entire farm program from top to bottom.

THE TIGHT MONEY POLICY IS ECONOMICALLY UNSOUND

Thus far, Mr. President, I have been discussing the social iniquities and economic injustice of the tight money policy and rising interest rates. But I said at the outset that economic injustice in a country like the United States is inconsistent with economic soundness or economic progress.

So let us now examine how the maldistributions in income, generated by the tight money policy and similar policies, have already created an unbalanced economic structure in its entirety. We have not yet reached the point where a depression is just around the corner. But we have certainly reached the point where a lot of warning signals are being flashed.

I suppose that there is no proposition more generally accepted by the American people, and by the experts also, than the proposition that the formula for economic stability is to keep production and consumption in fairly good balance. If we try to consume more than we can produce, inflation must result.

If we try to produce more than we can consume, recession or depression must ultimately result. Those who have studied most carefully the history of the great depression, have now concluded that its primary cause was not the stock market crash and the financial crisis.

These events were only the symptoms and the breakthrough. The primary cause was the failure of consumption to keep up with our growing productive capabilities. Consumption did not keep up, because the incomes of the bulk of consumers did not keep up with the incomes available for investment in productive facilities and for speculation.

For a number of years, we deferred the payoff by a rapid expansion of credit and installment buying, and by making loans overseas to enable other countries to buy our products. But while the payoff was delayed, it could not be avoided.

We are once again witnessing, as I have already reviewed, a growth in the incomes of investors and speculators much more rapid than the growth in income of the wage and salary people who are most of our consumers. The incomes and consuming power of the more than 21 million people in our farm population have been forced deliberately and cruelly downward. In consequence, investment in the means of production has been advancing far ahead of consumption.

Comparing the annual rates in the second quarter of 1957 with those in the second quarter of 1956, all measured in uniform 1956 dollars, investment in producers durable equipment has grown by 9.6 percent, while consumer expenditures have grown by only 1.7 percent. It is this trend during the past year, continuing during the first half of this year, which led the distinguished economist Sumner Slichter very recently to send a letter to the New York Times, stating his view that our No. 1 economic problem now is to expand consumption, so that our rate of real economic progress may be elevated to desirable levels.

Perhaps the most amazing thing about the testimony of the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, was his failure to appreciate the nature of this most serious problem. He argued, in fact, that consumers should be induced to spend still less and to save more, in order that these savings might be available to finance the investment boom which is already far out of hand relative to consumption.

The two spokesmen for the Treasury were almost as wrong on this subject as Chairman Martin. Treasury Secretary Humphrey and Under Secretary Burgess admitted that the investment boom is moving too fast, and that consumption is not moving fast enough. But they nonetheless advocated an increase in consumer savings.

Yet it is elementary, under current conditions, that an increase in consumer savings must result in less production and more unemployment unless these savings are absorbed in investment. Why should we have this shift from consumption to investment, when investment is already too high relative to consumption?

None of the three Government witnesses could appreciate the very simple fact that the tight-money policy and rising interest rates are not restraining excessive investment, while they are seriously retarding our already inadequate consumption.

We do not have to rely entirely upon forecasts to determine the consequences of this growing imbalance between investment and consumption. A large amount of the evidence is already here. All of the Government witnesses admitted that our economy needs to expand at a rate of between 3 and 4 percent in a year—and I think still more—in order to absorb a growing labor force, and to absorb improvements in technology and productivity.

This is how the standard of living moves ahead. Even 5 percent is not an overly rapid rate of growth.

Japan is expanding at 15 percent, Russia at 12 percent, West Germany at 6 percent.

But our average annual economic expansion, measuring our total national product in uniform 1956 dollars, has fallen from 4 percent during the period from the beginning of 1949 to date, to 3.1 percent for the period from the beginning of 1953 to date, to 2.7 percent for the period from the beginning of 1956 to date, and to only 2.6 percent when the first half of 1957 is compared on an annual basis with the first half of 1956. Keeping in mind that our population is increasing by 1.5 percent each year, our per capita gain is about 1 percent.

The trends in industrial production make the current situation even clearer. The industrial production index, during the most recent months, has been considerably lower than at the beginning of this year, still further below the levels of the last quarter of 1956, and hardly above the levels of a year ago.

As the economy is being forced into a state of virtual stagnation, excess productive capacities or surpluses of goods are almost everywhere. Most of our basic industries have moved down to within a range of 80 percent of full ca-

pacity operations, when they should be around 95 percent or, in any event, above 90 percent.

Unemployment during the first half of 1957, measured as a percent of the civilian labor force, was more than 50 percent higher than in 1952 or 1953. It was about 8 percent higher than in 1956.

Moreover, these figures on unemployment do not take account of temporary layoffs. They do not take account of the inefficient utilization of the labor supply, resulting from insufficient markets to keep plants running efficiently.

Now I want to say just a word about productivity, or output per man-hour worked. In grouping and grasping around for some logical explanation of the current inflation, the Government witnesses tried to tell the Finance Committee that the inflation is occurring because the rate of productivity growth is falling.

They told us that labor costs have been rising faster than productivity, and that this has made it necessary for prices to rise. But the Government spokesman who introduced this fallacious point beat a hasty retreat when I read to him the Government statistics on productivity increases.

These increases have been sufficiently large to result, in the absence of adequate consumer buying, in the vast increases of unused plant capacities and of unemployment which I have just mentioned. The figures do show that the rate of productivity growth has slowed down somewhat.

But the only reasonable explanation of this is the inefficiency of operations which results from inadequate markets to stimulate full operations. There can certainly be no technological reasons for the slowdown in productivity growth, when we have been witnessing this tremendous boom in new machinery and tools, combined with an increase in labor skills.

In short, the tight money policy itself, by holding back economic growth, is holding back productivity gains—and thus contributing to inflation.

THE ABANDONMENT OF A FULL EMPLOYMENT POLICY

In the full face of these economic developments, one might have expected the Government witnesses to question the tight money policy, which even these witnesses conceded has contributed to the slowdown of economic expansion, to the ominous rise in unused productive capacity, and to the serious growth in unemployment. Instead, all three of these witnesses seemed to feel that these unfavorable developments were in fact favorable. None of them would admit categorically that he liked rising unemployment, but they all insisted that unemployment now is not too high, and that in fact we now have full employment.

This viewpoint brought home to me a realization that the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board define "full employment" in a very different way from my definition—and I believe very different from the purposes of the Employment Act of 1946. I define "full employment" as a maximum opportunity for all of our people to obtain jobs in accord with their capabilities.

I define "full employment" as maximum utilization of our factories and our farms, to turn out an ever-increasing abundance of goods, and to raise the standards of living of all the people accordingly. The Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board apparently define "full employment" as the amount of unused plant and unemployment which they believe to be necessary to maintain a stable price level.

If a good case could be made to the effect that the amount of idle resources we now have were necessary to maintain a stable price level, something might be said on both sides of the question as to whether a stable price level is more desirable than full employment and a high rate of economic growth.

It is unnecessary for me to go into this interesting question. The entire case of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board vanishes because of this: The facts reveal clearly that the low rate of economic growth and the rising amount of economic slack, during the past year and a half, has been accompanied by much more price inflation than the higher rate of economic growth, and the much lesser degree of economic slack, during preceding years all the way back to the end of World War II.

Again and again, members of the Finance Committee challenged the Government witnesses to explain why full employment in peacetime has not been inflationary, and why the forced departure from full employment during the past year and a half or longer has been so extraordinarily inflationary.

Chairman Martin made a feeble attempt at explanation. He conceded that we should have a larger volume of economic activity, a faster rate of economic growth, and a larger volume of consumption. But he argued that we should have these things at a lower price level, and that we should not expect to have them until we achieve a lower price level.

This is an indirect way of conceding my point, to the effect that we have plenty of productive capacity now to produce much more goods and services for the benefit of the American people. But since we now have excess productive capacity relative to demand, why are prices still rising?

I could not obtain from any of the Government witnesses even an attempt to answer the question. So I will attempt to supply an answer of my own.

We now have rising prices because of the restrictionist economic philosophy, which the tight money policy represents. We now have rising prices, not because we have full utilization of our plants and manpower, but rather because we do not have full utilization. Full production is the fundamental cure for inflation in peacetime, and it is the best answer to inflation even in wartime.

Some of our administered-price semimonopolistic giant industries, in the absence of an adequate expansion of sales, have been raising their prices in order to obtain the funds which they think they need. I do not believe personally that they have needed so much funds.

If the economy were expanding at a full employment rate, they would obtain these amounts of funds through more sales, without inflating their prices so much or at all.

This is not a theoretical argument; it is supported by the fact that we are now witnessing a price inflation, in a retarded economy, enormously greater than the price increases that we had in a full employment economy.

The source of the error on the part of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board is that they are confusing the wartime and reconversion inflation with the current inflation. Those inflations, especially in wartime, were caused by necessary overemployment of our plants and manpower, accompanied by available purchasing power far in excess of our total productive capacities.

Restraints upon the money supply and many inducements to consumers to enlarge their savings, were entirely appropriate under such circumstances. Even then, we did not attempt to cut back on general production and employment. We had the vision to foresee that the expansion of production would do more than any other one thing to reduce the inflationary pressures.

But today, the situation is entirely different. We have underemployment, underconsumption, and underproduction. Yet the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board are applying their restraints to force all of these factors still lower. This is not a solution; it is a dangerous mistake based upon a dangerous confusion.

Instead of pursuing this dangerous course, we should be stimulating consumption until it catches up with our productive powers. We should be avoiding the current policies which feed the investment boom, until consumption catches up. Once this fundamental balance is reestablished, we can move ahead confidently, with full employment of both plant and manpower. This should always be the prime objective of national economic policy.

THE TIGHT MONEY POLICY IS IN ITSELF INFLATIONARY

In order to accomplish these fundamental purposes, we must recognize that an excess restriction of the money supply is an economic evil, no less than it is a social injustice. This excessive restriction, now in effect, hurts the economy and feeds inflation at one and the same time.

I have already given some specific examples of why it feeds inflation. So let us now look at the overall picture.

The crux of the matter is whether or not increases in interest rates really are a deterrent to inflation. If it cannot be demonstrated clearly that they are, then these increases have no justification whatsoever.

The fact is that the initial effect of increases in interest rates is the same as the initial effect of an increase in other costs. This initial effect is to push prices upward, and higher prices are the very essence of inflation. Since prices are still rising all along the line, this is evidence that the increases in interest rates are still continuing to be inflationary.

It is no answer to say that rising interest rates will no longer be inflationary, when future increases in prices deter purchases at the new price level. To say this is just like saying that inflationary price increases are anti-inflationary because, when the price increases continue for long enough, they produce a reaction which leads to a recession. One of the strongest arguments against rising interest rates is that they are, indeed, contributing to an inflation which could lead to a recession.

The analysis would be different, if we were now suffering from the wartime type of inflation, with consumer purchasing power far in excess of the available supply of goods. In that case, it would be desirable to restrain consumer purchases by desirable means, such as the encouragement of savings. Even so, it would not be desirable to restrain consumer purchases by rising interest costs and rising prices, which take goods away from low-income consumers, without taking goods away from those who have limitless money to spend.

The economic situation today is entirely different. The reason for the great price rises today is not an excess of purchasing power, or a shortage of production of consumer goods. The prices are rising, despite unused productive capabilities and an insufficiently utilized labor supply. The shortage today is a shortage of purchasing power by consumers, and this shortage is intensified by the inflationary price increases, to which rising interest rates contribute.

Furthermore, to let this inflationary process go on, only hurts the Nation's prosperity and retards the desirable growth of the economy, by adding to the deficiency of consumer purchasing power, and by adding to the already existing surpluses in the form of unemployed labor and unused productive capacity.

Thus the shortage which is contributing to inflation today is not a shortage of labor or of plant, but rather a shortage of purchasing power, including money and credit. The tight money policy adds to this shortage, and therefore adds to inflation. The proof of this is to be found in the fact that we now have inflation with a very tight money supply, while we had much less inflation in earlier years with a more adequate money supply.

During those years since World War II, excepting the reconversion and Korean war years, when we had reasonably full employment, a reasonable rate of economic growth, and comparatively little price inflation, the privately held supply of money and credit was expanding at an average annual rate close to 3⅓ percent.

During the year and a half since the beginning of 1956, we have had neither reasonably full employment, nor a reasonable rate of economic growth, but extraordinary price inflation. During this latter period, the privately held money supply has been expanding at an average annual rate of only 2.7 percent, or almost one-third less than the desirable rate.

Let us look at the price side of the picture, and this brings us to the crux of the whole matter.

The tight money policy and rising interest rates are not restraining, but rather are accelerating, price inflation. During the first half of 1957, compared with the first half of 1956, consumer prices have averaged 3.6 percent higher, wholesale prices 3.4 percent higher, and industrial prices 3.5 percent higher.

This might be called the annual rate of price advance which is currently in process. During the whole period from 1953 to date, the average annual expansion of the money supply was much greater than during the past year. The average annual rate of real economic progress was much greater.

We were much closer to full employment of plant and manpower, the average annual increase of consumer prices was only one-fourth as great, the average annual increase in wholesale prices was less than 30 percent as great, and the average annual increases in industrial prices was only about one-third as great, as the price increases during the most recent year from the first half of 1956 to the first half of 1957.

In the absence of explanations which have not been forthcoming, what better demonstration could there be that the tight money policy and rising interest rates are accomplishing at one and the same time the double purpose of endangering the economy and feeding price inflation? The Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board have made no attempt to answer this question. They have not even looked at this problem.

NO CASE HAS BEEN MADE FOR THE TIGHT MONEY POLICY

In summation, just what kind of case have the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board made? They have failed to explain the current inflation. Their attempts to explain it on grounds of extreme prosperity, excessive overall demand, and other classic explanations, do not fit the plain facts as they are. The current inflation has not been due to an economy suffering from overprosperity, but rather to an economy suffering from underprosperity.

It has not been due to strains upon our productive capacities. It has not been due to an excessive money supply and excessive purchasing power. It has been due, rather, to a bad distribution of an inadequate money supply and inadequate purchasing power, so that some have had too much money and credit and excessive incomes and prices, while others have had far too little of all of these things.

The current inflation has been due to a restrictionist economic philosophy and an unjust social philosophy, of which the tight money policy and rising interest rates are prime examples.

In a final desperate effort to offer some rational explanation, the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board have sought to fix the blame for inflation upon those who work for wages. They have claimed that excessive wage increases have forced prices upward.

I do not pretend to be enough of an expert to analyze all of the variations in the wage structure. Yet how can wages in general have been too high, when consumption in general has been much too low, and when wage earners are our most numerous consumers? How can wages in general have been too high, when big industry has been earning enough profits to lift their investment and productive facilities far out of line on the high side with the consuming power of the people?

Only a few years ago, many of the people who now claim that wages are too high were claiming that farm income was too high, even though at its peak farm income never yielded to our farm people a per capita income much better than half that of the population as a whole. Many of these same people are still pursuing policies which are driving farm income still lower.

For the good of our whole economy, including farmers, I for one am thankful that this kind of economic philosophy has not yet been more efficiently applied to the wage earners of America. If this kind of economic philosophy persists, I predict that the wage earner in due course will feel its full impact even as he did after 1929.

PLANNING A RECESSION TO CURE INFLATION

If this seems like an overstatement, let us examine the only morsel of hope or comfort proffered by the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board. They tell us that their current restrictionary policies are only beginning to take hold. They tell us these policies will be successful in containing inflation when we descend from the current level of prosperity, which Secretary Humphrey several times called extreme, to a lower level of prosperity.

Chairman Martin tried to assure us that he was not in favor of an economic recession. But the so-called adjustments which he described as essential to the restoration of price stability would, in fact, be an economic recession. There is a growing body of informed observers, to some of whom I referred earlier in my remarks, who now admit that the tight money policy and rising interest rates provide no answer whatsoever to the problems of inflation, except by bringing on an economic recession.

I reject totally and completely this brand of economic philosophy. An economic recession for the country as a whole would drive our farmers from poverty to destitution.

It would drive our small-business men from a precarious existence to bankruptcy.

It would drive additional millions of workers into unemployment.

It would automatically create huge deficits in the Federal budget, and make us even less able than we now seem to be to meet the needs of our growing population for essential public services.

It would perilously weaken our position in world affairs.

Clearly, we must find some better answer than a planned recession.

Even if the tight money policy and rising interest rates were not driving us toward an economic recession, they are nonetheless depriving us of the blessings of a full economy.

Right now, we are producing goods and services at an annual rate of at least $25 billion less than if we had a full economy. This comes close to $500 on the average, for every American family.

If we continue at the present restricted rate of progress for another few years, we could lose $100 billion or more in the goods and services which a full economy can produce for the benefit of the people.

Today, I shall detail only the first step of the full program required to get us back on the right course.

We should abandon the tight money policy. This policy is playing havoc with the management of the national debt; inflating Government costs; preventing full production and full employment; jeopardizing our economic stability; fanning general inflationary forces; fleecing the taxpayer; preventing the construction of necessary homes, schools, and other public improvements; penalizing farmers, small-business men, and ordinary consumers; and taking billions of dollars out of the pockets of our people, for the unjust enrichment of the few.

No case whatsoever has been made for the continuance of this tight money policy. All of the forces of fact and logic are against it. We must get rid of it before it is too late.

Mr. President, I have prepared some tabulations which support and greatly amplify the facts which I have presented. All these tabulations are based on official Government statistics; but they also include some factual computations of my own—for example, percentage computations of rates of price increases, rates of growth, and so forth. However, these factual computations merely translate the official Government statistics into their equivalents.

I have made the essential features of these computations available to the spokesmen for the Government, during the course of the hearings before the Senate Finance Committee. There has been no challenge of the factual accuracy of these computations. Of course, the interpretations I have placed upon the facts are my own, as must always be the case.

I ask unanimous consent that these tabulations be printed at this point in the RECORD, as the concluding part of my statement.

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

1. Various interest charges, 1950–57

[Averages for listed periods in percent per annum]

Period	Money market rates: U. S. Government securities (taxable)		Bond and stock yields			Computed annual interest rate on public debt	Bank rates on short-term business loans, 19 large cities (all size loans)
			State and local government bonds		Corporate bonds (total)		
	9- to 12-month issues	3- to 5-year issues	General obligations	Revenue bonds			
1950	1.26	1.50	1.94	2.34	2.86	[1] 2.200	2.7
1951	1.73	1.93	1.99	2.29	3.08	[1] 2.270	3.1
1952	1.81	2.13	2.22	2.45	3.19	2.330	3.5
1953	2.07	2.57	2.82	3.02	3.43	2.414	3.7
1954	.92	1.82	2.46	2.81	3.16	2.342	3.6
1955	1.89	2.50	2.57	2.85	3.25	2.370	3.7
1956	2.83	3.12	2.94	3.26	3.57	2.580	4.2
1955—March	1.49	2.30	2.49	2.80	3.20	2.334	3.54
June	1.71	2.42	2.49	2.80	3.23	2.351	3.56
September	2.14	2.72	2.70	2.92	3.31	2.402	3.77
December	2.56	2.83	2.70	2.97	3.33	2.490	3.93
1956—March	2.43	2.83	2.67	2.95	3.30	2.533	3.93
June	2.69	2.87	2.71	3.02	3.46	2.576	4.14
September	3.17	3.43	3.06	3.50	3.75	2.614	4.35
December	3.33	3.65	3.57	3.95	3.99	2.671	4.38
1957—January	3.17	3.40	3.51	3.92	4.04	2.683	[2]
February	3.23	3.33	3.29	3.75	3.99	2.719	[2]
March	3.35	3.38	3.36	----------	3.97	2.726	4.38
April	3.41	3.48	3.35	----------	3.96	2.725	[2]
May	3.37	3.60	3.48	----------	4.02	2.746	[2]
June	3.55	3.77	3.65	----------	4.15	2.730	4.40
July	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	2.742	[2]

[1] June figures (not yearly average).
[2] Not available.

Source: Federal Reserve bulletins and Treasury bulletins.

2. Sources of data on distribution of consumer savings and on income distribution:

The data on consumer savings are based upon the 1957 Survey of Consumer Finances by the Federal Reserve Board.

The data on general income distribution and on distribution of income among farm families are based on the statistics of the National Income Section, Office of Business Economics, Department of Commerce.

The data on the incomes of the aged are based on the statistics of the Bureau of the Census.

The data on low pay in various areas are based on a sample survey of the Bureau of the Census.

3. The relative rates of growth in various components of national income are computed by (a) obtaining the absolute figures in current dollars from the Economic Report of the President and Economic Indicators, (b) transforming these to uniform dollars by using the same deflator methods used in the President's Economic Report to deflate consumer expenditures, and (c) calculating the percentage rates of growth accordingly.

The following tabulation results:

	Percent change		
	1953–57 [1]		1956–57 [2] Annual rate
	Total change	Annual rate	
Wages and salaries	13.0	3.3	2.7
Farm operators' net income	−17.5	−5.0	−3.4
Business and prof. propr. income	2.9	.8	0
Dividends	24.5	6.0	5.1
Personal interest income	26.6	6.5	3.7

[1] Through 1st half of 1957 (at annual rate).
[2] Assuming growth (in constant dollars) from 2d half of 1956 to 1st half of 1957 continues through 2d half of 1957.

4. Relative growth rates in consumption, investment in producers' durable equipment, and investment in nonfarm residential construction. This data is derived by (a) obtaining the absolute figures from the Economic Report of the President and Economic Indicators, (b) deflating these to a uniform 1956 price level, and (c) calculating the percentage changes accordingly. This yields the following results:

Annual growth rates in uniform 1956 dollars

	Personal consumption expenditures	Investment in producers' durable equipment	Investment in residential nonfarm construction
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
1955–56	3.3	11.1	−11.6
2d quarter 1956–2d quarter 1957	1.7	9.6	[1]
1956–57 [2]	2.3	7.9	[1]

[1] Not available.
[2] Annual growth rate, assuming 2d half of 1957 grows at same rate as 1st half of 1957.

5. Trends and relative trends in key sectors of the United States economy, 1932–57

Year	Consumer prices [1] (1947–49=100)		Wholesale prices [2] (1947–49=100)		Industrial prices [3] (1947–49=100)		Gross national product [4] (billions of 1956 dollars)		Industrial production index [5] (1947–49=100)	
	Index	Percent change over previous year	Index	Percent change over previous year	Index	Percent change over previous year	GNP	Percent change over previous year	Industrial production	Percent change over previous year
1932	58.4	----------	42.1	----------	50.2	----------	133.5	----------	31	----------
1933	55.3	−5.3	42.8	+1.7	50.9	+1.4	130.1	−2.5	37	+19.4
1934	57.2	+3.4	48.7	+13.8	56.0	+10.0	143.6	+10.4	40	+8.1
1935	58.7	+2.6	52.0	+6.8	55.7	−.5	158.5	+10.4	47	+17.5
1936	59.3	+1.0	52.5	+1.0	56.9	+2.2	179.5	+13.2	56	+19.1
1937	61.4	+3.5	56.1	+6.9	61.0	+7.2	190.2	+6.0	61	+8.9
1938	60.3	−1.8	51.1	−8.9	58.4	−4.3	181.5	−4.6	48	−21.3
1939	59.4	−1.5	50.1	−2.0	58.1	−.5	196.2	+8.1	58	+20.8
1940	59.9	+.8	51.1	+2.0	59.4	+2.2	213.7	+8.9	67	+15.5

See footnotes at end of table.

5. Trends and relative trends in key sectors of the United States economy, 1932–57—Continued

Year	Consumer prices [1] (1947–49=100)		Wholesale prices [2] (1947–49=100)		Industrial prices [3] (1947–49=100)		Gross national product [4] (billions of 1956 dollars)		Industrial production index [5] (1947–49=100)	
	Index	Percent change over previous year	Index	Percent change over previous year	Index	Percent change over previous year	GNP	Percent change over previous year	Industrial production	Percent change over previous year
1941	62.9	+5.0	56.8	+11.2	63.7	+7.2	247.2	+15.7	87	+29.9
1942	69.7	+10.8	64.2	+13.0	68.3	+7.2	278.7	+12.7	106	+21.8
1943	74.0	+6.2	67.0	+4.4	69.3	+1.5	309.6	+11.1	127	+19.8
1944	75.2	+1.6	67.6	+.9	70.4	+1.6	332.6	+7.4	125	−1.6
1945	76.9	+2.3	68.8	+1.8	71.3	+1.3	325.7	−2.1	107	−14.4
1946	83.4	+8.5	78.7	+14.4	78.3	+9.8	290.6	−10.8	90	−15.9
1947	95.5	+14.5	96.4	+22.5	95.3	+21.7	289.6	−.3	100	+11.1
1948	102.8	+7.6	104.4	+8.3	103.4	+8.5	302.7	+4.5	104	+4.0
1949	101.8	−1.0	99.2	−5.0	101.3	−2.0	301.8	−.3	97	−6.7
1950	102.8	+1.0	103.1	+3.9	105.0	+3.6	329.9	+9.3	112	+15.5
1951	111.0	+8.0	114.8	+11.3	115.9	+10.4	354.2	+7.4	120	+7.1
1952	113.5	+2.3	111.6	−2.8	113.2	−2.3	366.6	+3.5	124	+3.3
1953	114.4	+.8	110.1	−1.3	114.0	+.7	381.6	+4.1	134	+8.1
1954	114.8	+.3	110.3	+.2	114.5	+.4	376.2	−1.4	125	−6.7
1955	114.5	−.3	110.7	+.4	117.0	+2.2	403.4	+7.2	139	+11.2
1956	116.2	+1.5	114.3	+3.3	122.2	+4.4	414.7	+2.8	143	+2.9
1956	[11] 115.1		[11] 113.2		[11] 121.1		411.9		[11] 142	
1957	[11] 119.2	+3.6	[11] 117.1	+3.4	[11] 125.3	+3.5	[11] 422.6	+2.6	[11] 144	+1.4

Year	Total civilian employment [6] (millions)		Unemployment as percent of civilian labor force [7]	Privately held money supply [8] (billions of dollars)		Federal expenditures [9] (billions of 1956 dollars) fiscal year		Federal surplus or deficit (billions of 1956 dollars) fiscal years [10]
	Number	Percent change over previous year		Supply (at end of year)	Percent change over previous year	Expenditures	Percent change over previous year	
1932	38.940		23.6	44.9				
1933	38.760	−.5	24.9	41.5	−7.6	12.2	+3.4	−6.9
1934	40.890	+5.5	21.7	46.3	+11.6	17.1	+40.2	−9.2
1935	42.260	+3.4	20.1	51.3	+10.8	15.6	−8.8	−6.7
1936	44.410	+5.1	16.9	56.4	+9.9	19.4	+24.4	−10.0
1937	46.300	+4.3	14.3	55.8	−1.1	17.1	−11.9	−6.2
1938	44.220	−4.5	19.0	58.1	+4.1	15.4	−9.9	−2.7
1939	45.750	+3.5	17.2	63.3	+9.0	20.2	+31.2	−8.9
1940	47.520	+3.9	14.6	70.0	+10.6	20.5	+1.5	−8.8
1941	50.350	+6.0	9.9	76.3	+9.0	27.8	+35.6	−13.0
1942	53.750	+6.8	4.7	91.3	+19.6	61.9	+122.7	−39.1
1943	54.470	+1.3	1.9	112.4	+23.1	134.2	+116.8	−97.0
1944	53.960	−.9	1.2	130.2	+15.8	158.2	+17.9	−85.5
1945	52.820	−2.1	1.9	150.8	+15.8	165.3	+4.5	−90.6
1946	55.250	+4.6	3.9	164.0	+8.8	92.4	−44.1	−31.7
1947	58.027	+5.0	3.6	170.0	+3.6	51.9	−43.8	+1.1
1948	59.378	+2.3	3.4	169.1	−.5	42.1	−18.9	+10.7
1949	58.710	−1.1	5.5	169.8	+.4	49.2	+16.9	−2.2
1950	59.957	+2.1	5.0	176.9	+4.2	47.6	−3.3	−3.7
1951	61.005	+1.8	3.0	186.0	+5.1	49.6	+4.2	+3.9
1952	61.293	+.5	2.7	194.8	+4.7	70.0	+41.1	−4.3
1953	62.213	+1.5	2.5	200.9	+3.1	80.7	+15.3	−10.2
1954	61.238	−1.6	5.0	209.7	+4.4	73.6	−8.8	−3.4
1955	63.193	+3.2	4.0	216.6	+3.3	68.0	−7.6	−4.4
1956	64.979	+2.8	3.8	222.0	+2.5	67.6	−.6	+1.6
1956	[11] 64.036			[12] 212.1				
1957	[11] 64.534	.8	[11] 4.1	[12] 218.6	+3.1	68.8	+1.8	+1.6

[1] Consumer Price Index, 1932–54: 1955 Supplement to Economic Indicators, p. 49. 1955–57 data: Economic Indicators, August 1957, p. 23.
[2] Wholesale Price Index, 1932–54: 1955 Supplement to Economic Indicators, p. 51. 1955–57 data: Economic Indicators, August 1957, p. 24.
[3] Industrial Price Index, 1932–54: 1955 Supplement to Economic Indicators, p. 51. 1955–57 data: Economic Indicators, August 1957, p. 24.
[4] GNP in 1956 prices, 1932–56 Economic Report of the President, January 1957, p. 124. 1957 data in current prices, Economic Indicators, August 1957, p. 2.
[5] Total Industrial Production Index 1932–56, Economic Report of President, January 1957, p. 152. 1957 data: Economic Indicators, August 1957, p. 16.
[6] Employment 1932–56, Economic Report of President, January 1957, p. 140. Data for 1957: Economic Indicators, August 1957, p. 11.
[7] Data 1932–56, Economic Report of President, January 1957, p. 140. Data for 1957, Economic Indicators, August 1957, p. 11.
[8] 1932–56 data, Economic Report of the President, January 1957, p. 165, col. 2. 1957 data, Economic Indicators, August 1957, p. 26, col. 3.
[9] Conventional budget. Basic data in current dollars, Bureau of the Budget data. Table adjusts to 1956 dollars by using same deflator that President's Economic Report uses to deflate Federal outlays for goods and services.
[10] Same as note 9.
[11] 1st half.
[12] 1st 5 months.

6. Annual averages, for various periods, of yearly trends depicted in (5) above

	Annual average percentage change over previous year [1]								Annual average	
	Consumer prices [2]	Wholesale prices [2]	Industrial prices [2]	GNP (billions of 1956 dollars) [3]	Industrial production [2]	Total civilian employment [2]	Privately held money supply (billions of dollars) [2]	Federal expenditures (fiscal years) (billions of 1956 dollars) [4]	Unemployment as percent of civilian labor force [2]	Federal surplus or deficit (fiscal years) (billions of 1956 dollars) [4]
1. 1933 to date, inclusive	+3.0	+4.5	+3.9	+5.0	+7.3	+2.2	+7.0	+13.0	+8.7	−17.0
2. 1933 to date, inclusive, excluding years 1940 to 1945, inclusive	+2.5	+4.1	+4.0	+3.7	+5.8	+2.1	+4.2	+1.1	+9.7	−4.8
3. 1933 to date, inclusive, excluding years 1940 to 1948, inclusive	+1.1	+2.0	+2.2	+4.8	+7.0	+1.7	+4.3	+8.2	+10.8	−4.5
4. 1933 to date, inclusive, excluding years 1940 to 1948, inclusive, and 1951	+.6	+1.4	+1.7	+4.7	+7.0	+1.7	+4.2	+8.4	+11.4	−5.0
5. 1933 to 1952, inclusive	+3.5	+5.3	+4.3	+5.4	+8.1	+2.3	+7.9	+16.0	+9.8	−20.5
6. 1933 to 1952, inclusive, excluding years 1940 to 1945, inclusive	+3.1	+5.1	+4.7	+3.9	+6.5	+2.3	+4.5	+1.5	+11.5	−5.5

[1] In computing the various annual averages through 1957, the year 1957 is weighted according to the part of the year included in the data.
[2] Data through June 1957.
[3] Data through 2d quarter 1957.
[4] Data through fiscal year 1957.

6. Annual averages, for various periods, of yearly trends depicted in (5) above—Continued

	Annual average percentage change over previous year [1]								Annual average	
	Consumer prices [2]	Wholesale prices [2]	Industrial prices [2]	GNP (billions of 1956 dollars) [3]	Industrial production [2]	Total civilian employment [2]	Privately held money supply (billions of dollars) [2]	Federal expenditures (fiscal years) (billions of 1956 dollars) [4]	Unemployment as percent of civilian labor force [2]	Federal surplus or deficit (fiscal years) (billions of 1956 dollars) [4]
7. 1933 to 1952, inclusive, excluding years 1940 to 1948, inclusive	+1.1	+2.4	+2.3	+5.5	+8.3	+1.8	+4.7	+11.6	+13.7	−5.2
8. 1933 to 1952, inclusive, excluding years 1940 to 1948, inclusive, and 1951	+.4	+1.5	+1.5	+5.4	+8.5	+1.8	+4.6	+12.3	+14.7	−6.1
9. 1933 to 1939, inclusive	+.3	+2.8	+2.2	+5.9	+10.4	+2.4	+5.2	+9.8	+19.2	−7.2
10. 1940 to 1945, inclusive	+4.5	+5.6	+3.5	+9.0	+11.8	+2.5	+15.7	+49.8	+5.7	−55.7
11. 1940 to 1948, inclusive	+6.4	+8.7	+6.8	+5.2	+7.8	+3.0	+11.8	+21.4	+5.0	−39.3
12. 1946 to 1948, inclusive	+10.2	+15.1	+13.3	−2.2	−.3	+4.0	+4.0	−35.6	+3.6	−6.6
13. 1949 to date, inclusive	+1.7	+1.4	+2.3	+4.0	+4.1	+1.1	+3.4	+6.8	+3.9	−2.3
14. 1949 to date, inclusive, excluding 1951	+.9	+.1	+1.2	+3.5	+3.8	+1.0	+3.3	+7.2	+4.1	−3.1
15. 1949 to 1952, inclusive	+2.6	+1.9	+2.4	+5.0	+4.8	+.8	+3.6	+14.7	+4.1	−1.6
16. 1949 to 1952, inclusive, excluding 1951	+.8	−1.3	−.2	+4.2	+4.0	+.5	+3.1	+18.2	+4.4	−3.4
17. 1949 to 1953, inclusive	+2.2	+1.2	+2.1	+4.8	+5.5	+.9	+3.5	+14.8	+3.7	−3.3
18. 1949 to 1953, inclusive, excluding 1951	+.8	−1.3	0	+4.2	+5.1	+.7	+3.1	+17.5	+3.9	−5.1
19. 1949 to 1955, inclusive	+1.6	+1.0	+1.9	+4.3	+4.5	+.9	+3.6	+8.3	+4.0	−3.5
20. 1949 to 1955, inclusive, excluding 1951	+.5	−.8	+.4	+3.7	+4.1	+.8	+3.4	+8.9	+4.1	−4.7
21. 1953 to date, inclusive	+.9	+1.0	+2.1	+3.1	+3.6	+1.4	+3.3	−.2	+3.9	−2.9
22. 1954 to date, inclusive	+.9	+1.6	+2.5	+2.8	+2.3	+1.4	+3.4	−4.6	+4.2	−1.1
23. 1956 to date, inclusive	+2.2	+3.3	+4.1	+2.7	+2.4	+2.1	+2.7	+.2	+3.9	+1.7

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4544) for the relief of Louis S. Levenson; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FORRESTER, Mr. DONOHUE, and Mr. BURDICK were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1419. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hannah Mae Powell;

H. R. 1883. An act for the relief of Benedict M. Kordus;

H. R. 2486. An act to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to grant relief with respect to claims arising out of deliveries of eligible feed grains on ineligible dates in connection with purchase orders under its emergency feed program; and

H. R. 5719. An act for the relief of Clara M. Briggs.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills and joint resolution of the House:

H. R. 4335. An act for the relief of Ramon Tavarez;

H. R. 7096. An act to amend paragraph 1684 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to istle or Tampico fiber; and

H. J. Res. 253. Joint resolution to establish a commission to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of the Civil War, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 281. An act for the relief of Jaffa Kam;

S. 684. An act for the relief of Ilse Striegan Bacon;

S. 880. An act for the relief of Necmettin Congiz;

S. 882. An act for the relief of Pauline Ethel Angus;

S. 1049. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ahsapet Gamityan;

S. 1271. An act for the relief of Daniel Alcide Charlebois;

S. 1321. An act for the relief of Junko Matsuoka Eckrich;

S. 1456. An act for the relief of Refugio Guerrero-Monje;

S. 1467. An act for the relief of Itsumi Kasahara;

S. 1635. An act for the relief of Maria Talioura Boisot;

S. 1835. An act for the relief of Maria Domenica Ricci;

S. 1921. An act for the relief of Maria Goldet;

S. 1972. An act for the relief of Letizia Maria Arini;

S. 2028. An act for the relief of Sherwood Lloyd Pierce;

S. 2041. An act for the relief of Sala Weissbard;

S. 2204. An act for the relief of Margaret E. Culloty;

S. 2413. An act to clarify the authority of the President to fill the judgeship for the district of South Dakota authorized by the act of February 10, 1954, and to repeal the prohibition contained in such act against filling the next vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for such district;

S. 2792. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9282. An act to provide additional office space in home districts of Congressmen, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners; and

H. J. Res. 453. Joint resolution to establish that the 2d regular session of the 85th Congress convene at noon on Tuesday, January 7, 1958.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, at this time, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECORD OF SENATE ACTIVITY DURING 1ST SESSIONS OF 82D, 83D, 84TH, AND 85TH CONGRESSES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a compilation showing the record of Senate activity in the 1st sessions of the 82d, 83d, 84th, and 85th Congresses.

I point out that, as of 3 o'clock today, we have passed more than 1,200 measures during this session of Congress. Two hundred and thirty-four public laws are the result of the bills we have passed. Some 150 or 175 measures are now on the President's desk awaiting his action. I expect that the session will produce in the neighborhood of from 350 to 400 public laws.

The public laws enacted in the 1st session of the 82d Congress numbered 255; in the 1st session of the 83d Congress, 288; and in the 1st session of the 84th Congress, 390.

The Senate has confirmed 43,810 Executive nominations.

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

Senate activity

	82d Cong., 1st sess. (Jan. 3–Oct. 20)	83d Cong., 1st sess. (Jan. 3–Aug. 3)	84th Cong., 1st sess. (Jan. 3–Aug. 2)	85th Cong., 1st sess. (Jan. 3–Aug. 30)
Days in session	172	125	105	143
Hours in session	996:46	763:35	559:41	860:19
Total measures passed by Senate	1,060	848	1,325	1,200
Senate bills	411	342	574	617
House bills	429	320	566	335
Senate joint resolutions	14	22	22	22

Senate activity—Continued

	82d Cong., 1st sess. (Jan. 3–Oct. 20)	83d Cong., 1st sess. (Jan. 3–Aug. 3)	84th Cong., 1st sess. (Jan. 3–Aug. 2)	85th Cong., 1st sess. (Jan. 3–Aug. 30)
Total measures passed by Senate—Continued				
House joint resolutions	29	21	20	54
Senate concurrent resolutions	23	25	25	24
House concurrent resolutions	19	14	21	27
Senate resolutions	135	104	97	121
Public laws	255	288	390	234
Confirmations	26,069	23,420	39,897	43,810

SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if I may, I should like to have the Chair lay before the Senate the sine die resolution. After we act on that, I have a brief statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair) laid before the Senate the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 229) which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Friday, August 30, 1957, and that when they adjourn on said day, they stand adjourned sine die.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, before some other Senator comes forward with a speech, while I am still in the good graces of a friend like Bill White, whom I told last night I would guarantee to get away from here by Saturday night, and before Tony Vaccaro, Bob Albright, Warren Duffee, Bill Knighton, Al Spivak, and the other boys looking at us from the Press Gallery, let something drop on us, in accordance with the terms of House Concurrent Resolution 229, I now move that the Senate stand adjourned sine die.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned sine die.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 30, 1957:

POSTMASTERS

FLORIDA

Victor Wray Irby, Zolfo Springs.

MISSISSIPPI

Burl J. Faulkner, Vicksburg.

MONTANA

John W. Loughnane, Belgrade.

OHIO

Hoyt G. Whitney, Sunbury.

OKLAHOMA

R. Ray Heath, Stillwater.

REPORT ENTITLED "TEXTILE PROCUREMENT IN THE MILITARY SERVICES" (S. REPT. NO. 1166)

Under authority of the order of the Senate of August 29, 1957,

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, on September 6, 1957, submitted a report prepared by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, entitled "Textile Procurement in the Military Services," which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "CONTROL AND REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS" (S. REPT. NO. 1167)

Under authority of the order of the Senate of August 28, 1957,

Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, pursuant to Senate Resolution 93, Senate Resolution 185, and Senate Resolution 286, 84th Congress, and extended by Senate Resolution 61, Senate Resolution 151, and Senate Resolution 192, 85th Congress, submitted, on September 6, 1957, a report prepared by the Subcommittee on Disarmament, entitled "Control and Reduction of Armaments," which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "DAYTIME RADIO STATIONS" (S. REPT. NO. 1168)

Under authority of the order of the Senate of August 15, 1957,

Mr. MORSE, from the Select Committee on Small Business, on September 11, 1957, submitted a report entitled "Daytime Radio Stations," which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES" BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY (S. REPT. NO. 1169)

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of August 29, 1957,

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, on September 19, 1957, submitted a report of that committee entitled "Summary of Activities," which was ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 230, agreed to August 30, 1957, the President pro tempore, on August 31, 1957, signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 1007. An act for the relief of Sgt. Donald D. Coleman;

S. 1636. An act for the relief of Delfina Cinco de Lopez;

S. 1791. An act to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1959;

S. 1996. An act to approve the contract negotiated with the Casper-Alcova irrigation project, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes;

S. 2377. An act to amend chapter 223, title 18, United States Code, to provide for the production of statements and reports of witnesses;

H. R. 580. An act to authorize the exchange of certain land in the State of Missouri;

H. R. 1315. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles H. Page;

H. R. 1411. An act for the relief of George H. Meyer Sons, Brauer & Co., Joseph McSweeney & Sons, Inc., C. L. Tomlinson, Jr., and Richmond Livestock Co., Inc.;

H. R. 1419. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hannah Mae Powell;

H. R. 1474. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jennie Maurello;

H. R. 1502. An act for the relief of Homer Cazamias;

H. R. 1677. An act for the relief of Gilbert B. Mar;

H. R. 1883. An act for the relief of Benedict M. Kordus;

H. R. 2486. An act to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to grant relief with respect to claims arising out of deliveries of eligible surplus feed grains on ineligible dates in connection with purchase orders under its emergency feed program;

H. R. 4174. An act for the relief of Filomena and Emil Ferrara;

H. R. 4335. An act for the relief of Ramon Tavarez;

H. R. 4351. An act for the relief of G. H. Litts;

H. R. 5719. An act for the relief of Clara M. Briggs;

H. R. 7014. An act for the relief of Madame Henriette Buaillon and Stanley James Carpenter;

H. R. 7096. An act to amend paragraph 1684 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to istle or Tampico fiber, to admit free of duty a beta-ray spectrometer for use at Stanford University, Stanford, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 7900. An act to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to sell to individuals land in Ottawa County, Mich., which was acquired pursuant to the provisions of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act;

H. R. 7964. An act to remove the limitation on the use of certain real property heretofore conveyed to the city of Austin, Tex., by the United States;

H. R. 7972. An act to provide for the conveyance to the city of Warner Robins, Ga., of certain lands and any improvements located thereon in such city;

H. R. 8374. An act for the relief of Virginia Ray Potts;

H. R. 8576. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain lands within the Old Hickory lock and dam project, Cumberland River, Tenn., to Middle Tennessee Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America, for recreation and camping purposes;

H. R. 9280. An act to facilitate the conduct of fishing operations in the Territory of Alaska, to promote the conservation of fishery resources thereof, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 253. Joint resolution to establish a commission to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Civil War, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The Secretary of the Senate presented to the President of the United States on August 31, 1957, the following enrolled bills:

S. 281. An act for the relief of Jaffa Kam;
S. 684. An act for the relief of Ilse Striegan Bacon;
S. 880. An act for the relief of Necmettin Cengiz;
S. 882. An act for the relief of Pauline Ethel Angus;
S. 1007. An act for the relief of Sgt. Donald D. Coleman;
S. 1049. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ahsapet Gamityan;
S. 1271. An act for the relief of Daniel Alcide Charlebois;
S. 1321. An act for the relief of Junko Matsuoka Eckrich;
S. 1456. An act for the relief of Refugio Guerrero-Monje;
S. 1467. An act for the relief of Itsumi Kasahara;
S. 1635. An act for the relief of Maria Talioura Boisot;
S. 1636. An act for the relief of Delfina Cinco de Lopez;
S. 1791. An act to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1959;
S. 1835. An act for the relief of Maria Domenica Ricci;
S. 1921. An act for the relief of Maria Goldet;
S. 1972. An act for the relief of Letizia Maria Arini;
S. 1996. An act to approve the contract negotiated with the Casper-Alcova irrigation project, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes;
S. 2028. An act for the relief of Sherwood Lloyd Pierce;
S. 2041. An act for the relief of Sala Weissbard;
S. 2204. An act for the relief of Margaret E. Culloty;
S. 2377. An act to amend chapter 223, title 18, United States Code, to provide for the production of statements and reports of witnesses;
S. 2413. An act to clarify the authority of the President to fill the judgeship for the district of South Dakota authorized by the act of February 10, 1954, and to repeal the prohibition contained in such act against filling the next vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for such district; and
S. 2792. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

APPROVAL OF SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to sine die adjournment of the Senate, notified the Secretary of the Senate that, on the following dates, he had approved and signed the following bills and joint resolutions:

On August 28, 1957:
S. 364. An act for the relief of the village of Wauneta, Nebr.;
S. 959. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes;
S. 999. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the State of North Dakota for the use and benefit of the North Dakota State School of Science;
S. 1631. An act to amend certain sections of title 13 of the United States Code, entitled "Census"; and
S. 1866. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to require the inspection and certification of certain vessels carrying passengers," approved May 10, 1956, in order to provide adequate time for the formulation and consideration of rules and regulations to be prescribed under such act.

On August 29, 1957:
S. 336. An act for the relief of Angela Ferrini;
S. 465. An act for the relief of Maria Concetta Di Turi;
S. 976. An act for the relief of Charles A. Sidawi;
S. 1685. An act for the relief of Sic Gun Chau (Tse) and Hing Man Chau;
S. 1736. An act for the relief of Rosa Sigl; and
S. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution to authorize establishment of the U. S. S. *Enterprise* (CV–6) in the Nation's Capital as a memorial museum.

On August 30, 1957:
S. 397. An act for the relief of Willem Woeras;
S. 398. An act for the relief of Benjamin Wachtfogel;
S. 441. An act for the relief of Jose Ramirez-Moreno;
S. 463. An act for the relief of Pedro Ampo;
S. 485. An act for the relief of Luigi Lino Turel;
S. 499. An act for the relief of Daniela Renata Patricia Zei;
S. 562. An act for the relief of Hideko Takiguchi Pulaski;
S. 567. An act for the relief of Vida Djenich;
S. 660. An act for the relief of Ursula Rosa Pazdro;
S. 662. An act for the relief of Howard I. Buchbinder;
S. 796. An act for the relief of Zacharoula Papoulia Matsa;
S. 1308. An act for the relief of Carmen Jeanne Launois Johnson;
S. 1387. An act for the relief of Rebecca Jean Lundy (Helen Choy);
S. 1496. An act for the relief of Nicoleta P. Pantelakis;
S. 1574. An act to provide for the disposal of certain Federal property in the Coulee Dam and Grand Coulee areas, to provide assistance in the establishment of a municipality incorporated under the laws of Washington, and for other purposes;
S. 1767. An act for the relief of Eileen Sheila Dhanda;
S. 1783. An act for the relief of Randolph Stephan Walker;
S. 1804. An act for the relief of Marjeta Winkle Brown;
S. 1848. An act for the relief of Michelle Patricia Hill (Patricia Adachi);
S. 1896. An act for the relief of Maria West;
S. 1902. An act for the relief of Belia Rodriguez Ternoir;
S. 2165. An act for the relief of Gertrud Mezger;
S. 2431. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Klamath River Basin compact between the States of California and Oregon, and for related purposes; and
S. 2460. An act to authorize the transfer of certain housing projects to the city of Decatur, Ill., or to the Decatur Housing Authority.

On August 31, 1957:
S. 268. An act to provide that the United States shall return to the former owners certain mineral interests in lands acquired for the Arkabutla, Sardis, Enid, and Grenada Reservoirs, Miss.;
S. 939. An act to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended;
S. 1290. An act for the relief of Lee-Ana Roberts;
S. 1293. An act for the relief of Eithaniahu (Eton) Yellin;
S. 1306. An act for the relief of Pao-Wei Yung;
S. 1307. An act for the relief of Toribia Basterrechea (Arrola);
S. 1421. An act for the relief of Ansis Luiz Darzins;
S. 1815. An act for the relief of Nicholas Dilles;
S. 1817. An act for the relief of John Panagiotou;
S. 1838. An act for the relief of Charles Douglas;
S. 1910. An act for the relief of Salvatore Salerno;
S. 1962. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey a certain tract of land owned by the United States to the Perkins Chapel Methodist Church, Bowie, Md.;
S. 2003. An act for the relief of Jozice Matana Koulis and Davorko Matana Koulis;
S. 2095. An act for the relief of Vaclav Uhlik, Marta Uhlik, Vaclav Uhlik, Jr., and Eva Uhlik; and
S. 2603. An act to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1896.

On September 2, 1957:
S. 524. An act for the relief of Robert F. Gross;
S. 1035. An act for the relief of Alice Eirl Schaer (Mi On Lee);
S. 1050. An act for the relief of Hrygory (Harry) Mydlak;
S. 1167. An act for the relief of John Nicholas Christodoulias;
S. 1335. An act for the relief of Sandra Ann Scott;
S. 1370. An act for the relief of Wanda Wawrzyczek;
S. 1482. An act to amend certain provisions of the Columbia Basin Project Act, and for other purposes;
S. 2063. An act for the relief of Guy H. Davant;
S. 2377. An act to amend chapter 223, title 18, United States Code, to provide for the production of statements and reports of witnesses;
S. 2438. An act to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act; and
S. 2500. An act to make uniform the termination date for the use of official franks by former Members of Congress, and for other purposes.

On September 4, 1957:
S. 281. An act for the relief of Jaffa Kam;
S. 684. An act for the relief of Ilse Striegan Bacon;
S. 807. An act for the relief of Jackson School Township, Indiana;
S. 880. An act for the relief of Necmettin Cengiz;
S. 882. An act for the relief of Pauline Ethel Angus;
S. 1049. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ahsapet Gamityan;
S. 1153. An act for the relief of Zdenka Sneler;
S. 1175. An act for the relief of Helene Cordery Hall;
S. 1241. An act for the relief of Edward Martin Hinsberger;
S. 1271. An act for the relief of Daniel Alcide Charlebois;

S. 1321. An act for the relief of Junko Matsuoka Eckrich;

S. 1456. An act for the relief of Refugio Guerrero-Monje;

S. 1467. An act for the relief of Itsumi Kasahara;

S. 1520. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of federally owned property at obsolescent canalized waterways, and for other purposes";

S. 1635. An act for the relief of Maria Talioura Boisot;

S. 1636. An act for the relief of Delfina Cinco de Lopez;

S. 1645. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant easements in certain lands to the city of Las Vegas, Nev., for road-widening purposes;

S. 1791. An act to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1959;

S. 1835. An act for the relief of Maria Domenica Ricci;

S. 1921. An act for the relief of Maria Goldet;

S. 1972. An act for the relief of Letizia Maria Arini;

S. 1996. An act to approve the contract negotiated with the Casper-Alcova irrigation district, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes;

S. 2028. An act for the relief of Sherwood Lloyd Pierce;

S. 2041. An act for the relief of Sala Weissbard;

S. 2204. An act for the relief of Margaret E. Culloty; and

S. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt.

On September 7, 1957:

S. 1007. An act for the relief of Sgt. Donald D. Coleman;

S. 2080. An act relating to the computation of income for the purpose of payment of death benefits to parents or pension for non-service-connected disability or death in certain cases;

S. 2229. An act to provide for Government guaranty of private loans to certain air carriers for purchase of modern aircraft and equipment, to foster the development and use of modern transport aircraft by such carriers, and for other purposes;

S. 2413. An act to clarify the authority of the President to fill the judgeship for the district of South Dakota authorized by the act of February 10, 1954, and to repeal the prohibition contained in such act against filling the next vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for such district; and

S. 2434. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide books for the adult blind."

On September 11, 1957:

S. 2792. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, AUGUST 30, 1957

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and ever-blessed God, we thank Thee for the high and holy privilege we have had during this session of the Congress of daily walking and working together in the service of our God, our country, and humanity.

We pray that, as we look back upon the yesterdays, may we feel that we have tried to blend our wills with Thine in the great task of establishing a nobler social order.

May we have joy of knowing that we have sought to affirm and champion courageously whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, and whatsoever things are of good report.

Grant that when the hour of adjournment comes and we leave this Chamber, may we commend and commit one another and all, who are near and dear unto us, to Thy love and care.

May the Lord bless us and keep us; may the Lord make His face to shine upon us and be gracious unto us; may the Lord lift upon us the light of His countenance and give us peace. Amen.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 218]

Alger	George	Morgan
Allen, Calif.	Gordon	Nicholson
Anfuso	Grant	Norblad
Barden	Green, Oreg.	Osmers
Beamer	Gregory	Pilcher
Belcher	Griffiths	Pillion
Bennett, Mich.	Gwinn	Powell
Bentley	Halleck	Preston
Berry	Harden	Rains
Blatnik	Harvey	Reece, Tenn.
Bolton	Hays, Ohio	Riehlman
Boykin	Hiestand	Rivers
Bray	Hill	Robsion, Ky.
Brooks, La.	Hillings	Roosevelt
Buckley	Hoffman	Sadlak
Cannon	Holifield	Scott, Pa.
Cederberg	Holt	Scrivner
Chiperfield	Holtzman	Sheehan
Clevenger	Horan	Sikes
Coad	Jackson	Siler
Coffin	Johnson	Simpson, Ill.
Cole	Kearney	Smith, Calif.
Coudert	Kilburn	Smith, Kans.
Cunningham, Iowa	Kirwan	Taylor
	Kluczynski	Teague, Calif.
Dawson, Ill.	Krueger	Thompson, N. J.
Dellay	Landrum	Udall
Dempsey	Lanham	Vinson
Denton	LeCompte	Vursell
Dies	Lesinski	Walter
Diggs	Lipscomb	Wharton
Dorn, N. Y.	Loser	Wier
Doyle	McConnell	Williams, N. Y.
Fascell	McDonough	Withrow
Flood	Mailliard	Young
Fogarty	Mason	Younger
Gavin	Miller, Calif.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 321 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills, a joint resolution, and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 230. An act to require the Secretary of the Army to convey to the county of Los Angeles, Calif., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain portions of a tract of land heretofore conditionally conveyed to such county;

H. R. 2654. An act for the relief of the Martin Wunderlich Co.

H. R. 3370. An act to amend section 1871 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the mileage and subsistence allowances of grand and petit jurors;

H. R. 7536. An act to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941;

H. R. 8508. An act to provide that there shall be two county committees elected under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for certain counties;

H. R. 8928. An act to amend the act of June 9, 1880, entitled "An act to grant to the corporate authorities of the city of Council Bluffs, in the State of Iowa, for public uses, a certain lake or bayou situated near said city";

H. R. 8994. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to increase the salaries of certain executives of the Atomic Energy Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9282. An act to provide additional office space in home districts of Congressmen, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners;

H. R. 9406. An act to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended, to provide that telephone and telegraph service furnished Members of the House of Representatives shall be computed on a biennial rather than an annual basis;

H. J. Res. 453. Joint resolution establishing that the 2d regular session of the 85th Congress convene at noon on Tuesday, January 7, 1958;

H. Con. Res. 176. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of certain material relating to the Central Valley project of California, and providing for additional copies; and

H. Con. Res. 188. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the document entitled "Congress and the Monopoly Problem: 56 Years of Antitrust Development, 1900–1956."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 77. An act to establish the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park and to provide for the administration and maintenance of a parkway, in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1049. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ahsapet Gamityan;

S. 1271. An act for the relief of Daniel Alcide Charlebois;

S. 1321. An act for the relief of Junko Matsuoka Eckrich;

S. 1972. An act for the relief of Letizia Maria Arini;

S. 1996. An act to approve the contract negotiated with the Casper-Alcova Irrigation District, to authorize its execution, to provide that the excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not apply to